

**TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN REVISION PROJECT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE
MEETING FEBRUARY 8, 2007**

The Tehama County General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee met in a regular session at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 8, 2007 at Red Bluff Community Center, 1500 South Jackson St., Red Bluff, CA.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alan Hess
Anne Read
Arlo Stroing
Burt Bundy
Charles Willard
Dexter Wright
Gregg Werner

John Roth
Linda Walker
Paul Mitchell
Pat Massie-Johnston
Ron Warner
Wally Roney

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Bill Burrows
Calvin Rasmussen
John Crosby
Ken Robison
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
Doti Watkins, Public Works Staff
Arthur Wylene, Deputy County Counsel

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

George Robson, Planning Director explained the process to date. Mr. Robson stated another meeting will be needed and tentatively scheduled for March 1, 2007 to finish reviewing the Comment Letters and responses from staff. He explained the minutes from the last two meetings and tonight will be submitted for approval at the March 1, 2007 meeting.

CITIZENS CONCERNS:

Mr. Robson asked for citizens concerns and comments.

Mr. Ron Warner, Board of Supervisors was present and asked if at sometime in the near future the committee could revisit the El Camino Irrigation District Land Use Designation.

Pat Massie-Johnston stated she would be submitting information regarding the Antelope Area. She stated they are not represented anywhere in the General Plan even though they are the

third largest population community in Tehama County. She stated it has been lumped in the 20,000 population on page 1 must be an accumulation of Red Bluff and Antelope. She stated the residents located in Antelope are actually located in the County. She stated the Red Bluff population is therefore an erroneous number because it includes Antelope. She stated on page 1 under "Character" it states there are approximately 20,545 people according to the most current census bureau, that number in Red Bluff is 14,059. On page 2A under Community Organization, Red Bluff is identified as Urban Center with Urban services such as water distribution and treatment systems. She stated that Antelope has no municipal services and Antelope is not part of Red Bluff and should not be included in the Red Bluff numbers. She also stated there is no specific map of Antelope as there is with other communities in Tehama County.

Mr. Robson stated the committee is addressing the Antelope issues. He suggested Ms. Johnston submit the information in writing and the committee can address it at the next meeting.

Ms. Johnston stated the yellow bar on the document pages detracts the eyes from reading it. She stated there are several things she would like to address at a later meeting. She stated there was discussion about definition of words at the last meeting regarding interpreted and determination. She read from the Webster dictionary the definition of both the words. She pointed out other errors she felt needed to be corrected and said she would submit her information to the Planning Department.

Mr. Willard stated that action on the minutes will be taken at the next agenda. He asked what is the position, can people can read them and make changes.

Mr. Robson stated there are some suggestions on the minutes. All suggestions are welcome. He stated that the minutes are essentially the reflection of actions taken with a minimal amount of conversation. He stated we have expanded the conversational points in this forum, if you look at the Board of Supervisors or Planning Commission minutes or more formal committees and commissions you will see those conversation portions of the minutes are fairly short, because they are not necessary to the actions taken. However, he stated we have tried and in some opinions may not have expanded large enough to what conversations took place ahead of a discussion or possible action. He asked that suggestions be submitted, however, we are not doing a transcription of the meetings. He stated we would try to capture the jist of conversations.

Mr. Willard asked if the minutes would be available at least a week prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Robson stated they would be.

Linda Walker asked for an opportunity to look at the maps again and get a clear understanding of the large maps.

Mr. Robson suggested that at another time the committee revisit the maps, there may be particular areas that have additional considerations possibly even a change in consideration by this committee, before the final Planning Commission meeting. He explained that we would be going through the five public meetings with the public draft, allowing the public to see the committee effort, take the testimony and then bring it back to the committee before the final recommendation commission meeting. At that time the committee would take a final shot at this and then the commission would like to know the consensus to the maps and policies. He explained the committee would get everything together for a public draft, the public having their

chance at the process, because they have yet to have this chance over the five years. Between the time of the last commission five hearing series and the sixth recommendation meeting the Planning committee will have a meeting or two and hash the issues out. This would give a filtering down period to allow time to address any other issues. The Commission would like to hear one good overview from the committee after that process.

Burt Bundy stated there are some discrepancies on the maps. He stated they are hard to understand as to which map is the final version. He stated if you look at the General Plan map and the dividing lines between Upland Ag and Valley Ag and download off the computer, you will notice the 8 maps do not line up. He stated it makes it difficult to make any comments. He stated he believes there are several areas of discrepancies on the maps. He stated it makes it difficult for the Committee to make sensible comments when the maps are not consistent and which is the baseline map they should be working on.

Scott Friend from PMC stated the website lists all the maps available for viewing. He stated they have tried to keep the maps available as a running record for the committee to show where they started and where they ended. The maps at the top of the list are the most recent. He stated by leaving all the maps on the website would allow the committee members could look back at the maps to see how the maps differs from the current map. The intent was to keep a running record on the website of how the maps have evolved.

Burt Bundy stated there is no way to differentiate which ones are the newer ones and which ones are not current. He stated it is very frustrating. He is concerned with the Los Molinos area.

Scott Friend stated he would separate the maps on the website with a header-bar to identify the current versions.

Mr. Robson stated the ones the most current maps to be circulated with the plan are the ones in the plan in miniature. He explained the same series of ten maps will be available for viewing by the committee.

Mr. Bundy explained the two black lines are of concern to him. He explained in detail the confusion in reading the maps.

Mr. Robson explained the series of ten maps will be able to review that reflects all changes on the maps to date.

John Roth asked if there would be another version of the map to review.

Scott Friend stated there would be as many versions as the committee needs. He stated we are trying to get through the comments and then review a clean version of the maps and the document.

Mr. Robson explained he would like to have all that together prior to the next meeting. He explained there will be at least one more meeting.

Mr. Bundy asked if there could be an overlay to view the changes to the maps.

Scott Friend stated he would have to check with their map expert to see if that would be a possibility. He stated they had tried it in the past and it was hard to read. He also stated they

have the Parcel View Software, the intent in developing the software so you can pull up two windows and view the old map against the new map on the same screen. He stated Vestra is working on that.

Doti Watkins from the Public Works Department and GIS system was present and explained the installation of software went very well. She stated they are testing it currently.

Scott Friend explained the intent to develop the view is to use it as a tool for the citizens to pull up the map and click on the map to get information by the Parcel number.

Mr. Bundy explained the color coding also needs to be adjusted to clarify the different areas.

Mr. Robson explained the committee is currently trying to get through the comments on the documents and maps and bring it back together for one last pass through before it goes to the public draft. He explained the public draft is not going to be perfect and that is the reason for the public process. He explained the public gets a shot at the draft which is a result of these efforts over the last five years. After the public viewing process the committee will come back together to go over the public comments. Mr. Robson stated a matrix of proposals submitted have been consolidated into a document he handed out showing if the requests made by the public were agreed to, amended, or rejected. He stated the maps show these changes as well.

He asked for any other public comments.

Commenter from the audience asked questions regarding the census of the maps and the Board of Supervisors actions on the Antelope area.

Mr. Robson stated the statistical information is from known statistical sources that the U.S. Census Bureau has available. He explained we rely upon other agencies and other sources that perform statistical development, therefore we have to use those numbers as there are no other sources. All documents will provide the most accurate data available and produced by government agencies responsible. Mr. Robson explained the vote the Board of Supervisors took action on was the Moratorium based on this committee continuing to do work to develop an Valley and Upland Agricultural concept that is yet to begin the public review process, it was not based upon statistical analysis, it was based upon lands out there that are producing agricultural products.

Commenter from the audience commented in 1854 a survey line came through the map at Township 27 and Township 28 and the lines are off by some 200 feet. He stated for 24 years he was involved in the survey crew for the county, especially around Manton.

Pat Massie-Johnston asked when the General Plan goes to the Board of Supervisors will it have the detailed maps for the general public to see.

Mr. Robson explained the General Plan documents do not have the detailed, scale of maps that are usable. The maps are 3 ft by 4 or 5 ft. The maps in the General Plan will be 8.5X11 or 8.5X14 that can be inserted into a document. However, you can go to the Planning Department to see a map in a much larger scale. If the public has access to a computer, they can access the maps on the website and use the new Parcel View Software to zoom in on a particular area, or come into the office and see the larger maps.

Commenter from the audience, Martin Carnes asked if the El Camino area will be discussed at tonight's meeting as was stated at the Board of Supervisors meeting on Tuesday, February 6, 2007.

Mr. Robson stated if he wanted to make a comment regarding the El Camino area he is welcome to make those comments.

Mr. Carnes asked when the El Camino area will be on the agenda so they know when to come. He stated they were led to believe by the Board of Supervisors that it would be discussed at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Robson stated that was up to the committee. He explained in Dec. 2005 the committee took action to include the El Camino Irrigation District in the Valley Agricultural Zoning District, which is currently considered to be a 20 acre non-contracted, 40 acre contracted designation, that is what the committee agreed to by consensus agreed to pursue under the Administrative Draft General Plan. He explained right now it is still part of the Administrative Draft General Plan and without being changed it would continue on to be put out to the public to begin the public hearing process which is 5 hearings. He explained we have public hearings to get the comments from the public, and that would be the time to go to the public hearings and express your support or non support. He explained the committee at this time has only decided to allow the El Camino area be included in the Valley Floor Agricultural Designation, which is suggested to have a 20 acre minimum non-contracted, 40 acre minimum contracted minimum parcel size. The plan would then go out on to the public for comment. After the five meetings the committee can evaluate what the public's opinions were on this issue and many other issues prior to the Planning Commission making a final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. He explained on Tuesday, the supervisors urged the people in El Camino Irrigation District come to the meetings and under Citizens Concerns, voice your concerns.

Mr. Carnes asked if the committee had time for his opinion. Mr. Carnes stated he is against the 20 acre minimum. He said the people in the area have been tied up and held hostage for the next 22 months. He stated a lot of people came tonight because it was to be discussed and they wanted to be represented.

Mr. Robson explained that there will be notices published in the paper prior to the five meetings. He explained if particular public members would like to have personal notification of the meetings they can submit self addressed stamped envelopes to the Planning Department or access the website for the meeting dates. He explained we will not be notifying individual property owners.

Commenter from the audience asked if anyone in the committee was representing the El Camino Irrigation District.

Mr. Robson stated Mr. Alan Hess is on the Irrigation District Board and also a member of the committee.

The Commenter stated there was a petition circulated in the El Camino Irrigation District, his understanding was that 77% of the El Camino Irrigation District want to retain the 5 acre minimum parcel size. He stated that Mr. Hess is on the Board of directors and is not representing his district or the will of the people of El Camino to this committee. He explained that is what the circulated petition suggests. He stated the signed petition was given to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Robson stated that information will be given to the Planning Commission prior to the public hearings. He explained Mr. Hess was approved to be on the committee by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Nelson Buck indicated he was confused. He stated Mr. Robson seemed to suggest that there would not be a point in time when this committee's work was done prior to going to the Planning Commission, but it would remain open after the series of Planning Commission meetings, which is confusing to him as he understood and believed the intent of the committee was an advisory committee was to submit to Planning Commissioners and the public a work product not something modified by the committee thereafter.

Mr. Robson explained the committee has requested that they have one more meeting prior to the commission's final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Commenter asked for clarification. Will the committee address the El Camino Irrigation District before the General Plan goes to the public.

Mr. Robson stated that was correct.

Commenter from the audience voiced her concerns regarding the public hearings.

Mr. Robson explained the five public hearings will be published in the paper, access the website or call the Planning Department for dates of the public hearings. He explained the hearings would be held in all five of the supervisorial districts in the evenings.

Scott Friend from PMC explained the handout regarding the new version of the comment letters. This version includes staff recommendations to help expedite the meeting.

Scott Friend followed up on a 318 acre Habitat Resource which was missed and has been corrected.

HANDOUT: TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN COMMENT LETTERS
(Responses or action by the Committee are shown in bold italic)

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)*
Staff Comment: Staff recommends addition to document
Committee recommended addition to document.

- 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)

Staff Comment: The California Vehicle Code(CVC) establish the base speed limits on various roadway classification and dictates the 25mph limit. Local agencies may establish different standards based upon a local road condition analysis.

Jerry Brownfield, Deputy Director of Public Works stated most of the County Roads are 55 MPH, in less they are residential then they are 25 MPH.

- 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.

Staff Comment: feasibility included the development of traffic calming design features when determined to be feasible in the first place. Signage is based upon the California Vehicle Code/Streets and Highways Code. Placement of a blanket policy on this subject may not be appropriate relative to cost, maintenance and safety.

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)

Staff Comment: Comment noted.

Scott Friend explained this was a comment – no action taken.

- 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)

Staff Comment: Staff recommends re-writing as follows: The County shall continue to ensure that all new development proposals comply with Section 9.14 of the Tehama County Code regarding cul-de-sac length and dead-end streets.

Committee recommended rewrite – proposed & recommended.

Steve Sherman made a comment that any previous or succeeding ordinances, development standards address this policy and we not only rely on Section 9.14 as it is subject to interpretation.

- 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)

Staff Comment: See revised language for comment E above.

Scott Friend stated Section 9.14 addresses this issue.

Mr. Robson stated that “all divisions” is all encompassing – he asked should you create a parcel with frontage on St. Marys Avenue are you asking it have a secondary access as well?

- F) Implementation Measure CIR 1.4b should say “Develop and Adopt” streetscape design standards.

Staff Comment: Staff recommends accepting comment and making change.

Staff recommends making the change as noted.

- G) Under Railroad Services, there is no mention of potential railroad stops or proposed railroad crossings.

Staff Comment: Comment noted. The document does not discuss potential railroad stops as there is none currently known and/or no plans for a future stop are known at this time. Railroad crossings: Location, type, size of railroad crossings are not controlled by County policy. The railroad and the California Public Utilities Commission control all aspects of this discussion. As such, no policy additions are recommended to be added. Staff noted comment. P.U.C. is authority overseeing Railroad crossings.

- H) Figure 3.1 should show Gyle Road through to Tehama and Los Molinos.
*Staff Comment: Comment Noted. Staff to make appropriate change.
Staff noted the comment and will make appropriate change.*

4.0 PUBLIC SERVICES

Discussion: Anne Read noted the verbage and punctuation needs to be gone through and the appropriate changes be made.

Pat Massie-Johnston noted the colors on the maps are not distinct.

Scott Friend stated they will work on color palate.

Anne read some of the document which is confusing due to the length of the sentences.

Scott Friend explained that in planner-ese language it makes sense, but they will review and see if they can clarify it better.

Mr. Robson asked if Anne could go through the document and see what changes could be made. He asked she give a couple of examples to work from.

Gary explained that for those who do not work with these documents it may be unclear, but to those who are used to reading these documents or being involved in it, it is not confusing.

Burt Bundy asked about the roadway master plan. He stated it is a conceptual document, but it is very confusing. The new bypass road which is east of Vina and goes across the plains, is this really realistic.

Mr. Robson stated this is a circulation plan. He noted if its not realistic from a time and cost factor in the planning time frame which is 10, 15 or 20 years then we need to look at this.

Scott Friend explained that by putting a line on the map is informing the public, investor or whoever, the county envisions something there. Should someone decide to split the property, they would know that the long range transportation plan proposes a road in the area, you need to reserve right of way, easement or whatever mechanism is necessary. This would prevent the county from having to perform Eminent Domain to buy it. This lays out a broad-based vision of the future transportation.

Gregg Werner asked if that was in the 160 acre minimum proposed and wouldn't they be heavy with vernal pools and expensive to build a road through there.

Gary Antone noted this is something that can be looked at as we go through the process.

Anne Read asked if there were any plans to get the traffic moving along the west side. She stated that Baker Road is built out and there should be a wish list to extend Wilder Road north.

Gary Antone stated there are a lot of topographical issues to get north and south throughways west of Red Bluff. He stated the primary focus now is looking at Paskenta Road and Baker Road.

- A) Include a discussion of the recreational facilities and opportunities found in Federal lands within the county in the Recreational Facilities section.
Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends that additional background information be added to this section regarding Federal lands.
Comment Noted - Staff recommended rewording.
- B) Tehama County Schools: There is no mention of Shasta College classes, classes for the disabled or adult education classes at the Community Center.
Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends that additional background information be added.
Comment Noted - Staff recommended rewording to include Shasta College site. Pat Massie-Johnston asked if the General Plan will reflect what will be happening on Diamond Avenue because that is where the college is going. Is there any indication of what is going to happen involving the freeway and on-ramp. Mr. Robson stated the only treatment the County General Plan would reflect is a public agency designation relative to the property, so therefore it would address the college site.
- 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.
Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends that language be added to existing IM PS-2.1a to support statement.
Comment Noted – Staff recommends additional language be added. Anne Read stated there were several comments she made that are not included. She also stated there is a nitrate problem and asked if it should be elaborated on. Discussion followed regarding nitrate issues and problems in the Antelope area. Scott Friend explained that there is no way to know where every nitrate problem is located. Discussion followed regarding density and wastewater treatment facilities. George explained there are only two nitrate areas identified in Tehama County and they are Antelope and the Hogs Back Road area. He stated AB885 septic systems are actually looked at by Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) nitrate controls. Mr. Stoufer explained RWQCB requires a nitrate loading and salt loading study out of any septic system. He explained they must meet waste discharge requirements of the RWQCB. Burt explained that in a General Plan we try to prevent problems from arising. Mr. Robson explained we note the two known nitrate study areas are Los Molinos and Antelope due to a lack of data of nitrate studies anywhere else within the County.

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)

Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff suggests inclusion of the concept and will reworded the proposed addition in the location suggested.

Staff will make the change noted.

- B) *Proposed Addition: Page 5-2, Part 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)*

Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends incorporation of proposed text.

Staff recommends incorporation of proposed text.

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).

Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of this information in text.

Staff notes comment. Staff recommends inclusion of this information in text.

- B) Needs to include more information about Oak Woodlands. (6-2)

Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends the expansion of existing this subject in the setting and background portion of this Element. Additional narrative to be prepared and included.

Staff notes comment. Staff recommends as stated above.

- C) Include that Mineral Headquarters Historic District is designated and managed by the National Park Service as a historic district (6-4).

Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of the proposed comment.

Staff notes comment. Staff recommends as stated above.

- D) Cottage of Mrs. John Brown doesn't serve as a museum (6-4).

Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends removal of reference to a museum.

Staff recommends removal of reference to a museum.

- 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)*

Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends that a new Implementation Measure be added as suggested.

Staff recommends a new implemental measure be added. Gary Antone stated he could assist with the additional wording.

Burt Bundy stated he had forwarded a comment regarding the Riparian Habitat and Sacramento River, however they are not in the comments.

Scott Friend asked Burt to forward that to him to research.

- 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)

Staff Comment: Through this IA, the County encourages all water agencies, regardless of existing water rights or water source, to explore the use of surface water resources. Staff does not recommend this change.

Staff does not recommend this change. Staff recognizes that El Camino has and uses the groundwater, the policy is that we are encouraging the use of non groundwater sources.

Burt stated the text always refers to districts and not all the irrigation entities are districts, some are mutual water companies and this should be noted.

Scott Friend stated they will go back and make sure it is not just an agency focus.

- G) Policy OS-1.3, Implementation Measure OS-1.3f – *Drainage plans shall be required of all land divisions (Proposed addition – 6-6).*

Staff Comment: PMC to fix typo. Staff believes that the existing Tehama County Land Division Standards adequately address the requirements for drainage plans for land divisions and that no new text is necessary.

Staff will correct typo, no other change necessary as stated above.

- 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)*

Staff Comment: The County cannot abrogate or assign its authority to regulate permitted structures or uses within the County. Staff does not recommend inclusion of the proposed addition.

After discussion with Arthur Wylene, Deputy County Counsel, Staff recommends adding “otherwise” to “permitted use”.

- I) Implementation Measure OS-1.4a – *Proposed Addition: The Development Policies of the Water District (6-7).*

Staff Comment: While the County is generally supportive of the various districts recommendations for projects within their service areas, the County cannot “blindly” defer to development standards to which it has no control and is not a party. Staff does not recommend inclusion of the proposed addition.

Staff recommends no change.

- J) Implementation Measure OS-1.5b: The “Agricultural Commissioner” should be changed to “Regional Water Quality Control Board.” (6-7)

Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff support the proposed change.

Staff noted the comment and supports the proposed change.

- K) Implementation Measure OS-1.3b – “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)

Staff Comment: Floodplain, flood hazard zones and flood regulations change and are not the responsibility of the County or the General Plan. Additionally, the County Planning Department and the General Plan do not regulate the use or storage of hazardous materials. Staff does not support making changes to this Implementation measure.

Staff recommends no change.

Meeting recessed at 8:12 p.m.

Meeting reconvened at 8:20 p.m.

- 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)
Staff Comment: Yes. Comment noted.
Staff noted comment. County has an adopted ordinance to not export groundwater.
- 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)*
Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of proposed language.
Staff recommends inclusion of proposed language.
- 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)
Staff Comment: Staff believes that this statement is valuable relative to future CEQA analysis and state air quality standards. Staff does not support the modification or removal of this item.
Scott Friend explained staff does not support the removal of this item. He explained there are often times the county may apply for a grant and if it's a road grant, one of the things the grant proposes to do is enhance our quality. If you can point to specific things in your general plan you score higher on the grant proposal so this one in particular was put in there because of Safe Routes to School Grants and other grants. Discussion followed regarding ordinances in other counties.
- 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 environmental "sensitivities" will never be known unless a Biologist conducts a field review. (6-11)
Staff Comment: Staff believes that this is already accomplished through the Department of Fish and Game project review process and imposition of this requirement could be unnecessary in many instances. Staff does not support the modification of this item.
Mr. Robson explained site overview is performed on each project, consisting of visitation by the Planning Department with assistance from DFG .
Mr. Stoufer explained there is a DFG database they check and if there is a question DFG may require additional information depending on what is found on site.
- P) Policy OS-3.4b: 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)

Staff Comment: Staff cannot locate the one-mile standard for consultation and requests the commenter to elaborate and/or explain comment.

Staff could not locate the one-mile standard, there was no change.

Discussion followed regarding OS-2.6e requiring trees be replanted.

Mr. Robson stated that involves design review.

Anne Read referenced Page 7-5, Policy AG-2.4: "Consider replacing trees, whose removal during construction is unavoidable, with native tree species". She stated there are two places this is referenced.

NOTE: **Scott Friend and George will reword and bring back to the committee.

- Q) Policy OS-3.2: 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)
Staff Comment: Comment is accurate. The CNDDDB is not used to designate areas of critical habitat. Staff cannot locate this Policy and requests that the commenter provide additional details as to the intent of comment.
Staff recommends no change.

- R) Policy OS-3.5: Implementation Measures are too weak. Weed species are a major problem to agricultural lands. Should add: OS-3.5c: *Implement weed management practices in development plans that address allowable species and maintenance or control of weed species.* (6-14)
Staff Comment: While staff concurs that weed species may be a significant problem but is concerned about the implementation of this type of statement. Staff does not support addition of this language.
Staff concurs and recommends no change.

Next meeting was scheduled for March 1, 2007, 6:00 p.m., Red Bluff Community Center, 1500 South Jackson St., Red Bluff, CA 96080.

Scott Friend noted they have prepared a map that references the letters that were received requesting changes and they will be available at the next meeting. He explained the handout earlier had the right column omitted. New handouts will be available at the next meeting. .

Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Recording Secretary
Kellee A. Taresh