
**PLUMAS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of the Meeting of January 17, 2013

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Mark Dotta, *Commissioner* (District 1)

Betsy Schramel, *Chair* (District 2)

Richard Rydell, *Commissioner* (District 3)

Larry Williams, *Commissioner* (District 4)

John Olofson, *Vice Chair* (District 5)



I. CALL TO ORDER

The Plumas County Planning Commission (*the Commission*) convenes in a meeting on January 17, 2013, at 10:02 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 (by telephone)

Commissioners Absent: none

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

Terry Swofford, *Supervisor, District 1*

Craig Settlemyre, *County Counsel*

Rebecca Herrin, *Senior Planner*

Greg Hagwood, *Sheriff (audience member)*

Approximately 45 members of the public are in attendance.

IV. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chair Schramel reads from Resolution Number P.C. 09-001 – Resolution Establishing the Rules of Conduct of Business of the Plumas County Planning Commission:

“The Chairmanship of the Planning Commission shall be on a rotating yearly basis. A new Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be elected every year, during the last regularly scheduled meeting in January, and shall take office on the first regularly scheduled meeting of the month of February. A Chairman may serve two consecutive terms, and then, if other members are unwilling to serve as the Chair, the current Chair may continue to serve on a year-to-year basis.”

M/S/C to elect Commissioner John Olofson as Chair: Williams/Dotta/5-0

M/S/C to elect Commissioner Larry Williams as Vice-Chair: Dotta/Rydell/5-0

V. CONSENT ITEMS:

A. ITEMS TO BE CONTINUED OR WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA –none

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES –none

VI. COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS

Commissioner Schramel presents two newspaper articles; one about beginning farmers seeking to lease land of one-eighth to five acres in size in order to obtain the skills necessary to produce food for local consumption, the other is about Humbug Valley. Humbug Valley is in the process of being granted to the Maidu people by the Stewardship Council, which is charged with disposition of certain Pacific Gas and Electric lands. The Maidu have a long history and heritage on the land. In the past month, after the Chips Fire, Pacific Gas and Electric logged off some of the areas which conflicted with the Maidu proposed practices and land use for those areas. Schramel notes that many of the agencies mentioned in the Cultural Resources section and other sections of the Plan are mentioned in the article.

Schramel goes on to state the General Plan update reflects the interests of the people in the County and that the Commission met with many, many groups when undertaking the update.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Larry Douglas discusses economic development. High unemployment is a concern, particularly in Portola. During the 1950s, the City of Portola had twice the population it has now. He mentions a book called Imaging the City-Continuing Struggles and New Directions.

VIII. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

A. CONSULTANT TEAM'S REPORT –the Consultant is not in attendance.

Herrin passes out copies of the comments received during the DEIR public review period to the Commissioners and a list of all commenters. Disc copies are made available to the public. She points out that the comment received from Stevee Duber of the High Sierra Rural Alliance contains more material (24 page letter and 220 plus pages of attachments) than all the other comment letters combined. She urges the Commissioners to read all the comment letters carefully.

IX. PRESENTATION BY THE INDIAN VALLEY CITIZENS FOR PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

Carol Viscarra, resident of North Arm of Indian Valley gives a power point presentation. She is the third generation of five generations of ranchers and over several months of review, has become concerned with the direction that the General Plan update has taken.

The presentation outlines the group's concerns and states the group's viewpoint that the updated General Plan has been hijacked and is full of the United Nation's Agenda 21 language and principles. They believe that the language in the update is taken almost verbatim from Agenda 21. The implementation arm of Agenda 21 is ICLEI (International Council for Local Environmental Institutes), a so-called Non-Governmental Organization (NGO). ICLEI has been renamed "Local Governments for Sustainability".

The Greenhouse Gas Inventory, background documentation for the Draft Environmental Impact Report, uses incorrect data for Plumas County and was directed by ICLEI.

Some Agenda 21/ICLEI buzzwords are "sustainable development", "smart growth", "sustainability", "Wild lands projects", "mixed use housing or development", "free trade", "open space", "smart growth", "smart food", "smart buildings", "regional planning", "walk-able", "bike-able", "food-sheds", "view-sheds", "consensus", "partnerships", "preservation", "stakeholders", "land use", "environmental protection", "development", "diversity", "visioning", "social justice", "heritage", "carbon footprints", "comprehensive planning", "critical thinking", "community service".

The three overriding goals of Agenda 21 are 1. reduce consumption, 2. social equity or social justice, and 3. preservation and restoration of biodiversity. Viscarra goes on to state that "Agenda 21 calls for governments to take control of all land use and not leave any of the decision making in the hands of private property owners. It is assumed that people are not good stewards of their land and the government will do a better job if they are in control."

Viscarra discusses the "Delphi Method", a technique developed by the Rand Corporation in the 1960s to create the illusion that this is your plan and that you have some part in crafting the outcome, while meeting facilitators block opposition and discard opinions that do not support a predetermined conclusion.

Viscarra discusses the "Agenda 21 strategy":

"To create ever increasing social and economic pressures on rural inhabitants that will force them to move closer to urban areas to survive, thus making rural areas more available for return to designated wild-land" and presents examples of where this is already occurring, including the General Plan update. She presents "troubling examples of language in our General Plan", mostly involving the use of terms such as "sustainable development".

Viscarra closes the presentation with steps local representatives can take to protect private property rights:

- "1. Place individual property rights first in all planning negotiations and actions.
- "2. Refuse federal or state money from new sustainable development programs and transition out of existing ones.
- "3. Do not accept grant money without examining all of the attached stipulations.
- "4. Avoid consortiums for the purpose of obtaining grant money. Grants always having conditions for funding.
- "5. Avoid partnerships with federal government, HUD, NGOs, foundations, and corporations that advance the sustainable development agenda.
- "6. Be certain any plan implemented can be repealed if it is found to infringe on individual property rights.
- "7. Work with citizens to create a Property Rights Council.

- "8. Work with planners who will protect citizens' property rights.
- "9. Pass an ordinance in Plumas County against Agenda 21 and ICLEI."

B.J. Pearson, member of the public and real estate developer, praises the presentation and encourages the group to give the presentation in each district. He states that the best way to test the viability of the new General Plan is take any piece of property and add up the cost of developing that piece of property. If the cost of development exceeds the value of the property, then the plan is not a good one.

Sheriff Hagwood praises the presentation as one of the best he has seen. He tells the Commission they should hold meetings on different days of the week, such as Saturdays, so that the public can attend. He is against the USFS Travel Management Plan and is involved in protecting the interests of the citizens against their own government. He encourages the Board of Supervisors to protect private property rights and include clear language on protection of private property rights. He doesn't like to use grant money, but the new jail will require the use of grant money. When the economy is good, grant money is not needed.

Todd Anderson emphasizes historic land uses and their use of water. He has tried to tell the Commission and the Board to include private water rights in the plan. Water is for the benefit of everyone in the County. He feels that the County has signed away the water.

Larry Douglas states that Portola is already seeing issues with overregulation and poisoning of Lake Davis, loss of business to other states. Taxes are being misused but grants can be put to good use for forest management, restoration of water and fisheries. Creation of jobs is key. He thinks that the General Plan is "right on". He asks the public where they have been for the last seven years? He states that we are losing business the longer we go without adopting the general plan update.

Various members of the public thank Carol for her presentation and her role in revealing Agenda 21 in the General Plan update. They feel that Agenda 21 is affecting all people in the County. Various members of the public ask that the General Plan update be halted and a new general plan be written using local resources and incorporating local input and policies.

The public participants add that landowners are the best stewards of land, there should be less use of the word "shall" in the plan, Plumas County should refuse grant money, should not let NGOs tell the County what to do, and that climate change is a fraud.

Mia Van Fleet states that if the plan violates private property rights, they don't care how long it takes to get a new one.

Jack McLaughlin reads from the constitution and warns that if the County representatives implement Agenda 21, they are guilty of treason. County Counsel Settlemire responds that the County is charged with implementing State law and all elected officials and County staff pledge to uphold and defend the constitution. Everyone here is working to uphold our oaths and the Constitution.

Herrin thanks everyone for coming. When asked what the next step will be, Herrin responds that staff is currently working on responses to comments received during the review period for the Draft Environmental Impact Report. She discusses the process

and scheduling of future meetings of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

X. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT *Planning Director is not present.*

1. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS – *no report*

2. ON-GOING PROJECT UPDATES – *no report*

IX. CORRESPONDENCE - *None*

X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Larry Douglas suggests discussion of Rohnert Park economic development efforts.

Commissioner Olofson suggests that Randy Wilson and Leah Wills do a presentation on the "missing water". He will discuss with Randy Wilson

Commissioner Rydell states that he will not be back by February 7th, which is the date of the next regular meeting. Commissioner Dotta states that he will not be able to attend. Chair Olofson states that the next meeting may be cancelled.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is set for February 21, 2013, at 10:00 a.m., in the Planning & Building Services Conference Room.

Betsy Schramel, Chair
Plumas County Planning Commission



Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner
Plumas County Planning Department