
**PLUMAS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Minutes of the Meeting of November 18, 2010

The Plumas County Planning Commission (the *Commission*) convenes in a Meeting on November 18, 2010, at 10:00 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: None

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

III. ROLL CALL

Present: Mark Dotta, John Olofson, Betsy Schramel, Larry Williams
Rich Rydell - *Attends the meeting telephonically at 7310 Winding Oaks Drive, Colorado Springs, CO, a public place where other members of the public can participate in the meeting*

Absent: None

IV. CONSENT ITEMS:

A. ITEMS TO BE CONTINUED OR WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA

The agenda is approved as presented.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MSC: Williams/Schramel (5-0) to approve the Minutes of October 7, 2010, as presented.

V. COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS

Betsy Schramel reports there was a small group meeting through the college a couple of weeks ago. The purpose of the meeting was to talk about how various groups could gather together to work on sustainability, whether through education or development, and how important it is to draw on other people to help and not stand alone in what you're doing. Schramel distributes a copy from a newspaper clipping from 1983 regarding the General Plan update, which talked about the same issues being talked about with the current General Plan update. Schramel also reports there was a Working Group meeting on Monday and they looked at the proposed mapping.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

There is no public comment.

VII. PRESENTATION BY THE NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION (NAHC)

Diane McCombs, archaeologist, introduces Rob Wood from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento. McCombs explains that since 2005 State planning law requires Native American consultation under SB 18. The Planning Department is aware of this requirement; however, there seems to be a disconnect between the law and implementation of the law on behalf of the General Plan. Rob Wood gives a Power Point presentation explaining that SB 18 requires local governments (Cities and Counties) to consult with tribes, and that any General Plan changes require consultation under this government code. Becky Herrin, Senior Planner, states that the Planning Department sent a request to the NAHC for the list of tribes in 2006 and sent out consultation letters, but there was no response to the letters. The guidelines in the law state you must send out the letters and the tribes have 90 days to respond. McCombs questions if any letters have been sent since 2006 and Herrin replies that they have not. McCombs questions if in the past year the Plumas County General Plan has involved any requests for Native American consultation. Herrin replies that it has not, but it is a process they are working on. Randy Wilson, Planning Director, states that we are not so far along in the process that anything has been compromised, adding that the Planning Department will send out letters and work to establish relationships with the tribes. Continuing, Wood states that according to the guidelines, tribes have 90 days to respond. If there is no response, a follow-up with a phone call, fax, and/or e-mail is made and you've done your due diligence. There is no need to wait 90 days before following up. Wilson adds that, for the record, the General Plan update process was stopped for over a year, and it's only been going on now for a year, so there's some catch up to do on this. Wood adds that once a relationship with the tribes has been established, it will make everything go a lot smoother the next time around. Wilson states that letters will go out and will be followed up with phone calls to establish those relationships.

VIII. PRESENTATION BY THE CULTURAL RESOURCES GROUP REGARDING ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESOURCES WITHIN THE COUNTY WITH REGARD TO THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND COUNTY PERMITTING PROCESSES.

Amy Huberland, Assistant Coordinator for the Northeast Information Center (NEIC), gives a Power Point presentation regarding NEIC's role in managing information from historical resources identified in California. The NEIC would like to set up an agreement with the County so they can assist in the review of projects, at a reduced rate.

Diane McCombs, archaeologist, notes that the language in the proposed General Plan is basically the same language in the current 28-year-old General Plan; there isn't a whole lot of change. Randy Wilson, Planning Director, states that before the General Plan is adopted, the Planning Department wants to work on the agreement and weave it into the process ahead of any policy language changes made to the General Plan. McCombs states that the current General Plan from 1982 states, "establish a panel of archaeological experts which will develop specific criteria necessary to determine site sensitivity." The revised language under consideration states, "establish a resources advisory panel comprised of archaeological and historical experts drawn from countywide, which will develop specific criteria necessary to determine resource sensitivity and significance. Authorize the resources advisory panel to apply said criteria to affected cultural resources and make recommendations derived there from." McCombs notes it is very similar language that has been on the books for 28 years and never implemented. Becky Herrin, Senior Planner, adds that the procedure for adoption of the document as a guideline is to submit a letter of interest from the panel to the Board of Supervisors. Once the advisory panel is established by the Board, the panel can advise the Board and Planning Commission on such

matters as adoption of guidelines, review and refinement of the constraint maps, and review and possible modification (expansion) of the language and mitigations in the General Plan. It was intended for the Board to establish the panel, not the Planning Department. McCombs questions if we need to continue having this kind of language in the General Plan if it has been demonstrated that it hasn't been useful, noting that it has been proposed how they would like to see it. Herrin clarifies that that's not language in the General Plan Goals and Policies, it's a procedure. Huberland comments that using volunteer professionals in the community as the primary consultation is not advisable. However, to use them "in addition" is commendable. Herrin questions if they are going to provide policy language. Huberland adds that she feels it would be up to the consultant and Planning Commission and Planning Department to review all the comments and revise the language, noting they can certainly help. Herrin agrees that that is the process and at this point they aren't going to take out language and replace it. They are going to take all the comments and review them and determine what the final draft language will be. Wilson adds that they can accommodate a meeting to work on that.

IX. GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROCESS

A. CONSULTANT TEAM'S REPORT

Randy Wilson, Planning Director, suggests having a long meeting on December 2nd to discuss the Goals and Policies. Coleen Shade had previously stated she is available for a meeting on that day. Another idea is to have a joint Working Group/Planning Commission meeting on that date to go over the maps and maybe discuss the Goals and Policies, too. Wilson states that staff believe it will be very valuable to have the Working Groups and Commission meet jointly.

Wilson also states they have been trying to schedule a joint meeting between the Planning Commission and the City of Portola Planning Commission. Coleen Shade has said she is also available on December 1st for that meeting.

Mark Dotta questions the desire of the Commission regarding these meeting dates. It is agreed to schedule an all day joint meeting with the Planning Commission and Working Groups on December 2nd, and have staff and consultant coordinate an agenda for that meeting. It is also agreed to try to schedule a joint meeting on the evening of December 1st with the City of Portola Planning Commission.

B. PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

Jerrod Gibson, a senior at Quincy High School, comments that he was invited to participate in the General Plan update by Supervisor Simpson and he is doing his senior project on it. He is interested because it involves so many different fields. Gibson states that he realized that the way the General Plan is suppose to work, in theory, is people are suppose to provide input. There are a lot of technical details that you need expert input on, too, but he realized that he could go to the high school and somehow gauge what the students thought about Plumas County and what it should look like in the future. They are the people who are going to be here 20 or 30 years down the line, so it's really important to get their input. Gibson feels he can best help this process by doing a survey and collecting and tabulating the data. Where he needs help is formulating questions that the students can understand. Randy Wilson, Planning Director, volunteers staff resources to work with him.

In response to a question from Josh Sebold of Feather Publishing, Wilson states that because the General Plan has a draft policy that states we want to focus development as much as we can in the communities, it ties into all the issues we're hearing about such as effective use of transportation,

energy, etc., and putting labels on it. On the Opportunity Area maps they started designating what should be towns, expansion areas, villages, etc. based on the existing land pattern. There are policies that drive the creation of that and how to create the towns and communities because the vitality of the communities and protection of the resource production areas is something that is desirable. There are policies and maps and they all work together. The consultant is taking all the comments and working on possible changes to the policies with the recognition that not all the comments will get into those changes. There will be public meetings on the policies all over the County, and at some point there will be a settling in of a project description for the EIR which would include the maps.

Rich Rydell leaves the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

X. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

There is no report.

XI. CORRESPONDENCE

Copies of the latest issue of CP&DR are distributed to the Commissioners.

XII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. Joint meeting with General Plan Working Groups and Planning Commission on December 2, 1010.
2. Joint meeting with City of Portola Planning Commission and Planning Commission on December 1, 2010.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Dotta adjourns the meeting of November 18, 2010, at 12:25 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is December 2, 2010, at 10:00 a.m., in the Plumas County Library Meeting Room.



Mark Dotta, Chair
Plumas County Planning Commission



Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary