

**TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING OCTOBER 4, 2007
GENERAL PLAN STUDY SESSION**

The Tehama County Planning Commission met in a special session at 9:00 am. On Thursday, October 4, 2007 in Conference Room E, Courthouse Annex, 444 Oak Street, Red Bluff, California, with the following members present: Commissioners Tony Turri, Don Jones, Linda Walker, Kim Tipton, and Delbert David.

Chairperson Tony Turri presided. Present were Director of Planning George Robson, and Recording Secretary Kellee A. Taresh.

CITIZEN'S CONCERNS:

Chairperson Turri called for public comments. None were received.

WORK/STUDY SESSION:

Chapter 6.0 Open Space and Conservation Element (Continued)

Policy OS-8.2, Implementation Measure OS-8.2a (Page 6.0-25)

Commissioner David asked about the grading ordinance.

Discussion followed regarding the Grading Ordinance. Gary Antone stated it has not been adopted yet. Steve Sherman pointed out "Uniform Building Code" and "California Building Codes" are not necessarily the same and there are sections in the Calif. Building Code that haven't been adopted by Building and Standards Commission.

Response: No change.

Policy OS-8.1, Implementation Measure LU-8.1a (Page 6.0-25)

Commissioner Walker read the Policy.

Response: George Robson indicated there is no "U.S. Oil Conservation Service" that should be replaced with "Department of Conservation". This change would be for both the bulleted items. Mr. Robson stated he will check into NRCS and see if that should be referred to here.

Chapter 8.0 Safety Element

Mr. Robson stated there were comments included from County Fire and they have submitted additional documentation dated Sept. 23, 2007 and March 28, 2007. Mr. Robson noted all CDF references should be changed to CalFire throughout the document.

8.2 Overview – Public Safety – Wildland Fire Protection (Page 8.0-3) (Line 2)

Correction of area to "Area".

Commissioner David pointed out another error on Page 8.0-2, last paragraph. There are now **4 (four)** stations (**remove El Camino**) as staffed year round twenty-four hours a day.

8.2 Overview – Public Safety – Airport Hazards (Page 8.0-4) (Paragraph 3, line 1)

Mr. Robson pointed out there are many more than 4 privately maintained airfields.

Response: Change “four” to “numerous” privately maintained airfields.

Discussion followed regarding “State Aeronautics.”

Response: Mr. Robson stated he would check on the correct agency as referenced in Line 3 “State Aeronautics”, discussion indicated the word “Board” may need to be added. Mr. Robson will research.

8.2 Overview – Public Safety – Seismic and Geologic Hazards (Page 8.0-4) (Last Paragraph)

Discussion followed regarding “minimal seismic hazards” and how that relates to Building Codes and Seismic Zones. No change required.

8.2 Overview – Public Safety – Flooding Hazards – (Page 8.0-6) (Paragraph 2 – Line 5)

Commissioner Turri questioned “Propane Tanks” and what size are they referring to as to “industrial uses”.

Response: Mr. Robson stated “Propane tanks” is not a land use. He stated we need to clarify language.

Discussion followed regarding “Red Bluff Diversion Dam” and flood issues.

Response: Mr. Robson stated staff would check and see if should the Dam break, would it be within the 100 year flood plain.

Goal SAF-1, Implementation Measure SAF-1.1a (Page 8.0-7)

Commissioner David asked if we already have an “Emergency Management Plan”.

Response: Mr. Robson stated the words “create, adopt, and” be removed. The County currently has one in place.

Goal SAF-1, Implementation Measure SAF-1.1e (Page 8.0-7)

Discussion was held regarding “Develop”, consensus was to change this to “consider adopting” or remove “adopt”.

Response: Mr. Robson stated he would check with the Consultant (PMC) as to whether this language is appropriate, he will check back.

Policy SAF-1.3, Implementation Measure SAF-1.3b (Page 8.0-8)

Discussion was held regarding “Tehama County Parks and Recreation District.”

Response: Mr. Robson stated there is no Tehama County Parks and Recreation District. That reference should be removed. This task is handled by Tehama County Grounds and Maintenance.

Discussion followed regarding fair-share implementation, Development Impact Fees, assessments and the studies associated with that fee analysis.

Policy SAF- 3.1 (Page 8.0-9)

Arthur Wylene stated there should be an addition to the end of the last sentence to read:

“and the installation of automatic fire sprinklers on new and redevelopment projects **to the extent permitted by law.**”

He noted there are restrictions presently on our ability to require fire sprinklers in new residential developments. Discussion followed regarding restrictions in effect as far as the Building Codes.

Policy SAF-3.1 – Implementation Measure SAF – 3.1b (Page 8.0-10) (Paragraph 2)

Tehama County Cooperative Fire Protection requested this Implementation Measure be changed to read:

“The County shall require that all new developments that are located in the SRA or in a LRA “Very High Fire” Severity Zone conform to the California Building Code’s “Material and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure” (Chapter 7A).”

Policy SAF-3.2 (Page 8.0-10)

Steve Sherman stated this Policy should be changed to read:

“The County shall require new developments in State Responsibility Areas and other fire prone areas to mitigate all hazards to acceptable levels.”

Policy SAF-3.2-Implementation Measure SAF-3.2a (Page 8.0-10)

Steve Sherman stated this Implementation Measure should be changed to read:

“Review development proposals to determine if new development projects are located in State Responsibility Areas or fire prone areas. If development is permitted in these areas, ensure that mitigation measures are required that ensure the health and safety of Tehama County citizens.”

Policy SAF-3.2-Implementation Measure SAF-3.3b (Page 8.0-11)

A typo correction to add ampersand was noted:

“(Development Impact Mitigation Fees.)”

Policy SAF-3.2-Implementation Measure SAF-3.3c (Page 8.0-11)

Steve Sherman stated this Implementation Measure should be changed to add the following to the end of the paragraph:

“to the extent permitted by law.”

Policy SAF-3.5 – Implementation Measure SAF-3.5a (Page 8.0-11)

Steve Sherman is requesting the following rewrite:

“With the assistance of CAL FIRE the County shall map and identify:

- 1. SRA and LRA Fire Severity Zones***
- 2. Evacuation Routes/Shelter in Place***
- 3. Wildfire risks and hazards***
- 4. Existing emergency service facilities and areas lacking service***

Policy SAF-3.5 – Implementation Measure SAF-3.5b (Page 8.0-11)

Steve Sherman is requesting the following rewrite:

“With the assistance of CAL FIRE the County shall identify specific topographic and geographic mitigation measures for fuel modification and fire risk reduction (including but not limited to public education, increased initial attack, fuel modification and vegetation removal).”

Policy SAF-3.5 – Implementation Measure SAF-3.3c (Page 8.0-11)

Steve Sherman is requesting the following rewrite:

“Require that public structures that do not meet adopted uniform code requirements for fire safety be upgraded, abated or downgraded in use. Priorities for the rehabilitation or phasing out of existing unsafe structures will be based on hazards to life and occupancy classification.”

Break 10:45 a.m.

Reconvened 10:55 a.m.

Policy SAF-3.5 – Implementation Measure SAF-3.5g (Page 8.0-12)

Discussion followed regarding rewording Implementation Measure SAF-3.5g, or moving the last sentence to a new Implementation Measure SAF-3.5m.

Response: Create new Implementation Measure SAF-3.5m

Policy SAF-3.5 – Implementation Measure SAF-3.5i (Page 8.0-12)

Mr. Robson read the Policy.

Response: Mr. Robson stated additional language will be added to address funding as part of the identification issues. Remove PUD (Tehama County does not use this term.)

Policy SAF-3.5 – Implementation Measure SAF-3.5j (Page 8.0-12)

Steve Sherman explained that this section addresses a list of issues sent to CalFire by Board of Forestry specific to General Plans and their expectations on items and issues to be included in the Safety Element of the General Plan. This is likely verbage taken directly from that directive. CalFire is required to submit the Safety Element of the General Plan to the Board of Forestry for review, there are specific checklist of items they want covered.

Steve Sherman indicated “(8-13)” should be removed from SAFE-3.5j(d)

Response: Remove reference to “(8-13)”.

Policy SAF-3.5 – Implementation Measure SAF-3.5k (Page 8.0-13)

Mr. Robson stated that “Develop and adopt” should be replaced with “Consider adopting”.

Response: Consensus was to make this change.

ADD: Policy SAF-3.5 – Implementation Measure SAF-3.5m (Page 8.0-13)

Noted that last sentence of Implementation Measure SAF-3.5g be moved to its own implementation measure.

Response: Add this implementation measure with wording from SAF-3.5g:

“The County shall also encourage and promote the installation of residential fire sprinklers in all new residential housing.”

Policy SAF-4.1 - Implementation Measure SAF-4.1d (Page 8.0-13)

Commissioner Walker asked if this implementation measure is currently done.

Response: Mr. Robson stated he would check with the Building and Safety Department and let the Commission know.

Policy SAF-4.3 - Implementation Measure SAF-4.3a (Page 8.0-14)

Commissioner Walker read the implementation measure.

Response: Mr. Robson stated he would check into the comment “designated as open space or agriculture.” The County does not annual update County maps and information on seismic and geologic hazards, State agencies perform this duty. He stated he would check into the origin of this measure.

Policy SAF-4.4 - Implementation Measure SAF-4.4c (Page 8.0-15)

Remove “planned unit developments (PUDs)”

Response: Consensus to remove this reference.

Policy SAF-5.2 (Page 8.0-16)

Commissioner David questioned “shall ensure”.

Response: Mr. Robson stated the word “ensure” be removed.

Policy SAF-5.2 – Implementation Measure 5.2c (Page 8.0-16)

Commissioner David questioned “Maintain drainage”.

Response: Mr. Antone stated verbage should be added:

“Maintain drainage facilities in order to ensure their proper operation during storms to the extent feasible.”

Policy 5.3 – Implementation Measure SAF-5.31f (Page 8.0-18)

Planned unit developments (PUDs) be removed

Response: Remove reference to Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) from entire document.

Policy SAF – 8.1 – Implementation Measure SAF-8.1c (Page 8.0-19)

Commissioner Walker asked about “Airport Land Use Master Plan”.

Response: Mr. Robson stated there is an “Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan”, “Airport Master Plan”, however, there is not an “Airport Land Use Master Plan”. Mr. Robson stated it should be changed to “Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan”.

Policy SAF-9.2 – Implementation Measure SAF – 9.2b (Page 8.0-20)

Commissioner Walker stated “establish”.

Response: Mr. Robson stated he will check to see what wording would be appropriate and let the Commission know.

Consensus reached in all above responses for change in Policies and Implementations.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:43 a.m.

Next meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 11, 2007, 9:00 a.m., Room E Annex Conference Room.

GEORGE W. ROBSON, SECRETARY
TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

TONY TURRI, CHAIRPERSON
TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION