

**JULIAN COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP**  
**Draft Minutes**  
**Monday, April 11<sup>th</sup>,2022 at 6:00 p.m.**  
**Julian Town Hall, Washington and Main Streets, Julian, CA 92036**

**Chairman Brown called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.**

**A. Roll Call**

Present: Pat Brown, Chair, Kiki Skagen Munshi, Secretary; Herb Dackermann, William Everett, Katherine Moretti, Kenny Mushet, Barbara Nigro, Rudy Rikansrud  
Absent: Rebecca Morales, Eric Jones

**B. Approval of the minutes for the meeting of March 14th, 2022.**

Moretti moved we should tell the County that we have said we have not received requests for PLDO funds.

Moved to approve Minutes as amended: Moretti

Seconded: Rikansrud

Approved: Unanimous, Dcakermann and Mushet abstaining

**C. Approval of the agenda**

Moved: Moretti moved we accept the agenda but delete Action Item 2 on PLDO funds

Seconded: Nigro

Approved: Unanimous

**D. Public Communication: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Group on any subject matter within the Group's jurisdiction and items on the posted agenda.**

None

**E. Action Items**

**1. MSCP Plan by San Diego County**

Chelsea Oakes leading North County MSCP plan development introduced herself.

Everett said it seems as if parts of East County plan area were now extended into North County. Answer was that not done deal but are moving forward with it. Look at adding up to Warner Springs, down to Lake Cuyamaca down to Ramona. Would have umbrella plan for various things. North County plan has been in process for 40 years and now they want to move forward with the larger plan. One of issues is that Rancho Guejito has high value habitat but is privately owned and it is difficult to negotiate with the owner. When do modeling look at all undeveloped land county wide and that is so large it skews data. So we are hoping to substitute other habitat to offset, which is what has made us look further east. At this time will leave Guejito out of all our plans. They will have to go to wildlife agencies both state and fed, depending on what they want to do. No major plans in place at this time. Everett asked isn't changing the scope of the north county plan going to slow process down further, and when likely to be approved. Answer, adopting plan if FY '25-26. Other things will affect it such as the VMT. Full general plan buildout not likely to happen, so have to redo assumptions. Won't require another general plan amendment for just MSCP. Everett said seems like some of terminology being changed. In South County plan, now approved, they have a pre-approved mitigation area; one of problems in East County, the plan is somewhere in limbo so that you can't even deal with what it may ultimately say, so if someone in our area wanted to do a project that impacted biological resources, could mitigate in mitigation banks—but there are none in this area. They would either have to do onsite mitigation or purchase another piece of property with similar habitat and place that in biological open space. So one of the problems we see is that, first County would like to have big areas set aside rather than on site

smaller areas, but problematic if no mitigation banks. If have reasonably sizeable mitigation need, 20-30 acres, odds very good that County and wildlife agencies will demand you establish an endowment fund to take care of that land in perpetuity. This means property would be put into open space and it would be managed by nonprofit entity. And if someone sets up a mitigation bank they can charge whatever they want for that land and it's very expensive. Everett's big fear is that will be ridiculously prohibitive which will bring an end to projects

Answer: We have heard this concern in South County. In North County are looking to have a set fee per acre, then County will acquire the land and be able to manage it directly. County Parks would be the managing entity.

Everett: Type of habitat here is just completely different from that in the present North County plan. Reanalysis, remapping?

Answer: Already have similar vegetation in North County plan so want to be sure will have species we really want to conserve. 9 of 30 species we want to conserve are in Julian area.

Everett: When all of this first started, what kicked it off was listing of California gnatcatcher on endangered species list. But it has a preferred habitat. Coastal sage brush was what gnatcatcher wants so only affected that land. Over the years added stuff to point that only things that don't require mitigation are things like existing agricultural lands, developed land. One of last habitat types to be added is non-native grassland. What that is, it consists almost entirely of species not native to California but are very common, all over the place. The problem has become is that no one who has a mitigation bank has non-native grassland. So can't buy mitigation credits for it. And now there is so little in mitigation banks is that non-native grassland is very expensive to mitigate and it is one of the most common habitats here.

Moretti: Why not leave all the ranches out? Not it looks like every time you change use, like move from cattle to grapes, have to give property to County.

Answer: We can provide exemption for single family homes, Also if you change use, County will acquire the property on our behalf.

Everett: I would like to see the County recognize grazing as a legitimate form of agriculture. Historically State of California allows local entities to control land use within their jurisdictions as long as they are within the subdivision map act guidelines. When all this began with the gnatcatchers, County agreed to a system whereby these agencies essentially have veto power over virtually any project out there. They call it "concurrence" but it's essentially veto power. So really doesn't matter what local communities want to do, will be dictated by federal law.

If one point I'd like to make, grazing land should be considered agriculture and then it wouldn't have to be mitigated.

Moretti: The point of doing things in South County, the point was a corridor for wildlife. How does this land relate to that.

Answer: We are identifying a "priority conservation area" which will do this kind of corridor. We'll focus on where those lands exist and vacant land between them. Also, we are bound by state and national laws on this.

Everett: They are serious about wildlife corridors but most here are east-west, not north-south. And grazing in East County is critical for fire management.

Kenny: What percentage of SD County is owned by State Prkas, etc.

About 50%. And about 35% of County already developed. So coming down to about 5 to 15% of County is privately owned that this will affect.

[Chlesea.Oakes@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:Chlesea.Oakes@sdcounty.ca.gov) 619 510 1516

**2. PLDO Funding – More sites are requested by the County—removed from agenda.**

**3. Site Plan PDS2021-STP-21-032; 830 Julian Estates Road; APN 292-141-13-00;**

**Joe Cottingham**

Joe Cottingham presented a site plan for approval December 13. Only issue was didn't present colors so have them here.

Moretti moved that colors presented for walls and roof here tonight are acceptable for the project. Dackermann seconded.

Approved: unanimous.

**4. JCPG Vacancy**

Everett moved Rom Smith be appointed to the vacancy on the Julian Community Planning Group.

Seconded: Moretti

Approval: Unanimous

**F. Group Business – Information and Reports**

**1. Whole House Generator Program – Rudy Rikansrud; SDG&E**

Got a call from Julian Gold Rush Hotel. SDGE said would put in a standby generator for the hotel. Other businesses haven't heard anything.

**2. Form 700**

Do it.

**3. 30,30**

Newsom proposing 30% on coast and 30% in mountains for recreation. Article in Ag magazine.

**4. Meeting updates**

**a. Future Group Meeting Dates (May 9th, 2022)**

**G. Adjournment**

**Moved: Rikansrud**

**Seconded: Mushet**

**Approved: Unanimous**

Members: Pat Brown, Chair; Rebecca Morales, Vice Chair; Kiki Skagen Munshi, Secretary; Herb Dackermann, William Everett, Eric Jones, Katherine Moretti, Kenny Mushet, Barbara Nigro, Rudy Rikansrud, Romulus Smith