

---

**PLUMAS COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING**

Minutes of the Meeting of December 13, 2012

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

**Mark Dotta**, *Commissioner* (District 1)      **Larry Williams**, *Vice-Chair* (District 4)  
**Betsy Schramel**, *Commissioner* (District 2)    **John Olofson**, *Chair* (District 5)  
**Richard Rydell**, *Commissioner* (District 3)



**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The Plumas County Planning Commission (*the Commission*) convenes a Special Meeting/Public Hearing on December 13, 2012, at 10:02 a.m. in the Mineral Building, Plumas County Fairgrounds, Quincy, CA; Chair Schramel, presiding.

**II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

**III. ROLL CALL**

**Commissioners Present:** Olofson, Williams, Dotta, Schramel

**Commissioners Absent:** Rydell, due to lack of conference call facilities

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

Lori Simpson, *Supervisor, District 4*  
Terry Swofford, *Supervisor, District 1*  
Craig Settlemire, *County Counsel*  
Randy Wilson, *Planning Director*  
Rebecca Herrin, *Senior Planner*

Coleen Shade, *R.O. Anderson*  
Ray Weiss, *ESA*

**IV. CONSENT ITEMS:**

**A. ITEMS TO BE CONTINUED OR WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA** –*none*

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*M/S/C: Williams/Olofson/4-0 to approve the minutes of the meeting of October 18, 2012.*

*M/S/C: Williams/Olofson/4-0 to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 15, 2012 with addition of email from Sierra Pacific Industries.*

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY**

Randy Wilson explains the procedure. This hearing is not mandatory; is an optional meeting to obtain input on the Draft General Plan Update Environmental Impact Report.

Ray Weiss, ESA, gives power point presentation, presenting a reader's guide to the General Plan Update EIR. Purpose of the meeting is to provide a brief update on the process and to gather input and comments.

Approximately 21 members of the public are in attendance. Comments should address the DEIR, not the General Plan update.

Todd Anderson submits back-up material to his email. Discusses water issues and legal issues with water.

George Terhune will be submitting written comments. He feels that the General Plan update needs to address federal, state and local requirements for private use airports. Perhaps needs to be incorporated into the zoning code.

Shade indicates that comments should be submitted in writing with Terhune's recommendation.

In response to a question from Commissioner Dotta, Shade answers that the purpose of the process is to identify any potential changes to the DEIR that would lead to changes in the General Plan update.

Discussion ensues about any strategic plan that the Board would adopt to set priorities versus the General Plan update.

County Counsel Settlemire adds that the General Plan update sets general priorities, specific goals and objectives with additional detail as necessary.

Stevee Duber, High Sierra Rural Alliance: Issue with implementation measures included in the plan; who's responsible? What is the timeframe for implementation?

Weiss responds that this will get filled in as final implementation is adopted as part of the approval process, along with any policy revisions.

Stevee Duber, High Sierra Rural Alliance: There is a lack of information on implementation, lack of information on the designations on the planning area maps, lack of building intensity standards beyond the residential designations. These are required in a general plan.

Harry Reeves: Will be submitting specific comments. He is impressed with the alternatives section. The Flexible Alternative, which he feels is soft on some impacts, such as water. Would like to see more emphasis on differences in the alternatives

This is a good General Plan, adopted by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Thinks a fine job was done, and wants to keep the process moving forward.

Stevee Duber, High Sierra Rural Alliance: What is the role of the zoning code update? What is the relation between the General Plan and the Zoning Code? Translations of the districts to the zoning code is unclear.

Supervisor Simpson: There are County funding constraints that will need to be addressed. Timeline of implementation may not be able to be achieved.

Larry Douglas: Lake Davis issue; state rule overrules local. Difference between "assert" and "usurp".

Craig Breon, Sierra Nevada Alliance: Representing 4 or 5 local groups.

1. Agricultural Preserve language for clustering.

Concerned with mitigation and ensuring that open space is preserved. Use of easements or deed restrictions. Needs more detail.

2. Secondary uses in Agriculture.

Encouraging long term viability while allowing uses. Needs language about constraining uses. Hands out language from Placer County. Intent of policy is good, but needs limitations to ensure that the secondary use is not the dominant use of the land.

3. EIR uncertainty with future housing units in certain areas.

Meadows, lakes, rivers, viewsheds need protection. Should be more language for ridgeline protections, wetland protections, ordinances for stream buffers. Protection of resources from impacts of climate change.

The plan encourages Climate Action Plan, but "waffles". Needs to go beyond the first steps. Needs a greater commitment to climate change planning.

Heather Kingdon: There are impacts to ranchers. Water language is misquoted. Do you want specifics?

Shade responds that specifics are more helpful. Weiss adds that in order to help identify comments, please be as specific as possible.

Kingdon: Need to protect ranching and agricultural heritage, water rights. Need for more allowable uses. Weiss questions whether she will be submitting written comments.

Kingdon: yes. Shade requests comments with backup.

Joyce Wangsgard: Concerned with Agenda 21 throughout the plan. Does not want the United Nations in Plumas County's General Plan. She will provide written comments.

Wilson comments that State agencies will submit comments through the State Clearinghouse. January 3<sup>rd</sup> is the cutoff for comments. Various members of the audience request an extension of the review period. Wilson responds that he will consider extension of the review period. Wilson encourages submission of written comments. All letters are to be funneled through Randy Wilson.

Supervisor Simpson: The Board of Supervisors is committed to finishing the General Plan; it is a Board priority.

Chair Schramel thanks everyone for coming and for all the input from everyone in the County. Continue to work with rules and regulations. She encourages all to sign in.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Schramel calls for a motion to adjourn the hearing.

*M/S/C: Dotta/Williams/4-0 to adjourn the hearing.*  
Hearing was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

---

Betsy Schramel, Chair  
Plumas County Planning Commission

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner  
Plumas County Planning Department