



## TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

444 Oak Street, Room "I"

Red Bluff, California 96080

Phone (530) 527-2200 Fax (530) 527-2655

Commissioner Don Jones	District 1
Commissioner Linda Walker – Chairperson	District 2
Commissioner Kim Tipton	District 3
Commissioner William Turri	District 4
Commissioner Delbert David – Vice Chair	District 5

### TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

---

<b>MINUTES FOR THE MEETING HELD ON:</b>	<b>February 5, 2009</b>
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Administration Building Board of Supervisors Chambers 727 Oak Street Red Bluff, CA 96080
<b>COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:</b>	Commissioners Walker, Tipton, Jones, David
<b>COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:</b>	Commissioner Turri
<b>PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:</b>	George W. Robson, Director of Planning Kellee A. Taresh, Recording Clerk
<b>OTHER COUNTY DEPARTMENTS PRESENT:</b>	Arthur Wylene, Assistant County Counsel

---

Chairperson Walker called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

#### **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairperson Walker.

#### **CITIZEN'S CONCERNS:**

Charles Willard addressed the Commissioners and thanked them for all their hard work on the General Plan.

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

Bill Burrows addressed the Commissioners and expressed his concerns with the Revised General Plan and also appreciates the time and effort the Commissioners have spent on the General Plan.

**MINUTES OF MEETING – January 15, 2009:**

**A motion was made by Commissioner David, seconded by Commissioner Tipton and carried by a vote of 4:0:1 of the Tehama County Planning Commission to approve the minutes of the January 15, 2009 meeting as mailed.**

Mr. Robson explained the consultant will be presenting a PowerPoint presentation and then the Commissioners will see some cleanup issues on five properties as well as some minor wording changes. He explained the Commissioners will be making recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for final approval of the Revised General Plan and FEIR. There will be a public comment period for addressing the Commissioners regarding the General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report with response to comments after the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Robson explained in detail the process over the last seven years involving the Revised General Plan and other documents.

Scott Friend, PMC Consultant presented a PowerPoint Presentation outlining the process involved in the Revised General Plan:

- Public Hearings held throughout the County, Property Owner Requests,
- Creation of the Planning GIS System,
- Housing Element,
- Background Report,
- Environmental Impact Report,
- Historic and Projected Population Growth,
- Significant and Unavoidable Impacts,
- Policy Additions Resulting from Pubic Comments

**CLEANUP:**

Mr. Robson provided a handout and explained there are five requests for zoning changes from property owners to be reviewed at today's meeting.

1. Virginia Marshall – Trustee, Galliano Living Trust

Mr. Robson explained the property owners request is for Rural Small Lot and this is the property owner's second request for a change. Proposed General Plan is Rural Large Lot. Staff Recommendation is to stay with the proposed General Plan of Rural Large Lot.

**Discussion was held, consensus from the Commissioners present was to not take action regarding the requested change to Rural Small Lot.**

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

2. Shirley M. Bowman, Richard L. Hill, C. Maday, R Maday, Steve R. & Cindy McClain, James R. Smith, W. Scott, Linda Young, – Request for Rural Small Lot

Mr. Robson explained the property owner's request is for Rural Small Lot. Staff Recommendation is to stay with the proposed General Plan of Valley Floor Agricultural.

Mr. Curt Martin and Mr. Brad Martin were present and addressed the Commissioners. Both property owners stated it would be detrimental to see higher density in this area and are requesting 20 acre minimum parcel size.

Mr. William Scott also addressed the Commissioners. Mr. Scott owns an olive orchard on Massachusetts and would like to see smaller minimum parcel size in the area.

Discussion was held regarding the request for Rural Small Lot and possible change in zoning to Valley Floor Agricultural for the area East of Illinois, between Connecticut Avenue and New York Avenue, East to the Sacramento River.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Walker, seconded by Commissioner Tipton and carried by a vote of 4:0:1 of the Tehama County Planning Commission to deny the request for Rural Small Lot as designated on the map; change the designation from Rural Small Lot to Valley Floor Agricultural in the area Eastside of Illinois, between Connecticut Avenue and New York Avenue, East to the vicinity of the Sacramento River to Valley Floor Agricultural.**

3. Dan Hollis – Request for Rural Small Lot

Mr. Robson explained the property owner is requesting Rural Small Lot, Proposed General Plan is Valley Floor Agricultural. Staff Recommendation is to deny the request for Rural Small Lot.

Mr. Hollis addressed the Commissioners and stated the soil type is poor and cannot support grazing of animals. Mr. Hollis explained there will be a new bridge constructed on Jelly's Ferry and this is a good location for the growth of a small community.

**Discussion was held by the Commissioners regarding the request for change to Rural Small Lot. Consensus was not reached.**

**A motion was made by Commissioner Tipton, seconded by Commissioner Jones to accept the applicant's request for Rural Small Lot as designated on the map. Motion did not pass with a tie vote of 2:2:1 with Commissioners Walker and David voting no, Commissioner Turri was absent.**

4. Bob Lee – Request for Rural Large Lot/Upland Agricultural

Mr. Robson explained the property owner is requesting Rural Large Lot/Upland Agricultural. The Proposed General Plan is also Rural Large Lot/Upland Agricultural, however the property owner is requesting to swap a portion of the Rural Large Lot to Upland Agricultural and into the Williamson Act Contract. This would be an equal swap of land. Staff Recommendation is to

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

approve Mr. Lee's request.

Mr. Lee addressed the Commissioners and explained his proposal to swap the land and do a Lot Line Adjustment. Mr. Lee also proposed the Rural Small Lot designation be moved to the East along the Section line, which would also border the West side of the property in question. This would result in adding approximately 20 acres to an existing Williamson Act Contract.

Mr. Robson stated he has no objection to moving the Rural Small Lot line to the section line to the east.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Tipton, seconded by Commissioner David and carried by a vote of 4:0:1 of the Tehama County Planning Commission to approve the request to change 23 acres to Upland Agricultural and add to the Williamson Act Contract and change 23 acres as depicted on the map to Rural Large Lot and to move the Rural Small Lot boundary easterly to the western line of APN#s: 011-050-08 and 011-050-24, then southerly along the ¼ section line to Hazen Road.**

Deleted: \_\_\_\_\_.

5. Quint & Karen Willingham – Requesting Rural Small Lot

Mr. Robson explained the request for Rural Small Lot, Proposed General Plan is Valley Floor Agricultural. Staff recommendation is to deny the request for Rural Small Lot.

Mr. Willingham addressed the Commissioners and explained he cannot farm the land and would like to split the property in the future. Mr. Willingham stated there are 4 properties in the area 15-20 acres; 4 properties 10 acres; 17 properties 5-9 acres; 29 properties 1-4 acres in the surround area. He would like to split his parcel into two 5 acre parcels.

Commissioner David clarified the 10 acre parcel in question would qualify for a caretaker residence and encouraged the applicant to pursue that option.

**Discussion was held by the Commissioners and Consensus was reached to not take action on the request for change to Rural Small Lot.**

Deleted: ¶

**Letter submitted by Tehama County AB3030 Coordinated Groundwater Management – Ad-hoc, Technical Advisory Committee, Dated November 10, 2008**

Mr. Robson handed out a letter received from the Ad-hoc committee regarding AB3030. Mr. Robson stated that staff concurs with the recommendation of the committee to add "Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3" to the plan document.

**A motion was made by Commissioner David, seconded by Commissioner Jones and carried by a vote of 3:1:1 of the Tehama County Planning Commission, with Commissioner Tipton voting no, to accept Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, from letter dated November 10, 2008 from the Tehama County AB3030 Coordinated Groundwater Management Committee be added to the plan document.**

Mr. Robson stated for clarification that the explanation of DOD (Dept. of Defense) acreage is the Army Corps of Engineers.

Deleted: C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

Chairperson Walker recessed the meeting at 11:57 a.m.

Chairperson Walker reconvened the meeting at 1:06 p.m.

**General Plan Clarifications & Corrections from Staff and Commissioners (Handout) - Revisions to Document Language**

Mr. Robson explained the handout outlining some minor changes to the Draft General Plan.

Discussion was held regarding the final cleanup of changes to the document.

Commissioner David stated he had a couple of changes:

**Section 1.0-1.5 IMPLEMENTATION AND AMENDMENT**

Commissioner David handed out possible replacement text to the Commission he had read in another plan as an alternate text for the Board of Supervisors to consider.

Replacement Text:

*The text revision has a legal significant and practical application of the General Plan has increased and has become much more important to maintain and up to date document accurately reflecting current policies. Consequently Government Code now requires the Planning Commission to file an annual report with the Board of Supervisors and State Office of Planning Research on the status of the plan. The progress and its implementation and its compliance with General Plan guidelines. An evaluation of policies and standards in this text will continue after adoption as a natural part of the day to day interpretation and application provisions by staff and decision makers. It is likely that changing conditions and experience in policy implementation will uncover a number of adopted policies requiring modification and need for written policies on additional subjects. Because the provisions of the General Plan are designed for application for the development of entire county, text amendments require careful consideration while the Board of Supervisors and the Commission on all possible implications.*

Implementation:

*The County will consider all suggestions for needed changes in the General Plan, and shall initiate formal approval proceedings on proposals if deemed worthy of further consideration. The annual report required by Government Code Section 32217 and 65400 shall be prepared by staff and submitted to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.*

Map Revisions:

*County regulations now allow revisions in the Land Use Plan which will be initiated by the county or private parties at any time with application and fees similar to rezoning. California Planning Law somewhat restricts the revision*

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

*process by permitting the actual adoption of amendments to any mandatory element, no more than four times per calendar year. However, since the Board is free to accumulate numerous revisions on adoption, on each of them date this restriction may result in only a short delay on some amendments.*

Commissioner David stated he would like to replace the three paragraphs currently in the Draft General Plan with the paragraphs above.

Discussion followed regarding the growth rate and possibly establishing a section in the document which will state the County is going to look at the growth rate on a timely basis to see how close we are to the projected growth rate. If it looks like the county is exceeding it or not meeting it, then it would behoove the board to say we need to change something now in order to stay within the growth patterns. This will give the general public the ability to look at on a yearly basis in open forum, to review the status.

Mr. Robson stated there is work to be done regarding the growth rate and staff will work together to make sure there is a vehicle in the document to address this issue.

**Letter received from Department of Transportation – February 3, 2009**

Mr. Robson provided copies of a letter received from CalTrans on February 4, 2009. They are suggesting a change to a Land Use Implementation Measure relative to “proportional fair-share” –vs- “reasonable fair share”. Mr. Robson stated that staff stands by “reasonable fair share” concept as this allows the Commission to exercise discretion on a project by project basis as to what is real as far as a reasonable fair share for application of improvement costs to a project as opposed to just simply doing mathematics.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN REVISION – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT #2009-1A.** Pursuant to Section 15088 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the Final EIR has been prepared. The proposed project could result in significant impacts, unless suitable mitigation measures are implemented, in the areas of: Agricultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Population and Housing, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems and Aesthetic Resources.

**2. TEHAMA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN REVISION - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT #2009-1A :** The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of a comprehensive update to the Tehama County General Plan. The last comprehensive update of the Tehama County General Plan was in 1983. The General Plan update will allow the community to establish its long-term vision for the future (to the year 2030). The General Plan includes the seven elements required by State law: Land Use, Transportation and Circulation, Public

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

Services, Open Space and Conservation, Noise and Safety, Optional elements include Economic Development and Agriculture and Timber. The Housing Element has been previously prepared and adopted and is incorporated into the General Plan by reference.

Chairperson Walker opened the Public Hearing on the Revised General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report

Ross Nammar (Handout provided to Commissioners):

- Too many negative impacts that could not be mitigated without bankrupting the county
- Final EIR appears not to conform to CEQA
- Water supply shortfalls
- Impacts on State Highways and I-5
- Encourages Alternative #2 as viable alternative

Bruce Webb – California Department of Fish & Game

- Problems with the analysis of DEIR, Goals, Biological Resources
- FEIR – Response F4: Dept. disputes threshold for significant wetlands, deer range
- County needs additional policy in Land Use Element to avoid take.
- Appendix Re: Biological Resources

Discussion followed regarding buffers and limiting specific buffer zones in the documents as well as California Native Plants, Riparian Resources, procedures for project notification to DFG.

Mr. Robson stated Tehama County Planning Department is one of the few counties which send the project out to agencies for pre-conditioning prior to completing CEQA document

Louise Wilkinson – Cottonwood Creek Watershed

- Concerned with population growth in Bowman Area as this is prime land
- Area has 5 to 7 endangered species of bats
- The Revised General Plan will destroy the Bowman area
- Asked the Commissioners to take more time before approving the Revised General Plan and FEIR

Lori Pritchett

- Feels comments from public were ignored
- General Plan needs to be reviewed more often
- Concerned with the policing of “idling diesel engines”
- Farm size in 4.2-1 is inaccurate
- DEIR 4.2-7 Agricultural Lands top 10 commodities includes leased grounds
- 34% of County Growth over last 8 years has been in the Bowman area
- Need infrastructure in the county, roads are a real issue

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc



Todd Smith – Representative of St. Elizabeth Hospital

- Strongly supports the Revised General Plan
- Looks forward to managed growth

Gretchen Cook

- Concerned with projected traffic counts
- Concerned with Water wells
- Sheriffs Dept. response time to the area is already 45 minutes

Commissioner David stated there are test wells currently located through the county monitoring the water wells and drawdown's. He stated he will look at infrastructure and confirm water will be there.

John Elko (Handout provided to the Commissioners)

- Concerned with noise element, feels it needs strengthening
- Feels the letters he has submitted have been ignored
- Between Diamond Avenue and I-5 noise is terrible
- Cited Tables and Sections which have Mile Per Hour data and many are in error
- Feels Ground Vibration Noise should be included in the Plan
- Noise from Railroad crossings should be addressed

Bill Moule – Red Bluff Chamber Board of Directors - TEDC

- Thanked George Robson, Staff and Consultant for all their work on the Revised General Plan
- Recognized the Plan has been studied enough and will never be a perfect document
- Noted the General Plan is not a "site specific" plan
- Stated the Revised General Plan and FEIR is ready to send on to the Board of Supervisors

Paul Mitchell – Lake California

- Concerned with air, fire, groundwater, traffic
- Significant and Unavoidable are shown without significant mitigation
- In Favor of Alternative #2 as he feels it has the least impact
- Endorses moderate growth, however feels this is a developer's plan
- Concerned with 4.9.1 Impact as there is no statement regarding Leviathon and road conditions in the area

Alan Abbs – Air Pollution Control/Landfill

- Clarified the Diesel Rule – this is a state regulation and doesn't apply to Agriculture. Idle time of 5 minutes is enforced by law enforcement and Air Pollution Control District
- Thanked the Planning Department, Arthur Wylene, Assistant County Counsel and PMC, Consultant for all the hard work on the Revised General Plan and FEIR
- Greenhouse Gas Issue – with evolving new regulations and legislation over the next three years his department could employ 4 more people.

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc



- Overview of the current Phases of the Landfill and existing life of the landfill acreage
- Appreciates the concept of the buffer zone around the landfill

Norm Gruver

- Thanked the Commissioners and the staff
- Concerned with the growth rates in the General Plan
- Supports Alternative #2 as a population alternative

Commissioner David explained that “Alternative #2” does not consider comments received since the recommendation at General Plan Revision meetings, it also does not allow the El Camino and Capay area recommendation. Commissioner David also noted that the 17% reduction in population in Alternative #2 is not enough to reduce impacts. Commissioner David explained that if Alternative #2 was chosen, it negates everything since that point. He explained that by changing the growth rate is not an easy change as it effects many other sections of the document.

Chairperson Walker recessed the meeting at 3:13 p.m.

Chairperson Walker reconvened the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

Gary Catlin

- Stated he was disappointed it took until 1:00 to get to the public comment portion of the meeting as many in attendance had to leave.
- Concerned with Morgan Ranch Specific Plan and Suburban overlay and density.
- Feels comment letters in DEIR are deeply flawed
- Concerned with the growth rate in the north county
- Stated he doesn't need an EIR to see this disaster
- Other concerns include: Roads, Air Quality, Water wells
- Feels what is now rolling oak grasslands will become rooftop views
- Feels the voting block will eventually change
- Most of the projected population of the north county is going to shop in Shasta County
- Feels Alternative #2 should be considered as it was the vote of the majority of the GPRPAC Committee and feels its an easy substitution to make
- Does not believe 2.2% growth rate
- Feels the Commissioners have not made public comments regarding public opinion and projected population growth

Burt Bundy – Member of the General Plan Revision Project Advisory Committee

- Echoes Mr. Catlin's comments
- Issue Challenge regarding growth in Tehama County
- Noted Residential growth is not economic growth
- Infrastructure is going to Shasta County
- Supports Alternative #2 as presented by the GPRPAC Committee

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

- Would like to Change overlay to Rural Large Lot in north county

Deleted: ¶

Commissioner David asked Mr. Bundy “how do we get your problem resolved”.

Discussion followed regarding Mr. Bundy’s concerns.

Eihnard Diaz – Diaz & Associates

- Explained the Sun City Project implemented measures and policies Tehama County currently does not have, including Impact Fees.
- Noted that Shasta County has implemented Impact Fees of \$7,500/Unit to help pay for Library, Law Enforcement.
- Sun City Tehama is going to have substation for law enforcement and orderly growth; currently the General Plan does not have orderly growth
- Revised General Plan has good blueprint for growth
- Noted every General Plan he has reviewed looks at ultimate build out in 20 year time frame.

Commissioner Walker asked Mr. Diaz what the Alternative #2 bad points are.

Mr. Diaz stated that Rural Small Lot is not feasible, need density in Alternative #1 for Special Planning Areas. He explained that Small Lot density does not generate density to support facilities. With Alternative #1 the developer must prove through the Special Planning process that it can support densities.

Gary Catlin

- Alternative 2 has many Specific Plan Areas, less total acreage is not the choice.

Chairperson Walker asked for anyone wishing to comment. None were received.

Chairperson Walker closed the public hearing.

Extensive discussion followed regarding Alternative #2.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Tipton, seconded by Commissioner Jones and carried by a vote of 3:1:1 of the Tehama County Planning Commission with Commissioner Walker voting no, to adopt findings pertaining to CEQA, as set forth in this Staff Report.**

**SUBFINDINGS**

1. Notice of the Planning Commission hearings on the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update, the Draft EIR and Final EIR was given as required by law and the actions were conducted pursuant to the Planning and Zoning Law, CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the County’s Procedures for Preparation and Processing of Environmental Documents.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold, Italic

Formatted: Indent: Left: -0.38"

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Deleted: C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

2. All individuals, groups and agencies desiring to comment were given adequate opportunity to submit oral and written comments on the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update, the Draft EIR and the Final EIR. These opportunities for comment meet or exceed the requirements of the Planning and Zoning Law, CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the County's Procedures for Preparation and Processing of Environmental Documents.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

3. All comments submitted during the public review and comment period on the Draft EIR and the public hearing on the adequacy of the Draft EIR were responded to adequately in the Final EIR. The changes made in response to the comments do not require recirculation as set forth in the CEQA Guidelines.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

4. The Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the EIR (including the Draft EIR, Final EIR, and all appendices and errata), and has reached its own conclusion in the exercise of its independent judgment.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

5. The EIR has been prepared in compliance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the County's Local Procedures for Implementing CEQA, and reflects the County's independent judgment.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

6. The EIR adequately identifies and addresses all of the environmental impacts resulting from the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update, and all feasible mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update in the form of goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures to reduce the anticipated environmental impacts.

7. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15025 (c), the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the information in the EIR prior to making the recommendations contained herein.

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5", Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 7 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.25" + Tab after: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.5", Tabs: 1", List tab + Not at 0.5"

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0"

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: -0.38"

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

**FINDINGS**

1. The Planning Commission therefore recommends the Tehama County Board of Supervisors certify the Final EIR prepared for the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update as adequate, complete and in compliance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the County's Procedures for Preparation and Processing of Environmental Documents.. The Commission finds that the Final EIR is adequate and complete for consideration in making a decision on the merits of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update.

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

2. The Planning Commission therefore further recommends the Tehama County Board of Supervisors find that, where the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update will have impacts that are not fully mitigated, there are specific economic, social, or other considerations that make infeasible the alternatives or mitigation measures identified in the EIR. The Planning Commission further recommends that the Board of Supervisors find that the remaining environmental impacts are acceptable due to the overriding considerations set forth in the "Project Subfindings and Findings" herein. The Commission further recommends that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared for the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update to ensure implementation of feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR. The Planning Commission believes these mitigation measures are fully enforceable as policies, goals, action items or implementation measures of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update, and should be binding upon the County and all affected parties.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

**A motion was made by Commissioner Tipton, seconded by Commissioner Jones and carried by a vote of 3:1:1 of the Tehama County Planning Commission with Commissioner Walker voting no, to Recommend that the Board of Supervisors certify the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update.**

Deleted: ¶

**A motion was made by Commissioner Tipton, seconded by Commissioner Jones and carried by a vote of 3:1:1 of the Tehama County Planning Commission with Commissioner Walker voting no, to Adopt Project findings pertaining to adoption of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update, as set forth in this Staff Report.**

## PROJECT SUBFINDINGS AND FINDINGS

### SUBFINDINGS

1. The project is the adoption and implementation of a comprehensive update to the Tehama County General Plan. The last comprehensive update of the Tehama County General Plan was in 1983. The General Plan update will allow the community to establish its long-term vision for the future (to the year 2028). The General Plan includes the seven elements required by State law pursuant to Government Code Section 65300 *et seq.* Optional elements include Economic Development and Agriculture and Timber. The Housing Element has been previously prepared and adopted and is incorporated into the General Plan by reference, but is not part of this project.
2. The Tehama County General Plan is informational, readable and has been available to the public for their review pursuant to Government Code Section 65357.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: -0.38"

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: -0.06"

Deleted: C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

3. Pursuant to Government Code section 65300.5 the data, assumptions and projections (e.g., for population, housing, jobs) used in various parts of the plan are internally consistent with one another.
4. The Plan as presented is consistent with State legislative policies relating to: Open Space, Housing, Surface Mining, Mineral areas and deposits of regional or statewide significance, Forest and Timber Resources, Timberland Preserve Zone and Environmental Quality.
5. The Plan covers all unincorporated territory within the boundaries of the County.
6. The Plan presents a long-term perspective that reflects the current thinking of the citizens of the County.
7. The Plan contains all the statutory criteria required by State law and judicial precedent.
8. The Plan includes diagrams and maps that show proposed land uses for the entire planning area. The maps are linked directly to the text of the General Plan and these maps and text are consistent.
9. The General Plan is integrated and internally consistent, both among the elements and within each element pursuant to Government Code Section 65300.5.
10. Based upon the information contained in the Final EIR, there will be 22 significant and unavoidable environmental impacts resulting from the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update in the following areas: Agricultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Population and Housing, Transportation and Circulation, Hydrology and Water Quality, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems and Aesthetic Resources. Although mitigation measures in the form of goals, policies, objectives, and implementation measures have been included in the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update to reduce the adverse environmental impacts, some impacts will remain significant and unavoidable, or in the case of cumulative impacts, cumulatively considerable. All other impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level.
11. The benefits of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts on Agricultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Population and Housing, Transportation and Circulation, Hydrology and Water Quality, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems and Aesthetic Resources for the following reasons:
  - a. The Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update reiterates and reinforces the County's commitments to protecting the County's rural

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

character and maintaining the total amount of land designated for agriculture in the community, while accommodating a reasonable amount of growth principally within existing developed or urbanized areas and adjacent to the I-5 corridor in the northern portion of the County.

- b. By focusing growth adjacent to the I-5 corridor in the northern portion of the County, the General Plan update facilitates circulation, reduces transportation-related air quality impacts, minimizes agricultural conversion and reduces impacts to sensitive biological species along the Sacramento River corridor
- c. The General Plan Update supports the local economy by designating an appropriate amount of land for development, while balancing the protection of agricultural and environmentally sensitive resources.
- d. The General Plan Update includes policies, goals, and objectives which facilitate a rate of population growth that perpetuates County residents' quality of life.
- e. The General Plan Update identifies performance standards and desired improvements for roadways in the County, including areas that currently experience congestion;
- f. The General Plan Update increases access to public open spaces and publicly-owned recreation trails over the next 20 years.
- h. The General Plan Update provides for the use and protection for the County's natural resources
- i. The General Plan Update avoids the reduction of allowable densities within existing residential areas.
- j. The General Plan Update includes goals, objectives, and policies that provide substantial additional protection of the County's important natural resources, such as water resources, biotic resources, scenic resources, timber and agricultural resources, while recognizing the rights of private property.
- k. The General Plan Update best reflects the community's expressions of quality of life and community values and guides the County's future growth in line with those values.
- l. The Plan Update supports a balance between agriculture, housing, environmental preservation and restoration, population growth and economic development.

**Deleted:** C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc

m. The Plan Address other issues of concern to the community such as the need for moderate-priced workforce housing, the needs of an increasingly aging population, incentives for historic preservation, and the effects of global climate change.

FINDINGS

1. The Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update meets the requirements of Government Code Section 65300 et seq., and meets all of the requirements for environmental review, therefore meets the legal standards for adequacy.
2. The Planning Commission further finds that adoption of the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update is in the public interest and is necessary for the public health, safety, and welfare of Tehama County and recommends that the Tehama County Board of Supervisors adopt the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update after considering the information in the Final EIR.
3. The custodian of records, documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Commission's decision is based shall be the Tehama County Director of Planning. These documents are located at:

**A motion was made by Commissioner Tipton, seconded by Commissioner Jones and carried by a vote of 3:1:1 of the Tehama County Planning Commission with Commissioner Walker voting no, to Adopt a resolution recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Tehama County 2008-2028 General Plan Update.**

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Deleted: ¶  
¶

**The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.**

Deleted: ¶  
¶  
¶

\_\_\_\_\_  
GEORGE W. ROBSON, SECRETARY  
TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

\_\_\_\_\_  
LINDA WALKER, CHAIRPERSON  
TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Deleted: C:\Documents and Settings\ktaresh\My Documents\FILES\Planning Commission\Minutes\2009\February 5, 2009-Special GP Mntg-PC Minutes.doc