

This section characterizes land uses and jurisdictions in and around Tehama County, and discusses land use planning documents and policies pertinent to the planning area. Please refer to Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources, for discussion and analysis focused on agricultural land use.

### 4.9.1 EXISTING SETTING

#### REGIONAL SETTING

Tehama County is bounded by Shasta County to the north, Butte and Glenn counties to the south, Mendocino and Trinity counties to the west, and Plumas County to the east. Within the County are the incorporated cities of Corning, Red Bluff, and Tehama.

#### LOCAL SETTING

Physically, Tehama County covers a total of approximately 2,951 square miles of land (or 1,892,572 acres). The General Plan Planning Area, which is the private land in Tehama County for which the County has jurisdiction, covers approximately 1,394,384 acres. A discussion of "non-jurisdictional" lands, for which the County government has no land use authority, is provided below.

Tehama County is largely rural in nature with isolated pockets of population primarily concentrated near the incorporated cities, and/or along the major transportation corridors. All of the major incorporated and unincorporated developed areas within Tehama County are located adjacent to major county or state transportation centers, with the majority located adjacent to Interstate-5 and Highway 99.

Clustered commercial land uses are also located primarily along the major state and county roadways, most of which are located in the vicinities of Red Bluff, Corning and in the unincorporated community of Los Molinos. Residential land uses within the developed portions of the County often tend to be located behind or beyond the commercial and service uses adjacent to the major street network.

In the western and eastern portions of Tehama County, large ranches, timber company holdings, and government land dominate the terrain. Much of the land use is resource-based, taking the form of cropland, rangeland and pasture land, timber land and non-farmland that can best be described as rural residential and suburban residential, as well as larger "estate" parcels on non-resource lands. Much of the agricultural and timberlands depicted in the current General Plan land use maps can be considered accurate in general to their actual land uses.

#### Nonjurisdictional Lands

A large portion of the physical County is not subject to the County government's land use planning authority. A total of 489,188 acres (26.3 percent of the land) is regulated or owned by entities that are not under the planning jurisdiction of the County. **Table 4.9-1** identifies the major categories of nonjurisdictional landholders in the County.

The largest nonjurisdictional land holdings within the physical boundaries of Tehama County are managed by federal government agencies (e.g., the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management [BLM], and Lassen National Park) and the State of California. The Native American owned land near the City of Corning is owned by the Paskenta Band of Nomlaki Indians which, for purposes of this EIR, is considered to act under federal law as a sovereign nation.

The cities of Corning, Red Bluff, and Tehama are also considered nonjurisdictional lands because they are incorporated cities. Each city serves as the planning authority within its own city limits. Approximately 7,741 acres are within the three existing incorporated cities in the County.

**TABLE 4.9-1  
LAND OWNERSHIP, TEHAMA COUNTY**

Land Ownership	Acres	Percent of Total Land Area
Mendocino National Forest	114,188	6.0%
Lassen Volcanic National Park	4,191	0.2%
Lassen National Forest	181,491	9.6%
Shasta-Trinity National Forest	76,515	4.0%
Bureau of Land Management	49,493	2.6%
Other	62,318	3.3%
<i>Subtotal</i>	488,196	25.8%
Native American	2,251	0.1%
Cities	7,741	0.4%
<i>Subtotal</i>	9,992	0.5%
<i>Total Non-Jurisdictional Lands</i>	498,188	26.3%
County-Jurisdictional Land	1,394,384	73.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,892,572</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Source: Tehama County General Plan; Tehama County Assessor's Office; Bureau of Land Management; U.S. Forest Service

**Table 4.9-2** illustrates the acreages of land use designations in Tehama County. Approximately 42 percent of the total land in the County is designated as "grazing" land (other compatible uses are allowed), while nearly 14 percent is designated primarily for agricultural use. Lands intended for residential development (Rural Large Lot, Rural Small Lot, Suburban, and Urban) make up less than four percent of the total County land. When considering only County-jurisdictional land, grazing land accounts for 57 percent, while cropland accounts for 18 percent of the total jurisdiction land area.

**TABLE 4.9-2  
EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATIONS AND ACREAGE**

Land Use Designation	Total Acres	Percent of Total Land in County	Percent of County Jurisdictional Land
Cropland, Cropland/NPS-Wilderness	254,822.31	13.46%	18.13%
Composite Cropland	7,435.71	0.39%	0.53%
City	7,197.04	0.38%	N/A
Commercial Recreation	344.23	0.02%	0.02%
Grazing, Grazing/NPS-Wilderness	795,069.74	42.00%	56.55%
General Commercial	2,127.12	0.11%	0.15%
Public Land, Public Land/Habitat Resources, Public Land/NPS-Wilderness	477,801.44	25.24%	N/A
General Industrial	3,131.17	0.17%	0.22%
Indian Land	1,913.94	0.10%	N/A
Neighborhood Center Commercial	13.52	0.00%	0.00%
Habitat Resource, Habitat Resource/NPS-Wilderness	16,132.00	0.85%	1.15%
Resource Lands, Conservation/NPS-Wilderness	14,327.24	0.76%	1.02%

## 4.9 LAND USE PLANNING

Land Use Designation	Total Acres	Percent of Total Land in County	Percent of County Jurisdictional Land
Open Space	234.23	0.01%	0.02%
Public Facility	368.99	0.02%	0.03%
Rural Large Lot	22,571.52	1.19%	1.61%
Rural Small Lot	24,631.02	1.30%	1.75%
Scenic Easement	2,633.67	0.14%	0.19%
Suburban	14,727.68	0.78%	1.05%
Timber, Timber/NPS Wilderness	243,570.47	12.87%	17.32%
Urban	1,631.88	0.09%	0.12%
Water	2,138.59	0.11%	0.15%
Total	1,892,823.51	100.00%	100.0%

Source: PMC; Vestra Resources, Inc

### 4.9.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

#### STATE

##### California Government Code

California state law requires that every city and county adopt a General Plan to guide physical development of land within the jurisdictions' boundaries. The law requires the Plan to be comprehensive, and requires the Plan at a minimum to contain the following elements: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise and safety. State planning laws relating to General Plans are contained in Chapter 3 of the California Government Code, and laws pertaining to zoning regulations are in Chapter 4.

#### LOCAL

##### County Of Tehama, General Plan

The Tehama County General Plan is used to guide future development in unincorporated areas of the County. State law requires that all local governments prepare a General Plan for future development in their jurisdictions. The County's current General Plan was adopted in 1983. The Tehama County General Plan of 1983 states objectives and policies that relate to community development and land use planning. Key objectives and policies that address land use include Objective CO-1 which states that planning within the County should be done in a manner which will provide opportunities for current and future residents to enjoy small-scale, community oriented living environments and to encourage higher densities to reduce agricultural land conversion demands. Policies CO-a, CO-b, CO-c, and CO-d require that the County develop, monitor, and update an inventory of developable lands to accommodate growth. Policies CO-e, CO-f, CO-g, and CO-h describe the four general types of communities, the land use designations, as well as densities allowed in certain categories. Policies CO-i, CO-j and CO-k describe preferred tower locations and development criteria.

The General Plan also includes Planning Area Policies for each of the recognized Planning Areas, including: the North 1-5 Planning Area (Policies CO (NI-5)-a through CO (NI-5)-h); the Central 1-5 Planning Area (Policies CO (CI-5)-a through CO (CI-5)-e); the South 1-5 Planning Area (Policies CO (SI-5)-a through CO (SI-5)-e); the Eastern Planning Area (Policies CO (E)-a through CO (E)-c); and the Western Planning Area (Policies CO (W)-a through CO (W)-e).

Since the proposed project is a comprehensive update of the Tehama County General Plan, the Updated Plan, when adopted, will replace the current General Plan and the current plan will cease to be applicable. The proposed 2008-2028 General Plan would substantially revise the current plan. For continuity, many provisions of the current plan will be incorporated, in part or whole, into the updated plan. The proposed plan will also update and expand upon the provisions of the current plan with the intent of formulating a comprehensive planning document that will more effectively and efficiently serve Tehama County.

### **Zoning Ordinance**

The Tehama County Ordinance implements the goals and policies of the County's General Plan. It establishes zoning districts that guide the development and use of land within the County by defining allowable land uses within each district. The Zoning Ordinance provides development standards such as land use limitations, building setbacks, height limits, and sign standards, among others. By State law, the Zoning Ordinance must be consistent with the adopted General Plan. Therefore, when the County adopts the 2008-2028 General Plan, the County will need to update its Zoning Ordinance as necessary to maintain consistency.

### **Airport Land Use Plans**

There are two public airports within Tehama County: Corning Municipal Airport, which is owned and operated by the City of Corning, and the Red Bluff Municipal Airport, which is owned and operated by the City of Red Bluff.

The Tehama County Airport Land Use Commission adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for the Red Bluff Airport Land Use Plan in 1990 (revised in 2001), and for the Corning Municipal Airport in 1991. The CLUP regulates land use in three primary areas: safety zones, noise zones, and height restrictions. It provides land use compatibility guidelines for lands near the airport to avert potential safety problems and to ensure unhampered airport operations. Under California Government Code Section 65302.3(a), general plans must be consistent with any airport land use plan adopted pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 21675. Section 4.13, Transportation and Circulation, provides more information regarding the airports and their CLUPs.

### **Local Agency Formation Commission of Tehama County**

In 1963, the State Legislature created local agency formation commissions (LAFCo) for each county, and assigned to LAFCos the authority to regulate local agency boundary changes. Subsequently, the State has expanded the authority of LAFCos, most recently with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000. Among the goals of LAFCos, in accordance with State law, are goals to preserve agricultural and open space land resources, and to provide for efficient delivery of community services.

The Tehama County LAFCo has authority over land use decisions in Tehama County affecting local agency boundaries. Its authority extends to the incorporated cities within the County. Specifically, LAFCo has the authority to review and approve or disapprove the following:

- Annexations to or detachments from cities and districts.
- Formation or dissolution of districts.
- Incorporation or disincorporation of cities.
- Consolidation or reorganization of cities and districts.
- Establishment of subsidiary districts.

## 4.9 LAND USE PLANNING

---

- Development of, and amendments to, Spheres of Influence. The Sphere of Influence is the probable physical boundary and service area of each local government agency. This may extend beyond the current service area of the agency.
- Extensions of service beyond an agency's jurisdictional boundaries.
- Provision of new or different services by districts.
- Proposals that extend service into previously unserved territory in unincorporated areas.

In addition, the Tehama County LAFCo can initiate and conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) for services within its jurisdiction. An MSR typically includes a review of existing municipal services provided by a local agency and its infrastructure needs and deficiencies. It also evaluates financing constraints and opportunities, management efficiencies, opportunities for rate restructuring and shared facilities, local accountability and governance, and other issues.

### 4.9.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that the project may have significant impacts associated with land use planning if it does any of the following:

- 1) Physically divide an established community.
- 2) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
- 3) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

#### METHODOLOGY

Evaluation of potential impacts to land use of the proposed General Plan was based on review of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan (relative to the current County General Plan) and the Tehama County Zoning Code. The proposed project is then compared to the existing conditions, and to other related land use plans (e.g., airport land use plans), to determine the impacts due to proposed policies and land use changes.

#### Physically Divide an Established Community

**Impact 4.9.1** Land use designation changes in the General Plan have the potential to physically divide or impact an established community. This is considered a **less than significant** impact.

The General Plan is intended to assess existing community development issues and anticipate and respond to related needs for the next 20 years. The Land Use Element of the General Plan is formulated to provide effective utilization of land with consideration of key land use components (e.g., agricultural, residential, commercial and industrial land use, public uses, parks, and open spaces). The Land Use Element is a means to encourage and facilitate a harmonious approach to addressing future needs, taking into consideration existing uses and development patterns as well as resource opportunities and constraints.

While the 2008-2028 General Plan includes the re-designation of land uses in the County, it does not include changes that would re-designate land uses in an established community, nor does it introduce new roadways, railroad tracks or any other development that would physically divide an established community.

### Proposed General Plan Policies and Implementation Measures that Mitigate Potential Impacts

The following General Plan policies and implementation measures contained in the Land Use Element will help ensure that established communities in the County are not further divided.

Land Use Element: LU-1, LU-1.1, LU-1.2, LU-1.3, LU-1.4, LU-1.4b, LU-2.2, LU-5.3

Land Use Goal LU-1 states the intent to plan development within the County in a manner which will provide opportunities for current and future residents to enjoy rural, community-oriented living environments that are similar to those currently found in the County. The 2008-2028 General Plan encourages higher densities in some areas, where appropriate, and promotes in-fill development to discourage agricultural land conversions. Policy LU-1.1 encourages future residential development to be located adjacent to existing communities and established residential areas or within areas for which Specific or Master Plans have been prepared. Small, isolated housing tracts in outlying areas are discouraged under this policy. LU-1.2 and LU-1.3 further encourage in-fill development, increased housing densities, and build-out of existing developed areas. Land Use Policies and Implementation Measures LU-1.4, LU-1.4b, LU-2.2, and LU-5.3 all support the maintenance of community identity through preserving open space and natural resources, buffers between dissimilar uses, and direct growth to non-agricultural areas that have appropriate and adequate services and infrastructure.

Consequently, it is the intent of the 2008-2028 General Plan to avoid the division of communities, as well as other significant impacts to established communities. Since there is no land use designation or specific project of sufficient size or in a location envisioned in the 2008-2028 General Plan that could effectively divide an existing community, it could be concluded that there is no impact. However, the term "community" could be interpreted to be a small neighborhood that could be affected by the extension of a new street; the creation of a school or park site; or the conversion of single family dwelling to a more intense use. These issues are more a concern of neighborhood design and compatibility but, in a sense, even small projects could "divide" a community. This impact is considered to be **less than significant**, while numerous General Plan goals, policies, and implementing measures are provided in the 2008-2028 General Plan which emphasize design compatibility with existing and adjacent neighborhoods.

Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan goals, policies and implementation measures assist in the protection of existing communities from physical division and would reduce this impact to **less than significant**.

### Mitigation Measures

None Required.

### **Conflicts with Relevant Land Use Plans, Policies or Regulations**

**Impact 4.9.2** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan has the potential to conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations of agencies with jurisdiction over parts of the Planning Area that provide for environmental protection. This is considered a **potentially significant** impact.

## 4.9 LAND USE PLANNING

---

### Tehama County Zoning Code

The Board of Supervisors adopted the Tehama County Zoning Ordinance in 1983 as Title 17 to the County Municipal Code. The Zoning Ordinance and is amended as necessary to implement the 2008-2028 General Plan and to ensure consistency of the zoning code with the 2008-2028 General Plan as defined in Chapter 17.76 of the Zoning Ordinance. All redevelopment and proposed development is subject to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, which is used in conjunction with the General Plan to ensure that redevelopment activities and proposed development is suitable and compatible with adjacent and nearby land uses, and protects human health, safety, and welfare. The proposed 2008-2028 General Plan results in the addition of new land use designations and results in the re-designation of lands from one land use to another. Some of the land use changes may require revisions to the Zoning Ordinance in order to maintain consistency between the Zoning Ordinance and the 2008-2028 General Plan. Consistent with California Government Code Section 65860(c) the zoning ordinance will be amended within a reasonable time so that it is consistent with the 2008-2028 General Plan as amended. This impact is considered to be **less than significant**.

### Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plans

Both the Red Bluff and Corning airports are required to have a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) which identifies the surrounding land uses acceptable within the safety and overflight zones for each airport. The Tehama County Airport Land Use Commission adopted a CLUP for the Red Bluff Airport Land Use Plan in 1990, which was revised in 2001. A CLUP was adopted for the Corning Municipal Airport in 1991. The CLUP regulates land use in three primary topic areas: safety zones, noise zones, and height restrictions. It provides land use compatibility guidelines for lands near the airport, designed to avert potential safety problems and to ensure unhampered airport operations. While the Red Bluff Municipal Airport and the Corning Municipal Airport are located within the city limits of the respective cities, the safety and overflight zones of both airports extend into unincorporated areas of the County. Under California Government Code Section 65302.3(a), general plans must be consistent with any airport land use plan adopted pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 21675.

Land uses surrounding the Red Bluff and Corning Airports have not been changed from existing land use designations in the proposed 2008-2028 General Plan. All development is required to adhere to policies identified in the Red Bluff and Corning CLUPs, as well as related policies identified in the 2008-2028 General Plan. As a result, the 2008-2028 General Plan would have no substantial conflicts with the CLUPs of the Red Bluff and Corning airports and, therefore, there will be **less than significant**.

### State and Federal Agencies

Various state and federal agencies have at least some jurisdiction over environmental and resource issues addressed in the 2008-2028 General Plan, at least to the extent that goals and policies of the 2008-2028 General Plan should not be inconsistent with their requirements. Agencies having some degree of authority over particular planning issues include: the Federal Emergency Management Agency (flooding); the Regional Water Quality Resource Board (water quality); CalTrans (state highways); and the State Mining and Geology Board (mining). The relationship with, or affect that these agencies may have on, issues addressed in the 2008-2028 General Plan is discussed throughout the EIR in those sections where their authority applies (e.g., Water Quality, Hazards, Transportation and Air Quality). In all instances the 2008-2028 General Plan is consistent with the requirements and regulatory jurisdiction of these agencies, or the 2008-2028 General Plan requires that development projects, when proposed, shall comply with the

applicable agency requirements. Therefore, there a **less than significant** impact relative to this issue.

Mitigation Measures

None Required.

**Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan**

**Impact 4.9.3** The 2008-2028 General Plan would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the area. Consequently, there is **no impact**.

There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in existence in Tehama County. Therefore, implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan would not lead to incompatible development with any area habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans,

Mitigation Measures

None required.

**4.9.4 CUMULATIVE SETTING, IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

CUMULATIVE SETTING

Land use impacts are typically isolated to a jurisdiction, except where land uses may interact or conflict with adjacent jurisdictions. The cumulative setting for land use includes existing, approved, proposed and reasonably foreseeable development within the Planning Area of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan. Total buildout of the 2008-2028 General Plan land uses could theoretically increase the population of the County to 416,967. A more realistic projection, based on actual and expected growth trends, predicts that the population may reach 63,647 by the year 2028.

Additionally, there are known development projects in the City of Red Bluff and the City of Corning that will contribute to cumulative changes in the landscape and land uses within each planning area.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Impact 4.9.4** Implementation of the 2008-2028 General Plan, in addition to existing, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in Tehama County, would contribute to cumulative land use conflicts. This would be a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

Under cumulative conditions, the 2008-2028 General Plan and subsequent development would not contribute to land use conflicts beyond those discussed in Impacts 4.9.1 and 4.9.2. Conflicts between planning documents, such as the Tehama County Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the General Plan land use map, would be specific to the 2008-2028 General Plan and specific development projects, and would not have an increased significance in the aggregate under cumulative conditions. Similarly, land use conflicts, particularly those between urban and agricultural resources that would occur under cumulative development conditions would also

## 4.9 LAND USE PLANNING

---

be site-specific. There are known development projects in the City of Red Bluff, City of Corning and Tehama County that will contribute to cumulative changes in the landscape and land uses within each planning area. However, these projects are not expected to interact or conflict with the land uses in the County of Tehama Planning Area. This impact, both in the context of impacts caused by cumulative conditions and the project's potential incremental contribution to cumulative impacts, is **less than cumulatively considerable**.

### Mitigation Measures

None required.

### 4.9.5 REFERENCES

Tehama County. 1983, as revised. *County Municipal Code (Title 17, Zoning Ordinance)*.

Tehama County Airport Land Use Commission. Revised, 2001. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Red Bluff Airport*.

Tehama County Airport Land Use Commission, 1991. *Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the Corning Municipal Airport*.