
**PLUMAS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Minutes of the Meeting of September 16, 2010

The Plumas County Planning Commission (the *Commission*) convenes in a Meeting on September 16, 2010, at 10:02 a.m. in the Planning & Building Services Conference Room, 555 Main Street, Quincy, CA; Chair, Mark Dotta, 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 and Lori Simpson

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

III. ROLL CALL

Present: Mark Dotta, John Olofson, Betsy Schramel, and Larry Williams

Absent: Rich Rydell

IV. CONSENT ITEMS:

A. ITEMS TO BE CONTINUED OR WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA

MSC: Williams/Olofson (4-0) to approve the agenda as submitted.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There are no minutes available for approval.

V. COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS

Olofson questions the status of the Communication Facilities Ordinance. Wilson replies that it has not yet been presented to the Board of Supervisors. Williams suggests scheduling Ken Capistran to come in and speak to the Commission regarding the cell tower and broadband issue.

Schramel comments that the General Plan Working Group meeting on September 2nd went very well.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Diane McCombs, archaeologist, requests the Cultural Resource Group be placed on the Planning Commission agenda for a future meeting. McCombs distributes a handout titled “*Proposed Standards for Heritage Resources under the Plumas County General Plan*” which outlines three standards for heritage resources that the Cultural Resource Group would like added to the General Plan: 1) To ensure that projects are adequately assessed for their archaeological needs under CEQA, Plumas County will participate in the City and County Project Review Program; 2) To ensure the adequacy of archaeological reports submitted to and accepted by Plumas County, the County will adopt the State recommended “Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Formats”; and 3) To ensure that qualified individuals are utilized by Plumas County for archaeological reporting, Plumas County will adopt the qualification standards utilized by the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Historical Resources Consultants List.

VII. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

A. CONSULTANT TEAM’S REPORT

1. STATUS ON CONSULTANT PRODUCTS - Wilson reports he received the meeting notes from the September 2nd Working Group meeting and copies were e-mailed to the Commissioners. Design Workshop also provided the General Plan Elements compiled and formatted differently, which will also be e-mailed to the Commissioners. Additionally, Wilson notes they are currently working on defining the boundaries on the opportunity area maps and are considering having a Working Group meeting on just the maps.

a. Briefing Report – There is no discussion.

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

C. DRAFT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES

Olofson comments that the Commission needs to focus on the implementation measures, the means of funding them, and how to ensure they are being carried out. Williams comments that those tasks would be the very last thing done, once it is established what the Commission would like to do. Olofson also feels the word “encourage” is fluff as opposed to “require”. There is discussion regarding the use of words such as encourage, require, shall, will, may, and might. Olofson states that words like “encourage” are open to interpretation and that means it’s also open to abuse by developers because you are encouraging exceptions. Wilson adds that words like “encourage” get translated into maps and the zoning codes.

Schramel notes that the “limited industrial” land use designation is missing from the list in Policy LU-1.2.1. Schramel also questions the absence of a watershed designation. Wilson responds that watersheds are usually defined by drainage basin and that everything in the County is within a watershed. Schramel feels watersheds should be included as a value of the land. Williams notes that watersheds are not a land use unless you establish a water bank. Herrin adds that they are identified in the current General Plan as watersheds and water sources that provide drinking water. Wilson notes that it could be included in the Water Element.

There is discussion regarding how the Policy, Goals, and Elements will appear in the final General Plan. Dotta questions the Open Space Element and State requirements. Herrin replies that in the Government Code and General Plan Guidelines there are certain things you have to have in the Open Space Element. Discussion follows regarding Open Space. Herrin distributes a handout from the General Plan Guidelines, which explains the requirements of the Open Space Element. Further discussion follows. Williams makes the suggestion that each Commissioner go through the Elements and prepare a list of concerns and then come back at the next meeting prepared to compare the lists and discuss the items. Wilson adds that the Commissioners should also be reviewing the Working Group notes and come prepared to take on each element on its own with a discussion of issues and areas of concern.

Dotta questions if it's reasonable for the General Plan to talk about what County positions are to be maintained. Discussion follows. Williams suggests rewording to address the function and not the position. Cedric Twight of Sierra Pacific Industries questions when an updated land use map will be ready. Herrin replies that we have the existing land use map available; it just needs to be checked before it is released. Wilson notes that they plan to work on those map scenarios sometime in October.

VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. CEQA CHECKLIST

Wilson distributes and discusses a handout from Abbott & Kindermann, LLP, titled "*California Land Development Guides - Permit and CEQA Processing*" flowchart. Wilson explains that when an application is received, there is a 30-day review period for completeness. During this time, the application is distributed to agencies for their review and input. If an application is not determined incomplete during the 30-day period, it becomes complete by default. If a reviewing agency identifies deficiencies, in writing, the applicant has 30 days to respond or file an appeal. A resubmittal of the application triggers a new 30-day review period. Once the application is deemed complete, the lead agency has 30 days to determine whether an EIR, Negative Declaration, or previous environmental document should be used. The lead agency has 180 days to complete a Negative Declaration and one year to complete an EIR. After the Negative Declaration is prepared, the lead agency has 60 days to act on entitlements, 50 days for a tentative map. After an EIR is prepared, the lead agency has 180 days to act on entitlements.

2. GRAND JURY REPORT

Olofson feels the Planning Commission needs to give serious consideration to what the Grand Jury is reporting if they intend to have an effective Economic Element. Schramel feels the Grand Jury report is very much in line with what they've been hearing in the community and working groups. The Safety Element is also in line with the Grand Jury report.

3. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REPORT

Lori Simpson reports the Board of Supervisors plan to have an economic development workshop next month. Wilson states the Commissioners will be notified of the date when it is set.

4. ON-GOING PROJECT UPDATES

Wilson reports there will be a public hearing on Thursday, September 23rd at the Veterans Memorial Hall in Chester at 3:00 p.m. regarding the Lake Front at Walker Ranch Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map and Planned Development Permit.

IX. CORRESPONDENCE

There is no correspondence.

X. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. Presentation by Ken Capistran regarding cell phone providers and broadband in the county.
2. Presentation by Cultural Resource Group
3. Report by Sheriff regarding law enforcement & the General Plan

XI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Dotta adjourns the meeting of September 16, 2010, at 12:25 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is October 7, 2010, at 10:00 a.m., in the Planning & Building Services Conference Room.



Mark Dotta, Chair
Plumas County Planning Commission



Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary