

Email Exchange between Travis Cleveland and Bea Riley re: CUP 82-0611 Review Process

On Tue, Jul 28, 2026 at 9:46 AM Bea Riley <bea.riley.ca@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Travis,

Could you please tell me if Condition 31 ("All of the subject property shall be maintained at all times in a neat, orderly fashion, free of junk, litter, and debris.") applies to the reclamation area as well as the CUP area? **Will need to have reviewer answer this.**

From Mission Gorge Road, which admittedly provides only a very limited view, it doesn't appear that the reclamation area has ever been mined, but it has been, correct? **I believe so, although it would have been prior to 1983. This area would be unlikely to be in the reclamation plan if it hadn't been mined.**

If it has been mined, that was obviously more than 40 years ago. Why has the reclamation process not only not been started, but also not been completed? **Will need to have reviewer answer this.**

For the upcoming review, is the entire area, more or less from the Admiral Baker Golf Course to Mission Vista Drive, included in the review? **The entire site is described in the permit and will be included in the review; however, most conditions refer to the actively mined area, not the reclamation only area.**

Is JJB Land now responsible for the reclamation of that area? **As the property owner, yes, but perhaps not solely responsible.**

The City Council in 1990 most likely assumed that the proper registrations and recordations would occur. Do we know with certainty that all necessary registrations and recordations have been completed for the new land deeds after the property was divided in December 2024? **I do not understand this question.**

Has there been any response from Vulcan or any other developments that we should be aware of? **Vulcan withdrew their CUP application last week (I have been in the process of letting everybody know). I intend to bring the property to the Planning Commission for its five year review as soon as possible, hopefully within the next six months. I solicit your input on compliance with each condition. The attached matrix contains the permit conditions for CUP 83-0611. I would appreciate a response via email by August 31, 2026, in the form of comments in the spreadsheet. If you prefer to respond via letter, that is also acceptable. I welcome any and all comments on the matter; however, I also recommend contacting your Community Planning Group to coordinate with them on a response if possible (I notified both CPGs already). A unified response may be more effective for all interested parties. You may have previously provided related comments. To ensure the community's most recent concerns are fully addressed, I respectfully request that an updated response be provided in response to this email.**

Thank you very much,
Bea Riley

[visit website CLEAN AIR FOR MISSION GORGE.com](http://visitwebsiteCLEANAIRFORMISSIONGORGE.com)
[visit FACEBOOK-CLEAN AIR FOR MISSION GORGE](https://www.facebook.com/CleanAirForMissionGorge)

From: Bea Riley <bea.riley.ca@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 31, 2026 12:09 PM

To: Cleveland, Travis <TCleveland@sandiego.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Questions, Condition 31 and more

Hi Travis,

Have you had a chance to look at any of the questions from this email?

Thanks,
Bea

On Tue, Aug 4, 2026 at 3:33 PM Cleveland, Travis <TCleveland@sandiego.gov> wrote:
Hi Bea,

I forwarded these questions to the reviewers for a response. I will check in. Below, I have answered what I believe I can in red without getting more information.

Thanks,
Travis

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Bea Riley <bea.riley.ca@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 5:42 PM

To: Cleveland, Travis <TCleveland@sandiego.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Revised "More questions about the review process"

Hi Travis,

Thank you very much for your response. I should have included your previous responses in this email because you indicated that you were waiting for responses from reviewers. So I am resending this email with your previous questions attached.

Below are my additional questions. I appreciate your sending the answers you know as soon as possible, with the remaining answers being sent as they become known.

Regarding the review process:

- Will the reviewers begin evaluating the project as comments are received, or will they wait until after the August 31 deadline before beginning their review? **Staff's review is independent of any other comments received. It is underway now.**
- Condition 4 states:"This review shall be for the purpose of determining if any additional conditions need to be imposed or existing conditions amended." Given that language, should suggestions for new or amended conditions be submitted now, or will there be another more appropriate opportunity to provide those recommendations? **I do not want to limit responses. Please submit whatever you see fit.**
- Should comments be limited to compliance issues that have occurred since Vulcan acquired the property in December 2024, or is it appropriate to include evidence of ongoing operational practices that have continued across multiple owners when those practices relate to compliance with the CUP? **I do not want to limit responses. Please submit whatever you see fit.**
- Do you want or accept supporting evidence (photographs, documents, complaint records, etc.)? **I do not want to limit responses. Please submit whatever you see fit.**
- If comments do not fit well within the matrix, what would be your preferred method of submitting them? For example, would it be acceptable to reference the condition in the matrix and include additional explanation in an attached document? **That would be acceptable.**
- Will all public comments become part of the administrative record and be available for review by the operator and other interested parties? **Yes.**
- After the review is completed, will the reviewer prepare a written report addressing each condition and explaining any findings or recommendations? **Once review is complete, I will prepare a report to the Planning Commission. I am not yet entirely certain of the format, but please be assured that I will discuss comments received.**

Regarding community input:

- You mentioned that a unified response from the Community Planning Group may be more effective. Are there any disadvantages to the community and the Planning Group submitting one joint matrix? **Not that I can see.**
- Is there any disadvantage of the community and the Planning Group submitting a unified response? **Not that I can see.**
- If the Planning Group and the community submit a consolidated response, would you still encourage individual community members to submit their own matrices and supporting evidence? **I do not want to limit responses. Please submit whatever you see fit.**
- If a compliance issue exists, is the number of independent reports itself considered relevant evidence regarding the frequency or extent of the issue? **This would be context specific.**

Regarding the CUP application:

- When you said Vulcan withdrew its CUP application, were you referring only to the application to amend the CUP, or did they also withdraw the application for the periodic review? **Only the CUP amendment.**
- Will the reviewers be considering the information that SRM previously submitted during the review and during the amendment process, or will Vulcan be submitting updated information for the review? **I have asked Vulcan to respond anew.**
- Will submittals made by Vulcan be available for the community and the planning groups to review? I ask because we found many seeming inaccuracies in the information that SRM submitted. **They will be available if requested.**
- Will we have an opportunity to send questions to the City and the reviewers before final decisions are made? **Yes. Depending on the volume of responses, we may not be able to address each issue raised with each commenter individually; the response may be in the form of a single document containing all questions and responses, or similar. But I will discuss all concerns with the Planning Commission.**
- Does the City still have the suggested revisions to CUP 82-0611 that were developed with community input and submitted by the Navajo Community Planning Group in January 2026? Will those recommendations be available to the reviewers during this review? **That information was submitted when the project was inactive and was not reviewed by all staff at the time. I have asked the CPGs to respond anew. I want to get the very latest concerns from all. If the CPG forwards that same document again, it would be fine.**
- Finally, thank you for asking for clarification regarding my earlier question about the property division.

My reference to the 1990 CUP was intended only as an example of how an administrative oversight can remain undiscovered for many years. I assume that when the City Council approved the 1990 amendment, everyone involved believed that all required procedural steps would be completed. I do not believe anyone intentionally failed to do so.

My question was simply whether the City is confident that all required recordings, filings, and other legal actions associated with the December 2024 property division and the permits or approvals processed since that time have been completed, so that years from now we do not discover that an important procedural step was inadvertently overlooked. **There has been no property division as defined by the Land Development Code. What appears to have happened is that JJB Land transferred all actively mined parcels to Vulcan. This was a private ownership transfer that the City did not have jurisdiction over. It was not required to be reported to or approved by us. CUPs run with the land and automatically apply to successors in interest, so Vulcan was subject to the CUP once they became the operator. Once they became owners of the**

mine parcels, they also became subject as the owner. No permits or approvals have been processed since that time.

Your continued assistance to the community is appreciated.

Thanks!

Bea Riley

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Cleveland, Travis** <TCleveland@sandiego.gov>

Date: Fri, Aug 7, 2026 at 7:02 PM

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Revised "More questions about the review process"

To: Bea Riley <bea.riley.ca@gmail.com>

Cc: Prinz, Michael <MPrinz@sandiego.gov>

Hi Bea,

See in red below.

Thank you,
Travis

From: Bea Riley <bea.riley.ca@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, August 4, 2026 5:42 PM

To: Cleveland, Travis <TCleveland@sandiego.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Revised "More questions about the review process"

Hi Travis,

Thank you very much for your response. I should have included your previous responses in this email because you indicated that you were waiting for responses from reviewers. So I am resending this email with your previous questions attached.

Below are my additional questions. I appreciate your sending the answers you know as soon as possible, with the remaining answers being sent as they become known.

Regarding the review process:

- Will the reviewers begin evaluating the project as comments are received, or will they wait until after the August 31 deadline before beginning their review? **Staff's review is independent of any other comments received. It is underway now.**
- Condition 4 states: "This review shall be for the purpose of determining if any additional conditions need to be imposed or existing conditions amended." Given that language, should suggestions for new or amended conditions be submitted now, or will there be another more appropriate opportunity to provide those recommendations? **I do not want to limit responses. Please submit whatever you see fit.**
- Should comments be limited to compliance issues that have occurred since Vulcan acquired the property in December 2024, or is it appropriate to include evidence of ongoing operational practices that have continued across multiple owners when those practices relate to compliance with the CUP? **I do not want to limit responses. Please submit whatever you see fit.**
- Do you want or accept supporting evidence (photographs, documents, complaint records, etc.)? **I do not want to limit responses. Please submit whatever you see fit.**

- If comments do not fit well within the matrix, what would be your preferred method of submitting them? For example, would it be acceptable to reference the condition in the matrix and include additional explanation in an attached document? **That would be acceptable.**
- Will all public comments become part of the administrative record and be available for review by the operator and other interested parties? **Yes.**
- After the review is completed, will the reviewer prepare a written report addressing each condition and explaining any findings or recommendations? **Once review is complete, I will prepare a report to the Planning Commission. I am not yet entirely certain of the format, but please be assured that I will discuss comments received.**

Regarding community input:

- You mentioned that a unified response from the Community Planning Group may be more effective. Are there any disadvantages to the community and the Planning Group submitting one joint matrix? **Not that I can see.**
- Is there any disadvantage of the community and the Planning Group submitting a unified response? **Not that I can see.**
- If the Planning Group and the community submit a consolidated response, would you still encourage individual community members to submit their own matrices and supporting evidence? **I do not want to limit responses. Please submit whatever you see fit.**
- If a compliance issue exists, is the number of independent reports itself considered relevant evidence regarding the frequency or extent of the issue? **This would be context specific.**

Regarding the CUP application:

- When you said Vulcan withdrew its CUP application, were you referring only to the application to amend the CUP, or did they also withdraw the application for the periodic review? **Only the CUP amendment.**
- Will the reviewers be considering the information that SRM previously submitted during the review and during the amendment process, or will Vulcan be submitting updated information for the review? **I have asked Vulcan to respond anew.**
- Will submittals made by Vulcan be available for the community and the planning groups to review? I ask because we found many seeming inaccuracies in the information that SRM submitted. **They will be available if requested.**
- Will we have an opportunity to send questions to the City and the reviewers before final decisions are made? **Yes. Depending on the volume of responses, we may not be able to address each issue raised with each commenter individually; the response may be in the form of a single document containing all questions and responses, or similar. But I will discuss all concerns with the Planning Commission.**
- Does the City still have the suggested revisions to CUP 82-0611 that were developed with community input and submitted by the Navajo Community Planning Group in January 2026? Will those recommendations be available to the reviewers during this review? **That information was submitted when the project was inactive and was not reviewed by all staff at the time. I have asked the CPGs to respond anew. I want to get the very latest concerns from all. If the CPG forwards that same document again, it would be fine.**
- Finally, thank you for asking for clarification regarding my earlier question about the property division.

My reference to the 1990 CUP was intended only as an example of how an administrative oversight can remain undiscovered for many years. I assume that when the City Council approved

the 1990 amendment, everyone involved believed that all required procedural steps would be completed. I do not believe anyone intentionally failed to do so.

My question was simply whether the City is confident that all required recordings, filings, and other legal actions associated with the December 2024 property division and the permits or approvals processed since that time have been completed, so that years from now we do not discover that an important procedural step was inadvertently overlooked. **There has been no property division as defined by the Land Development Code. What appears to have happened is that JJB Land transferred all actively mined parcels to Vulcan. This was a private ownership transfer that the City did not have jurisdiction over. It was not required to be reported to or approved by us. CUPs run with the land and automatically apply to successors in interest, so Vulcan was subject to the CUP once they became the operator. Once they became owners of the mine parcels, they also became subject as the owner. No permits or approvals have been processed since that time.**

Your continued assistance to the community is appreciated.

Thanks!

Bea Riley

From: Bea Riley <bea.riley.ca@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2026 7:25 AM
To: Cleveland, Travis <TCleveland@sandiego.gov>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Questions, Condition 31 and more

Hi Travis,

I am as eager as anyone to get the CUP review moving along, but I would like to point out that the NCPG doesn't have a scheduled meeting until September 8, and if there are any revisions by the Board that the subcommittee needs to correct, the earliest the Board would see those corrections would be November 12. Working in compliance with the Brown Act slows things down substantially.

Bea

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Cleveland, Travis <TCleveland@sandiego.gov>
Date: Thu, Aug 6, 2026 at 4:15 PM
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Questions, Condition 31 and more
To: Bea Riley <bea.riley.ca@gmail.com>

Hi Bea,

It is important to me to get fresh community input. It is not my intent to rush CPG review. If either CPG would like more time, I will ensure they are accommodated.

The mine does currently have a code enforcement case open against it for noncompliance with five-year reviews, so I don't want to delay indefinitely - but giving people more time to get their comments done is a reasonable ask (if it came from the CPG, I know you're not representing them).

That pesky Brown Act! (kidding of course)

-Travis

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bea Riley** <bea.riley.ca@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Aug 7, 2026 at 2:19 PM

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Questions, Condition 31 and more

To: Cleveland, Travis <TCleveland@sandiego.gov>

Thank you for your response, Travis.

I was seriously thinking about combining the community response with the Planning Group's responses, but if it helps move the process along, I can submit the community response as soon as I can. I can also send most of the spreadsheet back relatively quickly and send the rest (which would be the important stuff) back later if you don't mind a split response.

I'm not part of the planning group, but I feel their pain when they have time restrictions. :-) So, thank you.

Thanks,
Bea