

# TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

## COMMENT LETTERS

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- A) Should correct history page to reflect Lassen’s Rancho and proposed townsite in relation to Red Bluff. (1-1)
- B) Addition to Section 1.3, Legal Basis, end of second paragraph on page 1.6:  
Should add “All new Property Owner Associations and New Developments, over 50 units, must also have a Specific Plan or General Plan.” This would make these developments responsible for all elements, including roads and highways within T.C. (1-6)
- C) Add Agricultural and Timber Element as #7 in Element List, changing the following element numbers thereafter.

### 2.0 LAND USE

- A) The table on page 2-4 states that there are 318.24 acres of Open Space in Tehama County. However, under 2.0, there is no mention of open space. (2-4)
- B) In the North Planning Area, how would croplands in Bend be protected given the existing proximity of housing to small-acreage croplands? Development pressure is likely to target these farming parcels. (2-6)
- C) BLM has been expanding holdings along the Sacramento River in anticipation of establishing a national recreation area. As yet, there has not been much expansion of public use because public access and amenities have not been established. Some of this land is adjacent to residential development. Assuming that these improvements are in the works, *how will the BLM buildout impact communities in Bend, Jelly’s Ferry, Surrey Village, and Lake California?* (2-7)
- D) The East Planning Area section should include a discussion of commercial and residential parcels east of Morgan Summit along Hwy. 36E. This area is likely to receive development pressure as Almanor area grows. (2-7)
- E) In Table 2-3 – Community Types – there is no mention of Rancho Tehama as a community. (2-10)
- F) Definition and Purpose of Upland Ag – Change “promote” to “accommodate” the use of land for non-agricultural purposes...” (2-11)

- G) On page 2-12, there are three references to “gross acres”. What does this mean? Should we eliminate the word “gross”? (2-12)
- H) It should be noted that not all lands owned by industrial timber companies have been zoned TPZ by the County. Transitional parcels, which are small residential and commercial parcels that have not been fully converted to non-timber growing use but are still defined as timberland by the Public Resources Code, exist in the Manton, Mineral, Paynes Creek, and Tehama-Cohasset areas. (2-12)
- I) Include outdoor recreation as a land use. (2-13)
- J) On page 2-13; “General Uses: Additional uses may be determined by the *planning director*.” This should be the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. (2-13)
- K) Lands that are not designated as Natural Resource Lands will still have key resource amenities. Land use designations such as timber, agriculture, or water also support recreation and critical habitats. These resource benefits may be formally recognized or unrecognized by the land manager/owner. (2-16)
- L) How do Conservation Easements fit into the NR designation? (2-17)
- M) Conservation elements are not limited only to Scenic Easements. Conservation easements could be cropland or any other property with resource values. Conservation easements may also not be permanent, but may be a temporary status. (2-17)
- N) Non Jurisdictional Public – Add BLM and Fish & Wildlife lands. Particularly along the Sacramento River, these properties add recreational focus and thereby affect adjacent private land use. (2-18)
- O) Include Lassen Volcanic National Park in the list of examples. (2-19)
- P) The maps of Dairyville and Mineral are reversed (page 2-23 through page 2-27). These maps need to include the agricultural designation around the towns instead of just a white background. (2-23)
- Q) Policy LU-1.4 conflicts with the 20-acre Valley Floor Ag, non-contracted, which states under General Uses: “Residential...” (2-30)
- R) Implementation Measure LU-2.1c: “All lands classified as agricultural lands shall be considered eligible to enter into a contract...” *Should strike*, “to be placed within the Agricultural Preserve, and shall be...” (2-31)

- S) Implementation Measure LU-2.2 – Require the establishment of a *100-foot* buffer zone between any new residential subdivision developments and existing agricultural lands. Should require a *300-foot* buffer zone. 100 feet is not enough to safely use orchard spray equipment or aerial chemical application. (2-31)
- T) Implementation Measure LU-2.2a: “Require the establishment of a minimum 100-foot buffer zone.” What reference document will state what can or cannot occur in a buffer zone? Can it be farmed? Is it open space for anyone to use for recreation, etc? (2-32)
- U) Implementation Measure LU-5.1d: Where does requirement for 15-year supply come from? (2-33)
- V) Policy LU-5.4: How is “agricultural viability” determined? This determination could be subjective considering that a one-acre strawberry field or organic vegetable garden may be viable, but a 10-acre irrigated pasture could be part of a hobby farm. (2-34)
- W) Policy LU-6.1: This policy should include small minor land divisions which have a cumulative impact on the surrounding area, and its districts. An implementation measure needs to be added to address this. (2-34)
- X) Policy LU-7.2: Valley Floor Ag district, 20-acre minimums next to 40-acre contracted lands. (2-35)
- Y) For Figures 2.0.7 and 2.0.8, provide a key to the color designations of the maps.
- Z) General Plan should impose a specific growth limitation, such as two percent, as other counties within California have done.
- AA) Minimum parcels sizes in Contracted and Non-Contracted lands in “Upland Agricultural” should be changed from 160 acres to 640 acres.
- BB) “Valley Floor Agricultural” should be changed so that the all yellow area outside the grazing line be designated as “Upland Area; Grazing.”
- CC) 160-acre Jelly Ferry Road should be designated with 10-acre parcels because the Jelly Ferry Road’s topography lends itself to Rural Large Lot Zoning. Together with the availability of ample domestic water and soils suitable for septic and sewage disposal, this area would be ideal for 10-acre parcels.
- DD) Valley Floor Agriculture – Definition and Purpose are missing.

### 3.0 CIRCULATION

- A) *Proposed Addition; after first paragraph of P. 3-2:* “Access is a major fire protection need, whether wildland or structural. Failure to provide access for emergency equipment and concurrent evacuation egress for civilians can result in major loss of life, property and natural resources. Safe access requires street and road networks that limit dead-end roads and provide reasonable widths, grades, surfaces, and curves for all vehicular accesses.” (3-2)
- B) Local/Minor Roads: The roads are characterized as having a 25 MPH. I believe this to be inaccurate. Most of the roads are not posted and there is a safety issue in many places. (3-7)
- C) *Proposed addition:* Implementation Measure CIR 1.4c: Investigate the feasibility of *the development* of traffic calming design features in future residential developments and in areas with traffic issues. *Adopt a program of speed limit signs for roads classified as a local minor.*

Unsafe speeds on narrow (22-24) ft wide roads in all areas of the County are common. The County faces potential legal action for not posting when accidents occur, especially when traffic studies are not required for all new land divisions. Such a lawsuit used almost half of the Nevada County Road Budget several years ago. (3-14)

- D) *Proposed Re-Write:* Policy CIR-1.7: “The County shall ensure that all new development proposals contain street and road networks that limit dead end roads and provide a minimum of two improved all-weather accesses.” (3-15)
- E) *Proposed Re-Write:* Implementation Measure CIR-1.7a: “The County shall review its existing land development and zoning standards to ensure that all new land divisions and all new non-residential developments provide a minimum of two improved all-weather accesses.” (3-15)
- F) Implementation Measure CIR 1.4b should say “Develop and Adopt” streetscape design standards.
- G) Under Railroad Services, there is no mention of potential railroad stops or proposed railroad crossings.
- H) Figure 3.1 should show Gyle Road through to Tehama and Los Molinos.

#### **4.0 PUBLIC SERVICES**

- A) Include a discussion of the recreational facilities and opportunities found in Federal lands within the county in the Recreational Facilities section.
- B) Tehama County Schools: There is no mention of Shasta College classes, classes for the disabled, or adult education classes at the Community Center.
- C) Implementation Measure PS-2.1a – “County shall coordinate with federal land agencies that provide recreation opportunities to the public.” The private sector and County typically supplies the support infrastructure for such recreation.

#### **5.0 ECONOMIC**

- A) *Proposed Addition: Introduction, Par 3:* New resource-based businesses are encouraged by reutilizing traditional timber and agriculture industries. Changing demographic and culture shifts promote ecotourism, slow and organic food, non-consumptive recreation, field schools and boutique agriculture products. These are geographically diverse businesses that are based in land use. (5-2)
- B) *Proposed Addition: Page 5-2, Par 3:* Except for urbanized centers, most of the County’s landscape retains its agricultural or natural appearance. Natural (ecological) processes dominate the county. They provide an asset that can be utilized by business. Publicly-owned lands contribute to this natural endowment and can help to support the business economy. (5-2)

#### **6.0 OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION**

- A) Include that Lassen Volcanic National Park is classified as a Class 1 airshed in the Air Quality section (6-2).
- B) Needs to include more information about Oak Woodlands. (6-2)
- C) Include that Mineral Headquarters Historic District is designated and managed by the National Park Service as a historic district (6-4).
- D) Cottage of Mrs. John Brown doesn’t serve as a museum (6-4).
- E) *Proposed addition – Implementation Measure OS-1.1d – Recognize the existing Groundwater Management Plan of the El Camino Irrigation District on file with the Department of Water Resources. (6-5)*

- F) Implementation Measure OS-1.2a – Require all water supply agencies and companies in the county to identify and use water supply resources other than groundwater, if feasible, *with the exception of the El Camino Irrigation District, which has its own Groundwater Plan recognized by the State of California.* (Proposed addition – 6-5)
- G) Policy OS-1.3, Implementation Measure OS-1.3bf – *Drainage plans shall be required of all land divisions* (Proposed addition – 6-6).
- H) Implementation Measure OS-1.3g – *Proposed Addition: Prohibit the construction of permitted structures within existing public drainage, and inundation easements unless the approved by the owner of easement.* (6-7)
- I) Implementation Measure OS-1.4a – *Proposed Addition: The Development Policies of the Water District* (6-7).
- J) Implementation Measure OS-1.5b: The “Agricultural Commissioner” should be changed to “Regional Water Quality Control Board.” (6-7)
- K) Implementation Measure OS-1.3a – “Restrict storing hazardous material in the 100-year floodplain.” This could prohibit ranchers and farmers from storing gas, diesel, pesticides, etc. Many of the County’s creeks are in the 100-year flood plain and ranch buildings are located along the creeks. (6-7)
- L) Policy OS-1.9: “The export of groundwater from Tehama County shall be discouraged.” Isn’t there a Water Export Ordinance or some such document that was placed on the County ballot? (6-8)
- M) Implementation Measure OS-2.1e – Require all new wood burning fireplaces and stoves to meet EPA certified standards for fuel efficiency and air quality.  
*Comment: The TCAPCD’s rules and regulations has Rule 4:27 Fireplace and Solid Fuel Heating Device Usage rule to regulate fireplaces and stoves. Implementation Measure OS-2.1e should read: Require all new wood burning fireplaces and stoves shall meet the requirements of TCAPCD Rule 4:27; Fireplace and Solid Fuel Heating Device Usage.* (6-10)
- N) Implementation Measure OS-2.6k: “Adopt an ordinance that limits the amount of time diesel-powered trucks, buses and other heavy vehicles may idle.” Don’t you think this is going a bit far? Who would be the diesel police, AQCB? (6-11)
- O) Implementation Measure OS-3.1a: RE: “A Biological Site Inventory shall be required for all land divisions.” The Open Space Implementation Measures, as written, do not reflect the necessity of a Biological Inventory. This is the basis for conditioning all developments. Most the environmental “sensitives” will never be known unless a Biologist conducts a field review. (6-11)

- P) Policy OS-4.1b: DFG consultation within one mile of an endangered species or habitat may trigger an excessive amount of review. Instead of the one-mile trigger, consultation should be activated when the habitat elements used by the listed species are present in the project area. (6-13)
- Q) Policy OS-4.2: I don't believe the NDDDB is used to designate zones of critical habitat. Instead, it identifies general habitat types that are considered important or rare. (6-13)
- R) Policy OS-4.5: Implementation Measures are too weak. Weed species are a major problem to agricultural lands. Should add: *OS-4.c: Implement weed management practices in development plans that address allowable species and maintenance or control of weed species.* (6-14)
- S) Implementation Measure OS-5.1c: *Proposed addition:* "Ensure that mining infrastructure such as roads, pipes, and wires used to support the mining site do not adversely impact off-site resources." (6-15)
- T) Missing Implementation Measure: Where is the grading ordinance that would protect the water, wildlife, and cultural resources listed in Policies 1, 4, and 7? Currently, pre-submission road construction can be conducted in anticipation of future development project. This work is conducted without any public department oversight. (6-17)
- U) Implementation Measure OS-8.1a: What is the Tehama County Historical Commission? Can its mission and authority handle the consultation services mandated by this measure? (6-17)
- V) Implementation Measure OS-6.1d – "An archaeological survey should be conducted for all subdivisions as in the case of our neighboring counties." This should be a County requirement without CEQA. There is no way to know what is appropriate without this. (6-18)
- W) Include a description and discussion of lands in the county that are designated as wilderness by U.S. and Congress.
- X) Include the Lassen Volcanic National Park Highway as a historic district (as listed in the NPS Cultural Landscapes Inventory in 2002).
- Y) Should add policy and implementation measures to coordinate with local watershed groups in Cottonwood, Battle, Mill, and Deer Creeks, the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum, Westside Streams and others to help address resource issues and increase benefits within those interest areas.

Z) Should include the Development Policies of the Water District.

## **7.0 AGRICULTURE AND TIMBER**

- A) Second paragraph references dry land hay and grain. This crop is minimal to the foothills of Tehama County. (7-1)
- B) Policy AG-2.2 should include the Tehama County Resource Conservation District and the Tehama County Farm Bureau. (7-4)
- C) Policy AG-2.4 “Consider replacing trees” should be changed to “Shall replace trees”. (7-5)
- D) Should consider requirements for a project proponent to provide off-site mitigation where significant loss of native oaks are proposed. The measures could include tree planting, restoration of damaged lands in a particular watershed or community. (7-5)
- E) Does the Hardwood Advisory Committee still exist? (7-8)
- F) The RL, HR, UA restrictions adjacent to timberland do not recognize existing residential uses that are present (exe: Manton, Mill Creek, Mineral, etc.). (7-9)
- G) Implementation Measure AG-6.3 – TPZ minimum acreage limit could be reduced by the county to allow small parcels into the tax reduction program. Additional development limitations are attached to TPZ. (7-9)
- H) Policy AG-6.5 should include a reference to BMP’s in the policy. (7-9)
- I) Boundaries of the Valley Floor Agriculture/Upland Agriculture need to be finalized.
- J) South of Flournoy, the Western Valley Floor line needs to be moved easterly, to be in line with the line that is drawn from the Reeds Creek area, to the Rancho Tehama area. This area contains much grazing land and also land that is dry land farmed and needs to be included in Upland Ag area.
- K) Should add goals to conserve and preserve agricultural lands in Tehama County, especially areas currently farmed or having prime agricultural soils and outside existing planned communities and city limits.
- L) Should add goals to encourage local participation in County Planning and Land Use activities, including local Ag-based organizations.



- M) Should add goals to conserve, protect, and improve soil and water resources that support a variety of crops and products.
- N) Should add goals to ensure the compatibility of land uses adjacent to agricultural operations, so that agricultural productivity is not substantially affected.
- O) Should add goals that support and promote a healthy and competitive agricultural community and economy.
- P) Should add goals that maintain or create sites for agricultural industry in order to meet demand for agricultural suppliers, laboratory research, field research, seed research, food processing, and other related activities.
- Q) Should add goals to provide opportunities for recreation, tourism, and associated support services in appropriate locations, thereby accommodating the expansion of Ag tourism and supporting local Ag education programs.
- R) Should add goals to educate the public about the importance of agriculture in Tehama County.

## 8.0 SAFETY

- A) Include the National Park Service as an agency that has fire suppression responsibility in lands designated by the NPS.
- B) On pages 8-2, 8-3, and 8-4, Chief Gary Durden recommends the following changes/rewrites:
  - a. **Fire Protection** – The Tehama County Fire Department (TCFD) is administered under contract by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) and provides fire protection, emergency dispatching, specialized training, equipment repair and maintenance, fire prevention, fire safety education and emergency medical responses to the unincorporated areas of Tehama County with the exceptions of the Gerber and Capay Fire Protection Districts. Thus, in Tehama County, the Tehama County Fire Department and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection are integrated departments that mutually support each agency’s fire suppression and emergency response efforts.

The TCFD has automatic aid agreements with the Red Bluff City Fire Department, the Corning City Fire Department, the Gerber Fire Protection District, the Butte County Fire Department, Lassen Volcanic National Park, and the Shasta County Fire Department. Additionally, the TCFD

has mutual aid agreements with the Capay Fire Protection District and the Cottonwood Fire Protection District.

The Tehama County Fire Department currently provides fire responses to the citizens of Tehama County through a network of sixteen fire stations and fifteen volunteer fire companies. At present, five of the stations, Los Molinos, Corning, Bowman, El Camino, and Antelope are staffed year round twenty-four hours a day. In 2006 TCFD personnel included 140 volunteers, and 10 career firefighters to staff 25 fire engines, 8 rescue squads, and 9 water tenders. Career California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) firefighters are contracted by TCFD to augment wintertime fire protection staffing.

This distribution of stations places most residents of Tehama County within five road miles of a responding fire station. Prompt reporting and dispatching of a fire, equipment and personnel availability, water supply and time of response (directly affected by distance and type of staffing) are critical elements in the success or failure of structure fire protection. For more information, see the Tehama County Background Report, Sections 7.0 (Community Facilities and Services) and 9.0 (Hazards). (8-2)

- b. **Fire Hazards** – A *Fire Management Plan 2005* was prepared for Tehama County by CDF in cooperation with the Tehama County Fire Safe Councils. The Tehama/Glenn Unit includes areas in both Tehama and Glenn Counties. The plan is the instrument by which pre-fire planning activities are identified, prioritized and implemented through the cooperative efforts of local fire agencies and fire safe councils. It has been noted that most of the non-federal land outside the valley floor of Tehama County is classified as wildland area that may contain substantial forest fire risks and hazards. Furthermore, rural and wildland development has increasingly impacted wildland fire suppression priorities in areas where development has moved into the grasslands, oak woodlands, and forests. Generally referred to as the “Wildland-Urban Interface,” this encroachment of dwellings into previously uninhabited areas has exacerbated the challenges of managing wildland fires. (8-3)
- c. **Wildland Fire Protection** – Tehama County Fire Department (TCFD) is responsible for suppression of wildland fires (vegetation fires) within the Local Responsibility area (LRA) not protected by other jurisdictions. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) is financially responsible for wildland fire suppression and prevention in the State Responsibility Area (SRA). The cities of Red Bluff and Corning, and fire protection districts in Gerber, and Capay are responsible for wildland fire suppression within their jurisdictions. The U.S. Forest Service is responsible for the suppression of wildland fires on National Forest

property not protected by other agreements. The TCFD provides wildland fire protection through its existing fire department organization and resources.

The TCFD is combination career and volunteer department. Time constraints for training the volunteers result in only one or two training sessions per year being devoted solely to wildland fire tactics, methods, and procedures. TCFD volunteer firefighters range in age from eighteen to sixty-five. While some volunteers maintain a physical fitness program that allows them to perform well during wildland fires, volunteers are most effective on smaller fires and emergencies of limited duration. (8-3)

- d. **Fire Department Medical Response** – Tehama County Fire Department (TCFD) provides various levels of emergency medical services (EMS) to an area of 2,951 square miles with a population of about 40,000 people. Approximately 64% of TCFD responses over the past five years have been to EMS emergencies. These include traffic collisions, which require a combination of fire protection, rescue and EMS. In 2000 emergency medical incident responses for TCFD/CDF totaled 1,527. In 2005 emergency medical incident responses for TCFD/CDF totaled 2,727, a 78.6 percent increase. Based on proposed development and subsequent population increases the number of emergency medical incident responses by TCFD/CDF will continue to rise. For a complete description of the emergency medical response services provided by the TCFD, please see the Tehama County Background Report, Section 7.0 (Community Facilities and Services). (8-4)
  
- e. **Fire Department Homeland Security/Hazardous Materials Response** – The Tehama County Fire Department (TCFD) currently trains personnel to the state mandated minimum level of *First Responder Haz Mat Operational*. Some CDF employees within the Unit are certified to the *Hazardous Materials Technical Specialist* level. TCFD has no legal responsibility for abatement of hazardous materials incidents; however, because TCFD is a “first responder” to this type of incident and its mission includes the protection of life and property, TCFD takes basic action to isolate and deny entry.

The threat of a terrorist attack has permeated even the rural areas of the United States; consequently, Red Buff City Fire Department, Tehama County Sheriff’s Office, California Office of Emergency Services, and TCFD/CDF operates, staffs, and maintains a Mass Casualty Incident/Decontamination (MCI) trailer. Funded by a Department of Homeland Security grant the MCI trailer has the capability of providing the equipment for mass decontamination and injury triage and treatment. (8-4)

- C) Airports: You mention six but only name four (8-5).
- D) *Proposed Re-Write*; Policy SAF-3.1: “The County shall require accepted fire resistive construction practices, including but not limited to site design and layout; use of appropriate landscaping and building materials; and the installation of automatic fire sprinklers on new and redevelopment projects.” (8-10)
- E) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1a: “The County will continue to enforce local, state, and federal fire and safety codes. The County Fire Departments and all fire protection districts will enforce the uniform codes adopted by the California Building and Standards Commission and the Office of the State Fire Marshal in addition to fire and life safety regulations within the California Government Code and Code of Regulations and those adopted via county ordinance(s).” (8-10)
- F) *Proposed Addition* – Implementation Measure SAF-3.1 – “Require all home or manufactured home replacements to comply with current fire suppression requirements, including electrical wiring components.” (8-11)
- G) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1b: “Require all new developments located in “Very High Fire Severity Zones” and “High Fire Severity Zones” to conform to California’s Wildland Urban Interface Building Standards.” (8-11)
- H) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1c: “Ensure through the project review process that new developments include accepted fire engineering and design features that complement and enhance fire suppression capabilities and reduce fire hazards. Fire engineering and design features include sufficient fire hydrant “fire flow” capacity and/or residential fire sprinklers.” (8-11)
- I) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1d: “Require that new developments and redevelopment projects provide for safe, all weather, unobstructed access for emergency equipment and simultaneous civilian evacuation. (8-11)
- J) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1f: “Require on-site fire suppression systems for new commercial and industrial development, as well as multi-family residential development with five or more units, to reduce the impact on fire department equipment and personnel.” (8-11)
- K) *Proposed Re-Write*; Policy SAF-3.2: “The County shall prohibit new developments in ‘High and Very High Fire Severity Zones’ and other fire prone areas or require mitigation to minimize hazards to acceptable levels.” (8-11)

- L) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.2a: “Review development proposals to determine if new development projects are located in “High” or “Very High Fire Severity Zones” or fire prone areas. If development is permitted in these areas, ensure that mitigation measures are required and followed.” (8-11)
- M) *Proposed Re-Write*; Policy SAF-3.3: “The County shall ensure that sufficient levels of service for fire protection are maintained by requiring development projects to provide and/or fund fire protection facilities, personnel, operations, and maintenance or provide alternative methods that sustain adequate levels of service.” (8-11)
- N) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.3a: “Where determined to be necessary, the County will require as condition of approval the dedication of land and/or establishment of an appropriate funding mechanism to help offset costs for fire protection facilities and services.” (8-12)
- O) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF 3.3b: “Require new construction to pay their fair-share for necessary fire protection improvements by continuing to review Chapter 9.15 of the Tehama County Code (Development Impact Mitigation Fees.” (8-12)
- P) *Proposed Addition*; Implementation Measure SAF 3.3c: “Require, in the areas of the county not served by rated fire hydrants (minimum of 250 gallons per minute for 2 hours), that any new dwelling unit have installed an engineered, automatic fire suppression system that complies with the most current edition of NFPA 13D.” (8-12)
- Q) *Proposed Re-Write*; Policy SAF-3.4: “The County shall continue to support and cooperate with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) in providing fire protection services and fire prevention programs for the unincorporated areas of the County.” (8-12)
- R) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.4a: “Participate in mutual aid agreements and continue to collaborate with CDF and the county’s fire departments and fire protection districts.” (8-12)
- S) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5e: “Require and inspect for compliance with California Code Public Resources Code Section 4290-4299; Tehama County Code Chapter 9.14 (Fire Safe Regulations); and adopted Development Standards.” (8-12)
- T) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5f: “Encourage strategic road placement and the use and maintenance of firebreaks, fuel breaks, and green belts for effective pre-fire suppression planning by local fire departments and

districts, the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.” (8-13)

- U) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5g: “Encourage and promote the installation of smoke detectors and fire extinguishers in existing structures through continuing public education. Encourage and promote the installation of residential fire sprinklers in all new residential housing.” (8-13)
- V) Implementation Measure SAF-3.5h – “Require all homes to have lighted address signs.” This is not practical in many outlying areas because often there is no power along the road where the signs are located. (8-13)
- W) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5h: “Require businesses and homes to have legible, lighted and/or reflective address signs located along identified streets.” (8-13)
- X) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5j: “The County Fire Department, in conjunction with CDF and local fire protection agencies, will implement the following fire prevention programs as funding and staff availability allow:
  - a. Upon request, assist businesses in preparing their fire prevention plans.
  - b. Present fire prevention programs at local schools and community events.
  - c. Carry out routine fire inspections.
  - d. Perform pre-fire plan inspections for businesses, Office of State Fire Marshal regulated facilities, and all medium and high hazard occupancies.(8-13)
- Y) Implementation Measure SAF 8.1a: “a plan for each airport.” Does this include the private airports? (8-19)
- Z) Implementation Measure SAF 9.3 as determined by the “County Planning Department.” This should be the “Environmental Health Department,” not planning. (8-22)

## **9.0 NOISE**

No comment letters were received for Element 9.0: Noise.