

*****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
FINAL MINUTES**

Tuesday September 14, 2021

APPROVED SEPTEMBER 28, 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 7:31 p.m.

2. **ROLL CALL:**

PRESENT: Dan Neirinckx, Janet Mulder, Summer Piper, Kevin May, Streeter Parker, Ed Mollen, Steve Wragg, Preston Brown, Eve Nasby, Paul Romero,

EXCUSED: Amber Swanson-Recklau, Michael Casinelli, Rachel Vedder

ABSENT:

VACANT SEATS: 7 and 14.

GUESTS: Carol Green, Erica Pinto, Kathleen Lippitt, Carol Green, Madai Parra, Naomi Willis, Judi Strang, Kerry Patterson

3. **APPROVAL** of the Agenda for September 14, 2021, and Final Minutes for August 10, 2021. **Motion to approve made by Kevin May. Vote unanimously approved.**

4. **OPEN FORUM :**

- a. **Carol Green** wanted to thank everyone on our Planning Group for making sure we knew that she publicly wanted to state that she appreciated us always listening to her comments. She realizes we are all volunteers and wanted us to know of her appreciation.
 - b. **Judi Strang** pointed out that the Board of Supervisors is taking input to include Open Transparency and there is a survey that is online and encourages us to take part in it.
5. **MULTI USE PATHWAY ALONG SR -94 – Dan Neirinckxx asked staff members to brief us on this plan. Madai Parra and Naomi Willis, representing SANDAG,** shared their information on the computer. This is an overview on the feasibility study. The slides showed the Study Route which is about 7 miles from Jamacha Road and Campo along SR 94. This multi-use path would be a shared use path that is paved and separated from motor vehicle traffic and would be used by people biking, walking and on wheels. The main purpose is to make it safer for people who want to walk SR 94, but can't do it safely today. Their goals are: Looking for the most feasible path alignment, identifying key cross section features, path amenities and encouraging the cooperation of all. The Study started in Spring 2020 and has been going through concept development and analysis, public outreach, presenting to stakeholders. The multi-use path would fill a gap in the regional bike network, thus increasing access and mobility options to key community designations for the Rancho San Diego and Jamul-Dulzura communities. It will create a safer corridor for all roadway users including people biking, walking and driving. She presented an alignment alternative analysis overview. They propose dividing it into 3 potential segments. They analyzed whether the north or the south would be the better path at each area. Potential trail users include walkers, bikers, skaters, equestrians, students, commuters, and recreational users. In the Alignment Analysis Overview, seven categories were reviewed. They proposed a preferred alignment, that would meet project goals while minimizing cost and impacts. They recommend that Segment 1 would be from the YMCA to Steele Canyon Road on the South side, Segment 2 Steele Canyon Road to Lyons Valley Road on South side, Segment 3 Lyons Valley Road to CDFW on North side to make it safe. The cross section shows a hard surface multi-use trail only. The project team developed preliminary concepts for key locations and the project is mostly located within Caltran' right-of-way. It would include parking spaces at the trail head at the **Steel Canyon Bridge**. The next slide showed a concept drawing of segment 2 which allows the crossing from the south to the north side of SR-94. Segment 3 was team designed and determined that the north side would be used. However there are property right of way concerns. Project Amenities that have been proposed include lighting, trees, benches, trash receptacles, doggy bags, water fountains, restrooms, parking, bike parking wayfinding and public art opportunities. The Construction Cost is a high-level cost as estimates were developed for each segment. The chart is preliminary for this study which has a high-level construction cost per half mile. There were two phases of community outreach that were completed as part of the project. Phase 1 had over 350 participants and phase II had over 220 participants. Most survey respondents considered themselves a parent, resident, an/or commuter. Over 75% of survey respondents travel along the corridor daily. Next steps include funding possibilities, preliminary engineering, environmental clearance, design and permitting, r/w acquisition and encroachment, utility coordination, construction, maintenance, all before community use! Funding opportunities include Caltrans State Highway Operation and Protection Program, State Transportation Improvement Program, plus private and discretionary funding. **Janet Mulder** asked that they send the slide presentation to her. **Paul Romero** thanked them for the information and asked if they had considered a bridge across SR94 rather than walking across the highway. **Madai Parra** said they did not consider a steel ridge, however they are looking at a possible alternative of going under SR 94 at that bridge. **Summer Piper** asked why we were spending so much time on a walkway rather than increasing the number of lanes of SR 94, and where would

the pedestrians be coming from as we don't have pedestrians on SR-94 at this point. **Madai Parra** pointed out that there are people walking along the shoulder today and the goal would be to encourage more users to travel in a safe manner. **Summer Piper** asked if there was any consideration given to adding another lane to SR94 – **Madai Parra** said no they were looking at safer walking. **Summer Piper** asked why there was no other study done to increase the number of lanes so necessary for safe evacuation rather than this plan? **Naomi Willis** pointed out that the path is roughly 10 foot wide and emergency vehicles could travel on it. **Summer Piper** suggested strongly that until the fire department or sheriff signed off on this as a possible evacuation route that they should not be promoting it as such. **Kevin May** thanked them for all of their work, but pointed out that we had suggested an increase on the size of SR94 to four lanes, rather than a walking path should be the priority. **Eve Nasby** thanked them for all of their work, but was concerned that the segment at Steele Canyon High needs to be worked on first. **Madai Parra** said that they realize this has the highest priority as it does include the Steele Canyon High School students. However there are “avid riders” that are trying to use SR 94 for recreational activities and need to be safe. **Ed Mollon** also thanked the County for putting it together, but feels that it is in the wrong order, as it seems to be based on the existing roadway and all of it would need to be redone if SR 94 is expanded. He suggested that the priorities should be to increase the lanes for vehicular traffic before pedestrian traffic. **Madal Parra** pointed out that they were working with a grant and while she understands what the community would see the most value in is extra lanes. **Ed Mollon** suggested we needed to look at the needs of the community. **Steve Wragg** asked if this was an action item or an informational item. He asked where were we in the timeline today? Where do we go from here? **Madai Parra** said this was a final report showing what they had done and could serve as a blueprint for an agency or organization. They have prioritized Segment number 1 as the top priority. **Steve Wragg** pointed out that there is an existing pathway and if they followed the current dg walk from the YMCA to Steele Canyon High and to forget the parking lot as there is one across the street that is not utilized heavily. Segment 2 would be a huge cost and Segment 3 would have right of way costs way above their estimates. He would suggest that they come back and let us take another look. **Preston Brown** suggested that this is really a beginning stage rather than an ending stage and this should be given more time with more involvement from the Planning Group and community. **Janet Mulder** suggested that while we appreciate your work on this, the problem is that we feel that increasing the number of lanes on SR-94 should be a priority due to safety concerns, and a walking path should not be considered first. **Madal Paarra** thanked the Planning Group and said they would return again to give us more input at a later date.

- 6. SHELTER AND HOUSING FACILITIES ZONING CHANGES.** **Dan Neirinckx** read the following: The Zoning Ordinance amendments being considered exempt County-owned, operated, leased, or funded Emergency Shelters, Transitional, and Supportive Housing from Zoning Ordinance provisions. The project would also expand the use classification of “Emergency Shelter” to include (1) safe parking facilities that are not a Recreational Vehicle (RV) park or mobile home park, (2) safe storage facilities, (3) safe camping facilities receiving direct financial assistance from the County of San Diego, and (4) day shelter facilities. This item is related to Zoning Ordinance amendments. No physical development or construction of emergency shelters, transitional housing, supportive housing, or permanent supportive housing is proposed as part of this item.

On April 6, 2021, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to continue with the amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, and suspend current efforts previously directed by the Board of May 19, 2020, that authorized the development of ordinance intended to minimize the impacts associated with homelessness on park and recreation users and facilities.

Dan Neirinckx pointed out that today, most of the parks in the County deny overnight shelter use. His concern is that the homeless use of public parks is unacceptable, unless it has a definite time limit. **Janet Mulder** suggested that this is another case in which the current BOS is over-ruling the decisions of the previous BOS which was considerably more conservative. **Summer Piper** asked why the homeless should be exempt from safety features that other members of the community are required to use? **Kevin May** said that page 5 states that there is a community review process set up, but there is no time limit nor any vehicle for setting it up. **Ed Mollon** asked why the County is not working on treatment and help rather than just putting up a tent or increasing capacity for homeless. **Steve Wragg** suggested that there needs to be public review for use of our parks and recreation areas as “temporary” residences. What is the enforcement process? **Kathleen Lippitt** pointed out that the County’s refusal to look at the proposal is troubling. **Preston Brown** asked what was the timing for our comments? **Dan Neirinckx** said it was going to the Planning Commission this week, and we probably need to voice our concerns tonight. **Preston Brown** suggested it needed to be further defined. After further discussion, the following motion was made to represent our Group’s stand:

Preston Brown moved: “While our JDCPG recognizes that homelessness is indeed a problem, we strongly oppose suspending efforts to minimize the impacts on parks and recreational users and facilities associated with homelessness. It is inadvisable to make a zoning exemption without any time parameters, as these zoning exemptions should have a definite time limitation. In addition, some process needs to be established that elicits continual public evaluation and comment from the communities directly impacted, and further, any zoning exemption needs to be limited in scope as to when an exemption can be used. As a final note, we find the language needs to be more clearly defined as it seems disturbingly vague.” Motion passed unanimously.

- 7. CANNABIS ZONING ORDINANCE, PROPOSED CHANGES: Dan Neirinckx sent out a list of Webinars to be held, suggesting we needed to watch one of them. Dan** went over all of the recommendations agreed to by the Planning Commission and pointed out that #3 and 4 were not recommended by them. He asked if we could agree with recommendations 1 & 2. **Eve Nasby** reminded us that we have had many comments from people suggesting that the use of cannabis should not be extended as number 1 sets up allowing the five existing dispensaries to continue to operate past the “sunset” date after April 14, 2022. **Preston Brown** reminded us that there are none of these dispensaries within our community and that Ramona who has three in their community, is in favor of this proposal. **Kathleen Lippitt** reminded us that this would set a precedent for all future cannabis ordinances. **Judi Strang** is concerned that they can add 10,000 square feet remembering that there are some that are over 6000 sq ft now and that would set a precedent creating a very large facility. **Dan Neirinckx** pointed out that recommendation number 5 is allowed in most other businesses. **Eve Nasby** disagreed and feels that each one needs to be qualified as should have to go through the same rigorous requirements that the original one did. **Paul Romero** agreed with Dan on number 5 but feels that there seems to be too much leeway given. **Kevin May** asked if the certificate goes with the business in other businesses like liquor stores. **Paul Romero** said it depends on what the conditions are going to be and set the limits at a later date. **Kevin May** suggested that transferring the use license is a concern. **Preston Brown** asked if **Paul Romero** was familiar with the El Cajon location. **Steve Wragg** said it was near Gillespie Field but, he thinks it is within the County jurisdiction.. **Judi Strang** pointed out that the five pot shops were allowed five years ago, and the one in El Cajon is about 8000 feet and if allowed to increase in size to the proposed 10,000 feet, it would be a dramatic

difference. **Dan Neirinckx continued this item until the next meeting.** **Preston Brown** suggested that he would contact Ramona Planning Group and asked **Paul Romero** to also check with the other groups. **Kevin May** asked that their recommendation be broken down into the six areas listed so we could discuss them separately when they present them to us at the next meeting.

AT THIS POINT IN THE MEETING, CHAIR DAN NEIRINCKX POINTED OUT THAT WE NEEDED TO END OUR MEETINGS AT 10:00 AS WE ARE USING THE OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL FACILITY, AND WE AGREED TO VACATE THE PROPERTY AT 10 P.M. AND THEREFORE HE ANNOUNCED HE WOULD POSTPONE THE REST OF THE AGENDA UNTIL NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURNED THE MEETING AS FOLLOWS....

- 8. NEW MEMBER APPLICATION, Paul Dombkowski was introduced by Chair Dan Neirinckx who apologized to him for running out of time at this meeting. He reminded us that we all got a copy of Mr. Dombkowski's application last week and he will be interviewed next meeting, with our thanks for his patience!**
- 9. REGIONAL DECARBONIZATION FRAMEWORK - Steve Wragg will report out next meeting as this is not a time sensitive project.**
- 10. COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS REQUEST FOR PROJECT LIST – Postponed until next meeting.**
- 11. JDCPG OFFICER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND REPORTS : Postponed until next meeting.**
- 12. Adjournment: Chair Dan Neirinckx adjourned the meeting at 10:06**

Respectfully submitted:

Janet Mulder, Secretary

NOTICE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

7:30 P.M. TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 28, 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