

*****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: 869-0213-0606 and Meeting Password: 286896

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.

To join the meeting via the web use the following link:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86902130606?pwd=bWRHQW8wR0NsK0lwOUFNdGU2WUpxQT09>

*****SPECIAL NOTICE*****

**JAMUL DULZURA
COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP
FINAL MINUTES
Tuesday August 10, 2021**

APPROVED SEPTEMBER 14, 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 7:38 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

Present: Dan Neirinckx, Janet Mulder, Eve Nasby, Kevin May, Michael Casinelli, Paul Romero, Rachel Vedder, Streeter Parker, Ed Mollon, Steve Wragg

Excused: Amber Swanson-Recklau, Summer Piper, Preston Brown

Absent:

Guests: Kathleen Lippett, Cherry Diefenbach, Peggy Walker, Paul Domkowski, Christina Martinez,

3. **APPROVAL** of the Agenda for August 10, 2021, and Final Minutes for July 27, 2021. Motion to approve made by Michael Casinelli. Motion carried unanimously.

4. **OPEN FORUM:**

a. Eve Nasby pointed out that there was a great article in The Shopper about the activities of our Planning Group and inviting people to our meetings, as well as encouraging any interested Jamul or Dulzura resident to apply to serve on Group. Please

note that our meeting dates are the second and fourth Tuesdays of the month. Thanks to Eve for submitting the article.

- b. **Michael Casinelli** pointed out that our next meeting is scheduled for September 14, which is election day and wanted to be sure that the Oak Grove Library (where we would meet) is not designated as a polling place. **Kevin May** looked it up and the Jamul polling place is at Jamul Intermediate School, not Oak Grove Middle School.
 - c. **Kathleen Lippett** presented significant take-aways from the August 6 Planning Commission hearing regarding cannabis changes. All 7 amendments came from the industry consultants for the 5 existing marijuana retailers with CUP's that would otherwise expire in 2022, not from any of the 27 County's Community Planning or Sponsor Groups. Past policies prioritized the health and safety of young people and what was beneficial to county residents. It now seems there is a for-profit private MJ industry calling the shots. She further pointed out the following from the PC meeting: a) A serious concern was regarding the industry request not to be limited to metropolitan water and restricted from using groundwater. They also noted that with an administrative process the County will not have the ability to monitor or RESTRICT the use of groundwater should the Board allow MJ businesses to use groundwater. b) Consultants asked for CEQA exemptions 15301 and 1530 which together would allow expanding up to 35k sq ft MJ consultants also asked for CEQA exemption 15304 which is for minor alterations on land; grading with less than 10% slope, bicycle lanes, minor trenching, backfill, brush clearing, c) Commission Barnhart moved not to grant premise expansion amendment under an Administerial permit because it was an unfair advantage over other businesses. He told them If they want to expand, they should get in line like everyone else. d) She pointed out that Janet spoke at the meeting pointing out that the new sensitive use setbacks puts the closer to schools which is undesirable, and reminding the Commissioners that Proposition 64 section 2 paragraph E allows local governments... to ban marijuana businesses by a vote of the people within a locality. e) Therefore, a cost-benefit analysis on behalf of the residents of the unincorporated areas who should be the Board of Supervisor's concern as well as the Planning Commission's concern, not the 5 MJ businesses.
 - d. **Peggy Walker** pointed out that the six amendments proposed by County Staff to the Cannabis Proposal were all approved but the one dealing with expansion. She urged us to all speak out at the BOS meetings on August 16 and 17 so they will know the concerns of our community. The only amendment not granted was the 10,000 ft expansion to be allowed, but when it comes before the BOS it might pass. The AAA just put out a report that there were lots of problems and increases in accidents due to the use of marijuana. It will be important to have our Jamul Dulzura Community's voices heard at the meeting.
 - e. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that the Planning Commission voted to approve opening up the five current marijuana retailers to recreational use and changes the conditions upon which they can be approved. It is setting a precedent, one which he cautions could lead to problems in the future.
5. **ROAD GUARDRAIL IMPROVEMENTS:** Rachel Vedder thanked Kevin May and Eve Nasby for their help on this subject. **Rachel Vedder moved that our JDCPG recommend the following: After reviewing the county's current plans for the upcoming project to repair, replace and install guardrails, we move to request that the county add four more guardrail locations and address a high area of concern in regards to traffic accidents. The requested guardrail locations are: 1) Lyons Valley Road just past the**

home at 14976 when traveling to the west/south. This is a very sharp and sudden turn with an eroded shoulder. Please see the attached picture (guard rail 1) with the area of concern highlighted. (This location may be one of the areas that we have already been notified of the county intending to place a guardrail at. However, it is difficult to determine if the locations match exactly. As such, we are including it.) 2) The second location where a guardrail is requested is just past 15109 Lyons Valley Road. There is a guardrail already in place that ends just before this location. The shoulder is eroded here and this area of the road is alongside a ravine. Please see the attached picture (guardrail 2) with the location highlighted. This location may be one of the areas that we have already been notified of the county intending to place a guardrail at. However, it is difficult to determine if the locations match exactly. As such, we are including it. 3) The third location where a guard rail is requested is at 13962 Proctor Valley Road. There is a 90-degree turn at the location and a vehicle recently went through a homeowners fence when they failed to navigate the turn. Please see the attached picture (guardrail 3). 4) The fourth guardrail location is on Lyons Valley Road just past the Real Estate Results office. Please see the attachment (guardrail real estate) with the location highlighted. There have been multiple deaths and several accidents at this site. JDPG member Michael Casinelli has been communicating with SD County representatives Sam Coohi, James Bolz, and Keith Kezer regarding this location. 5) A guardrail removal is also requested at mile marker one at Montiel Truck Trail that was damaged in the Valley Fire. Reportedly, the DPW maintenance supervisor Mike Anderson noted that this guardrail is unnecessary and can be removed. Please see the attachment (guardrail removal). 6) In addition, we request that the intersection of Lyons Valley Road and Jefferson Road is reviewed for safety improvements due to poor visibility in this area and poor conditions in inclement weather. The last fatality at this intersection was Aug 2, 2020. Please see attachment Jefferson Rd. 7) Finally, although this is not a guardrail issue, many people noted concerns regarding the Campo Road 7-11's ingress/egress for SR-94 access. Illegal left/east turns onto Campo Road have caused many accidents over the years, with many of them being at high speed. Jamul citizens are hopeful that County Traffic Engineers may be able to install a safety measure such as 40" tall plastic posts along the double yellow for lines for a distance that would inhibit left/east turns from the 7-11. Please see the attachment labeled 7-11. The Motion carried unanimously and Dan Neirinckx thanked Rachel Vedder for her work on this project.

Michael Casinelli asked us to pass on the information to Caltrans regarding the community concerns listed as number 7 above, dealing with the Steele Canyon/SR-94 left turn problem to see if they could weigh in on ways to avoid accidents. Dan Neirinckx will contact Caltrans and ask for help on this issue.

6. **JACUMBA HOT SPRINGS CSG REQUEST:** Cherry Diefenbach spoke on behalf of the community of Jacumba and presented information about a huge 600-acre solar farm has been proposed right next to their small town which they feel would ruin their chances of attracting visitors. As laid out in the MUP, it would consume all of the best flat land within their rural village boundary, the area where the town could and should expand. Half of the JVR solar project area is in a flood plain. Therefore the electrical components would have to be raised as much as five feet above ground to avoid water damage, and this would add to the visual blight. The developer, Bay Ware, has already signed a 20-year power purchase agreement with the San Diego Community Power, a community choice aggregate (CCA). The Jacumba residents are asking for the support of other planning groups as we are all neighbors as it is incredible to them that County Staff seems to dismiss their comments. PDS staff says this is an interim 35-year plan because it has a decommissioning in 2058.

There are proposals for Solar farms and other renewable energy projects in other rural areas like Boulevard. It could possibly happen in Jamul. **Cherry Diefenbach** told us they are attempting to get the proposed 600-acre JVR solar project reduced in size and moved north, away from residences, scenic Hwy 80 and the Jacumba Airport runway. The community developed alternative plan is known as “Equity for Jacumba Alternative”. It features a 300-acre footprint instead of the 600-acre one being proposed

Steve Wragg’s company is not involved in this project, so he has no issues speaking on it. He feels it is dangerous for our Planning Group to take a position on something we have not reviewed and suggests we should not respond as a Group to this request. **Ed Mollon** asked what the alternative project was as he is concerned with the sheer size of the proposed project. **Michael Casinelli** asked if there is an EIR on this and **Cherry Diefenbach** said yes and they have support in it. **Michael Casinelli** asked if the land has been previously used as agricultural land. **Cherry Diefenbach** said although it is not being used today, it has been used for agriculture for at least 65 years. The last time it was under cultivation was 2012. **Michael Casinelli** partially agreed with **Steve Wragg’s** reticence to back the Jacumba Sponsor Group without hearing both sides, but feels that this project could be devastating for this community. He said that if they were to do a 300-acre, would the town then want a sunset clause and **Cherry Diefenbach** pointed out that it is the size and placement of the project to which they are objecting to, not the length of time. **Michael Casinelli** said that in the WindFarms Project in Boulevard the people’s concerns were well documented and the Planning Commission did not agree. **Cherry Diefenbach** said that when this one came before the Planning Commission two of the Commissioners did not agree with the majority and she is hoping that our Planning Group will echo their concerns. **Eve Nasby** thanked **Cherry Diefenbach** for her passion and stated that she would support a letter supporting our neighbors’ concerns. **Paul Romero** said that more information would help us. He asked if they have to have an agreement with Fish and Wildlife. **Cherry Diefenbach** said that CA Fish and Wildlife Agency made comments and that the developer has creatively tried to mitigate the wildlife in the Final EIR. She also provided information about the “heat island effect” associated with large solar facilities. Although there are limited studies, hundreds of acres of superheated solar panels could raise ambient temperatures in the vicinity as much as 15 degrees. Jacumba has recently had 110-degree F temperatures, and residents are concerned about extra heat. **Janet Mulder** suggested that we could support Jacumba Community Sponsor Group’s concerns and ask that a thorough study be done evaluating the two plans. **Kevin May** asked if there is a timeline. **Cherry** said they asked for more time, but that the JVR solar project will come before the **BOS on August 18**. They are trying to get all of their information together and would appreciate our support to add to the list of local Community Planning Groups echoing their concerns. **Michael Casinelli** asked how did the draft EIR gloss over community impact? **Cherry Diefenbach** said that they could not mitigate the visual and community character so “A Statement of Overriding Considerations” is part of the project documents. According to **Cherry**, this document basically states the needs for green energy within the county outweighs any significant impacts to Jacumba, and also that this solar project would “Put San Diego on the map as a producer of alternative energy!” **Ed Mollen** suggested we endorse the right of the Jacumba Planning Committee to be heard and supported by their community. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that the Board of Supervisors seems to base some of their decisions via equity of publicity. **Rachel Vedder** said that she thanked **Cherry** for coming and would like to see our Planning Group support their efforts to keep their community in tack.

Michael Casinelli moved that the Jamul Dulzura Community Planning Group send a letter to the Board Of Supervisors in support of the rights of

the Community Planning and Sponsor Groups to be heard and to have the alternative proposal seriously considered as presented by the Jacumba Hot Springs Community Sponsor Group, as that would ensure that the process was being equitable to all parties.

Steve Wragg asked how many meetings were held and was any compromise proposed by the developer? He cautioned, that we need to hear both sides before the JDCPG makes a decision as to the merits of either side. Since this did not occur, he would want to recuse himself from voting on this motion and will abstain when called for the vote.

The vote on Michael Casinelli's motion (see above) 8 yes; 1 no (Streeter Parker); 1 abstained (Steve Wragg) Motion carried.

- 7. SANDAG DRAFT 2021 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE:** **Dan Neirinckx** reviewed his comments from the last meeting including the problems and challenges including 25,000 people were killed nation-wide and he suggested that there were better statistics they could use. The Plan promotes growth and development in the developed areas rather than the rural areas, and looks at reducing pollution and improving public transportation. 163 billion dollars is to be gleaned from ADT, paying for commuter lanes and using more taxis and ride sharing. **Kevin May** feels that much of this plan does not apply to the rural areas, but did note that their plans to increase transportation in the rural area will help improve the safety element. They are trying to get people to change their methods of transportation, but if successful, would lose some in the user fees. **Michael Casinelli** commented on the high funding proposal depending on the ADT that would reflect on the back country folks as they are the ones who have to travel the farthest. The funding question is one that is a concern, but **Dan Neirinckx** said they are looking for State and Federal funds to add to the increased local taxes and fees. The EIR is not out yet, and he would suggest waiting until it comes out to make our comments. **Cherry Diefenbach** had also reviewed the plan and pointed out they identified funding at only \$90 billion but the cost is \$163 billion to pay. They are projecting a 4-Billion deficit and then it becomes a huge wish list.

8. JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS :

a. Preston Brown reported to **Janet Mulder** that **Amber Swanson-Recklau** called and informed us that her husband was killed in an accident this week. We sent sympathy flowers to her home and all received a thank you note from her in which she told us, "I'll be seeing you soon." We send our condolences and hope she will let us know if there is anything we can do to help her and/or her family.

b. Dan Neirinckx announced that there will probably **not** be a meeting until next month because as of now, we have very little for the Agenda. He will send out a notice next week with the date of the next meeting which may be held as late as September 14 (the second Tuesday in September).

- 9. Adjournment: Chair Dan Neirinckx adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted:

Janet Mulder, Secretary

NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

7:30 P.M. TUESDAY AUGUST 24, 2021

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

Meeting minutes and agendas can be accessed at

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

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