

# *Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group*

## MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, June 5, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

Scripps Ranch Community Library - Community Room

10301 Scripps Lake Drive, San Diego, CA 92131

### **I. Welcome! 7:02pm**

Call to Order and Roll Call: Tamar Silverstein, Wally Wulfbeck, Marc Sorensen, Julie Ellis, Paul Vaughan, Marvin Miles, Gordon Boerner, Scot Hilberg, Emma Lefkowitz, Sandra Wetzel-Smith, Todd Phillips, Gwen Bandt, Karen Ringel, Stan Williams, Mary Oling-Sisay,

**A.** Absent: Dan Buell, B. Ilko, Gary Harrison, John Lyons,

**B.** Approval of Minutes, May 1, 2014. Motion/2<sup>nd</sup>: Williams/Miles 12-0-0 Approved

### **II. Non-Agenda Public Comment:**

Jan Kane shared lessons learned after the first softball tournament at the Sycamore Canyon Park in Stonebridge, and found a potential safety issue with vehicle speed near the park.

### **III. Modifications to Agenda. Emergency Items. Items to be Continued, Postponed, or Withdrawn: None**

### **IV. Announcements**

**A.** MCAS Miramar Fire Chief James Gregory Magill described how the Marine Corp interacts with the community in managing fires. Logistics and Seamless Role into the community, 5 percent humidity, strong winds, and dry conditions is monitored. All Federal Fire Fighters 3 engines, 17 minimum staffing, reserve break and brush break, rescue truck, participate in boundary drop= seamless mutual aide with city fire fighters.

Tuesday sent an engine company up to the Bernardo Fire 1pm-9pm, back filled station with other fire fighters. Engine 61 assigned to Poinsettia Fire on Wednesday, along with fire at Hoyt Park as soon as he saw the header, Tomahawk Fire the Incident management chief attended, Asst. Chief on Friday the Pendleton Fire broke out and sent an engine, brush truck and water truck. Saturday on east Miramar in the Santee Lakes area recreation area is still under investigation. Worked on Harland Fire for 10-12 hours. Made a heavy commitment to support the community. Recalled fire fighters within 30 minutes to up-staff additional fire fighters. Multiple mutual aide agreements with many counties and agencies. County is broken down into 4 zones, we are in the Metro Zone. Zones were created to prevent over commitment. The Zone Coordinator performs the coordination of resources or assets, such as the Proactive and Aggressive Control Burn and Fire Break Programs.

**B.** MCAS Miramar Update (J. Lias)

Airshow is 3-5 October 2014; Video of Marine Corp Fighting Fires at Camp Pendleton is available on YouTube. The fire burned almost up to the fuel tanks and the air field.

**C.** Councilmember Mark Kersey (T. Vinson)

1. Distributed The Kersey Report, announced new staff members,

2. Phenomenal responses from the fire departments from the recent fires. 21Jun2014 a First Responder Appreciation BBQ see flyer for more details.

3. Email received from a resident in Stonebridge who is interested in creating their own planning group. To create a Planning Group you must have enough people to support it and follow the Council Policy 600-24. Three separate Planning Commission meetings plus three separate Council Meetings. S. Diego Planning website provides the information for creating a planning group.

**D.** Supervisor Dave Roberts (E. Bollinger) Not present

**E.** Assembly member Brian Maienschein – 77<sup>th</sup> District (R. Knudsen) Not present

**F.** Congressman Scott Peters (S. Benton) Not present

**G.** Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee (Lorayne Burley)

Welcomed a new member to the board, presentation of Urban Forest Management Plan to improve San Diego's urban forest. Requesting citizen input via online survey at [www.surveymonkey.com/s/CXS5KXC](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/CXS5KXC), AT&T wireless vote was rescinded 11-0, The 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of MRNPG activities and hosting a 5K fun run event application with County of S. Diego. 230kVolt Transmission Power line running from Sycamore to Penauquitos, next meeting scheduled for 5August2014.

**H.** CalTrans Update Not present and No response. Email letter states they will not modify their previous response to the Carroll Canyon Draft EIR. The three questions asked were not addressed in the response. CalTrans' email is attached to tonight's meeting minutes, with the questions and responses or lack of response in the letter. If their comments on the draft were not addressed in the Final EIR, then they will comment on it later.

**V. Information Reports, Presentations & Discussion**

**A.** Renzulli Property Discussed plans for historical parcel

**B.** Chairperson's Report (W. Wulfeck)

CIP project lists on file, about 40 of the 300 projects submitted will be funded partially. CLC is still working on their project and is on track.

Wulfeck, Ilko, Wetzel-Smith met with Jerome's Furniture for a proposed new sign plan. It is Process II, which does not require them to inform community of their plans, so we thank Jerome's for involving the community.

From 27June-1September14 work will be performed on the new sign for Miramar Ranch Elementary School.

**VI. Action Items**

**A.** Verizon Chabad Cell Tower Relocation, Project No. 344834

Unlike most projects, the applicant provided no handouts, drawings, photos, or description of the project, and instead gave a verbal description. Verizon stated the proposals include; 2 faux trees, one a mono-Eucalyptus, submitted everything to the city, in process of responding to comments, photo simulations were sent out electronically, yet none were presented to SRPG at this meeting. Verizon has not met with the Crown Point HOA. According to the Verizon representative, the city development project manager (Alex Hempton) suggested Verizon not meet with any other groups besides what's required by the city, in an effort to conserve resources and prevent multiple requests. SRPG did not receive a copy of the project plans for this cell tower via email or USPS. SRPG stated that the un-willingness to speak with Crown Point HOA is not a good idea, as they are the residents nearest the proposed tower. The proposed location of the tower is located on the Knoll which is under agreement between Crown Point HOA homeowners and Chabad, signed in 1995 and is recorded with the city. A resident stated as of Tuesday 3June14 at 3pm Chabad has not had any communication with Verizon about the position of the new tower. All five homeowners of the Cul-de-sac (nearest proposed tower) were present and voiced their concerns of not wanting a cell tower so close to their homes. The HOA is open to hosting a meeting just for Verizon in order for the home owners to hear the proposed project. Verizon was given the joint agreement in writing at this meeting by Crown Point HOA. Verizon stated that this is a new lease that has recently been signed by Chabad, not a part of the old lease of an existing tower. Residents request a recommendation for Verizon Application to be put on hold until Verizon meets with HOA, for this CUP, PDP. Motion/2<sup>nd</sup>: Ellis/Wulfeck 15-0-0 Pass

'To continue the item due to not having sufficient information on the project.'

**B.** AT&T Sycamore Estates, Project No 351705, possible reconsideration.

The Planning Commission docketed this item on May 29. Neighbors requested a continuance based on lack of notification, wrong address on application, homeowners were not aware of project but are now aware of project. A Continuance was granted to 19June14.

Project is now two faux trees (one is a eucalyptus that is nearest the street), a new shelter to be built on site, designed to match the existing maintenance building, both trees are 35 ft tall, the address was assigned by the city but the street number does not land on the water tank site. Homeowners presented packet containing historical data and application mistakes, screening trees are not permitted, other sites were not properly vetted, disagreement with the statement of 'lack of response from the HOA'. Residents request motion to overturn the 4Mar14 decision and recommend denial of application until AT&T work with homeowners for the responsible placement of cell towers in their neighborhood. A resident requests a copy of the letter stating that the military is no longer leasing property for cell towers on military property.

#1Motion/2<sup>nd</sup>: Sorensen/Miles 13-2-0 PASS

'Recommend to rescind decision of 4March2014 vote, due to insufficient information'

#2Motion/2<sup>nd</sup>: Ellis/Sorensen 12-1-2 PASS

'Recommend denial of application based on homeowner concerns and additional information provided from AT&T tonight'

**C. Speed Limit Reduction on portion of Stonebridge Parkway**

Data presented appears to show majority of motorists driving an average of 35mph although the nearest sign in the area of the radar survey states 45mph. Keep the speed limit as is.

#3Motion/2<sup>nd</sup>: Phillips/Sorensen 15-0-0

'Keep the speed limit the same since the average speed is 35mph'

**D. Speed control on Tribuna Ave. (Miles)**

Request for traffic calming measures on a curved road, Tribuna. There is a possibility that the speed limit may increase due to the results of this study.

#4Motion/2<sup>nd</sup>: Vaughn/Boerner 14-0-1

'T.Phillips will request the city to suggest traffic calming measures for this road. A speed survey is required in order for the city engineers to suggest traffic calming measure.'

**E. Public safety: Fire fuel reduction. (Sandy Wetzel-Smith)**

Photos of brush and dead foliage in our community were shown and the need for recommendations for brush management was discussed. Request to appoint a subcommittee to; come up with a long range plan for fire safety of wooded areas of public lands, develop brush management priorities, and analyze evacuation conditions. The city has a current map of brush management priorities and the cost of brush management has doubled. Wetzel-Smith-chair, Wulfeck, Silverstein, Sorensen will be on this subcommittee.

**VII. Committee Reports**

**A. SR LMD-MAD (M. Sorensen) – Update**

Recreation Center was renamed.

**B. MCAS Miramar (J. Lyons) – Not present**

**C. Ad Hoc Committee on Chabad Educational Complex (Lefkowitz) Postponed until next meeting.**

**D. Ad Hoc Committee on Carroll Canyon Commercial Center (Wulfeck) Subcommittee meeting held 29May14, waiting for final EIR.**

If we need to have a meeting in July 2014 Wulfeck will notify us, otherwise, we'll go dark in July 2014.

**VIII. Adjournment 10:00pm**

## INQUIRY AND CALTRANS RESPONSE

Subj: RE: Interstate 15 and Carroll Canyon Road -- Commercial Center  
From: Armstrong, Jacob M@DOT <jacob.armstrong@dot.ca.gov> Wed, Jun 4, 2014 at 9:40 PM  
To: Wally Wulfeck <whw@san.rr.com>, "Hampton, Marisa A@DOT" <marisa.hampton@dot.ca.gov>, "Blake, Martha" <mblake@sandiego.gov>, Bob Ilko <srilko4@aol.com>, Tiffany Vinson <TVinson@sandiego.gov>, Tony Kempton <kempton@sandiego.gov>, "Lorayne W. Burley" <mrnpchair@scrippsranh.org>  
Cc: "Jewel, Karen M@DOT" <karen.jewel@dot.ca.gov>, "Hampton, Marisa A@DOT" <marisa.hampton@dot.ca.gov>

Mr. Wulfeck,

Thank you for providing the meeting minutes for our review. I have passed the minutes on to Karen Jewel and will let you know if we have any comments.

In regards to Caltrans providing a follow-up letter rescinding previous comments, we have no intentions at this time of providing any further correspondence pertaining to the EIR. We have worked with Sudberry Properties and the City to address our comments on the Draft EIR as part of their efforts on responding to our comments for the Final EIR. We have not seen or been provided by the City the formal Final EIR Response to Comments. Once we receive the Response to Comments for the Final EIR, we will review and determine if our comments were appropriately addressed. If we feel our comments were addressed based on the responses provided for the Final EIR, Caltrans will have no further comments on the record. However, if we feel our comments were not responded to appropriately, we may determine to provide some response to the City either in a formal letter, or speaking at the project Hearing.

I hope this provides some clarification. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Jacob Armstrong, Chief  
Development Review Branch  
District 11 Planning Dept.  
CA Dept. of Transportation  
4050 Taylor Street MS-240  
San Diego, CA 92110  
ph: (619) 688-6960cell: (619) 709-4345  
fax: (619) 688-4299

=====  
From: whwulfeck@gmail.com [mailto:whwulfeck@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Wally Wulfeck  
Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2014 5:52 PM  
To: Armstrong, Jacob M@DOT; Hampton, Marisa A@DOT; Blake, Martha; Bob Ilko; Tiffany Vinson; Tony Kempton; Lorayne W. Burley  
Subject: Interstate 15 and Carroll Canyon Road -- Commercial Center

Dear Mr. Armstrong,

In the letter attached below to Ms. Martha Blake at the City of San Diego, Caltrans submitted several comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the proposed Carroll Canyon Commercial Center.

At the May 1, 2014 meeting of the Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group, a Caltrans representative, Ms. Karen Jewel, presented an update on the Carroll Canyon project. Here is an except from our minutes concerning that presentation:

I. Information Reports, Presentations & Discussion

1. CALTRANS Update on Carroll Canyon Commercial Center (Karen Jewel)

(1) Answered questions concerning the CCCC Project, look at impacts and effects, Level of

Service, Queing of On Ramps, Improvements needed for project. Traffic methodology using Sandag Table, Intersection Delays from volumes presented, Ramp Metering Analysis from Caltrans Data, Intersection Lane Volumes, Discrepancies between the two different programs, Queing for Left Turn Pockets for On Ramps Only (not for Off Ramps), Intersection Control Evaluation Policy, Right of Way to follow Standards & Encroachments.

(2) Cal Trans (Jewel) advised that:

- (a) Cumulative Effects were NOT considered for this project analysis.
- (b) Adding a 2<sup>nd</sup> lane to the I-15N ramp is being discussed with City
- (c) She is not certain whether either Cal Trans or Sandag looked at the west/eastbound traffic crossing the Carroll Canyon Bridge; she promised to get back to SRPG re: clarifying this.
- (d) The RAMS project needs to be reviewed to ensure all lights with freeway are synchronized.
- (e) If Community alternative Traffic Study were submitted, Cal Trans response time is typically 30 days; focused studies could be shorter review time.
- (f) Mr. Boerner asked about attendees at a meeting which apparently occurred between CALTRANS and City Development staff. Ms. Jewel stated it was actually a TelCon and she wasn't sure since she couldn't see who was there. Although the discussion was vague, Ms. Jewel said it was City staff, CALTRANS, and Sudberry representatives. However, she did not have any notes or specific memory of what actually had been discussed or if any agreements had been reached.
- (g) Ms. Jewel stated that CALTRANS did not have the authority to make decisions about the project.. Rather they were in 'more of an advisory role' and the City had the responsibility to take any actions. She stated that CALTRANS was not a 'decision-maker'.
- (h) Ms Jewel stated that she had not carefully looked at the Draft Environmental Impact Report and would have to get back to the Group. I believe that Gordon then asked if she had looked at the D-EIR and the full analysis/design and she stepped away and said that she had not read the actual analysis and would have to get back to him. She was not sure if they had a copy but again would check and get back.
- (i) Ms. Jewel stated that there was no interaction between CALTRANS and SANDAG on this project.

Please pass our thanks to Ms. Jewel for her presentation.

At a SMRPG subcommittee meeting on May 28, 2014, representatives of Sudberry Properties, the developer of the proposed project, indicated that there have been meetings among Caltrans, the City of San Diego, and Sudberry Properties concerning this project. The developer made the statement that after meetings between Caltrans and the developer, Caltrans will be submitting a follow-on letter on the Carroll Canyon Rezone Project rescinding their previous negative comments. However, according to Sudberry's presentation, nothing has changed in the project plan that would warrant any modification to Caltrans comments. Since the project hasn't changed; the (lack of) mitigations haven't changed; and thresholds for mitigation haven't changed, our group is interested in what has changed that might lead Caltrans to revise its position. If Caltrans is indeed revising the assessment, could you please provide:

1. Caltrans' revised position and assessment
2. reasons for the revised assessment, and explanation for the revisions.
3. data and metrics used to reassess

Thank you very much for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your response.

Wallace H. Wulfeck  
Chair, Scripps Miramar Ranch Planning Group  
whw@san.rr.com