

**TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN REVISION PROJECT
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE
MEETING MAY 3, 2007**

The Tehama County General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee met in a regular session at 6:07 p.m. on Thursday, May 3, 2007 at Red Bluff Community Center, 1500 South Jackson St., Red Bluff, CA.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Dexter Wright
John Crosby
Leroy Myers
Linda Jenkins

ALSO PRESENT:

George W. Robson, Planning Director
John Stoufer, Planning Staff
Robert Halpin, Planning Staff
Sean Harrasser, 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:

George Robson welcomed the committee and thanked those in attendance for coming.

CITIZENS CONCERNS:

John Elko addressed the committee with his concerns regarding the noise element. He stated he does not think the committee has adequately addressed the noise element of the Draft General Plan. He stated he has reviewed previous minutes of the General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee and the noise elements needs a lot of work. He questioned the comments that have been submitted as he was told comments were not being accepted as it was after the comment period. He provided a handout to the committee dated 5-3-07.

A lady in the audience asked if the public hearing dates and locations have been scheduled. Mr. Robson stated they would not be scheduled until the committee finishes its work.

A gentleman in the audience stated the committee should stop listening to the public and focus on the tasks and get through the draft so the public can comment on it.

Bartley Fleharty an attorney for several landowners in the North I-5 area was present and addressed the committee. Mr. Fleharty stated back in the 1983 General Plan the north I-5 corridor is where a significant amount of growth was projected over the next 20 years and stated that since 1983 this has pretty much been accomplished. He stated the plan was to preserve and protect the south I-5 corridor and the soils in that area. He stated the new draft general plan also promotes development in the north I-5 corridor. He explained the process and steps involved in developing property. In conclusion he stated it is time to move this Draft General Plan on to the public hearing process, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Bill Moule was present representing the Red Bluff Chamber and Tehama County Local Development Corp. He thanked the committee for their hard work and stated it is time for closure and submit the Draft General Plan to the Planning Commission and public hearing process. He stated he is concerned this has been in the committee for too long.

Pat Johnston referred to the Caltrans issues with the Del Webb Project and the increased traffic and noted just because there will be an increase in development in the county, the county is not going to make any money, there are no jobs in Tehama County, no infrastructure.

Eric Battan stated it is time to move forward, there will be differences of opinions among the committee members, however the EIR still needs to be prepared. He stated the landowners want to move forward to plan for the future and asked the committee to get the Draft General Plan to the public for comment.

Scott Rubright addressed the committee and stated this is a timing issue, the committee has done a great job and has been working a long time and they cannot reach a level of perfection with the document. He asked to get it to the public and get it moving forward.

Gary Catlin addressed the committee. He stated he is a resident of the Bowman area and asked the committee to take their time to study the density issues. He stated he is very concerned.

A lady in the audience addressed the committee and stated she concurs with Gary Catlin, she is not for high density, 5 acres or more is acceptable.

Alan Hess stated it has taken 5 years and now at the 11th hour there are critical issues and this is not a time to hurry. He asked that the committee have another meeting or two as there are still too many questions.

Mr. Robson stated there are a couple of housekeeping items relative to the protocol for voting. He stated we are operating under the Common Law of California procedures as opposed to a particular statute which directs a particular body to act as a majority of the full body much as Planning Commission and Board of supervisors are restricted to act only as a majority of the full body. He explained the Committee can convene and conduct business with a quorum. A quorum of this committee is 11 persons as there are 20 members in this committee. If there is a quorum present, which is 11 members then they can conduct business with a majority vote of those present. He stated tonight there are 16 members present, 4 absent, therefore a quorum has been established, a majority

would be 9 members. He explained the action items on tonight's agenda are the minutes, the issues with the North I-5 Planning area, per Mr. Roth's motion that was passed at the last meeting with the potential for changes and the items placed by a member of the committee to be discussed and possibly action or sending this plan to the Commission and adjourn the Committee. Those items require a majority vote of the Committee members present or 9 members. The other item, discussion action majority/minority opinions regarding the rest of the county, which was decided by the committee last meeting to exclude the rest of the county and deal with it on a comment basis only with no changes.

He explained there were a couple of handouts. One is "Growth Projections/Population" statistical analysis of timing, this is not a discussion item, just for information only.

Anne Read asked who prepared the document.

Mr. Robson stated PMC prepared the document, which is all from government sources.

Mr. Bundy passed out a handout "North I-5 Corridor Area Recommendations".

Mr. Bundy asked to expand on the voting procedure. He stated at the last meeting there was a vote taken, deemed as a failed vote 8:8 with 1 abstention. Under Common Law abstention votes in favor automatically to that motion.

Mr. Robson stated that not if the abstention was for cause.

Mr. Bundy said there was no cause stated.

Mr. Robson stated he was told by County Counsel that it was for cause and did not go to the majority.

Arthur Wylene, Deputy County Counsel was present and stated he has done a considerable amount of research on this subject and the Common Law of California back to the English cases in the 18th Century dealing with Parliamentary Procedure. Generally speaking an abstention counts with a majority of those voting, there are some cases that an abstention indicates a tie vote automatically votes in favor of the motion on the floor, he stated some cases in history have actually gone the other way. He stated the committee member in question had requested to know if it would be in any fashion improper or could be perceived to be improper to express an opinion on a subject that would come before them in the future as a Planning Commissioner. He stated that he explained if the person perceived that to be something that might interfere with their ability to perform their future duties then that would be cause.

Mr. Bundy asked under the rules of tonight's meeting if that abstention would count or not.

Mr. Robson stated that there are three people on this committee that could declare cause, two Board Members and a Planning Commissioner. If they believe it would be a conflict of future decision making issues coming before them, then they can determine they have cause to abstain, it is their choice.

Mr. Robson stated the other handout, which was one item the Committee requested be brought back to the Committee, entitled "Chapter 17.53 Hillside and Ridgeline Development". This is for information only. Two other items are the Flournoy/Ag Upland/Valley Ag Upland line and that will be addressed through the deliberations tonight when we get to the meeting discussion topic having to do with the decision on various maps around the county; the last item is referencing Mr. Bundy's comments and current Administrative Draft, has everything we suggested or discussed been included in the County's Draft General Plan at this time.

Linda Hayes asked Mr. Robson to clarify a General Plan description.

Mr. Robson stated that the General Plan does not grant you any permission immediately on the property, it is not an entitlement, it is a beginning of plan the county sees for future development growth, preservation, and conservation. It is not a license to subdivide, or develop properties in any fashion, it is a plan that would conceive that might happen in the future, based upon a number of other steps.

Mr. Bundy stated there was a lot of confusion regarding the agenda revisions sent out. He stated he wanted to go with the original agenda for tonight's meeting. He stated he requested to have the North I-5 corridor agenda item listed first. He stated they are prepared to speak to that tonight.

A motion was made by Burt Bundy, seconded by Linda Walker to move the North I-5 Corridor – SP Areas action item to the first item on the agenda.

Discussion:

Bill Goodwin stated there are a couple of things the Committee should consider before making that change. He stated there are some really good ideas in what has been presented, however it is hard to digest these items on the fly, there is a lot we could be thinking about. The other item is the idea of a "clustering policy". He proposes that the Committee work with PMC for a draft clustering policy. One other item is that the Committee really needs to show some progress. He stated the Committee could go through all the other maps and make a great deal of progress. He stated if the Committee goes straight to the North County and it isn't as quick, then at the end of the night there is no resolution on anything, that is going to cause a problem.

Burt Bundy explained the reason they wish to go directly to North County is it would take time to change the maps. The other maps may not require any changes, the North County may require changes and if they can get them done PMC can start the changes to the maps and get them out sooner to the public.

Pat Johnston stated the Committee has been asking to look and change the maps for the last five months.

Linda Walker stated if they got moving on the maps, they may be able to get through all the maps and eliminate the meeting scheduled for May 24th.

Mr. Robson asked for any more discussion on the motion.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #1 – MOVE AGENDA ITEM #4 TO BEGINNING OF AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE		COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	Y		John Roth	Y
Anne Read	Y		Ken Robison	Y
Arlo Stroing	Y		Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	Y		Linda Hayes	Y
Burt Bundy	Y		Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	Y		Linda Walker	Y (*)
Charles Willard	Y		Norm Gruver	Y
Dexter Wright	ABSENT		Pat Johnston	Y
Gregg Werner	Y		Ron Warner	Y
John Crosby	ABSENT		Wally Roney	Y

Motion Passed: 16 Yes – 0 No – 4 Absent

NORTH I-5 CORRIDOR –SPECIAL PLANNING AREAS

Mr. Robson stated it will take 9 votes to have majority vote. He explained on the map the locations that are to be discussed. He asked for someone to open up the discussion.

Burt Bundy stated he would like to ask Gregg Werner to make a presentation.

Ken Robison stated he feels its appropriate to discuss the outrageous underlying figures that have been thrown out there. He stated the City of Red Bluff recently discussed outrageous population growth which recommended 7 new fire stations in the City of Red Bluff based on the growth predictions coming from the Planning Dept. He stated in the handout that PMC put together part of the projections have come from the fastest growing county in the State of California, which comes no where near the numbers that have been discussed by the Committee. He recommended that Scott from PMC walk the group through the handout to get a reality check.

Mr. Robson stated that if anyone has questions, it can be discussed by all.

Gregg Werner suggested starting with Sun City Tehama Project. Since the project has already had an approved Specific Plan and Development Agreement, it makes no sense to suggest any changes.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #2 – SUN CITY TEHAMA DIAGRAM MAP

A motion was made by Burt Bundy, seconded by Ken Robison and carried by a vote of 16:0:4 of the General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee to not make any changes to the diagram for Sun City as designated on the map.

MORGAN RANCH PROPERTY

Gregg Werner started the discussion on Morgan Ranch Property, north of Sun City Tehama almost to Cottonwood Creek on the West side of the freeway. The project for the concept plan would be approximately 4,000 units, it is his understanding there is not an approval for the project, however an application may be in process. The major access would be from I-5, traffic is a concern.

Mr. Robson stated there is no project currently. He explained the rules of the general plan concept. All comments need to be kept at that level. This is review of the General Plan Diagram.

Discussion followed regarding the concept plan of the development.

Alan Hess asked if this is not a project, why are we talking about it.

Mr. Robson stated there is a Conceptual Plan. All the Special Planning areas at the request of the committee and staff, submitted conceptual development plan to get an idea of what might be considered potential development projects in the future.

Ken Robison stated that for five years he has heard how we want to accommodate growth along I-5 and it seems to fit our definition to accommodate growth. The developer would have an opportunity to have solutions at the time it comes to the table.

Mr. Werner stated the concept plan gives you an idea of what may happen under that General Plan Designation. He suggested that density in combination with everything else causes a wide range of problems, suggestion is something be added to allow 2 units per acre, it would be a limitation on the number of units.

Mr. Robson stated they are not requesting a change to the map, a policy change attributable to a specific geographic area.

Arthur Wylene stated he agrees with Mr. Werner, this is within what is on the agenda.

Burt Bundy stated his motion would be to change the density for that particular concept plan to 2 units per acre. He stated that they don't feel the density for that particular area is appropriate, quite a bit of it is in Class I ag land. They recognize that there is an off-ramp and it is going to grow in that particular area and with a Special Plan that specific property could develop into very valuable land, however the density is not appropriate.

A motion was made by Burt Bundy, seconded by Alan Hess to change the General Plan Land Use Designation for a maximum of 2 units per acre on this piece of property.

Mr. Robson asked the consultants how that would be accomplished.

Mark Teague, PMC stated one way would be to interject a map and number them and have policies that pertain specifically to that site. In the interest of being clear when you establish a density, one thing that makes them happy is the cluster word. It is possible and can work.

Mr. Robson clarified that should the motion prevail, then the proponent would request an amendment to the General Plan.

Discussion:

Ken Robison stated he doesn't want to see the rural preservation and character goal disappear. He stated this is how you do it – when you give it up you give it up with density and accommodate growth to preserve the balance. That was agreed to early on and he thought there was a high level of consensus on that concept.

Wally Roney stated the best location for the density along the I-5 corridor. This area of the I-5 corridor is not going to have the rural atmosphere, it's gone already.

Linda Hayes read from the 1984 General Plan “the North I-5 area will capture 70% population growth to occur in Tehama County during the Planning period of 1980-2000”, they projected “in the year 2000 county population of 75,000 people.” These are projections.

Burt Bundy stated that if we don’t think the projections are accurate, why are we putting them on the map? What is the benefit of the people of Tehama County by putting them on the map. There is a benefit to the developer so he can make money.

Linda Hayes asked if the committee had voted to put the Special Plan area on the map just so we could outline the areas of interest and did we vote on them.

Mr. Robson stated yes they did put them on the map for that reason and yes they did vote on them.

Charlie Willard asked Gregg Werner the number of development units if they went through.

Gregg Werner stated on the last page of the handout, if we make assumptions that tie in with the concept plans they came up with approximately 100,000 persons in these concept plan areas. The possibility that exists within the land use designation subject to project approval is certainly over 100,000.

Burt Bundy stated their recommendations when we get through this would reduce the 100,000 population to approximately 25,000.

Ron Warner asked what the rate of growth would be over 20 years, 11 or 12 percent? He feels that would be an unrealistic number.

Gregg Werner explained that no one is suggesting that would happen, but projects could be locked into development agreements to where it would happen over a longer period of time.

Anne Read called for question.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #3 – MORGAN RANCH – 2 Units/Acre

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE		COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	Y		John Roth	Y
Anne Read	Y		Ken Robison	N
Arlo Stroing	N		Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	Y		Linda Hayes	N
Burt Bundy	Y		Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	Y		Linda Walker	Y (*)
Charles Willard	Y		Norm Gruver	Y
Dexter Wright	ABSENT		Pat Johnston	Y
Gregg Werner	Y		Ron Warner	N
John Crosby	ABSENT		Wally Roney	N

Motion Passed: 11 Yes – 5 No – 4 Absent

(*)Linda Walker stated she will be reviewing this at the Planning Commission level and this will not be her final vote.

Mr. Goodwin asked if this would go to the Planning Commission showing 11 yes votes, 5 no votes.

Mr. Robson stated yes it would.

Mr. Goodwin stated the map would be changed, but the Commissioners would know what the Committee votes were.

Mark Teague, PMC, stated he wanted to clarify that the vote just capped the total number of units to 2,500 for this planning area and we are not changing anything else, is that correct?

Mr. Robson answered yes that was correct.

Mark Teague indicated there would be a policy statement in the document, the map would remain the same, but the policy document would indicate this area will have a maximum number of units of 2,500. He wanted to make sure the group knows the difference between maximum units and density. You can still have 4 units to the acre.

MOORE RANCH AREA

Gregg Werner explained the location is above and to the West of Jelly's Ferry Road. He explained the area that is Suburban Special Plan, approximately 1,770 acres owned by Moore and 2,055 acres south and west that is also Special Plan, part of Sunset Hills Property. The portion not in the Sunset Hills Concept Plan it was generally the area Residential Small Lot and the concept plan did not include the area that is in yellow and is Suburban.

Mr. Robson stated the Concept plan was cut off, Concept plan is to show Suburban Residential through the rest of the Sunset Hills Properties, that is why there is yellow on the map. The concept plan does address the Suburban Residential of all the Sunset Hills Properties below the Rural Small Lot. Page A-3.

Gregg Werner stated there are 1,770 acres of elevation change, steep slopes, concept plan shows what you need to achieve that type of density on that site. There is concern about the traffic on I-5 overall, the recommendation is that rather than Suburban that it be Rural Small Lot. That would reduce the potential number of units from 5,000 to 870.

A motion was made by Burt Bundy, seconded by Anne Read to change the Moore Ranch Suburban designation to Rural Small Lot limiting it to one unit to two acres.

Discussion:

Ken Robison asked if this is specifically following the lines of this ranch.

Mr. Robson stated yes that is the clarification, the misconception was that there was no plan on the rest of the properties to the west and it is part of the Sunset Hills Conceptual Plan, it just doesn't show on the page.

Ken Robison asked, by singling this out, how does this affect the Circulation Element.

Mr. Robson stated that within the Circulation Element there is the concept of a new road coming through and picking up Lake Calif. Drive as well as a new road from Jelly's Ferry over to Snively Road/Hooker Creek Road areas. It does affect the possibility/feasibility of particularly the proposal

based upon the densities of 4 units to the acre. The necessity of that density is driven by the feasibility of ever seeing the secondary access from Jelly's Ferry to Lake Calif. Drive. Therefore it has an affect on the circulation.

Ken Robison stated that Norm Gruver at Lake California has a problem now, getting in and out of Lake Calif. and if you can't make it feasible for someone to build that road, you are not going to get it.

Gregg Werner stated you still have the potential of getting the dedication, grading and substantial part of the right of way built depending on the amount of development in Lake California. They may need to assist with the actual paving. There is no reason almost a 1,000 units can't provide most of the road because most of the road goes through the project.

Bill Goodwin stated the issues from a circulation element is there is a major ridge going through there and the smaller density, Moore Ranch would probably just go to the south and not be conditioned to go over to the north. At the higher density they would go to the north and be part of the zone of benefit for the Bowman Interchange. So it has an effect on the widening of Lake California and the Bowman Interchange and getting over the ridge.

Gregg Werner stated there is a tradeoff with the amount of improvements you get from projects and the amount of traffic improvements it would require on I-5.

Norm Gruver asked if Sunset Hills would be involved in that project.

Mr. Robson stated that circulation does not touch Sunset Hills Estates.

Arlo Stroing asked if the road were built who would maintain it?

Ken Robison stated the cost is really beyond belief.

Mr. Robson stated it would cost approximately \$1 million per mile.

Burt Bundy stated that is one of the concerns about development in those areas, the area is steep and having ¼ acre density for every housing unit out there is ridiculous. Due to these costs he feels the development is appropriate for that type of density.

Pat Johnston stated the committee has to consider safety, fire, and schools.

Mr. Robson stated those are issues that would be addressed at the point of development application. The potential is still there for that to happen, with the appropriate safety, fire, schools – it cannot happen without that.

Pat Johnston stated there are a lot of fires in that area due to lightning strikes so the more density you have the more chances of loosing homes.

Ken Robison stated there should be some number between 5,000 and 870 – what science brought that number to the table?

Mr. Robson stated that he doesn't know you really have any because you don't have a conceptual plan for 870, you would just reduce the density by a factor of 8.

Mr. Robson explained a motion has been made to change the Moore Ranch from the portions that are Suburban designated under the Special Planning Area, staying under the Special Planning Area which allows flexibility and mixed use, but no more than Rural Small Lot densities which is 1 Unit to 2 Acres.

Anne Read asked if this was Moore Ranch only.

Mr. Robson stated yes it was Moore Ranch only.

Ken Robison stated Del Webb was approved at approximately 1 acre per unit.

Burt Bundy stated that this is not entirely arbitrary because the committee talked about development in the I-5 corridor, the Moore Ranch is not in the I-5 corridor, it sits off Jellys Ferry Road, there is some rough country over to I-5. He stated he feels that 2 acre density is still too dense for that area. Those hills are pretty steep.

Arlo Stroing stated someone is going to have to maintain the road being discussed, when you start cutting the lots down where is the money going to come from and who is going to maintain all this.

Burt Bundy stated the County is going to have to maintain it.

Mr. Robson stated we need to stay with the protocol of the rules of order – if the Committee wishes to discuss this matter then the maker of the motion needs to rescind the motion so discussion can continue, otherwise we don't have any order here.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #4 – MOORE RANCH – Rural Small Lot 1 Unit/2 Acres

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE	COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	Y	John Roth	Y
Anne Read	Y	Ken Robison	N
Arlo Stroing	N	Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	Y	Linda Hayes	N
Burt Bundy	Y	Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	Y	Linda Walker	Y (*)
Charles Willard	Y	Norm Gruver	Y
Dexter Wright	ABSENT	Pat Johnston	Y
Gregg Werner	Y	Ron Warner	N
John Crosby	ABSENT	Wally Roney	N

Motion Passed: 11 Yes – 5 No – 4 Absent

(*) Linda Walker stated “this may not be my final vote, I will be reviewing this project again at the Planning Commission level”.

SUNSET HILLS ESTATES

Gregg Werner stated that since we discussed the Moore Ranch, the southern portion of the Sunset Hills Estates which is designated as Suburban Special Planning this is very similar physically to the Morgan Ranch area, with valleys and hills above Jellys Ferry Road, most of the same things apply. The suggestion is that it be Rural Small Lot.

Mr. Robson asked if we are looking at the whole thing? If not, we need to.

Gregg Werner stated the remainder of Sunset Hills Estates which includes the area that is Rural Small Lot (purple section) includes the area that is currently subdivided into 88 lots and it also includes the area north of the 88 lots which runs down to Cottonwood Creek. It is the area shown on the concept plan. The Suburban area is generally the area to the south and east of the concept plan and then the areas to the north, recommendation on all that is Rural Small Lot.

Mr. Robson explained the map and the color coding of the proposed General Plan designations.

A motion was made by Burt Bundy, seconded by Anne Read to change the area shown as Suburban, recommendation is Rural Small Lot for the area which is currently shown as Rural Small Lot; recommendation is to keep that for the area along Bowman Road, designated as Commercial and Valley Floor Ag, recommendation is to keep the Valley Floor Agriculture and Commercial.

Mr. Robson stated they have done that with the classification.

Mr. Werner stated as long as it is clear Rural Small Lot up to Bowman Road and changing the Valley Floor Ag and Commercial north of Bowman Road and this concept plan be eliminated.

Discussion:

Mr. Robison asked Mr. Robson to clarify the motion.

Mr. Robson explained the area on the map that would go to Rural Small Lot would be, the rest of the area would stay the Rural Small Lot, which would be 1 unit/2 acres, the area north of Lake Calif. would retain the Valley Agricultural Designation and Commercial along I-5. He stated that opposed to Urban Residential on both sides of Lake Calif. Drive with Commercial being suggested, then Suburban Residential below that, Rural Small Lot for the already approved and tentatively approved subdivision maps and then reducing the Suburban Residential to the south and east of the property to a Rural Small Lot designation 1 unit to 2 acres.

Linda Walker stated she is not real sure how valuable it is to retain that piece in Valley Ag would be when you have those densities around there, not sure how you would farm it. For Open Space purposes it would be beautiful.

Ken Robison stated he feels it's a loosing battle, however this is where we wanted our densities to be and he will keep saying it.

Wally Roney stated on the southeast end where we have Rural, is that going to be land-locked, is there a road going in there?

Mr. Robson stated all the access is out through Snively Road.

Mr. Roney asked if it was all in the southeast?

Mr. Robson stated there may be an easement out to Jellys Ferry, he's not sure, its too specific at this point.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #5 – SUNSET HILLS ESTATES – Eliminate Concept Plan-except for Commercial along Lake Calif. & Bowman

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE	COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	Y	John Roth	Y
Anne Read	Y	Ken Robison	N
Arlo Stroing	N	Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	Y	Linda Hayes	Y
Burt Bundy	Y	Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	N	Linda Walker	Y (*)
Charles Willard	Y	Norm Gruver	Y
Dexter Wright	ABSENT	Pat Johnston	Y
Gregg Werner	Y	Ron Warner	N
John Crosby	ABSENT	Wally Roney	N

Motion Passed: 11 Yes – 5 No – 4 Absent

(*)Linda Walker stated she will be reviewing this at the Planning Commission level and this will not be her final vote.

**Meeting Recessed at 7:45 p.m.
Meeting Reconvened at 7:57 p.m.**

LAKE CALIFORNIA

Gregg Werner stated we will be discussing the area that is not part of the Lake Calif. Property Owners Association.

Mr. Robson explained the location on the map. He stated it's the areas to the north and west and southwest.

Gregg Werner stated he is discussing the two large parcels and the area to the west.

Mr. Robson asked if he is addresses everything that Leviathan owns, except for the interior lots they may own.

Gregg Werner confirmed. He stated it is difficult to sort out all the acreages and things on the existing plan, a lot of it is resources and open space in this area, there is not a precise acreage for what is green and yellow on the map. To simplify is twofold: (1) to have a maximum of 1,000 additional units in the Leviathan area (2) is to delete this plan from the General Plan.

Mr. Robson asked what they would make it, you cannot just delete it. The current designation is Urban and Suburban.

Gregg Werner explained they are suggesting having the cap of 1,000 units. If you calculate out this plan it is probably several thousand units in very rough ground. So the suggestion is to keep the designations and have the cap of 1,000 units and delete the plan that provides for clearly much more than that.

Mr. Robson asked what would it be classified to, the current classification deleting this plan, which is a compromise reached by the committee to a Suburban density for this area on the map. Going from Urban and Suburban to all Suburban densities in this area was voted on twice by the committee. If you

ask to take it out of the Admin. Draft Plan what you have left is Urban and Suburban Land Use densities.

Gregg Werner stated they feel the Suburban is appropriate, but with the cap of 1,000 units. He stated there will probably be a need to cluster and determine what fits the land.

Mr. Robson explained that if you say 1,000 units in the Leviathan properties, the proposal to locate 1,000 units here would be consistent with what they are suggesting.

Gregg Werner stated there is approximately 500 acres there.

Discussion followed the different areas involved and what they should or should not be classified.

Burt Bundy made a motion, seconded by Charlie Willard to change Rural Small Lot on 4,000 acres and leave 776 acres Suburban around the Lake with a cap of 1,000 units.

Discussion:

Bill Goodwin stated he is confused how we are going to split the 1,000, he really wishes the proposal would be what you want to do within the current gated boundaries of Lake Calif. and what do you want to do outside separately because it is really confusing.

Gregg Werner explained the couple of parcels that are north and south of the equestrian area are currently shown partially as suburban and partially as resource plan. They would be maintaining that land use designation but having the 1,000 unit cap. In the Westerly area maintaining the streaks of resource land which are generally steep slopes or creek bottoms and changing the yellow suburban to Rural Small Lot, with no cap and to eliminate the previous master plan.

Burt Bundy asked Norm Gruver if that would be acceptable?

Norm stated yes.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #6 – LAKE CALIFORNIA – 4,000 Ac. Rural Small Lot; 776 Ac. Suburban around the Lake with cap of 1,000 units

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE	COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	Y	John Roth	Y
Anne Read	Y	Ken Robison	N
Arlo Stroing	Y	Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	Y	Linda Hayes	Y
Burt Bundy	Y	Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	Y	Linda Walker	Y (*)
Charles Willard	Y	Norm Gruver	Y
Dexter Wright	ABSENT	Pat Johnston	Y
Gregg Werner	Y	Ron Warner	Y
John Crosby	ABSENT	Wally Roney	Y

Motion Passed: 15 Yes – 1 No – 4 Absent

(*)Linda Walker stated she will be reviewing this at the Planning Commission level and this will not be her final vote.

JELLYS FERRY SOUTH

Gregg Werner explained the area is bordered by I-5 on the West, Sacramento River on the north and east, Jellys Ferry Road on northwest. There are three alternatives in the plan that were products of the county study a few years ago. Development potential in those range from 417 units to 3,897 units. The proposal of 417 is very close to the existing General Plan and is providing for less development overall to recommend the lower density development alternative be incorporated into Land Use Element.

A motion was made by Gregg Werner, seconded by Pat Johnston to recommend Conceptual Plan #1 Low Density.

Discussion:

Ken Robison stated the higher density had been discussed at length along the General Commercial areas along Jellys Ferry Road. He stated he will be voting no on this for the record.

Pat Johnston asked if that would keep the density up close to I-5?

Mr. Robson stated all three options show Rural Large Lots surrounding commercial and below that Rural Small Lot, some Suburban. The only thing this does is remove a bit of Suburban upward.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #7 – JELLYS FERRY SOUTH – Rural Large Lot/Rural Small Lot

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE		COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	Y		John Roth	Y
Anne Read	Y		Ken Robison	N
Arlo Stroing	Y		Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	Y		Linda Hayes	Y
Burt Bundy	Y		Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	Y		Linda Walker	Y (*)
Charles Willard	Y		Norm Gruver	Y
Dexter Wright	ABSENT		Pat Johnston	Y
Gregg Werner	Y		Ron Warner	Y
John Crosby	ABSENT		Wally Roney	Y

Motion Passed: 15 Yes – 1 No – 4 Absent

(*)Linda Walker stated she will be reviewing this at the Planning Commission level and this will not be her final vote.

BATTLE CREEK RANCH

Gregg Werner explained the location as on east side of River, above Jellys Ferry Road and runs from valley land up into the steeper hillside. It is a very isolated site away from services, and not an appropriate place for urban development. The recommendation is to change the designation to Upland Agricultural and remove the Special Planning Overlay and concept plan.

Mr. Robson stated you would be running into the same issue Valley Ag/Upland Ag. He noted this is not within the action item to change the Valley Ag/Upland Ag area. That is not in the purview of the action item to change the Valley Agricultural/Upland Agricultural boundary at all. You took a vote the last time on this action item and you are deviating from the action item if you start working at all on the Valley Ag/Upland Ag line. The motion is inappropriate. The action item is limited to changing the land use

designation within the Special Planning areas, but to change the land use designation that affects the Valley Ag/Upland Ag line is not part of the action item. He explained if you change it there then you have basically violated the contention of the committee last time that you would not do that. You can make suggestions minority/majority opinion about that, but you would not change it on the maps. The only map changes were meant on the Special Planning areas and the Valley/Upland Ag issue was set aside for majority/minority discussion only and not change.

Bill Goodwin explained it could be changed to Valley Ag and make the suggestion that the Valley Ag/Upland Ag line be reconsidered.

A motion was made by Burt Bundy, seconded by Alan Hess to remove Special Planning designation to all Valley Ag.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #8 – BATTLE CREEK RANCH – Remove SP and make Valley Ag

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE		COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	Y		John Roth	Y
Anne Read	Y		Ken Robison	N
Arlo Stroing	N		Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	Y		Linda Hayes	Y
Burt Bundy	Y		Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	Y		Linda Walker	Y (*)
Charles Willard	Y		Norm Gruver	Y
Dexter Wright	ABSENT		Pat Johnston	Y
Gregg Werner	Y		Ron Warner	Y
John Crosby	ABSENT		Wally Roney	N

Motion Passed: 13 Yes – 3 No – 4 Absent

(*)Linda Walker stated she will be reviewing this at the Planning Commission level and this will not be her final vote.

A motion was made by Ron Warner, seconded by Wally Roney to accept the maps prior to the changes that occurred tonight be submitted as a minority opinion to the Planning Commission along with the changed maps.

Discussion:

None

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #9 – Accept existing maps w/minority opinion positions

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE	COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	Y	John Roth	Y
Anne Read	N	Ken Robison	Y
Arlo Stroing	Y	Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	N	Linda Hayes	N
Burt Bundy	Y	Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	Y	Linda Walker	Y (*)
Charles Willard	Y	Norm Gruver	Y
Dexter Wright	ABSENT	Pat Johnston	Y
Gregg Werner	Y	Ron Warner	Y
John Crosby	ABSENT	Wally Roney	Y

Motion Passed: 13 Yes – 3 No – 4 Absent

(*)Linda Walker stated she will be reviewing this at the Planning Commission level and this will not be her final vote.

Mr. Robson explained that both maps will be submitted during the public hearing process which will be allowed and observed by the public.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF:
April 12, 2007

Charlie Willard had one correction to Page 11 of 11 add “will” to first sentence.

Anne Read stated she saw four typos. She will forward the corrections to the Recording Clerk for corrections.

Pat Johnston had a correction to Page 5 of 11 – she stated her comment was “it was generated by the Planning Department.”

A motion was made by Linda Walker, seconded by Charlie Willard with a unanimous vote to accept the Minutes of April 12, 2007 as mailed with the corrections noted above.

Mr. Robson stated the next agenda item would be committee action on the maps except the I-5 Special Planning Areas, action on policy documents limited to consensus majority/minority opinions, no changes to maps or documents.

Mr. Robson stated the maps would be reviewed in map number order.

Bill Goodwin pointed out there was one other thing on the agenda to discuss and possible action to send the draft general plan as it is now to the Planning Commission to begin the public hearing process and adjourn.

A motion was made by Ron Warner, seconded by Wally Roney to accept the rest of the maps without moving through them with the Special Planning areas and policy documents to Planning Commission and adjourn the Committee.

Linda Walker stated she would like to committee to go through the maps together.

Burt Bundy stated he is in opposition to motion, he has expressed many times he has problems with the division between the Valley Ag and Upland Ag lines and a minority opinion needs to be stated to this committee. He has similar problems with the Circulation Element and he feels a minority voice from the committee should be stated.

Anne Read stated she is also opposed to the motion, she is concerned about the Johnson Road area, Reeds Creek and Hwy 36.

Pat Johnston stated that committee action on the maps was on the agenda before it was decided to send it on.

Mr. Stoufer read the roll.

VOTE #10 – ACCEPT MAPS AS POLICY DOCUMENT-ADJOURN COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE		COMMITTEE MEMBER	VOTE
Alan Hess	N		John Roth	N
Anne Read	N		Ken Robison	Y
Arlo Stroing	Y		Leroy Meyers	ABSENT
Bill Burrows	N		Linda Hayes	N
Burt Bundy	N		Linda Jenkins	ABSENT
Calvin Rasmussen	N		Linda Walker	N (*)
Charles Willard	N		Norm Gruver	N
Dexter Wright	ABSENT		Pat Johnston	N
Gregg Werner	N		Ron Warner	Y
John Crosby	ABSENT		Wally Roney	Y

Motion Failed: 4 Yes – 12 No – 4 Absent

(*)Linda Walker stated she will be reviewing this at the Planning Commission level and this will not be her final vote.

A motion was made by Charlie Willard, seconded by Ken Robison to continue the meeting to May 24, 2007. Motion was unanimous with no opposition.

Meeting Adjourned 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted, Recording Secretary
Kellee A. Taresh