

\*\*\*\*\*SPECIAL NOTICE\*\*\*\*\*

To take part in the VIRTUAL meeting call in by phone at either 669-900-6833 or 346-248-7799 starting at 7:15 pm. When directed, enter the meeting ID: 825-8974-8600 and Meeting Password: 827443

You will be placed in a Queue until admitted by the Host. You will then be placed on hold until the Meeting begins. When it is your turn to speak, the host will say the last four digits of your phone number and you will be permitted to speak at that time.

If you become disconnected, call back and enter the appropriate ID and PW numbers.

\*\*\*\*\*SPECIAL NOTICE\*\*\*\*\*

**JAMUL DULZURA  
FINAL MINUTES**

Approved: March 9, 2021

Tuesday FEBRUARY 23, 2021

\*\*\*\*\*VIRTUAL MEETING\*\*\*\*\*

CALL IN BEGINS AT 7:15 p.m.

**7:30 p.m.**

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Dan Neirinckx, called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Dan Neirinckx, Janet Mulder, Summer Piper, Preston Brown, Michael Casinelli, Streeter Parker, Ed Mollen, Kevin May

**Absent:** Steve Wragg

**Vacant Seats:** 5, 7, 9, 11,13,14 (11 – Eve Nasby who forgot to pull her election papers)

**Guests:** Amber Recklau, Kathleen Lippitt, Virginia Casey, Jenna Roady, Eve Nasby, Sean McClain, Rachel Vedder, Judy Strang, Liz Bystedt, Becky Rapp

3. **APPROVAL** of the Agenda for February 23, 2021 and Final Minutes for the Meeting of February 9, 2021. Motion made by **Preston Brown** to approve passed unanimously.

4. **OPEN FORUM**

a. **Ed Mollon** checked into the Parking lot near Millar Ranch Road off of SR94, and asked what was happening there as he has seen cars parked there and often not properly parked. **Dan Neirinckx** spoke to **Jill Terp** and she said that Fish and Game is not going to open it due to Covid 19 restrictions. and there is a “signage issue” they have to get resolved. USFW also has to meet with the public before-hand. **Ed Mollon** suggested that people are using it and it could be dangerous. **Summer Piper** stated that she had not seen many cars parked there and did not feel it was a problem since most of the people parked there were hiking nearby.

b. **Michael Casinelli** asked about the the long talked about effort to get a safe trail for students walking and jogging along SR-94 between Steele Canyon High School and Rancho San Diego. No one has any information on this.

c. **Eve Nasby** asked if anybody knew if there was a “GoFundMe” for the people who lost their home in the Lawson Valley Fire? No one answered. **Preston Brown** asked the name of the Family. **Eve Nasby** did not know. NOTE: If anyone knows the name of the Family please let our group know.

5. **County Guidelines for Hydrology and Water Quality Dan introduced Jenna Roady and Sean McCean from the County. Jenna Roady** presented “Guidelines for Determining Significant Hydrology and Water Quality. The County has guidelines for determining significance which include 23 different documents and CEQA analysis. The project timeline is being given minor guideline changes including ones to reduce the timing and cost of a CEQA hearing. They are suggesting two options: Water Quality Option 2 (using BMP design manual tools) and Hydrology Option 2 which would require a CEQA level analysis which would codify the hydrology option into the design. A Conditional Letter of Map Revision would be a condition of approval for final map approval. **Janet Mulder** asked if any of the regulations referred to ground water. **Sean McCean** said they are looking at the three components “Pollutant Controls, Erosion and Flood Control and Infiltration”. Infiltration is not considered in two areas, but potentially the water quality component is limited and regulated by basic standards. They cannot infiltrate within 100 feet of a well, nor 10 feet above the ground and nit within 50 feet from the septic area. The guidelines are not impacting groundwater. **Dan Neirinckx** asked if the County is using temporary water basins in construction. They answered yes that “in some cases infiltration is encouraged with the use of retention basins during and after construction”. Infiltration is not considered in two areas, but potentially the water quality component is limited, they cannot infiltrate within 100 feet of well, plus several other restrictions to limit infiltration. The guidelines are not impacting groundwater. **Michael Casinelli** asked about the CEQA requirement that will be delayed until the end of the process. He questioned the advantage for the delay. **Sean McCean** said that a full hydrologic study is not necessary as the information is required later. In some cases a developer will only want to do a CEQA study after a fast schedule analysis is completed and then the project is put for sale. **Preston Brown** said he understood that they were not trying to change the process, but asked if they had a strike-out, underlined version that we could see which would show us the proposed changes and what they are changing. **Jenna Roady** said that they did not as there were many areas that they totally reformatted and she could make that available. **Preston Brown** said he would like that and asked if there were other examples of where they do not feel a full hydrologic study would be necessary. **Sean McCean** said they worked to make sure that the BMPs would take care of the information about your site and make a conservative estimate thereby allowing the builder to overestimate the size of the water quality BMP. **Preston Brown** asked if we could receive the summary referred to by **Jenna Roady** and she will provide the summary to us and contract **Steve Wragg** regarding his concerns. We will wait until the next meeting and receive the materials before we vote.

6. **County General Plan changes: 1. Safety Element, 2. Environmental Justice Element.**

**Preston Brown** reported that the sub-committee met and they are looking at two documents that deal with the Evacuation Routes in Jamul. He said that Jamul and Valley Center were the only planning areas that the County paid for Independent Studies of Evacuation Routes back in 2011. He will contact their Planning Group to learn how they used this information. The BOS will have a workshop on April 7 regarding the Safety Elements Update. He would like to have a recommendation or proposal from our group that will seek a commitment

from the County to continue the work of creating a comprehensive CEP, a “specific area” Community Evacuation Plan for Jamul Dulzura regarding safety and evacuation routes.

**7. Board of Supervisors Proposed Needle exchange program – Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that we received a letter from Supervisor Anderson asking for our opinion on this question that came before the BOS. **Summer Piper** said she was not a huge proponent of this program, and feels that some studies have shown that this type of program was not too successful and rather their studies were not comparative and could possibly produce more needles in waste. **Michael Casinelli** read the studies and felt that they had good sample studies and it changed his mind and made him aware that people that participate in a needle exchange are 5 times more likely to go into rehabilitation rather than others. **Preston Brown** said that people coming to pick up needles puts the user in contact with people who might be able to help them. **Janet Mulder** suggested that we should not encourage needle exchange in the rural areas like Jamul Dulzura as it would seem to be more necessary in the more populated areas where the need is greater. **Ed Mollon** has a concern is that it only makes sense if it is in conjunction with a County Health Facility and he feels it doesn't make sense to have such an office in Jamul as there is not a large enough need. **Kevin May** disagrees with what the Board of Supervisors is doing when they are making a decision for the County. He is in favor of the needle exchange program but feels it should be located only where there is a problem, and he doesn't see it happening in Jamul. **Dan Neirinckx** stated to put out a needle exchange program in a rural area is putting it in the wrong spot. If the problem doesn't exist in an area and a needle exchange program is established, it would tend to draw people who have the problem to that area. **Rachel Vedder** questions whether there is enough volume to require such a facility in Jamul. She is not against the concept, but feels that it is unlikely that people who are from out of the area would drive all the way out here. **Kelly McCormick** joined the meeting at this point. **Eve Nasby** stated that she had also read the study and that it also stated that the Orange County had to do a cleanup effort after they established such a needle exchange. It is needed but not here. **Summer Piper** read the studies and felt that the problem was with the questions were asked, and wasn't sure if the answers were accurate. **Liz Bystedt, Superintendent of Jamul Dulzura Schools**, stated that she has not read all of the reports but her concern is where it would be located as the schools are close to downtown and a facility of this sort should be connected to a health office and not advertised. **Kathleen Lippitt** Public health practitioner wanted to comment on the County's program which overlooked the early intervention program which prevents drug addiction rather than limiting police enforcement and pointed out that Supervisor Fletcher said it was a prevention program, which it is not as it does not prevent use. The needle exchange program is addictive, allowing people to continue with their drug of choice. She hopes the County will work towards a robust prevention program which is not a needle exchange. **Dan Neirinckx** said he would send him a copy of the minutes. **Janet Mulder** pointed out that Supervisor Fletcher does not have **any** of the unincorporated County in his District, and yet he is advocating that the Intervention Program be put in the unincorporated parts of San Diego County. **Michael Casinelli** stated that he did not feel that this would be a problem. **Summer Piper** said she felt there could be a problem if it is located in the back county. **Janet Mulder moved that while we were divided on whether or not a needle exchange program was necessary, our JDCPG makes the statement that we do not feel that there is a verifiable need for such a program in our Jamul Dulzura rural area. Motion did not pass, 7, Yes:1, No Voting in favor: Neirinckx, Mulder, Casinelli, Brown, Mollon, Parker, May: Voting no: Piper.**

**8. Board of Supervisors Proposed County Cannabis Zoning Changes.** **Preston Brown** asked if anyone had seen the article in the newspaper that the Planning Commission in Oceanside has approved a dispensary in an agricultural cannabis facility. This may become the trend as

agriculture zoned areas are designated as possible locations for dispensaries. Farmers in our area might want to take advantage of this. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that any regulations would be at a recreational level as a medical level would be covered by State law which limits our local control to recreational use not medical use. **Dan Neirinckx** suggested we could recommend a greater distance from schools. **Michael Casinelli** is concerned about the possibility using the space that exists today in the new Storage unit if it is not fully utilized by people for storage, since it's zoned C 36 which allows for a variety of businesses, and because this location is too near to local schools. **Amber Recklau** agreed with Michael that the new building going up could be used and it was too close to schools. **Summer Piper** felt that they have not controlled the distribution yet and have problems with current program so why would we open up wider distribution until we control the existing program. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that the law says the community is allowed to vote on this issue and feels that would be a good idea to implement. **Ed Mollon** suggested that he is concerned that there is less resources to handle any problems and if they are putting it out here, they need to work on mitigation including time for police response and traffic as well as the impact on schools and churches. **Kevin May** asked if the storage unit is in industrial zone and **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that it is commercial. **Kevin May** said that we should propose that they only be allowed in industrial areas. However, it would allow people in our area to get their cannabis legally rather than illegally. **Janet Mulder** started with the question, "Why are they recommending these changes to the back-Country?" She continued stating, People don't want Cannabis sold in their communities as it draws a criminal element. There are lots of dispensaries in cities to get cannabis and it would only create traffic out here. Important to remember that we were told that Proposition 64 was "overwhelming supported" which isn't true... Only 57% of the votes supported it – hardly consider that overwhelming! Almost half of us voted "no"! The proposition did say that communities would be able to determine whether or not they wanted to allow it within their community, and not be mandated as a total County. In 2017, the BOS voted to prohibit permits for new medical facilities with a 2035 sunset clause. In Colorado, the Sheriff and DA both opposed the Proposition and it was proven that it did not eliminate the drug cartel and in fact, increased the number of cartels in Colorado after the law was implemented. **Janet's** suggestion was that we ask our Supervisor to support the existing ordinance (2017) realizing that cannabis is actually marijuana and it IS a Gateway drug giving greater accessibility to youth, the more on the market the greater exposure to kids! Evidence exists through the Sheriff that in the City of Chula Vista, on any given block there were more illegal shops than legal selling on the black market. the terrific problem that occurs when legal facilities are opened as the illegal facilities multiply even faster, compounding an already difficult problem by further exposing the youth of our unincorporated communities to a greater degree to marijuana. It is interesting to note that the two Supervisors promoting this proposal do **not** have unincorporated areas within their district so they do not have a handle on how much more inappropriate it is to allow these businesses to operate in the rural back county than within their cities. **Eve Nasby** said that the black market is a problem and studies show that we could endanger our population and our children and questioned why we would want to increase our crime as studies show this is what happens in communities that have these businesses. **Rachel Vedder** looked up articles and feels that they would need to mitigate traffic due to the probable increase and would suggest the facilities be only placed in industrial areas. **Dan Neirinckxx** pointed out that he questions that the 1000 feet from schools would not be a great enough distance. **Judi Strang** shared her experience working with this issue for the last 8 years, and was surprised that Supervisor Fletcher who has no unincorporated area in his district proposed this. She questions the process and why they need to have the program set up at such speed. **Liz Bystedt** told us she was concerned about the traffic on SR94 which is already dangerous for her school buses, in addition to the

problems it could impose on her students. **Kathleen Lippitt** pointed out that the resolution that was passed would allow communities to vote as to whether they want to have the facilities or not and asked why we were not being given that option. She points out that the drug dealers target the areas and the growers have taken the groundwater that hurt an area. Traffic on one-lane roads while under the influence of marijuana is also a problem. **Virginia Casey** has been working with the cannabis community and is representing the Cannabis Coalition and would invite people to contact her for more information. She would seriously question that any licensed retailer would come into this district. She would invite us to come to one of the Coalition meetings to see what it was about and to understand the importance of having a safe place for people to get their cannabis. **Preston Brown** asked for the url of the Coalition. This URL <<https://www.facebook.com/pavinggreatfutures>> will take one to their website. **Summer** asked about water usage and **Virginia Casey** said it takes 1 gallon a day for 1 plant. **Kelly McCormick**, who is the parent of a couple of teenagers pointed out that in the County currently there is a ban against the cultivation of marijuana and there is no enforcement of the sale of marijuana. She is also concerned about the smell from the cultivation and extensive water use of the plants. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that the golf courses had a regulation that after the water level dropped beyond a certain mark, they needed to stop using the groundwater, and he would like to see the same regulation happen here. He suggested a motion that would show us in opposition to Cannabis stores in our area, as they would need much of the same enforcement that liquor stores and other facilities. Traffic, water use, and nearness to schools all need to be included according to **Michael Casinelli**. **Preston Brown** looked up on the Internet and found that cannabis uses twice the amount of water that grapes do. **Virginia Casey** pointed out that BOS would be discussing this next week. **Janet Mulder** suggested that Proposition 64 says that a vote of the residents would be taken to determine whether or not a community would have cannabis stores. **Streeter Parker** asked if there is any other business is required by state law to have security, as by definition this means that the facility is high risk. **Discussion continued until next meeting.**

**9. JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS:**

**a. Dan announced that our new JDCPG members approval should be occurring on March 2 BOS meeting and then they would take their position to be voting members at the March 9 meeting!**

**10. Adjournment: Dan Neirinckx, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.**

**NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:**

**7:30 P.M. TUESDAY March 9, 2021**

**SITE: Virtual Meeting format until public/in-person meetings permitted.**

**Meeting minutes and agendas can be accessed at**

**<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/CommunityGroups.html>**

**NOTICE OF SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING:**

**GENERAL PLAN: SAFETY ELEMENT AND**

**ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ELEMENT**

**6:30 P.M. TUESDAY FEBRUARY 23, 2021**

**VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT, SIGNIN/JOIN INFORMATION SAME AS REGULAR MEETING**

**CALLIN BEGINS AT 6:20 PM**

## PUBLIC NOTICE

We strive to protect personally identifiable information by collecting only information necessary to deliver our services. All information that may be collected becomes public record that may be subject to inspection and copying by the public, unless an exemption in law exists. In the event of a conflict between this Public Notice and any County ordinance or other law governing the County's disclosure of records, the County ordinance or other applicable law will control.

### Access and Correction of Personal Information

You can review any personal information collected about you. You may recommend changes to your personal information you believe is in error by submitting a written request that credibly shows the error. If you believe that your personal information is being used for a purpose other than what was intended when submitted, you may contact us. In all cases, we will take reasonable steps to verify your identity before granting access or making corrections.

## **JAMUL/DULZURA COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**

### **MISSION STATEMENT:**

*The mission of the Jamul-Dulzura Community Planning Group is to represent the best interests of the communities of Jamul and Dulzura while adhering to County of San Diego, California Board of Supervisors Policy I-1.*

### **PURPOSE STATEMENT:**

*The purpose of the Jamul-Dulzura Community Planning Group is:*

*To provide a public forum where local citizens can learn about issues of importance to them and their community and provide input.*

*To carefully consider all input when advising the county on such issues as planning, land use, discretionary projects, and community and sub-regional plans.*

**APPROVED 5/12/2020**