
**PLUMAS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Minutes of the Meeting of August 19, 2010

The Plumas County Planning Commission (the *Commission*) convenes in a meeting on August 19, 2010, at 10:03 a.m. in the Planning & Building Services Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, CA; Vice Chair Betsy Schramel presiding. Members appointed are as follows:

1. Mark Dotta, Chair (District 1);
2. Elizabeth "Betsy" Schramel, Vice Chair (District 2);
3. Richard Rydell, Commissioner (District 3);
4. Larry Williams, Commissioner (District 4); and
5. John Olofson, Commissioner (District 5).

Staff in Attendance: Randy Wilson, Planning Director
Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner
Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary

Supervisors in Attendance: Terry Swofford

I. **CALL TO ORDER** - The meeting is called to order at 10:03 a.m. by Vice Chair Schramel.

II. **SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

III. **ROLL CALL**

Present: John Olofson, Betsy Schramel, and Larry Williams

Absent: Mark Dotta & Rich Rydell

IV. **CONSENT ITEMS:**

A. ITEMS TO BE CONTINUED OR WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA

Schramel asks the Commissioners if there are any items to be continued or withdrawn from the agenda. Wilson requests the Grand Jury report be pulled from the agenda because he does not have the Board of Supervisors' response. Schramel states that item will be held until the response from the Board of Supervisors is available. Schramel questions if there are any items to be added to the agenda. There are none.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There are no minutes available for approval.

V. COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS

There is discussion regarding the General Plan update booth at the Fair.

Schramel reports on an article she read regarding photo-electric vs. ionization smoke detectors.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

There is no public input.

VII. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

Wilson reports the consultant is not in attendance today. Wilson requests the agenda items be re-ordered putting Sierra Pacific Industries' comments first. **MSC: Williams/Olofson (3-0) to re-order the agenda.**

A. CONSULTANT TEAM'S REPORT – There is no report as the consultant is not in attendance.

1. STATUS ON CONSULTANT PRODUCT

a. Briefing Report – There is no discussion.

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

C. SIERRA PACIFIC INDUSTRIES' COMMENTS ON DRAFT POLICIES

Cedric Twilight of Sierra Pacific Industries gives a report on his comments regarding the Land Use, Noise, Circulation, and Water Elements. Copies of the comments are provided to the Commissioners. Discussion follows.

D. DRAFT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES – This item is continued to the September 16th Planning Commission meeting.

E. MEETING NOTES FROM JULY 22, 2010, WORKING GROUP WORKSHOP – This item is continued to the September 16th Planning Commission meeting.

VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. CEQA CHECKLIST

Wilson explains that CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) is not just an analysis. It provides a process of public disclosure, provides an opportunity to comment, and provides the process to file a lawsuit. The CEQA checklist contains several factors what would potentially be affected by a project. The level of analysis in a CEQA document is tied to the specificity of a project. A background is written up which creates the environmental setting. A list of factors that would potentially be affected is reviewed and the appropriate box is checked for each factor: "Potentially Significant", "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures", "Less than Significant", or "No Impact". When the checklist is completed, it determines if a mitigated declaration can be prepared. If a project can't be mitigated to "Less than Significant", then an EIR needs to be prepared. The only way a project can be approved with an un-mitigated significant impact is to do a statement of overriding considerations, which means when there is an identified

significant impact on the environment, there needs to be a greater economic or social benefit that outweighs the environmental impact.

The mitigated negative declaration is then distributed to trustee agencies and agencies for either 21 or 30 days along with the checklist. If a trustee agency is reviewing the document, it is distributed for 30 days. The public does not get the opportunity to identify impacts during the 30-day period; that comes in at the end of the process. If any of these agencies raise an issue about a significant impact and recommend further study, then it must be studied; however, we may not draw the same conclusions. It can take a minimum of 3 months to approve a project if it's required to go through this analysis. The process for an EIR is even longer.

2. **GRAND JURY REPORT** – This item has been removed from the agenda.
3. **PLANNING COMMISSION SUPPORT TO DO AN ORDINANCE REGARDING WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITIES**
Wilson explains that what he's asking for is authority from the Board of Supervisors to look at and develop a wireless communication facilities ordinance.
MSC: Williams/Olofson (3-0) authorizing Randy Wilson to present to the Board of Supervisors on behalf of the Planning Commission a wireless communication facilities ordinance.
4. **PLANNING DEPARTMENT WEBSITE UPDATE** – There is no report.
5. **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REPORT**
 - A. Wilson reports there was a discussion regarding an exchange of the Indian Valley Airport for the Indian Creek riparian corridor. The Board authorized further study. If the County disposes or acquires property, there needs to be a determination of whether it's consistent with the General Plan.
 - B. Wilson reports there was as public hearing on an application for the Disaster Recovery Grant. A portion of the grant, \$150,000, is for future-looking planning related to disaster: \$70,000 can be used to update the County's Hazardous Mitigation Plan which was done in 2005 by staff, and \$80,000 can be used to update the Safety Element in the General Plan. It will allow the County to get disaster monies from FEMA and create a checklist of things we'd like to see funded when they become available from FEMA. The preference would be to have a consulting firm that has some expertise update the Hazardous Mitigation Plan rather than do it in-house. An RFP has already been prepared. The other element is to acquire \$80,000 to help pay for the existing cost of the General Plan. Some of the monies would be used to pay the consultant for what we're already committed to, and some of the monies would pay for the augmentations to the General Plan such as the community plans and zoning code.
 - C. Wilson reports that in discussions with the CAO, there will very likely be a workshop on the County's Economic Policy on September 14th at 1:30 at the Board meeting.
6. **ON-GOING PROJECT UPDATES** – There is no report.

IX. CORRESPONDENCE

There is no correspondence.

X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Grand Jury Report
- CEQA Checklist
- Sierra Pacific Industries' Comments
- Draft General Plan Policies
- Working Group Meeting Notes
- Design Workshop Timelines
- Possible need for more meetings

The General Plan Working Group meeting is September 2nd at the Fairgrounds. The next Planning Commission meeting will be September 16th.

There is discussion regarding the possible need for more Planning Commission meetings.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Schramel adjourns the meeting of August 19, 2010, at 1:15 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is September 16, 2010, at 10:00 a.m., in the Planning & Building Services Conference Room.


Betsy Schramel, Vice Chair
Plumas County Planning Commission


Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary