

**TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN REVISION PROJECT  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF THE  
MEETING MARCH 1, 2007**

The Tehama County General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee met in a regular session at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 1, 2007 at Red Bluff Community Center, 1500 South Jackson St., Red Bluff, CA.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Alan Hess	John Roth
Anne Read	Norm Gruver
Arlo Stroing	Pat Massie-Johnston
Burt Bundy	Ron Warner
Calvin Rasmussen	Wally Roney
Charles Willard	
Gregg Werner	

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Bill Burrows  
Dexter Wright  
John Crosby  
Ken Robison  
Leroy Myers  
Linda Hayes  
Linda Jenkins  
Linda Walker

**ALSO PRESENT:**

George W. Robson, Planning Director  
John Stoufer, Planning Staff  
Sean Harrasser, Planning Staff  
Robert Halpin, Planning Staff  
Scott Friend, P.M.C.  
Mark Teague, 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:**

Mr. Robson welcomed the committee members to the meeting. He explained an additional public hearing will be held primarily for the El Camino Irrigation District issue alone to be held as the first public hearing. Therefore instead of there being 5 public hearings there will be 6. Tentatively around the first couple of weeks of April. This would give the El Camino residents a chance to voice their concerns. Mr. Robson explained the public hearing would be well publicized and the public is welcome to contact the Planning Department for information regarding the upcoming meetings.

### **CITIZENS CONCERNS:**

Mr. Robson asked for Citizens Concerns.

Pat Massie-Johnston passed out information to the Committee. She stated Antelope is not being addressed, she stated there are significant changes in Antelope on both the Northern and Southern side of Antelope Blvd. She stated she had come into the Planning Department to research maps, junkyards, InEntec project. She stated that there is a problem with zoning between the two sloughs in Antelope and there is no real plan for a sewer district. She expressed the zoning in Antelope needs to be kept at 1 acre minimum. She stated they have ¼ acre lots however there are no plans on how to deal with the infrastructure. She stated the committee has written goal AG-1 to preserve and protect agricultural land.

Speaker: She asked if the committee was going to look at the El Camino area before it went to the Planning commission.

Mr. Robson stated it will be looked at one last time by the Planning Commission prior to making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. He stated the Committee will meet one last time before it goes to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Robson explained there is a necessity to get through the comments to conclude the project and get it out to the public.

Burt Bundy stated he agreed with the speaker that the General Plan Revision Committee needs to review this total document before it goes to the Planning Commission. He stated he is entirely unsatisfied with the product so far. He stated he feels it is currently not a product that is representative of the work the committee has put into it. He asked the Committee to have one more look at the product before it goes to the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Robson explained that with the changes being made to the document and the maps it is impossible to have an updated document available at each meeting. He explained that at the conclusion of the Committee's meeting a draft document will be made available to the public as the "Draft Document".

Burt Bundy asked if the revisions would come out of the minutes before the committee and he explained the minutes from 2005 are entirely missing, he has not seen them, they do not know what was acted on by who and this document lacks documentation as to where it came from and who acted on it.

Mr. Robson explained the committee has had copies of the Administrative Draft to review. He asked for comments to be in writing stating concerns the committee has with the document.

Mr. Bundy explained he mailed his comments to the Planning Dept. on December 26, 2006.

Mr. Robson explained his comments are represented in the document.

Mr. Bundy stated they are not. He stated at the last meeting his comments were not there.

Mr. Robson stated he would have to refer his question to the consultants as it is their responsibility for accumulating comments and responding to them.

Mr. Bundy stated he has stated his displeasure with the maps also. He feels the committee needs to review the maps one more time.

Mr. Robson stated the committee is jeopardizing the process to date if they want to start the process over.

Mr. Bundy stated several of his comments were not represented in the comment document.

Anne Read also stated her comments have not been addressed.

Pat Massie-Johnston stated she was told there are no minutes detailing the votes taken. Therefore the committee does not know who voted for what and when. She stated there is no paperwork to go along with the decisions made.

Mr. Robson stated there are many members present who remember voting on many areas of the Antelope area. He explained the committee has two options available. They can work for conclusion and get the product to the public to allow the public process to begin. The public process can not begin until the committee allows it to begin. He stated it is not a perfect plan. It is a plan to present to the public for further consideration and discussion. That is the Planning Commission's responsibility is to filter now what would be on the street and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, who is the ultimate decider of what the plan will look like. The other choice is for the committee to begin all over again.

Anne Read asked if the maps will be available to compare the before and after.

Scott Friend stated they are not available tonight, however there is new software available. He stated that the new software will allow two screens, one will open the existing general plan and the proposed general plan for review. He stated that overlaying maps will not work.

Mr. Robson stated the committee has done a tremendous job and its time to release it to the public for comments.

Mr. Bundy explained that no one is suggesting the committee start all over again, all they are asking for is one additional meeting so the committee can come to a final decision that this is a product they are representative to send out to the public. At this time he stated he is not satisfied with it.

Mr. Robson stated he has a fear that if someone disagrees with the document, and the committee changes its mind, then the consultant and staff have to revisit the entire land use designation system. Because one parcel, one property, one area affects all the rest of it. It is not on the agenda to begin revisiting areas and land use issues that have been decided by this committee. He stated it is a question of policy.

Pat Massie-Johnston stated the committee has done a great job on the document, the problem is the decisions the Planning Department has made on their own. She stated no one requested these changes.

Mr. Robson stated that staff has a responsibility to exercise its professional judgement relative to land use issues given the committee's direction.

Pat Massie-Johnston stated she is making a motion to revisit the maps.

Mr. Robson stated that if she does that, then the committee is starting over again.

Mr. Bundy stated that with the help of another committee member, he calculated the number of people that this general plan will accommodate in this county if it was built out to this general plan using the suburban lots and urban lots, very conservatively over 400,000 people could live in Tehama County under this general plan. The numbers in this general plan would increase the population without changes in land use from 60,000 to over 400,000. He asked if that was a 15 year plan, it is something this committee is happy with.

Mr. Robson stated he would have to suggest that if you took the current general plan land use designations with the same map and did the calculations you would be around 250,000 to 300,000.

Mr. Bundy stated if the build-out were at 50%, there would 164,000 additional people in Tehama County.

Mr. Robson stated that is not realistic, we grow at 1.2% per year and it depends on a lot of factors. It is a mathematical extrapolation and it is what it is. He asked what does that mean to the committee, what does the committee want to do with the document. Do they want to move forward and get to a product and see what they have.

Scott Friend stated they received copies of the comment letters from the Planning Department. He stated they were reviewed, sorted by topic or section of the document. He stated they took liberty with the comments to reformat and reorganize them. Where there were comments regarding punctuation or grammar they were not included in the handout. These were observations and did not require a change to the document. If it were worthy of discussion, a policy statement change, reword an implementing action, question a philosophical approach to a section they were included. Therefore it is true not everyone's comments are in the comment discussion. He stated that the committee members should have the comment letters that were received.

Mr. Robson stated the comment letters are also posted on the internet.

Mr. Friend stated that if the comments raised questions or inaccuracies or question about data, the comments are in the document.

Mr. Bundy stated he had a new goal to add to OS-3 to protect and preserve and enhance fish and wildlife species, and it indicated to add policy implemental measurers to coordinate with local watershed groups on Cottonwood, Battle, Mill, Deer Creek, Sacramento River Conservation, Westside Streams and others to help address resource issues and increase benefits within those interest areas and none were addressed or included.

Mr. Robson stated he wanted to ask a critical question of Mr. Goodwin, he asked about funding, where are we? What if the committee wants to continue and take more meetings, it is critical to the committees consideration.

Mr. Goodwin stated what he is hearing the committee say is they would like to see the finished document, all their documents incorporated, they would like to have one last look at it. Mr. Goodwin stated that as it is presented to the Planning Commission if they are truly looking for input from the public and you are saying the maps are not finalized, make sure you make it clear this is not a unanimously supported document. He stated there is a lot of give and take in the document and the Planning Commission should look at these public comments attentively because there are still changes to be made. He explained we really need to get this out on the street, one of the major frustrations going on is people saying "hey look, we cannot even make comments at this time, you are only taking comments from the committee". He stated the sooner we get this out and get the public comments the better. He stated this document will not make everyone happy. He stated he feels it isn't a budget question, it is more just the committee wanting to have one more meeting.

Scott Friend stated that after each meeting the comments are changed in the document. He stated that it may take a little time and three weeks would probably be enough time to reproduce the document and have it printed for distribution at the next meeting.

Mr. Goodwin stated he does not wish to start the process over however it is a fair question as to what is the document looking like before it goes to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Robson stated that once you see that be warned that if they make wholesale changes to the Land Use Diagrams specifically they we are starting over again. He asked to keep that in mind. He stated his position is to facilitate the committee's efforts.

Ron Warner stated he would like to have another meeting and bring the questions the committee has to a conclusion.

Robert Harvey asked about the Rodney Beard, Fairview Ranchos subdivision and stated the permits had been issued in 2005 by Robert Halpin in the Planning Dept. He stated the county has already accepted the money.

Mr. Robson stated there have been no permits issued, there has been no process. He stated Mr. Beard gave funds to begin the application process which has been on hold since that time.

Mr. Harvey stated Mr. Beard applied for ¼ acre lots, all septic tanks.

Mr. Robson explained the project is on hold as it cannot move forward.

Mr. Harvey stated that was against the CC&Rs.

Mr. Robson stated that is too specific for any issue before this committee. It is not an issue to be heard before this committee.

Mr. Harvey stated he had copies of the documents, in the meantime the records regarding the CC&Rs are from the county records, which he paid for, he went to check in Oct. 2006 and these records are not in the county records any longer.

Mr. Willard asked Mr. Harvey if he was a committee member or a member of the public.

Mr. Harvey indicated he was a member of the public and wanted to make comments under "Citizens's Concerns."

Mr. Robson stated it is not a project at this point and stated we would like to receive those comments when there is a project in the public process. Currently it does not exist.

Scott Friend stated the updated maps are available on the website, they have been updated for over a month. The maps were updated as recently as 8 days ago and are updated after every meeting.

Doti explained the public will be very happy with the maps as they are on the website. The new software is working great. She explained the software is installed at Public Works, therefore its available on the Public Works website: [www.tehamacountypublicworks.ca.gov/tehamaco\\_IMS/](http://www.tehamacountypublicworks.ca.gov/tehamaco_IMS/)

Scott Friend explained the series of 8 maps will be updated by next Thursday.

Burt Bundy stated that is one of his concerns, there are inaccuracies in the maps. The one that was updated, the general plan full county map still has the inaccurate lines between the Upland Ag and Valley Ag that were on there before.

Scott Friend stated that according to his information they are right, however, if someone finds something wrong with the maps we need to talk about it.

Pat Massie-Johnston asked if the committee would be meeting together to revisit the maps and vote on them as a committee and posted in the agenda what we are going to be doing. She explained that when they voted on Antelope the members of Antelope were not there, therefore will the committee know what they are going to be voting on prior to the meeting.

Mr. Robson stated the meeting will be to go over what has been worked out through the policy document and look at the maps that have been agreed to by consensus of the committee. He stated if the committee starts changing the maps then we will be back where he said the committee would be again.

John Elko asked if the issue of noise along I-5 has been covered, he stated it is getting louder each year. He stated a section on noise levels in the document are inadequate, the levels are too high and there is no mention of how the noise level will be monitored and enforced. He stated it is very important with new developments being planned to have something in the document. More traffic will be caused by the developments coming in North of Red Bluff, the Wal-Mart Superstore and the College. There will be additional highway changes that CalTrans will have to do which need to be considered.

Mr. Robson stated Mr. Elko's comments are really more appropriate for Planning Commission public hearing and the Board of Supervisors hearing, however we welcome the comments and if they are in writing please submit a copy to the Planning Dept. Mr. Robson explained there is mention of noise issues within the Administrative Draft General Plan and if he would like a copy, the Planning Dept. has the document available on CD.

A question was asked if the Specific Plan area map posted as of February 22, 2007 will be available to view before it was shown as one designation, as it is now shown as Special Plan/Valley Floor Ag/Rural Residential/Rural Small Lot which would seem to indicate there is an underlying designation over that.

Mr. Robson stated that is correct because that is the way Planning Policy is written. He stated that was to clarify what is underneath there.

Nelson Buck asked if he was not a member of the public and did not attend the meeting tonight would he know tomorrow or the next day that the draft document is on the website and how would they know if there are two different websites.

Doti Watkins stated the reason for the 2<sup>nd</sup> website is so the committee has access to it and to keep it for the Planning Dept. prior to announcement to the public. This would give the committee a chance to have a shot at it and make sure it is functional.

Scott Friend stated they will be putting a direct link on their website ([www.tehamagp.com](http://www.tehamagp.com)) to the [www.tehamacountypublicworks.ca.gov/tehamaco IMS/](http://www.tehamacountypublicworks.ca.gov/tehamaco IMS/), however it is available as of today.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF:**

**December 7, 2006**

**January 11, 2007**

**February 8, 2007**

### **December 7, 2006:**

**MOTION: It was moved by Ron Warner, seconded by Wally Roney and passed unanimously with no opposition by the General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee to approve the minutes of December 7, 2006 as mailed.**

### **January 11, 2007:**

Wally Roney stated on Page 4 of 7 of the January 11, 2007 minutes under 2.0 Land Use (F) the definition of Upland Ag he had submitted by the Cattlemen's Association and was agreed upon by the committee as the definition is not in the minutes and should be amended to read:

#### **"UPLAND AGRICULTURE LAND USE**

The upland agriculture land use designation is used to preserve lands devoted to grazing, capable of supporting sustainable grazing activities; to provide for areas of intensive and extensive agricultural land uses; including silva culture, to conserve areas of open space combined with working landscapes and to identify the use of land for non-agriculture purposes that is compatible with grazing such as hunting, fishing, commercial recreation and habitat management."

Charlie Willard stated in "Announcements" there were 3 comments submitted from the Landfill Management, Linda Walker and Anne Read to the committee via email.

Mr. Robson stated they were sent by email and in the mail.

Charlie Willard stated on page 6 of 7, 2.0 Land Use (X) Valley Floor Ag. He stated there was a lot of talk at this time about this committee saying yes "we will stay with that 20 and 40 acre minimum". He asked if the committee agreed with that.

Mr. Goodwin explained that so much has changed since January, that we want to look at El Camino separately at a special hearing. At the January meeting one of the things that came up was "does the committee want to look at El Camino separately from the rest of the Valley Ag,

and the consensus of the group was no, lets just keep it as Valley Ag". The consensus at the time was why would we treat El Camino any different then any other area. He asked if the group even remembers talking about El Camino at that time.

Pat Massie-Johnston stated they had discussed it, however, there was not an actual vote which the committee needs to start doing so we have a record.

Mr. Goodwin stated we will just let it drop if the committee doesn't remember having the conversation.

Charlie Willard stated that both Arthur Wylene and Will Murphy were present and not listed in the minutes.

Mr. Robson stated they would be added as present.

Burt Bundy stated on page 6 of 7 of the minutes, 2.0 Land Use (S) he made extensive comments regarding Buffers and Implementation of Buffers and would like that noted in the Discussion Comments.

He stated he had submitted additional comments he believes on January 8<sup>th</sup>, it was after the comment period, he didn't see them on the 11<sup>th</sup>, but wants the comments noted.

John Roth stated on page 3 of 7 in the minutes, 2.0 Land Use (A) under the "Discussion" there is no mention of Wilderness acreages, he would like to add a comment to include Wilderness acreages within table 2.4.

Comment: Anne Read, page 6 of 7 in the minutes, 2.0 Land Use (V) stated "Discussion followed regarding in-fill development, longer term viable operations. Mr. Friend stated they would rewrite this policy to get the "in-fill" concept included and they will bring it back with word changes. She stated that has not happened. She stated this is just a comment not a correction to the minutes.

Anne Read, page 7 of 7 in the minutes, under MOTION it states the motion carried by a vote of 6:6, and then states motion died due to tie vote.

Corrected to read as follows:

***MOTION: A motion was made by Linda Walker, seconded by Anne Read to change minimum parcel size to 640 Acre Minimum in Upland Agricultural Zoning District. Motion died due to tie vote of 6:6.***

***MOTION: A motion was made by Anne Read, seconded by Linda Walker to change minimum parcel size to 320 Acre Minimum in Upland Agricultural Zoning District. Motion died due to tie vote of 6:6.***

**MOTION: A motion was made by Ron Warner, seconded by Wally Roney and carried by a unanimous vote without opposition to approve the minutes of the January 11, 2007 meeting of the Tehama County General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee with corrections noted.**

**February 8, 2007:**

Charlie Willard stated the minutes are much better and thanked George Robson and staff for their work on them.

Charlie Willard stated page 3 of 13, paragraph 10, he asked if the clean version of the maps are ready as stated.

Mr. Robson stated it did not happen. There are no maps at tonights meeting.

Burt Bundy stated on page 4 of 13, paragraph 4, states Mr. Robson is trying to get through the comments.....before it goes to the public draft. Mr. Bundy stated the committee would then in fact have one more chance to review the document and maps before it went out to public comment.

Mr. Robson stated that was correct and that is what we will do.

Charlie Willard, page 8 of 13, 4.0 Public Services; he questioned Anne's comments regarding some of the document is confusing due to the length of sentences. She confirmed yes she continues to say there is a problem with the language, etc.

Charlie Willard, page 9 of 13, (C) under Discussion: Hogsback is spelled incorrectly. Mr. Robson stated there were two areas of water quality, one is Antelope and Hogsback.

Mr. Robson stated it should read Los Molinos and Antelope. However, Antelope and Hogsback are in the same water study. He stated that Burt Bundy had pointed out there was an old study in Los Molinos, therefore Antelope and Hogsback is one study and Los Molinos is the 2<sup>nd</sup> study.

**MOTION:** A motion was made by Ron Warner, seconded by Burt Bundy and carried by a unanimous vote without opposition to approve the minutes of the February 8, 2007 meeting of the Tehama County General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee with corrections noted.

**CONTINUED MEETING FROM FEBRUARY 8, 2007 STARTING WITH  
6.0(S) OPEN SPACE AND CONSERVATION**

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

- S) Implementation Measure OS-4.1c: *Proposed addition:* "Ensure that mining infrastructure such as roads, pipes, and wires used to support the mining site do not adversely impact off-site resources." (6-15)  
*Staff Comment: Commenter is referred to IA OS-4.1C which addresses this comment. Staff does not believe that the proposed addition is necessary.*  
***Scott Friend explained the item is inclusive and wasn't necessary to add language as proposed. No change was made.***
  
- T) Missing Implementation Measure: Where is the grading ordinance that would protect the water, wildlife, and cultural resources listed in Policies 1, 4, and 7? Currently, pre-submission road construction can be conducted in anticipation of a future development project. This work is conducted without any public department oversight. (6-17)  
*Staff Comment: While the County supports the adoption of a Grading Ordinance, staff does not believe that an Implementation Action could be added to the General Plan to*

address this comment on a practical scale. Staff does not recommend making any changes as written.

**Discussion:**

**Scott stated the rule of the General Plan isn't to write ordinance, the ordinances shake out of the policy and goals of the plan. Scott stated there are a couple of different places where adopting a grading ordinance is mentioned within the document.**

**George Robson suggested we check on the issue of a grading ordinance, etc. Scott stated he believes it is in there, however they will check it out.**

**Mark Teague stated that grading ordinances can be a big issue because they can be very tough to implement and can cause a great deal of discussion. He stated that Grading Ordinances typically trigger CEQA and that can be a real problem for a farmer wanting to relevel his field.**

- U) Implementation Measure OS-6.1a: What is the Tehama County Historical Commission? Can its mission and authority handle the consultation services mandated by this measure? (6-17)

*Staff Comment: Comment noted and staff concurs with commenter. Staff recommends that the IM measure be removed as this process is already done as part of the CEQA process.*

**George Robson explained that the department handles this through the CEQA referral process. Every project the county planning department handles is referred to the Northeast Information Center, which is both historical and archeological resources.**

- V) Implementation Measure OS-6.1d – “An archaeological survey should be conducted for all subdivisions as in the case of our neighboring counties.” This should be a County requirement without CEQA. There is no way to know what is appropriate without this. (6-18)

*Staff Comment: Projects are already routed to the NE environmental center for comment as part of the existing development review process.*

**Discussion:**

**Scott stated that Mr. Robson had explained that each project is already routed to the Northeast Information Center for comments as part of the process.**

**Mr. Bundy asked if there was any harm in including it in a General Plan statement. Mr. Robson answered that yes there is, because it requires an archeological study as opposed to referring it to the NEIC when they do a record search and if there is no evidence of archeological importance, you are not required to do an expensive archeological study for something that does not exist. That is the harm in having that kind of implementation measure to blanket something that is not necessary unless we are told it is necessary by the experts.**

**Anne Read asked if that is someplace in the document that says all projects will be routed to the NEIC.**

**Mr. Robson stated that is not a General Plan Policy, that is a CEQA requirement for processing specific permits and development proposals.**

**Mark Teague read Implementation Measure OS-6.1 for clarification and it is there. He stated that once in a while the NEIC states no archeological study is needed, occasionally it happens they submit a letter stating otherwise.**

- W) Include a description and discussion of lands in the county that are designated as wilderness by U.S. and Congress.

*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends that additional text be added on this subject*

**Comment noted – staff recommends the additional text be added.**

- X) Include the Lassen Volcanic National Park Highway as a historic district (as listed in the NPS Cultural Landscapes Inventory in 2002).

*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends that additional text be added on this subject.*

**Comment noted – staff recommends the additional text be added.**

- Y) Should add policy and implementation measures to coordinate with local watershed groups in Cottonwood, Battle, Mill, and Deer Creeks, the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum, Westside Streams and others to help address resource issues and increase benefits within those interest areas.

*Staff Comment: Staff does not believe that a new policy or IM is necessary and believes that to the extent possible, the development review process will consider the adopted policies of the various watershed groups in the County.*

**Discussion:**

**Burt Bundy stated he does not agree with that. This comment was supposed to go with OS-3 Page 6-11 per his notes. This would protect, preserve and enhance fish and wildlife species. He stated that part of the county should preserve and protect environmental sensitive and significant lands and water valuable for plants and wildlife habitat, natural appearance and character, he wanted to add “recognize, preserve and protect Sacramento River and its tributaries are significantly important biologic, historical, visual, recreational water resources to Tehama County.”**

**Pat Massie-Johnston stated she does not think it would hurt for the watershed area closest to the development to have input.**

**Burt Bundy stated that many of the watershed groups are active, most are locally governed and it’s important they are involved in the process whenever there is an activity going on particularly a subdivision or land use activity within the watersheds. He also had implementation measures tied to that, to notify appropriate groups when land use activities are proposed and to schedule periodic public information workshops with stakeholder groups, county staff, Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.**

**Scott Friend commented that he recognizes to protect the Sacramento River, its tributaries, etc., he feels that is a fair statement and he would not be opposed if the group wanted to put that in there as well. He stated he has concerns with some of the implementation measurers, they would basically be suggesting that the county would then have to go through potentially new implemental requirements, scheduling periodic public informational workshops.**

**George Robson stated it gets the information out and if they have comments then we would want to hear from them. He stated that as far as the rest of it maybe leave that for your suggestions from a watershed group to other forums, rather than have it in a General Plan document, because someone may go to the General Plan and ask if we have had the meeting this year, well it doesn’t say we have to have it this year, it could be a problematic issue. He felt it is “do-able”, however not particularly identified in the General Plan implementation.**

**Burt Bundy stated he agrees with scheduling periodic workshops – we can delete that, but he believes to notify appropriate groups when land use activities are proposed.**

**George Robson stated we have maps of the watersheds, we know who they are, we are trying to put staff in the watershed group meetings as best as possible. The department has always made efforts to listen to what they have to say and do as best we can to implement your suggestions.**

**Anne Read stated there needs to be an addition of the Tehama County Resource Conservation District, because the district represents all the watersheds it doesn't have a specific group such as Antelope, Paynes, Reed Creek, Red Bank south.**

**George Robson stated they are all on our "must notify" list.**

**Scott stated we add the recognized statement and notify appropriate group when land use activities are proposed and per Anne's comment we add the Resource Conservation District to the list that is included in the suggestions for goal OS-3.**

**George Robson stated included but not limited to.....**

**Burt Bundy stated he has one other implementation measure – utilize technical expertise with members of these groups when developing best management practices, biological siting and other studies and guidelines.**

**Scott said that is a good idea, maybe caution this is a little beyond the scope of the General Plan, but if the group concurs with the rest of the items we will note these as additions.**

**Pat Massie-Johnston stated she wanted to make a comment regarding OS-3, Open Space; she wanted to check on Policy OS-7.1 The county shall identify significant scenic watershed.....she asked if that was going to help correct the problem, going out Hwy 36 there is a mining operation which is really disrupting her view. She asked if they would still be able to carve big holes in the ground. She asked how are we protecting scenic views and aesthetic qualities of Tehama County such as Lassen.**

**George Robson stated you identify public viewing areas, to protect those areas from intrusive development.**

**Scott Friend explained that on any CEQA review it is standard under aesthetics there is a question that has to do with whether the project is visible from a scenic highway or viewing area. So by including in the language that you are protecting individual resources and identify scenic highway corridors when you go through the CEQA checklist you can analyze a project relative to its scenic impacts.**

**Language is put in there because it triggers CEQA requirements for staff when going through the checklist and it specifically says "is it viewable from a scenic corridor or watershed area." Then a determination can be made.**

**Anne Read stated she had a comment that was not included pertaining to gas wells (Page 6-14, OS-4.1) she feels the county should require permits for all gas wells prior to drilling. She stated dry wells are bad for the environment and all wells should be permitted.**

**George Robson stated the only wells which do not require Use Permits to be drilled are those in the Upland Agricultural areas because they are considered to be exploration. He stated the county can revisit that issue and make Use Permit required for all drilling wells. He stated there is a very helpful website under the Calif. Dept. of Oil & Gas regarding gas wells and how carefully the activity is monitored.**

**Bill Goodwin discussed ridgelines. One of the things he wanted to bring up is the ridge between Jelly's Ferry and Lake Calif. Road. He stated he knows that is a specific plan area, however he would like to not see homes on the ridgeline but they are located below the ridgeline so when looking up you keep the nice ridgeline view. He stated he isn't sure if the committee should look at it as a**

**special implementation measure that may be something to bring up to the Planning Commission or if it should be addressed in the different special projects. Mark Teague stated this gets into a huge discussion because realtors will tell you the high dollar lots are the ones that set up high and look at the valley floor, this changes the ridgeline that everyone else has to look at. Usually you only look at this issue after someone has already messed up.**

**Gregg Werner stated it is not unusual to have a policy in the general plan that provides some additional direction so when a project comes in you have that beginning direction.**

**George Robson asked to bring something back to the committee next time and it can be circulated before the next meeting.**

**MOTION: A motion was made by Norm Gruver, seconded by Charlie Willard and carried by a unanimous vote without opposition to bring the ridgeline issue back before the committee at the next scheduled meeting of the General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee.**

**Anne Read asked about Page 6-10 planting of trees, Implementation Measure OS2.6(e).**

**George Robson read the measure**

**Scott Friend indicated he would bring that back to the next meeting.**

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

*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 any addition changes.*

**Alan Hess stated he made the comment, but wasn't sure where it went within the document.**

**Mark Teague stated that working cooperatively with the districts is in the document a couple of times, it needs to be embellished with the text, because it doesn't quite convey the county will continue to work with the districts, they should probably modify something there.**

**MEETING RECESSED AT: 7:37 P.M.**

**MEETING RECONVENED AT 8:47 P.M.**

## **7.0 AGRICULTURE AND TIMBER**

- A) Second paragraph references dry land hay and grain. This crop is minimal to the foothills of Tehama County. (7-1)

*Staff Comment: Comment Noted. Paragraph two is only background information and makes no summary determination as to meaning, quantification, etc. of the value of the crop. Staff does not believe any action is necessary on this item.*

**Comment noted – no changes necessary.**

- B) Policy AG-2.2 should include the Tehama County Resource Conservation District and the Tehama County Farm Bureau. (7-4)

*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends change be made.*

**Comment noted – staff recommends change be made.**

- C) Policy AG-2.4 “Consider replacing trees” should be changed to “Shall replace trees”. (7-5)

*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Wording is directly reflective of existing adopted County Policy. Staff does not recommend that any change is made. Any change would need to be endorsed by the Board as it would represent a change of adopted County Board Policy.*

**Comment noted – no change recommended.**

**Discussion:**

**George Robson explained there is a new Public Resources Code this last year and directly reflects options for mitigation when a significant effect is determined on oak woodlands, etc., you really have to keep in mind there are options provided for by the legislature and statute and the options are meant to provide for flexibility for jurisdictions, assessment and dealing with significant effect on oak woodlands, one of which is to replace trees, but others are not to replace trees but to buy conservation easements to make monetary contributions to Calif. Wildlife Fund, etc. In some areas it is not appropriate to replace trees based upon the kind of project, he asks they consider there are options in statute and we need to reflect options available as opposed to being more restrictive.**

**Pat Massie-Johnston asked if Shasta County has a 5-1 Tree Ordinance, and if Chico or Butte County have one also? She feels it should be at least 1-1.**

**George Robson stated legislature has provided for statutory protection programs without being defined as “must” replace trees.**

**Bill Goodwin stated that would be an implementing ordinance that we would deal with, this is a policy statement which basically says we want to do something about trees being removed and implement ordinance can get pretty specific.**

**George Robson explained right now we don’t have an ordinance we have a policy, he stated he is not sure the Board will ever get to an ordinance regarding tree protection because the state pre-emts the field at this stage.**

- D) Should consider requirements for a project proponent to provide off-site mitigation where significant loss of native oaks are proposed. The measures could include tree planting, restoration of damaged lands in a particular watershed or community. (7-5)

*Staff Comment: The Public Resources Code provides for oak woodlands to be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. State already establishes regulations on this issue and impacts are evaluated under the CEQA. Existing County policy is to follow state Public Resources Code requirements on this subject.*

**Comment noted – no change recommended.**

- E) Does the Hardwood Advisory Committee still exist? (7-8)

*Staff Comment: Yes. This Committee is a committee of the County Ag. Commissioners Office.*

**Scott Friend & George Robson indicated yes it does still exist. The committee is a committee within the Tehama County Ag. Commissioner’s Office.**

- F) The RL, HR, UA restrictions adjacent to timberland do not recognize existing residential uses that are present (exe: Manton, Mill Creek, Mineral, etc.). (7-9)

*Staff Comment: General Plan policies deal with future land use conditions and generally do not deal with preexisting land uses occurring on an individual occurrence level. This General Plan policy is intended to deal with future address future land use issues.*

**Pat Massie-Johnston stated that Mill Creek is another community, she asked if there is a map of Mill Creek to reflect the changes that have happened out there, they are pretty significant, they no longer live on National Forest Property, each person owns their own land.**

**Comment noted – no change recommended**

- G) Implementation Measure AG-6.3 – TPZ minimum acreage limit could be reduced by the County to allow small parcels into the tax reduction program. Additional development limitations are attached to TPZ. (7-9)

*Staff Comment: The County is limited to following State requirements for inclusion of land into the TPZ program. The County cannot have policies that are more inclusive than those of the State TPZ program. Staff does not believe that a change to this Implementation Measure should be made.*

**Comment noted – no change recommended.**

- H) Policy AG-6.5 should include a reference to BMP's in the policy. (7-9)

*Staff Comment: Comment noted and staff recommends that the suggestion be incorporated. Additionally, staff recommends that a definition of BMP to be added to Planning Glossary.*

**Scott Friend indicated this would appear in the next revision of the document that will be printed.**

- I) Boundaries of the Valley Floor Agriculture/Upland Agriculture need to be finalized.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the current boundaries have been adopted by the full GPRAC and are final by consensus of the GRPAC. However, Staff believes that additional consideration of movement of the eastern line to follow the Highline Canal should be considered by the GPRAC.*

**Discussion:**

**Anne Read indicated she believes the committee never adopted those lines.**

**George Robson stated the subcommittee drew the lines, it was brought back to the committee and there was consensus to accept the subcommittee's recommendations.**

**John Stoufer explained that the committee decided to go co-terminus with the open range to make them a co-terminus line on the East side.**

**George Robson stated we can review the lines at the next meeting.**

**Anne Read stated there are still 2 lines on the West side and East side also.**

**Scott Friend indicated the maps have been updated to reflect a single line on the East and the West side.**

**Burt Bundy stated the 8 maps that cover more detail, they are the ones with 2 lines on them.**

**George Robson explained we are not looking at those maps, just the single November 7, 2006 map. George stated he is going by the only map that is in the book which is directly behind Page 2-39 in the November 2006 Administrative Draft General Plan. George indicated the series of maps is not reflective of what is in the Administrative Draft. We need to go by this map.**

**Burt Bundy stated his understanding was the lines on the maps that are more detailed were the more accurate lines.**

**George Robson stated it is just the opposite.**

**Burt Bundy stated had he realized these were the official lines he has strong comments regarding the map.**

**Anne Read stated her recollection was that the line on the East side was to follow meets and bounds, not follow the foothills.**

**George Robson stated the General Plan lines do not need to be legally described. He stated the recommendation came from the cattle owners on the East side to follow the open range line.**

**Bill Goodwin stated at the time the committee was looking at the line, there was some major debate whether that line was also the open range line. They were torn trying to find a balance, if it's a Valley Ag/Upland Ag line they may want to move it closer to the freeway, if its an Open Range Line they may wish to move it further from the freeway.**

**Mark Teague stated they sidestepped that issue and talked only about Valley Ag. John Stoufer stated the subcommittee had several different lines on the East side, the committee voted to go with the subcommittee's lines on the West side through the Flournoy area, Wally Roney made the motion to move the line on the East side to coincide with the proposed open range/closed range land. That is why the map was changed to show where the line is.**

**Discussion followed regarding legal descriptions, meets and bounds, and open range.**

- J) South of Flournoy, the Western Valley Floor line needs to be moved easterly, to be in line with the line that is drawn from the Reeds Creek area, to the Rancho Tehama area. This area contains much grazing land and also land that is dry land farmed and needs to be included in Upland Ag area.

*Staff Comment: The GPRAC voted on the existing line and approved the line as it's currently shown. Further changes to the line are encouraged to be noted and discussed at future Planning Commission meetings.*

**Committee recommended to bring this comment back to the committee at the next meeting.**

- K) Should add goals to conserve and preserve agricultural lands in Tehama County, especially areas currently farmed or having prime agricultural soils and outside existing planned communities and city limits.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document as it currently stands (see Goal AG-1).*

**Burt Bundy stated he disagrees, he does not believe they are included, there is only one goal in AG-1 side of it and he believes they do not include that.**

**George Robson stated it is to preserve and protect agricultural lands.**

**Burt Bundy stated the county shall provide for the protection of ag lands from non-agricultural development pressures. To conserve and preserve agricultural lands in Tehama County should be a goal.**

**George Robson asked if he wanted to reword the goal.**

**Burt Bundy indicated yes, he wants to add this as part of it – it may be redundant.**

**He stated he had at least 3 implementation measures to go with each one.**

**Anne Read indicated they should be brought back to the committee.**

**George Robson stated the committee should look at the full text of Burt's comments relative to implementation.**

**Scott Friend indicated we will bring that back to the committee.**

- L) Should add goals to encourage local participation in County Planning and Land Use activities, including local Ag-based organizations.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document as it currently stands.*

**Discussion:**

**RESPONSE TO ITEMS L) THROUGH R):**

***Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document and will bring it back to the committee after they see where they fit.***

***George Robson & Mark Teague stated they will cross check and see where they might be addressed.***

- M) Should add goals to conserve, protect, and improve soil and water resources that support a variety of crops and products.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document as it currently stands.*

**See L) above.**

- N) Should add goals to ensure the compatibility of land uses adjacent to agricultural operations, so that agricultural productivity is not substantially affected.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document as it currently stands.*

**See L) above.**

- O) Should add goals that support and promote a healthy and competitive agricultural community and economy.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document as it currently stands.*

**See L) above.**

- P) Should add goals that maintain or create sites for agricultural industry in order to meet demand for agricultural suppliers, laboratory research, field research, seed research, food processing, and other related activities.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document as it currently stands.*

**See L) above.**

- Q) Should add goals to provide opportunities for recreation, tourism, and associated support services in appropriate locations, thereby accommodating the expansion of Ag tourism and supporting local Ag education programs.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document as it currently stands.*

**See L) above.**

- R) Should add goals to educate the public about the importance of agriculture in Tehama County.

*Staff Comment: Staff believes that the desired goals and policies are included in the document as it currently stands.*

**See L) above.**

**Discussion:**

***Pat Massie-Johnston stated at Belle Mill Landing her daughter was shot with a pellet gun and City Police showed up immediately, however they could not do anything because of the small patch of county property, it took 45 minutes for Sheriff to get there. It turned***

**out to be a lengthy ordeal and recommended the county start annexing in order to keep pressure off the Sheriff's Dept. and put it over to the City Police Dept. She phoned Sheriff Parker and he stated from a public safety point of view, to tell the committee he encourages annexation on little pockets along Antelope.**

**George Robson stated that would be under "comment noted".**

**Bill Goodwin asked if there is anything in the county code regarding "islands". He stated that is a point well taken.**

**George Robson stated LAFCo policies discourage "islands". He indicated the only island that exists is a little North of the Elks Lodge. He stated LAFCo requirements would require the consensus of those folk that live in the islands.**

**Scott Friend stated there is a section in the document talks about annexation. It would be in the language section and not in the Safety Section.**

**George Robson stated you can add language that says we promote the participation of removing islands of city/county areas. LAFCo nor the city has the authority to annex property without the will of the people.**

## **8.0 SAFETY**

**Scott made a suggestion that Section 8.0 SAFETY is 4 to 5 pages of information, most of the information was submitted by Cal Fire to PMC and PMC concurs and supports the changes on each comment. His suggestion is that baring any specifics we agree and incorporate the fire department suggestions, which eliminates the committee having to go through the last 6 pages of the comments.**

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

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

The Tehama County Fire Department currently provides fire responses to the citizens of Tehama County through a network of sixteen fire stations and fifteen

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

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

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

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

- d. **Fire Department Medical Response** – Tehama County Fire Department (TCFD) provides various levels of emergency medical services (EMS) to an area

of 2,951 square miles with a population of about 40,000 people. Approximately 64% of TCFD responses over the past five years have been to EMS emergencies. These include traffic collisions, which require a combination of fire protection, rescue and EMS. In 2000 emergency medical incident responses for TCFD/CDF totaled 1,527. In 2005 emergency medical incident responses for TCFD/CDF totaled 2,727, a 78.6 percent increase. Based on proposed development and subsequent population increases the number of emergency medical incident responses by TCFD/CDF will continue to rise. For a complete description of the emergency medical response services provided by the TCFD, please see the Tehama County Background Report, Section 7.0 (Community Facilities and Services). (8-4)

- e. **Fire Department Homeland Security/Hazardous Materials Response** – The Tehama County Fire Department (TCFD) currently trains personnel to the state mandated minimum level of *First Responder Haz Mat Operational*. Some CDF employees within the Unit are certified to the *Hazardous Materials Technical Specialist* level. TCFD has no legal responsibility for abatement of hazardous materials incidents; however, because TCFD is a “first responder” to this type of incident and its mission includes the protection of life and property, TCFD takes basic action to isolate and deny entry.

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

*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of comment.*

- C) Airports: You mention six but only name four (8-5).

*Staff Comment: Text refers to “privately maintained airfields” which differ from Airports. However, staff recommends the addition of support text to locate the other two airfields.*

- D) *Proposed Re-Write; Policy SAF-3.1: “The County shall require accepted fire resistive construction practices, including but not limited to site design and layout; use of appropriate landscaping and building materials; and the installation of automatic fire sprinklers on new and redevelopment projects.” (8-10)*

*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*

- E) *Proposed Re-Write; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1a: “The County will continue to enforce local, state, and federal fire and safety codes. The County Fire Departments and all fire protection districts will enforce the uniform codes adopted by the California Building and Standards Commission and the Office of the State Fire Marshal in addition to fire and life safety regulations within the California Government Code and Code of Regulations and those adopted via county ordinance(s).” (8-10)*

*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language with the change of “will” to “shall”.*

- F) *Proposed Addition* – Implementation Measure SAF-3.1 – “Require all home or manufactured home replacements to comply with current fire suppression requirements, including electrical wiring components.” (8-11)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- G) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1b: “Require all new developments located in “Very High Fire Severity Zones” and “High Fire Severity Zones” to conform to California’s Wildland Urban Interface Building Standards.” (8-11)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- H) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1c: “Ensure through the project review process that new developments include accepted fire engineering and design features that complement and enhance fire suppression capabilities and reduce fire hazards. Fire engineering and design features include sufficient fire hydrant “fire flow” capacity and/or residential fire sprinklers.” (8-11)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- I) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1d: “Require that new developments and redevelopment projects provide for safe, all weather, unobstructed access for emergency equipment and simultaneous civilian evacuation. (8-11)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- J) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.1f: “Require on-site fire suppression systems for new commercial and industrial development, as well as multi-family residential development with five or more units, to reduce the impact on fire department equipment and personnel.” (8-11)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- K) *Proposed Re-Write*; Policy SAF-3.2: “The County shall prohibit new developments in ‘High and Very High Fire Severity Zones’ and other fire prone areas or require mitigation to minimize hazards to acceptable levels.” (8-11)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- L) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.2a: “Review development proposals to determine if new development projects are located in “High” or “Very High Fire Severity Zones” or fire prone areas. If development is permitted in these areas, ensure that mitigation measures are required and followed.” (8-11)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- M) *Proposed Re-Write*; Policy SAF-3.3: “The County shall ensure that sufficient levels of service for fire protection are maintained by requiring development projects to provide and/or fund fire protection facilities, personnel, operations, and maintenance or provide alternative methods that sustain adequate levels of service.” (8-11)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- N) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.3a: “Where determined to be necessary, the County will require as condition of approval the dedication of land and/or establishment of an appropriate funding mechanism to help offset costs for fire protection facilities and services.” (8-12)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*

- O) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF 3.3b: “Require new construction to pay their fair-share for necessary fire protection improvements by continuing to review Chapter 9.15 of the Tehama County Code (Development Impact Mitigation Fees.” (8-12)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- P) *Proposed Addition*; Implementation Measure SAF 3.3c: “Require, in the areas of the county not served by rated fire hydrants (minimum of 250 gallons per minute for 2 hours), that any new dwelling unit have installed an engineered, automatic fire suppression system that complies with the most current edition of NFPA 13D.” (8-12)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- Q) *Proposed Re-Write*; Policy SAF-3.4: “The County shall continue to support and cooperate with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) in providing fire protection services and fire prevention programs for the unincorporated areas of the County.” (8-12)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- R) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.4a: “Participate in mutual aid agreements and continue to collaborate with CDF and the county’s fire departments and fire protection districts.” (8-12)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- S) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5e: “Require and inspect for compliance with California Code Public Resources Code Section 4290-4299; Tehama County Code Chapter 9.14 (Fire Safe Regulations); and adopted Development Standards.” (8-12)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- T) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5f: “Encourage strategic road placement and the use and maintenance of firebreaks, fuel breaks, and green belts for effective pre-fire suppression planning by local fire departments and districts, the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.” (8-13)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- U) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5g: “Encourage and promote the installation of smoke detectors and fire extinguishers in existing structures through continuing public education. Encourage and promote the installation of residential fire sprinklers in all new residential housing.” (8-13)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- V) Implementation Measure SAF-3.5h – “Require all homes to have lighted address signs.” This is not practical in many outlying areas because often there is no power along the road where the signs are located. (8-13)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- W) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5h: “Require businesses and homes to have legible, lighted and/or reflective address signs located along identified streets.” (8-13)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*

- X) *Proposed Re-Write*; Implementation Measure SAF-3.5j: “The County Fire Department, in conjunction with CDF and local fire protection agencies, will implement the following fire prevention programs as funding and staff availability allow:
- a. Upon request, assist businesses in preparing their fire prevention plans.
  - b. Present fire prevention programs at local schools and community events.
  - c. Carry out routine fire inspections.
  - d. Perform pre-fire plan inspections for businesses, Office of State Fire Marshal regulated facilities, and all medium and high hazard occupancies. (8-13)
- Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language.*
- Y) Implementation Measure SAF 8.1a: “a plan for each airport.” Does this include the private airports? (8-19)  
*Staff Comment: No. Plans for private airports are not required.*
- Z) Implementation Measure SAF 9.3 as determined by the “County Planning Department.” This should be the “Environmental Health Department,” not planning. (8-22)  
*Staff Comment: Comment noted. Staff recommends inclusion of new language. Change to include both Department of Environmental Health and Tehama County Fire.*

## 9.0 NOISE

No comment letters were received for Element 9.0: Noise.

### **Discussion:**

***Anne Read stated she had 2 comments/questions.***

- 1) Potential disasters – there is no mention of volcanic eruptions or terrorist safety.***

***Arthur Wylene stated Page 8-5 (1<sup>st</sup> paragraph) has a reference to that.***

- 2) Map showing TCFD fire response area should be included in General Plan.***

***George Robson stated fire protection plan are co-documents referred to, this is not the fire protection plan. He has no objection to a map being included.***

***Steve Sherman with Cal Fire was present and made one other addition and that is there is a reference to the unit fire plan done by Cal Fire and that fire plan is specific to Tehama and Glenn Counties. Both of the Board of Supervisors have adopted a fire plan as a “Community Wildfire Protection Plan” CWPP which he would like in the General Plan as this is a document which is constantly being updated it would have in the local and state responsibility areas and it would be a reflection of what would happen in any community as far as various projects meeting the fire problems within the county. He will work with George Robson to establish the wording.***

**Scott explained the website for the parcel-viewer software. There will be a link on the webpage: [www.tehamagp.com](http://www.tehamagp.com) webpage. He recommended doing the following to allow viewing from your home computer:**

- 1) Turn off pop-up blocker entirely**
- 2) Print output - there are so many versions - update to the most recent internet explorer for best results**
- 3) The Legend is not showing the Upland/Valley Floor boundary line, it shows on map, but not on the legend.**

**He encouraged everyone to use it and provide feedback at the next meeting. He stated that DSL or fast internet is recommended as you may have problems with downloading.**

**Doti Watkins explained how to zoom in and use the new software program. She explained you need to access the Public Works website because that is where the new software program is loaded.**

**[www.tehamacountypublicworks.ca.gov/tehamaco IMS/](http://www.tehamacountypublicworks.ca.gov/tehamaco IMS/)**

**Next meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 29, 2007, 6 p.m. at Community Center.**

**Meeting Adjourned 8:30 p.m.**

---

Respectfully Submitted, Recording Secretary  
Kellee A. Taresh