
**PLUMAS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of the Meeting of December 15, 2011

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Mark Dotta, *Commissioner* (District 1)

Larry Williams, *Commissioner* (District 4)

Betsy Schramel, *Chair* (District 2)

John Olofson, *Vice Chair* (District 5)

Richard Rydell, *Commissioner* (District 3)



I. CALL TO ORDER

The Plumas County Planning Commission (*the Commission*) convenes in a meeting on December 15, 2011, at 10:03 a.m. in the Planning and Building Services Conference Room, Quincy, CA; Chair Betsy Schramel presiding.

II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

III. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Schramel, Olofson, Dotta, Williams & Rydell (*Rydell attends telephonically at 7310 Winding Oaks Drive, Colorado Springs, CO, a public place where other members of the public can participate in the meeting*)

Commissioners Absent: None



Also in attendance (Supervisors, Consultants, County Staff):

Terry Swofford, *Supervisor*

Randy Wilson, *Director - Planning*

Rebecca Herrin, *Senior Planner*

Ray Weiss, *Consultant with ESA*

Heidi Wightman, *Recording Secretary*

IV. CONSENT ITEMS:

A. ITEMS TO BE CONTINUED OR WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA

Schramel calls for a motion to approve the agenda for December 15, 2011. Motion is made by Williams, seconded by Olofson, with a unanimous affirmative voice vote recorded.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – *No minutes are available for approval.*

V. COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS

Schramel makes reference to and briefly discusses a water map that she brought to the meeting that shows the entire Feather River Watershed.

Larry Williams notes the passing of District 4 Working Group member, Ray Evan.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Todd Andersen reports that he attended the Board of Supervisors meeting last week.

VII. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

A. CONSULTANT TEAM'S REPORT

1. STATUS ON CONSULTANT PRODUCTS

After introducing himself, Ray Weiss with the consulting firm ESA begins by explaining that the EIR process is mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The public review periods, requirements, description of what needs to go in the document, and the topics are all described in CEQA. The law dictates the review periods, what's required to be looked at, and all the different deliverables. The process begins with the Notice of Preparation (NOP), which is projected to occur sometime in January. The NOP is a brief summary that is distributed to the public and agencies for review, and which announces that the EIR process has begun. The NOP begins with a project description and includes a description of the alternative that will be looked at. It also lists the key environmental issues that might be studied in the EIR. The focus of the NOP is to get people involved and give them a preview of what they will see in the EIR. The NOP is available to the public and sent to the State Clearinghouse (OPR) who acts as a distributing agency, distributing the NOP to different State agencies. ESA has been working on the EIR throughout the General Plan update process, collecting the study information used to prepare the baseline report. Part of the NOP is a 30-day scoping period, which provides people 30 days to come back with comments. Randy Wilson interjects that there is a plan to have a joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisor meeting to discuss scoping and alternatives. This meeting has been tentatively scheduled for January 12th.

Following the 30-day review period for the NOP, the Draft EIR is distributed. The draft EIR is also available to the public and sent to OPR for distribution to agencies. The Working Groups and the Board of Supervisors also receive a copy. Following is a 45-day public review period. The goal is to have the Draft EIR completed sometime in late March/early April. The final EIR includes the Draft EIR, comments, and responses to relevant comments as a result of the 45-day review period.

Continuing, Weiss explains the difference between a Program Level EIR and a Project Level EIR. A Project Level EIR looks at specifics. The analysis and mitigation is focused on the project area. A Program Level EIR looks more broadly over the course of where development is going to occur in the county. It does not deal with specific impacts on a parcel, but rather issues on a countywide level. Mitigations are also at a much broader policy level. The impacts are the same, but the analysis & mitigation differs.

When preparing the Draft EIR, there are three key items: 1) A solid project description with project objectives; 2) Alternatives. CEQA requires that we look at a reasonable range of alternatives. Reasonable meaning those alternatives that can be reasonably implemented and that are similar to the General Plan. More importantly, the alternatives have to look at mitigating the impacts of the General Plan; and 3) Cumulative Analysis, which looks at the impacts on neighboring counties.

Wilson points out that the EIR analysis could change policies in the General Plan. Williams questions if the Planning Commission makes a formal recommendation to approve the Draft EIR. Weiss responds that that is not usually done. Olofson questions if there will be meetings during the 45-day public review period and if the public would be encouraged to bring their concerns to the Planning Commission at that time. Weiss responds affirmatively.

Continuing, Wilson explains that after the Board of Supervisors approves the final EIR, a Notice of Determination (NOD) is filed. The filing begins a 30-day period during which a lawsuit may be filed. A lawsuit can only be made on comments received during the 45-day review period.

After the General Plan is adopted and the EIR certified, the next step is updating the Zoning Code to make it consistent with the General Plan.

B. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY – *There is no comment.*

C. CONTINUED REVIEW & DISCUSSION ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' MEETING ON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE OF NOVEMBER 15, 2011

Randy Wilson reports that any changes made by the Board of Supervisors to the Draft General Plan will be made by the consultant and the document will be posted on the County website.

VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. DVD OF 1997 NEW YEARS FLOOD – VIEW DVD AND DISCUSSION

A portion of the 1997 New Years Flood DVD is viewed and discussed by the Commissioners and others present. An article on the history of flooding in Plumas County is distributed by Commissioner Schramel.

B. DISCUSSION REGARDING SEISMIC HAZARDS WITHIN PLUMAS COUNTY

Handouts regarding seismic hazards within Plumas County are distributed and discussed.

C. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS – Randy Wilson reports that the Board of Supervisors continues to deal with budget issues.

2. ON-GOING PROJECT UPDATES

a) **Zoning Administrator** – Randy Wilson reports that at the December 14th Zoning Administrator meeting he approved a Tentative Parcel Map application from the J & D Revocable Living Trust (John & Deborah Pinjuv). The application was for re-division of previously merged parcels.

b) **Current Planning** – *No report*

IX. **CORRESPONDENCE** - *None*

X. **FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

No items are suggested.

XI. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Schramel calls for a motion to adjourn the meeting of December 15, 2011. Motion is made by Olofson, seconded by Dotta, with a unanimous affirmative voice vote recorded. The meeting adjourns at 12:34 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is set for January 5, 2012, at 10:00 a.m., in the Planning & Building Services Conference Room.



Betsy Schramel, Chair
Plumas County Planning Commission



Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary
Plumas County Planning Department