

**TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN REVISION PROJECT  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF THE  
MEETING APRIL 12, 2007**

The Tehama County General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee met in a regular session at 6:05 p.m. on Thursday, April 12, 2007 at Red Bluff Community Center, 1500 South Jackson St., Red Bluff, CA.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Alan Hess	John Roth
Anne Read	John Crosby
Arlo Stroing	Ken Robison
Bill Burrows	Linda Walker
Burt Bundy	Norm Gruver
Calvin Rasmussen	Pat Johnston
Charles Willard	Ron Warner
Dexter Wright	Wally Roney
Gregg Werner	

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Leroy Myers  
Linda Hayes  
Linda Jenkins

**ALSO PRESENT:**

George W. Robson, Planning Director  
John Stoufer, Planning Staff  
Sean Harrasser, Planning Staff  
Scott Friend, P.M.C.  
Kellee A. Taresh, Recording Secretary  
Gary Antone, Public Works Director  
Jerry Brownfield, Public Works Staff  
Doti Watkins, Public Works Staff  
Arthur Wylene, Deputy County Counsel  
Williams "Bill" Goodwin, County Administration

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

George Robson, Planning Director, welcomed the committee and public to the meeting. Mr. Robson explained the Revised Draft General Plan was originally mailed out containing maps that were light and hard to read. P.M.C. had the document reprinted and a new copy was mailed out to the Committee on April 6, 2007.

**CITIZENS CONCERNS:**

A lady in the audience asked about the dates for the public hearing meeting regarding El Camino. Mr. Robson stated it depends on the Committee Recommendation at tonight's meeting as to when the meeting would be scheduled and El Camino will be the first public hearing. Mr. Robson said it would be no sooner than May 24, 2007 depending on the ability to reprint the public drafts and make necessary notifications, which is a minimum of 10 days, but we would like to do 20-30 days. He stated there would be another 5 meetings, one meeting each week (excluding the week of graduation and the week of the 4<sup>th</sup> of July).

Alan Hess handed out the "El Camino Irrigation District Acreage" and explained the handout to the Committee.

Pat Johnston stated public comment time limit is running out and anyone wishing to comment is welcome regarding Lake Red Bluff. Anyone wishing to comment can contact the Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF:**  
**March 1, 2007**

Anne Read asked about the items from the last minutes which stated they would be brought back to the committee for review. She also questioned the CalFire Maps.

Mr. Robson stated that those items were not included in the agenda and stated there are new CalFire maps coming out. He asked Chuck Schoendienst from CalFire if there would be new maps. Mr. Schoendienst stated they should be out in mid July.

**MOTION: It was moved by Ron Warner, seconded by Anne Read and passed unanimously by the General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee to approve the minutes of March 1, 2007 as mailed.**

**PowerPoint Presentation**  
**Gregg Werner, Burt Bundy, Anne Read, Bill Burrows**

Burt Bundy started the PowerPoint presentation. He stated a group of committee members had put together a presentation. He stated he wanted to connect the quality of life and rural nature of Tehama County. He stated they know there will be growth and they support growth, but they think it needs to be a reasonable level of growth and in specific areas. The specific areas they discussed early on was the north I-5 corridor and they feel the Proposed General Plan fails in many different ways to meet those goals that the committee has put in place over the 5 years.

Gregg Werner talked about the contents of the General Plan and how that may affect Tehama Co. in the future. He explained Tehama Co. has approximately 62,000 people. He explained the Housing Element which was approved last year states a projected growth of about 1.4% per year, which is consistent with the State Dept. of Finance projection for Tehama County. He stated for reference if you applied that to the Unincorporated population that could mean about 11,000 people between now and 2025. He stated that with some of the large development proposals, faster is not a bad bet. He stated the General Plan is the County's policy document. He stated it creates expectations on the part of land owners and developers. In the Sacramento Valley there are a number of large developments coming together by large developers in Colusa, Glenn, Tehama and Shasta Counties. He stated that Central Valley is going to be the big growth area of California, therefore the potential for substantial growth is much greater now than ever in the past.

Mr. Werner stated the General Plan could allow perhaps 300,000 people in Tehama County, unincorporated portion of the County, which is approximately 260,000 more than are in the area now. Which means 21 times the 11,000 projected population forecast.

Dexter Wright stated the PowerPoint presentation states "would allow at least 300,000 people" and shouldn't that state "would allow at the most 300,000 people". Mr. Wright handed out "Land Use

Designation – Proposed General Plan” chart showing Rural Large Lot acreage and percentage, Developable Land, Open Space/Non-Development and Other Jurisdictions.

Mr. Werner stated it does not include any people added to the City limits of Corning or Red Bluff. It is a very large amount of development. He stated that in the future you may have a population approaching 400,000 people. Most of it is in the area north of Red Bluff. There are about 50,000 acres which is in the Special Planning areas where city type development is proposed. He stated the different projects proposed are Sun City, Morgan Ranch, Moore Ranch, Jelly’s Ferry South, Sunset Hills Estates and Battle Creek Ranch. He explained each of the proposed projects. He estimated the maximum population would increase by 99,029 people or more as there are adjacent properties which could create more development.

Mr. Werner explained each of the different planning areas infrastructure, densities and Services (Schools, Fire, Law Enforcement)

**Note: Refer to PowerPoint Handout “Tehama County’s Future – The Tehama County General Plan”.**

Burt Bundy stated the concern of the General Plan sub-committee is the impact of these areas of the General Plan, these projects will affect the quality of life in Tehama County. He explained that if you look at a few of these projects some of these projects are along the Sacramento River Corridor and not along the I-5 corridor. He stated that the densities are way too dense. He referred to the definition of “Leapfrog Development” in the Glossary. He stated there are several developments which fall under this definition. He stated the Rawson Road West is one that falls under this designation. It would allow ¼ acre zoning, is this an inappropriate density, there are no facilities such as schools, etc? He explained there are sewer problems which exist also. He explained the Battle Creek Ranch. He stated this is a wetland area, Sacramento River corridor, this is leapfrog development. He stated this sets a precedent as far as development on the Eastside of the River as this is no where near the I-5 corridor.

Mr. Bundy displayed a map of the East and West lines on the General Plan Map. He explained the lines the committee supposedly set as far as the division between grazing and Valley Ag line (the black line) this is a 160 acre development on the outside of the lines and if you are Williamson Act it is 40 acre, Ag land is 20 acre. He stated this is supposed to be an area for crop lands and orchards for the Valley Ag. He stated the lines are at the base of the foothills. He explained in detail the lands and crop capabilities. He stated this line is a political boundary line and not a scientific boundary tied to soil types or water availability. He stated he would like more time to review the maps.

Ken Robison stated there were committee members which reviewed these maps and went over the boundary lines. He stated the committee has had the time and has reviewed the maps in detail.

Mr. Bundy stated the committee that reviewed the map probably came up with a line they felt was appropriate, however, there are no minutes showing the committee acted on those lines.

Mr. Bundy reviewed the Highway 99 Bypass and its location. He stated years ago the County recognized there was going to be a substantial need to increase traffic capacity on Highway 99. He stated that years ago the county felt that getting the most traffic off the Highway 99 corridor from Los Molinos to Red Bluff was to improve South Avenue and take it to I-5 and make South Avenue 4 lanes. He stated he was unsure why that was not used. He stated the new Highway 99 Bypass would promote development in an area with many vernal pools, range lands and not an area prone in

development, there is actually a lot of area in conservation easements, very unrealistic to put a highway out there.

Mr. Bundy reviewed "Unresolved Issues", including Antelope, Los Molinos, Dairyville, El Camino, Woodson Bridge, and West Red Bluff. Density, septic systems, historical lot sizes are problems in some of these areas.

Anne Read addressed the committee and those in attendance. She stated the policies are in place, however the maps do not follow the policies. She stated the Administrative Draft General Plan includes far too much development potential, and most Tehama County residents do not want this much change. She stated the huge development potential threatens agriculture, "the backbone of Tehama County's Economy."

Bill Burrows addressed the committee. He stated his family has lived in the area since 1848 and the most important part of this plan is the quality of life and working landscapes and view-scapes. He reiterated the comments from earlier about 20 times more people, meaning 20 times more cars, realizing probably we will not develop to that type of development. He stated his recommendation is to address the problems in the Land Use Maps and address the policies.

Mr. Burrows related a personal story regarding his wife and an incident at the Wal-Mart Store. He stated with development and population movement with the potential in this General Plan we will have more and more types of criminal activities happen and with rapid growth there is no way for infrastructure to keep up with it.

Pat Johnston asked if we could take a vote to see where the committee stands?

Burt Bundy stated because of the Brown Act the sub-committee did not go out and talk with other members. He stated they are ready to make a motion to do just what their recommendation was. He said it is only fair to listen to the sub-committees concerns before we move on.

Arlo Stroing stated it looks to him like the committee has worked five years for nothing.

Burt Bundy stated sometimes he feels the same way. It is very frustrating, he feels the process got short-circuited because there is no correlation between the written document and maps.

Anne Read stated she felt the committee has done a lot of good work on the General Plan document.

Arlo Stroing stated there have been comments regarding the lines and maps never being talked about, however he remembers it being talked about and voted on. He stated the lines had been moved around several times.

Anne Read stated the map in the Background Report shows the lines in a different location.

Burt Bundy stated the map in the background report shows the correct lines. He believes the lines on the current map are a mistake, and the map in the background report is the one the committee intended to adopt.

Arlo Stroing stated if the line were moved where the sub-committee wants, you are putting subdivisions on each side of open space. You cannot run agricultural with subdivisions on both sides of it. He stated his land is currently experiencing this and it just doesn't work.

Wally Roney stated much of the land in the Vina Plains is in Conservation Easements and it could not be divided.

Ken Robison stated that Arlo is exactly right, the committee went through a lot to establish the lines. He stated he believes the sub-committee is coming in at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour and saying they have changed their mind.

Ken Robison then asked Mr. Robson how many people are trying to get projects going and have been told their project is on hold until the General Plan is adopted.

Mr. Robson stated the committee accepted requests for changes (the original list) and that numbered around 105 until the letters of interests were cut off. These were the numbered requests on the old version of the General Plan maps and the committee agreed or disagreed on the letters of requests submitted. There are others waiting for the committee's agreement or disagreement with their request for change.

Bill Goodwin stated it is clear the committee is not unanimous on one or another location of this line so a thought would be to vote on this one, record the vote that says this is the line that the committee agrees to and then explain for the Planning Commission that the majority one way or the other, likes this line or would like the Planning Commission to consider a line closer. He stated he feels it is time to get comment beyond this committee. He stated it is clear there is not a consensus of where the line should be and maybe its time to have the Planning Commission and the public weigh in on that.

Burt Bundy indicated the line is minor, it's the development that is going on in key areas of the General Plan. He feels the committee needs to take a hard look at how do the maps meet the elements we have here and bring up the issues that are key to discuss and go back and discuss them.

John Roth stated it was his understanding the committee put out a reasonable document that the public can respond to. You will not get a perfect document that would go out to public comment. He stated that where that line ends up, we will still have a lot of opportunity to comment on it along with the public. He stated that the development going on in the northern part of the county, that in its totality was not discussed in this group. He stated he feels comfortable saying that we do need to look at the cumulative impacts and evaluate how that will affect the county. He stated he is comfortable letting the lines go forward realizing there is still an opportunity to make changes.

Bill Goodwin explained he did not mean this is the map for all purposes, we actually noted in the agenda that we would review each detail map, one of them would be the north county, then at the end you would have discussion, you may or may not be ready to take action on that map. We would have a consensus of the committees for or against the idea and why, so that information can go out to the Planning Commission along with the maps, so it would start a different dialog. He explained he did not want anyone to think that once there is a vote on those lines we are agreeing to everything on the map.

Dexter Wright stated he is receiving 10 to 15 calls per week asking when the General Plan will be out so they can have input and get it moving forward.

Pat Johnston stated her concern with the Antelope area, she thought the rezone was supposed to be generated by the owner, generated by the committee, and generated by the community. Her problem with the rezoning of Antelope is that it was not generated by anyone.

Burt Bundy was referencing a parcel of land on one of the maps at the front of the room, it showed a large yellow section of land (located on West side of Rawson Road in the Ohm Road area) is proposed

for Planned Development yet it has yellow wrap around which is Suburban Density which is ¼ acre parcels. He stated he doesn't have a problem with a development there as long as it's a reasonable density. The density should be 5 or 10 acre parcels, ¼ acre parcels out there have very little sewer disposal options, to do that is not reasonable. He stated this will become another Rancho Tehama.

George Robson stated what we are hearing here individual, personal views and a plea by some individuals of the committee to do something other than move forward with the product you have currently to the public. Some of these views will be expressed whether or not more time is spent before it goes to the public. George stated the job was to advise the Commission and the Board on a plan to be reviewed by the public process. He stated there is nothing in the General Plan that entitles, it is a consideration that begins an entitlement process. The parameters of development and growth are so fraught with variables starting with population, time, growth rates, economies – which no one can perceive, that the consideration of when and if development occurs is not something as simple as taking the number of acres and multiply the number of people based upon the number of parcels which could be created. It is a number, but relevancy has to be validated by factors such as past historical growth rates, time based upon those past historical growth rates and things you cannot determine such as economic and market swings as they come and go. He stated no one agrees on everything in the General Plan is ever going to change any land without 10 more things happening, you have Commissioners and Board Members that get to have input before the decisions are made.

Burt Bundy stated that one of the first big steps in land use is a General Plan Amendment. He referred to the piece of property on Rawson Road it says it is available with a General Plan Designation for development. He stated by putting a designation on there it says "we would accept development proposal on this for ¼ acre parcels".

George Robson stated that is correct – you would accept the proposal, it doesn't mean you would approve the proposal, it means you would accept the proposal and then go through the process and it may not make it. This is a decision that is made by at least 3 of 5 elected Supervisors. He stated this plan does not tell them to approve a development that is not appropriate.

Mr. Robson asked where the committee would like to go with tonight's agenda.

Burt Bundy stated he would like to go to the maps as the end product is what he is concerned about. He stated if the committee should vote a certain thing down it would be removed from the map or it is changed? If the committee should change something they feel is not appropriate for General Plan designation, and we make a change such as a Rural Large Lot Designation instead of Suburban designation then that recommendation would be put in this document and in the maps and sent on to the public for comments.

John Crosby asked how would the public ever know it was designated the other way, and when would they get to make a decision on it?

Burt Bundy asked why would they have to know if it was designated that way. He explained that the designation is on there only because someone put it on there.

Mr. Robson explained that designation came through the committee process. He stated that "yes it did happen, absolutely". He stated that particular property was a request, the committee looked at it and it was granted by the committee's consensus. He explained that the particular parcel on Rawson Road went to the densities because so much of land has a rudimentary specific plan developed in the old days and is on the zoning maps. The owner requested to move the density to ¼ acre is to utilize the

lands feasibly and that proposal was routed through the committee and ended up ¼ acre (yellow) because of that. Due to the fact this land is wetland with vernal pools does not mean it will happen.

Mr. Robson asked Scott Friend of P.M.C. if a vote on the maps is done, if the change was made prior to it becoming a Public Draft, what are the ramifications of that. He explained to the committee should they vote to change something the plan will not be on the street tomorrow.

Scott Friend stated depending on the change there could be ripple effects through the document. Depending on the magnitude of change we will ultimately decide the ripple effect. A minor change such as change of color on map is not a difficult process, however if the meaning or intent or something text driven supported, they go back to the document, see what it does, and analyze the change.

Mr. Robson asked what would it do to the environmental analysis that goes along with this document should you wholesale change land use designations that you have been studying along the lines with the environmental document.

Scott Friend explained one of things they try to do is keep the environmental document somewhat consistent with the General Plan so they are not starting an EIR at the end of the General Plan process. It would definitely set them back, no doubt. Because the base-line conditions for the EIR is the Background Report. They would not know the impact until they knew what the change was. However, there would be time ramifications.

Mr. Robson stated the protocol that was expected this evening was that the Committee would review, act on the maps and policy document with the majority, minority opinions without changes to the maps to get it out to the public. He stated the alternative would be to act on the maps and policy document and change those documents before it goes to the public. Depending on the changes it is going to take more time. He stated that what he is hearing Anne, Burt, Greg and Bill say is that when you vote on the maps and policy document if you vote up or down on a particular land use area and its down, then take it off the map and bring it back with it changed to the alternative. He recommended they make a motion to see if that is the consensus of the committee and we can move on.

Charles Willard asked for a recess for them to make a decision on what they want to do.

**Meeting Recessed at 7:32 p.m.**  
**Meeting Reconvened at 7:43 p.m.**

Norm Gruver asked about the public hearings and the process involved.

Mr. Robson reviewed the process of the public hearings, Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meeting.

Bill Goodwin explained this document will change at the end of the Planning Commission hearings before it goes to the Board of Supervisors.

**MOTION:**

**A motion was made by Burt Bundy, seconded by Anne Read Committee to review the Land Use Maps in detail and make recommendations for changes which would then be included in the Draft Plan prior to Public Hearing.**

Discussion:

Calvin Rasmussen stated that not everyone in the room agrees, it is a Draft General Plan and it is important to get it to the public and it is recognized that everyone on the Committee and attendees at the public hearings have a right to request changes as an individual or as a group. He stated it is important to get it on its way and not hold it up for any more discussions.

John Roth asked to reiterate his comment from before was he felt most of the issues brought up were not fatal flaws and that there will still be time to adequately address and deal with a number of things that have been brought up and again he sees a glaring exception that development in the north part of the county has not been brought up in a way that was presented tonight and he feels that is such a huge potential on the county. He asked that not the whole county be looked at, just look at one portion which he believes would make an major impact on the county.

Mr. Robson clarified that if there is not success in this motion that there would be another motion.

Bill Burrows stated he is concerned the committee is looking at ants instead of the anthill. The major challenge in his mind to the recommended plan is a potential for growth. He stated that realizing that potential may not come but if we could grow to 400,000 people with this plan that is what we are talking about here. That potential development along the line, what will the trend be in 2025, that is a quarter of a lifetime. There is too much potential for growth with this plan. He stated he feels the committee needs to vote it down and go back to the drawing board.

John Crosby stated he would like to hear what the citizens have to say and how they feel. He feels there is ample opportunity for them to express their concerns in the upcoming meetings. He stated he does not feel this has been a rushed plan, it has been many years in development. He stated a meeting will be held in the North area, concerns could be heard there so we can hear how they feel.

Alan Hess used development in Yuba and Nevada County as an example, the residential population rises 4-6% a year. We are a strong agricultural community and eventually the agricultural community loses its voice.

Mr. Robson asked Burt to restate the motion.

**Burt Bundy re-read the motion as follows:** The Committee review the Land Use Maps in detail and make recommendations for changes which would be included in the Draft Plan prior to public hearing.

Charlie Willard asked if that would send it back to PMC.

Mr. Bundy stated we are talking about the Land Use Maps and recognize Scott's concern that if substantial changes are made to the Land Use Maps it might affect the document, he stated that this document in his mind is not the committee's document, he feels its acceptable to go to the public, he does not believe the land use maps compliment this document and are unacceptable to go out to the public.

Mr. Robson stated that there is a majority vote to change a map or designation on a map that would be the order of the day, PMC would have to come back yet another time with a changed map to show it was changed. He stated the committee will review the maps anyway, what the motion really means is that your changes are changes opposed to a comment on the maps.

**COUNT OF VOTES BY MEMBERS:**

<b>COMMITTEE MEMBER</b>	<b>VOTE</b>	<b>COMMITTEE MEMBER</b>	<b>VOTE</b>
Ron Warner	N	John Crosby	N
Charles Willard	Y	Pat Johnston	Y
Linda Walker	Abstain	Norm Gruver	Y
Ken Robison	N	Dexter Wright	N
Alan Hess	Y	Burt Bundy	Y
Arlo Stroing	N	Bill Burrows	Y
John Roth	N	Wally Roney	N
Anne Read	Y	Gregg Werner	Y
Calvin Rasmussen	N		

**TOTAL VOTES: 8 VOTED NO; 8 VOTED YES; 1 ABSTAINED; 3 ABSENT – MOTION FAILS**

Linda Walker explained she voted abstain because she is a member of the Tehama County Planning Commission and she will be hearing this at the Planning Commission level and she feels she should be approaching it with an open mind.

**MOTION:**

**A motion was made by Ken Robison, seconded by Dexter Wright for the Committee to discuss the maps and documents, have vote on the various areas with recordation of minor/majority opinions, do not change the maps or document before it goes to the public hearing process.**

**Discussion:**

Gregg Werner asked if that would be discussion at tonight's meeting, a vote and things go on or was that an opportunity to review in detail.

Mr. Robson explained the intention was to dispense with this business at tonight's meeting. He explained what will come before the Committee, only for consideration and not for voting is what the Commission expects to recommend to the Board of Supervisors as a courtesy to the Committee. He explained the minutes of the meetings will be the record that is available to review discussion regarding the maps and can be used to evaluate what the Commission is going to recommend.

Burt Bundy suggested an amendment to the motion could be made.

John Roth indicated he would like to try an amendment and again his earlier issue is for the Committee to look at a portion of the Land Use Map particularly the north I-5 corridor realizing there are significant issues to be addressed there and realizing that the failure to do that and send this document on now, that portion would become a lightning rod for public focus thereby detracting from the rest of the document which he doesn't want to see, he wants to see the public review the whole document. He proposes the Committee review a portion of the Land Use document, Land Use Map specifically the north I-5 corridor.

Mr. Robson stated the maker of the motion has to accept the amendment.

Discussion followed whether the vote should be taken on the original motion or the amendment to the motion.

Arthur Wylene, County Counsel, stated Roberts Rule of Order which are not mandatory provide that while there is a motion and it has been seconded on the floor, the motion maker and the maker of the second agree to accept the amendment.

Mr. Robson asked if the maker of the motion accepted the amendment as stated.

Ken Robison stated that if his motion allows for the comment and a vote from the whole committee particularly on that area he does not accept the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Robson stated you have heard the maker of the motion object to the amendment so we must vote on the first motion made.

Mr. Robson stated the motion was to accept the agenda action items as stated with the protocol that the Committee would vote on the maps and the document with the recordation of majority/minority opinions only, but not change the maps prior to public hearing process.

Ron Warner explained his vote tonight probably will not be his final vote when it comes to him as a Supervisor. He is not making any statements here other than how he feels at this time.

**COUNT OF VOTES BY MEMBERS:**

<b>COMMITTEE MEMBER</b>	<b>VOTE</b>	<b>COMMITTEE MEMBER</b>	<b>VOTE</b>
Ron Warner	Y	John Crosby	Y
Charles Willard	N	Pat Johnston	N
Linda Walker	N	Norm Gruver	Y
Ken Robison	Y	Dexter Wright	Y
Alan Hess	N	Burt Bundy	N
Arlo Stroing	Y	Bill Burrows	N
John Roth	N	Wally Roney	Y
Anne Read	N	Gregg Werner	N
Calvin Rasmussen	N		

**TOTAL VOTES: 10 VOTED NO; 7 VOTED YES; 0 ABSTAINED; 3 ABSENT – MOTION FAILS**

**MOTION:**

**A motion was made by John Roth, seconded by Charles Willard for the Committee to review a portion of the Land Use Maps particularly the north I-5 corridor referred to as Map 3 and reviewing the proposed Special Planning Areas with a possible result of changing the map before it goes to the Public Hearing process.**

**Discussion:**

Mr. Robson explained that if this motion does not fail, it is his suggestion that the Committee not go on at tonight's meeting and there will need to be another meeting as soon as possible to address any suggestions or thoughts and make suggestions and comments and have votes if in fact the motion passes, if it fails we will try to get through the remainder of the agenda prior to 9 p.m.

Bill Goodwin made a clarification to John's motion the committee would still look at all the specific land Use areas and make comments on those.

John Roth stated he would like to have it looked at in totality.

Bill Goodwin stated we not be accepting the other areas without comments.

Pat Johnston requested an amendment to the motion to add the Antelope area also be looked at and voted on.

John Roth, maker of the motion, stated he knows that Antelope needs some attention, however he would like to get this moving along and at this time he declined the amendment to the motion.

**COUNT OF VOTES BY MEMBERS:**

<b>COMMITTEE MEMBER</b>	<b>VOTE</b>	<b>COMMITTEE MEMBER</b>	<b>VOTE</b>
Ron Warner	N	John Crosby	N
Charles Willard	Y	Pat Johnston	N
Linda Walker	Y	Norm Gruver	Y
Ken Robison	N	Dexter Wright	N
Alan Hess	Y	Burt Bundy	Y
Arlo Stroing	N	Bill Burrows	Y
John Roth	Y	Wally Roney	N
Anne Read	Y	Gregg Werner	Y
Calvin Rasmussen	N		

**TOTAL VOTES: 8 VOTED NO; 9 VOTED YES; 0 ABSTAINED; 3 ABSENT – MOTION PASSED**

George Robson stated another meeting needs to be set immediately. Several dates were discussed. It was then set for May 3, 2007 if the Community Center is available.

***Meeting Adjourned 8:25 p.m.***

---

Respectfully Submitted, Recording Secretary  
Kellee A. Taresh