

From: [Jeffrey Osborne](#)
To: [Koutoufidis, Nicholas](#); [Harris, Susan](#)
Subject: JVR PARK
Date: Thursday, May 20, 2021 12:34:34 PM

Hey Nic/Susan, I have a few questions, I forgot to ask some of these more specific questions at the planning meeting on Tuesday evening...it was running a bit long... some came up after. I am just trying to have better understanding of all of our roles and responsibilities. I am new to the planning process and as I have mentioned I have aspirations for developments as an applicant in the Jacumba area myself, and just want to get a grasp on how this works as well as be an informed community representative on matters such as the JVR Park.

1. What role does the Sponsor Group play in the planning process as far as PDS is concerned? for example, if we accept, reject, or ask for changes, how does that affect the development as far as PDS and their recommendations to the applicant/planning commission? We voted to reject 5-0 as the project was presented, so what does that mean? Does it result in any specific changes and how so?

2. What is the relationship between the PDS and the Mountain Empire Subregional Plan ("MESRP")? Is PDS staff's job to make sure recommended projects are in-line with the MESRP? How is PDS/the applicant dealing with the clear conflicts regarding the size/scale/placement of this project within a Village boundary and of a type, industrial utility, that completely changes the character of the area? What conditions need to be present to allow for an applicant to get a recommendation from staff if their project is not in line with the Subregional Plan?

I am including these specific quotes from the subregional plan in order to make sure we are all looking at the same things, also I want to note I read through the section in the EIR 3.1.4.2 regarding the MESRP and none of these are mentioned.

Mountain Empire Subregional Plan - SD County General Plan

1. **Community Character - GOAL ENCOURAGES THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND IN A MANNER THAT REINFORCES THE UNIQUE IDENTITY OF THE MOUNTAIN EMPIRE SUBREGION AND ITS COMMUNITIES**

1. Land Use Element - Policies and Recommendations 1. Apply a Rural Village Boundary to each of the following historically significant settlement in this Subregional Area (Jacumba) - **5. avoid - creation of a landscape foreign to that of surrounding sites.**

INDUSTRIAL GOAL - PROVIDE A LAND USE PATTERN WHICH WILL PERMIT THOSE KINDS OF INDUSTRIAL USES THAT WILL NOT DETRACT FROM THE RURAL CHARM AND LIFESTYLE OF THE SUBREGION.

1. **New Industrial development should consider all views into the property from public streets, adjacent properties and residences on nearby hills.**

Old Highway 80 through Boulevard and Jacumba is an identified Scenic Highway in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element. (pg27)

3. Community Representation and Benefit Discussions - it has come to my attention, as mentioned in the meeting, that someone named Bill Pape is somehow representing the community of Jacumba Hot Springs to the applicant? I am confused? He does not even live in the community, he lives in Yuma, AZ, nor does he have any public role in our community. Community members have mentioned him getting personal gifts from developers in the past and I am a bit suspicious of his role in this process. Why is he allowed to represent the community? What is PDS official position on community benefits and who represents the community in those discussions or how they are supposed to happen?

4. The development does not even have a Final EIR out yet and the developer is already in late stage discussions to sell the power from the development to a regulated utility SDCP:

<https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/business/story/2021-05-17/sdcp-rollout>

Is there something we don't know about this? How can the developer sign contracts with other government regulated agencies before even releasing a Final EIR or obtaining any official form of approval?

5. Heat Island Effect - I gathered at the meeting the PDS does not think the heat island effect is real? or substantiated by evidence? I am not sure if I got that right, but just wanted to include this article in Nature magazine:

<https://www.nature.com/articles/srep35070>

Can you please again help me better understand PDS response to this scientific and published study that was referenced by the State Parks?

6. Is there a possibility of PDS requesting the applicant re-size their project to fit within our concerns and goals as a community and the MESRP (Community Character, Economic Consequences, Heat Island, Airport Safety, etc.) in order to get an official recommendation from staff? What would influence that decision and how is that decision made in regards to PDS and their recommendation of this project to the planning commission?

Thank you, for taking the time to read this and hopefully being able to provide informative answers.

Jeff Osborne