

**TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING SEPTEMBER 27, 2007
GENERAL PLAN STUDY SESSION**

The Tehama County Planning Commission met in a special session at 9:00 am. On Thursday, September 27, 2007 at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 633 Washington Street, Red Bluff, California, with the following members present: Commissioners Linda Walker, Kim Tipton, and Delbert David. Commissioners Tony Turri and Don Jones were absent.

Vice-Chairperson Linda Walker presided. Present were Director of Planning George Robson, and Recording Secretary Kellee A. Taresh.

CITIZEN'S CONCERNS:

Vice-Chairperson Walker called for public comments. None were received.

WORK/STUDY SESSION:
Discussion of Draft General Plan Policy Document

George Robson explained the Commission had finished up with the review of Chapters 1.0 (Introduction); Chapter 4.0 (Public Services Element); Chapter 5.0 (Economic Development Element). The Commission would start today's meeting with Chapter 6.0 Open Space and Conservation Element.

Mr. Robson noted there were a couple items held over at the last meeting in regards to Solid Waste Disposal. Mr. Robson contacted Alan Abbs, Director of the Tehama County Landfill Management Agency and Air Pollution and Mr. Abbs is in attendance.

Mr. Robson explained there had been a couple of questions in regard to buffering. He stated there was a handout from Alan Abbs in their packets. Policy PS-6.1 (Page 4.0-10) "The County shall provide for solid waste collection, disposal services, and recycling in a cost-efficient manner."

Alan Abbs was present and explained there is one permitted landfill in Tehama County. It is a 160 ac site, right now it is a one-stop shop for municipal solid waste, construction and demolition waste, household hazardous wastes, some small business generated waste, wood waste, scrap metal, anything that is disposed of. There are two separately permitted landfills through the state, one is an un-lined landfill that was converted to a landfill in the early 1970s, there is approximately one year of life left in that landfill. There is also a partially constructed new lined landfill which meets current Federal guidelines, which has approximately one years worth of waste in and has another 19-20 years of life left in it. Those two landfills take up approximately 50 acres of the 160 acre site. The material recovery facility for curb side recycling, construction and demolition material recycling, hazardous waste facility, the landfill gas flare, wood waste and metal piles take up another 40-50 acres of the site. When you take out the storm water drainages and the vegetated areas with respect to the permit that leaves a remaining 40 acres, which most likely would be a future Phase III Landfill 15-20 years down the road.

The potential Phase III Landfill is on the southern end of the landfill site toward Minch Road and Walnut St. The surrounding area of the landfill is either Upland Agriculture or Rural Residential, about 25% of the surrounding property is Rural Residential, 10 acre minimum. The remaining 75% of the property boundary is Upland Agriculture, part is taken up as a soil remediation facility and the remainder is grazing land. He stated that 15-20 years in the future there is residential development right up to the fence line of the landfill. He stated there are currently no violations with the State on record, there have been no violations in the last 5-6 years. He explained there was approximately \$500,000 spend on a flare to capture the methane gas. There is

litter fencing, storm water management plans and prevention against fugitive dust. Right now it would be easy for anyone building today in that vicinity to say there is not a problem, however landfills do smell on occasion, the wind blows and occasionally there is a complaint there is a cloud of dust, there are blown litter complaints on Baker and Plymire, plastic bags that blow away. Realizing there are associated issues to a landfill, it would be in the best interest to try to limit future development at least in the immediate vicinity of the landfill.

Mr. Abbs stated that other counties either through ordinance or their General Plan, propose the concept of a landfill buffer zone to prevent some of the residential development from coming up to the property boundary of the landfill.

Commissioner Tipton asked about purchasing adjacent lands.

Mr. Abbs stated the landfill agency is comprised of the County Board of Supervisors and the City Council. They are an Enterprise Fund they approve fees and collect money and set-aside monies for long term liabilities, he feels they would probably entertain offers to purchase property. He stated they purchased approximately 60 acres to the West 6 or 7 years ago.

Mr. Abbs explained that landfill gas does not respect property boundaries and so right now there are monitoring wells surrounding the property to measure gas and there have been no measurements of gas. However 5 to 6 years ago the measurement was 50% gas at the property boundary. That meant that gas was stretching offsite for an unknown distance. He stated if there were ever a groundwater impact from the landfill, there hasn't been so far, groundwater is not going to respect property boundaries either. The general groundwater flow from that vicinity is from the Northwest to the Southeast towards the River. That is in the general area of the development that would be a worry.

Commissioner David asked if he had an area he would recommend for a buffer.

Mr. Abbs stated there was a letter he wrote on June 19 and it was provided to the Commission. He stated that coming up with specific linear distance is not a hard science, there is no formula. He stated that Placer County has a mile buffer, Kern County has ¼ mile buffer and other counties have variations of that.

Commissioner David asked if it had been looked at from the point of view of the parcels around the landfill which can be identified as prospects.

Mr. Abbs stated that in past environmental reviews for landfill expansion there are three parcels within 500 feet of the property boundary. There is one that overlooks the landfill off Plymire Road. There are two others to the East that are relatively close, in his proposed Implementation Measure suggested he put down a 660 feet or 1/8 mile, but if the Commission wishes to recommend something else he is open to suggestions.

Commissioner Tipton asked for his explanation of the suggested "require the establishment of a minimum 300 foot residential setback between any new residential land divisions."

Vice-Chairperson Walker stated that is what they currently have as Agricultural buffers in the Plan.

Mr. Abbs stated he had taken the setback from the Agricultural buffer.

Mr. Robson stated the presentation from today's meeting be considered when the Commission reviews Land Use Policies that Solid Waste Facilities be included in the category to include a buffer. Then maps and areas can be reviewed.

Mr. Abbs volunteered to come back to the Commission when its appropriate and show a map of the landfill and review various distances to show what the effect would be.

Commissioner David explained he was interested in knowing if an additional landsite would be needed with the special planning areas to the North and possibly South.

Mr. Abbs stated they want to maintain the Plymire Road site as long as possible because they can provide the most cost effective services with the existing facilities.

Vice-Chairperson Walker also asked if the county shouldn't be looking for additional property since the majority of the growth is going to be in the North end of the County. Would the county be smart in looking for additional lands in the North end of the County.

Mr. Abbs stated that one of the requirements by Regional Agencies in charge of Solid Waste is to provide at least 15 years of landfill space in their jurisdiction and then they have to start going through the process to identify sites for future landfill disposal or programs to minimize landfill disposal. He stated at the State level there is a push to start raising up the 50% recycling rate towards the 60-75% level. He stated in the next 5 years that will be interesting as to what that will mean for solid waste facilities. He stated the County may have to get more serious about construction and demolition recycling, composting, food waste composting and other ways to separate even more materials.

Mr. Robson explained the idea is not to have more landfills, but to use less landfill area and recycle more, he stated you probably wouldn't need to have another facility site, especially if you do a 75% more recycling. Mr. Robson stated the landfill issue will be addressed again when the Commission reviews the Land Use Policy in the Draft General Plan.

Vice-Chairperson Walker asked if there was any way to productively use the Methane Gas.

Mr. Abbs stated the landfill agency is open to having businesses spend their own capital to come to the site and put up a gas energy system and give a royalty to the agency for the use of the gas. Similar to a natural gas well. The royalty would be used to off-set other public expenses. The proposal will be heard and hopefully ready to go in the next couple months.

Commissioner David stated there was a letter on June 26 and June 19 and are there any additions or corrections to the letters. He stated he would like to see more discussion of solid waste and recycling in the General Plan.

Mr. Robson reminded the Commissioners they can revisit any portion of the Draft General Plan at any time, should they have questions, comments or concerns.

Chapter 6.0 Open Space and Conservation Element

Mr. Robson stated that there are handouts for Chapter 6 received from staff.

6.1 Introduction

Vice-Chairperson Walker stated she had no corrections to the Introduction.

Response: Mr. Robson stated staff has a comment. First paragraph, second line in reference to Ag and Timber resources, collectively staff stated there is an Ag and Timber Element. He stated these issues are more thoroughly discussed in the Ag and Timber Element. Clarification requested.

6.2 Overview

Vice-Chairperson Walker stated she was unhappy that the statement “The County’s agriculture production exceeded \$125 million in value for commodities (Tehama County, 2003).” She stated she called the County Ag Department and they have figures for 2004, 2005, and 2006. She stated in 2006 they have a figure of \$161, 922,100.

Response: Mr. Robson explained that we will update as best we can prior to the documents going to board, so the figures are the closest we can be. He stated staff will refresh the figures as we get close to the end of the review of the Draft General Plan. He stated this has been a five year process, therefore the figures are outdated.

6.2 Overview – Historic Sites – Page 6.0-4

Vice-Chairperson Walker asked about the reference to “Leland Stanford Ranch in Vina”. She asked if that was a reference to the Monastery.

Response: Mr. Robson stated the Monastery was there after Leland Stanford established his ranch.

6.2 Overview – Lassen Volcanic National Park – Page 6.0-5

Vice-Chairperson Walker stated that the majority of Lassen Volcanic National Park is mostly located in Shasta County. She asked if we should have a Shasta County site referenced in the Tehama County General Plan.

Response: Mr. Robson stated this is an overview and reference to facilities available to Tehama County.

6.2 Overview – State Route 36 – Page 6.0-7

Commissioner Tipton asked who determines where a scenic highway stops. She explained this comment states that the scenic highway starts in Manton and proceeds Easterly, who designates the ‘scenic highway’. She stated at the top of the hill by Wheeler Ranch there is volcanic rock, there is no residential, just rangeland, ranch land and BLM from there to Manton and further. She explained there are rock outcroppings that are part of our sensitive habitat if we declared that scenic highway from the edge of town East. The volcanic rock is being hauled off at a large rate, maybe the County could buffer the area along the scenic highway by 50 or 60 feet so native plants and outcroppings of rock are left along the highway.

Response: Mr. Robson stated there is criteria for the scenic status. He stated he will check the criteria, there are some restrictions.

Commissioner David stated Scenic Highways are mentioned, however we did not stipulate “historic”, which leaves out Highway 99W.

Response: Mr. Robson stated that if the Commissioners wish to add something in regards to “historic Highway 99W” he will mention that to the consultant.

Mr. Antone stated that the “Historical Highway Signs” are not made by the County, the State is responsible.

6.2 Overview – Tehama County Parks – Page 6.0-6

Commissioner David stated under Tehama County Parks there is no mention of Woodson Bridge Park. He asked if Tehama County River Park is Woodson Bridge Park.

Response: Mr. Robson stated Tehama County River Park is Woodson Bridge Park.

6.2 Overview – Soil Resources

Mr. Robson stated this section should be moved to the Ag and Timber section, it is more relevant there.

Response: Commissioners agreed, consensus reached by those in attendance.

Commissioner David stated he has a question for County Counsel in regards to the interaction between Open Space and Local Open Space Plan. Mr. Wylene was present and he stated the definition defines the Open Space Plan is the Open Space Element the General Plan adopted. Unless told otherwise he stated that is what he thought we were attempting to do. The other question involved a designation of Open Space Lands in the General Plan.

Discussion followed regarding the definition of Open Space lands. Mr. Wylene stated that it may be a fruitful thing to look at to determine if our Open Space Land Element is meeting all the criteria. Mr. Wylene stated he would research.

6.3 Goals, Policies and Implementation Measures

Policy OS-1.1; Implementation Measure OS 1.1h (Page 6.0-11)

Vice-Chairperson Walker stated that she feels “export of groundwater from Tehama County” shall be discouraged.

Response: Mr. Robson stated that it is allowed, it requires a special Use Permit. It is a discretionary permit by the Board of Supervisors.

Discussion followed regarding surface water and water company mitigation.

Mr. Robson stated in Land Use it is included in there. He stated there are various policies, coordination and concurrence with irrigation and water districts.

Gary Antone, Public Works Director stated that his department pays a lot of attention to this. He stated the water districts need to protect themselves through their policies. The county cannot regulate for them.

Mr. Robson explained that the districts are notified whenever a project is received in the Planning Department that is located in their district. He stated that they usually always respond and the Planning Department has put conditions on the development projects.

Policy OS-1.2; Implementation Measure OS – 1.2b (Page 6.0-12)

Mr. Robson stated he has a comment that is relevant to several of the implementation measures. Mr. Robson read the implementation measure. However, he stated that discussion with staff was “how will we do this – how do we make a finding”, but how would you address water conservation as a mandatory condition for a project. He stated that water conservation issues have to do with State laws regulating construction which are building code issues. Therefore you would not have to do a finding that you will comply with building code. He explained there are currently 7 Findings on each project, this would create an eighth finding.

Discussion followed regarding rewording this Implementation Measure to quantify this comment.

Policy OS-1.4; Implementation Measure OS-1.4a (Page 6.0-13)

Commissioner Tipton stated that under this implementation measure a third bullet should be added which addresses “to encourage provisions to ensure that all agricultural lands that are members of a district pay a reserve fee”.

Response: Mr. Robson explained that is writing a district policy and assessments and the Commission cannot do that. Mr. Wylene stated it would be very difficult for the County to mandate that as part of the subdivision process. He stated we could encourage it, but cannot mandate it to happen.

Policy OS – 1.7; Implementation Measure OS-1.7a (Page 6.0-14)

Commissioner David questioned this Implementation Measure.

Response: Mr. Robson stated again this should be clarified for “threshold”. Refers to the Water Code, threshold as far as project sizes.

Implementation Measure OS–1.7c

Comment regarding Utilize State of the Art Irrigation Systems that reduce water consumption.

Response: Mr. Robson asked the same questions, new development how inclusive is that, or it is required for projects of greater size and number, otherwise is there a threshold because of this project requirement.

Discussion followed regarding State of the Art Irrigation Systems to reduce water consumption.

Implementation Measure OS-2.1d

Commissioner David questioned “how do we rope in Shasta College” since they are still in flux. He stated Shasta College wants to put in the road and parking area in gravel.

Response: Mr. Robson asked they remember this would apply to discretionary permit approvals. General Plan kicks in when there is discretion. When you don’t have discretion these things do not kick in. He explained the General Plan, Implementation Measures and Zoning Codes deal with permitting development. He stated the college can build on a heavily industrial site without discretionary approval by Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors, therefore this would not kick in.

Implementation Measure OS-2.1b

Mr. Robson read the Policy, his question is “new development”, again the threshold arises.

Response: Mr. Robson stated he would need to check “thresholds”.

Policy OS-2.4 (Page 6.0-15)

Commissioner Tipton read the Policy and asked if “Park and Ride” could be mentioned as well as bicycle and bicycle racks to encourage alternative modes of transportation.

Response: Mr. Antone stated that is part of Bike Lane Plans being adopted.

Policy OS-2.4; Implementation Measure OS-2.4a

Mr. Robson stated Park and Ride should be added to this Implementation Measure also.

Policy OS-2.2, (page 6.0-15)

Vice-Chairperson Walker read the Policy. She questioned “sensitive land uses”.

Response: Mr. Robson read Policy LU2.2, it lists Implementation Measures that make 300 foot buffers, policy standards to support 300 foot residential setbacks for voluntary Land Conservation Programs. He stated that is where the sensitive uses are.

Policy OS-2.5, Implementation Measure OS-2.5b (Page 6.0-16)

Commissioner David read the measure. He stated this measure is confusing and he is unsure what this is proposing. He asked they reword the measure to more clearly state the purpose. He is reading from August 23, 2007 correspondence from TCAPCD.

Response: Mr. Robson stated he would reference this and have Mr. Abbs talk with the Consultant to clarify what this means.

Policy OS-2.6, Implementation Measures OS-2.6a thru f

Mr. Robson stated this is regarding building and construction issues.

Implementation Measure OS-2.6k

Vice-Chairperson Walker read this measure. She questioned “consider adoption” of an ordinance.

Response: Mr. Robson stated that PMC handout states they are going through the environmental document and making it self-mitigating in getting to the levels of significance and to do so these Policy and Implementation Measures on the Matrix handout are meant to be included in these parts so the plan can then be mitigated with the implementation measures. He stated Vice Chairperson Walker’s concern is a requirement under the Air Resources Control Board Rules. He stated this is part of the integration of the Global Warming, and one of the Mitigation Measures they are asking be part of the General Plan or EIR on the General Plan are things like this, adopting an ordinance which allows the time limit of diesel idling. Mr. Robson stated this is a suggestion by the Consultant to beef up the Implementation Measure to have this wording which states you will adopt an ordinance that says “diesel engines don’t idle” for a certain amount of time.

Implementation Measure OS-2.6a (Page 6.0-16)

Commissioner David stated that Alan Abbs had a written request to change the first bullet “striking the word standards” replacing it with “best available control technologies to reduce air pollution.”

Response: Consensus reached by those in attendance to make this change.

Add – Implementation Measure OS-2.6m (Page 6.0-17)

Mr. Robson explained that PMC wants to add an Implementation Measure to read:

“Utilize the guidelines in the California Air Resources Control Board Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective when evaluating new development requests that either would generate toxic air contaminant emissions near sensitive receptors or locate new sensitive receptors near existing sources of air toxic emissions in order to minimize health hazards.”

Response: Mr. Robson stated this is another mitigation measure suggested under the global warming and air quality issues. PMC is suggesting this be added as an Implementation Measure.

Implementation Measure OS-2.6l (Page 6.0-17)

Mr. Robson stated that staff’s comment was “this implementation measure is an energy conservation and air quality measure that should be incorporated into a County Tree Ordinance and mentioned as a measure to reduce global warming.”

Goal OS-3 – Fish and Wildlife Resources (page 6.0-17)

Mr. Robson explained they are suggesting this section be pulled over into “Conservation”. There is a lot of discussion in Ag and Timber regarding Oak Woodlands (Chapter 7.8 through 7.13).

Policy OS-3.1; Implementation Measure OS-3.1b

Commissioner David stated that the word “to” be removed after the word “refer”.

Response: Mr. Robson stated yes that should be removed.

Policy OS-3.4 (Page 6.0-19)

Vice-Chairperson Walker read this policy and stated the word “endeavour” should be replaced with something stronger. She stated the population in the North I-5 area where there are migration trails and she would like to see we provide for mitigation for those migration trails.

Response: Mr. Robson stated that the Implementation Measure talks about the effect of wildlife movement be analyzed prior to approval of post development and encroachments upon vital corridors, consultation with CDFG evaluate current wildlife movement and migration. He stated it would be mitigation under the environmental document. He stated there were similar mitigations in another project, the culverts were specially designed so wildlife could walk through them instead of across the roadways.

Add - Implementation Measure OS-3.4c (Page 6.0-19)

Vice-Chairperson Walker stated in the handout from PMC they are adding this Implementation Measure, however they stated “City” should be “County”.

“The County shall avoid the placement of new roadways within habitat preserves to the maximum extent feasible.”

Response: Mr. Robson stated there are no habitat preserves.

Add - Implementation Measure OS-3.5c (Page 6.0-19)

Mr. Robson stated PMC would also like to add Implemental Measure OS-3.5c

“The County shall adopt and maintain a Noxious Weed Ordinance. The Noxious Weed Ordinance shall include restrictions on the use of non-native exotic species known to be invasive and damaging to existing plant species.

Response: Consensus reached by those in attendance.

Commissioner David stated he had a letter which was submitted by Beverly Abbs dated August 14, 2007. She stated the following:

“Chapter 6 – Open Space and Conservation -

Add: Recognize and protect the Sacramento River and associated riparian habitat as an important biological, historic, recreational, and water resource in Tehama County.
(In the Background Report – Recognize the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum, local Watershed Groups, and Tehama County Resource Conservation District.)”

Commissioner Tipton stated the first part has already been addressed and the second part is very good.

Mr. Robson stated this would be taken under submission for the Background Report.

Commissioner David continued with the letter from Beverly Abbs:

“6.2 – Overview –

Bureau of Land Management – correct area to reflect actual BLM lands, “over 400 acres” does not adequately reflect the 17,000 acres of BLM property in the area along the Sacramento River. Indicate that this is a designated Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).

Significant Visual Features – Brokeoff Mountain has an elevation of 9235’, significantly higher than the 8200 feet indicated as the high point in the county.”

Discussion followed as to whether the highest peak is actually in Tehama County. In checking the map it was noted Brokeoff Mountain is on the county line.

Response: Consensus of those present to make the changes above.

Commissioner David continued with letter from Beverly Abbs:

“6.3 – Goals, Policies, and Implementation Measures –

Add Policy and Implementation Measures to coordinate with the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum (SRCAF), local watershed groups, Tehama County Resource Conservation District (TCRCD), Westside Streams and others to address resource issues.

- notify appropriate groups when land use activities are proposed.”

Response: Duplication of previous statement in letter.

“Policy OS – 3.3

- Implementation Measure OS 3.3a

Work with the SRCAF, local watershed groups, TCRCD, and Westside Streams and utilize their technical and local expertise to identify BMP’s, site inventories and other studies.”

Response: Mr. Robson stated we will refer projects to the conservancies as we do already, we want them to be involved in the process, however the county is the final determination as to whether they are appropriate, relevant and realistic. Mr. Robson stated the policy directs implementation of the policy, State and Federal agencies have their own intra-jurisdictional programs as opposed to conservancies and RCDs. This is meant for State and Federal Agencies.

“Policy OS – 3.5 – The County shall work with local watershed groups, TCRCD, SRCAF, and State and Federal agencies to control and eliminate invasive plants from the County.

- Implementation Measure OS – 3.5a

Contact local watershed groups, TCRCD, SRCAF, and State and Federal Agencies to determine potential assistance and obtain information for the control of invasive plant species.

- Implementation Measure OS – 3.5b
(such a leaflet exists)

Utilize the available NRCS educational leaflet that identifies common invasive species and recommends the planting of non-invasive species.”

Response: Commissioner Walker stated that many of the agencies have racks of leaflets available. Mr. Robson stated that again this is a policy that deals with coordination with State and Federal agencies. Commissioner David recommended that we add the "leaflet" part to 3.5b. Vice-Chairperson Walker stated she felt that was too specific. Mr. Robson stated we could come up with our own leaflet. It was the consensus of those in attendance that it was too specific.

Policy OS-3.6

Vice-Chairperson Walker read the policy and asked if this was already in existence. Mr. Robson stated it is not.

Response: Mr. Robson stated it was written this way to explore options. Gary Antone stated it has to be a huge amount of property.

Policy OS-3.6; Implementation Measure OS-3.6b (Page 6.0-20)

Vice Chairperson Walker read the policy and asked if we are going to encourage projects that contain wetland preserves.

Response: Mr. Robson stated that if you have them then you design them for visibility and appropriate access.

Policy OS-3.6; Implementation Measure OS-3.6c (Page 6.0-20)

Vice Chairperson Walker read the policy.

Response: Consensus reached by those present.

Policy OS-3.5 – Add Implementation Measure OS-3.5c (Page 6.0-19)

PMC requests this implementation measure be added to read:

"The County shall adopt and maintain a Noxious Weed Ordinance. The Noxious Weed Ordinance shall include restrictions on the use of non-native exotic species known to be invasive and damaging to existing plant species."

Response: Consensus reached by those present.

Policy OS-4.2 (Page 6.0-21)

Mr. Robson explained this policy incorrectly identifies preparing and implementing gas operations. It suggests that you must prepare and implement a Reclamation Plan through SMARA, which you do not. It is not applicable to gas well development. He stated it is being recommended to add Policy OS4.4 Abandoned and Depleted Gas Wells meet Calif. Code of Regulations.

Response: Staff recommends "SMARA" is not applicable to gas well development. CA Code of Regulations, Title XIV, Division 2, Section 1776 addresses reclamation of gas well pads and roadways. Recommend adding Policy OS-4.4. The County shall require all abandoned and/or depleted wells meet CA Code of Regulations, Title XIV, Division 2, Section 1776 requiring the reclamation of as prescribed by State law under the Supervision of the State Department of Conservation Division of Oil and Gas. Remove reference to gas wells in Policy OS-4.2.

Implementation Measure OS-4.2b (Page 6.0-21)

Commissioner David read the implementation measure and noted there is no statement about concurrent.

Response: Mr. Robson stated that is in the SMARA guidelines. There may be some inactive mines that are not compliant with SMARA because they are inactive and we do not know about them.

Policy OS-3.7; Implementation Measure OS-3.7a (Page 6.0-20)

Commissioner David read the implementation measure and asked if that affected any current dams.

Response: Mr. Robson answered no. No change recommended.

Discussion followed regarding Policy OS-4.3 Special Mining Zones. No changes were recommended.

Policy OS-6.1; Implementation Measure OS-6.1d (Addition) (Page 6.0-23)

Mr. Robson read the following addition recommended by PMC:

“The County shall impose the following conditions on all discretionary projects in areas which do not have a significant potential for containing archaeological or paleontological resources: “The Planning Dept. shall be notified immediately if any prehistoric, archaeological, or paleontologic artifact is uncovered during construction. All construction must stop and an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to evaluate the finds and recommend appropriate action.”

Response: Mr. Robson stated this is for clarification of the Implementation Measure. He stated he would discuss this with PMC.

Policy OS-6.1; Implementation Measure OS-6.1a (Page 6.0-22)

Vice-Chairperson Walker stated “Chico State” should read “California State University, Chico”.

Response: Change will be made to “California State University, Chico”.

Policy OS-7.2; Implementation Measure OS-7.2d (Page 6.0-24)

Commissioner David read the implementation measure and stated it seems to conflict with Policy OS-7.3.

Discussion followed regarding the wording. It was clarified that the wording in OS-7.2d is talking about the visual impact and addressing issues.

NEW Policy OS-7.4 (Per PMC)

“New development should be designed to be compatible with surrounding development in ways that contribute to the desired character of the surrounding area.”

NEW Policy OS-7.4 (Per PMC) Implementation Measure OS-7.4a

“New development shall include provisions for the design of outdoor light fixtures to be directed/shielded downward and screened for avoid adverse night-time lighting spill over effects on adjacent land uses and night-time sky glow conditions.”

NEW Policy OS-7.4 (Per PMC) Implementation Measure OS-7.4b

“All structures shall be designed to minimize glare potential including the use of low-emissivity glazing, the pre-finishing of metallic surfaces to avoid hot-spots, and non-reflective window treatments and exterior surfaces. The use of mirrored coatings, industrial brushed or polished features, aluminum, or other non-weathering materials

shall be strictly prohibited. Reflectivity may be reduced or mitigated through the use of deep overhangs or other methods to provide shading or shadowing.”

NEW Policy OS-7.4 (Per PMC) Implementation Measure OS-7.4c

“Non-glare glass shall be used in all residential and commercial buildings to minimize and reduce potential sources of glare.”

Response: Architectural Review Issue. Mr. Robson stated he would discuss these additions with PMC.

Vice-Chairperson Walker stated that Commissioner Tipton needed to leave the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:07 a.m.

Next meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 4, 2007, 9:00 a.m., Room E Annex Conference Room.

GEORGE W. ROBSON, SECRETARY
TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

LINDA WALKER, VICE-CHAIRPERSON
TEHAMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION