

**Herrin, Becky**

---

**From:** Wilson, Randy  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2013 12:29 PM  
**To:** Herrin, Becky; rweiss@esassoc.com; Coleen Shade  
**Subject:** FW: Plumas County General Plan EIR

---

**From:** Lorraine Nielsen [mailto:[fourwinds@gotsky.com](mailto:fourwinds@gotsky.com)]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2013 12:09 PM  
**To:** Wilson, Randy  
**Subject:** Plumas County General Plan EIR

Hello,

The Agenda 21 protocols in Plumas County are a square peg in a round hole. Many thanks to Feather Publishing for the information and explanations they have provided, which have led me to the conclusion that a General Plan Update heavily influenced by Agenda 21 does not fit this county. Paraphrasing: "the suburban lifestyle is unsustainable." Consider the vast area of Plumas County, then think of how little of it could actually be considered suburban. You might count four square miles here, and eight or ten there, maybe one or two square miles in the county seat, with a county dominated by 1.2 million acres of National Forest; I just don't think you could call it one big suburb. Should a primarily rural population get the fine-toothed comb treatment from the strict protocols of Agenda 21?

Next, the protocols were agreed upon at the Rio conference of 1991. This is slightly less than a full generation ago. The local newspaper mentioned ranches in Indian Valley (I'm sure this is also true for Mohawk, Sierra and American Valleys) where the same ranches had been in operation for five, six, and even seven generations. Doesn't seven generations tell you a little something about sustainability? Do we go with 22-year-old protocols, or with the knowledge accumulated through successful operation of a ranch from the time of Jim Beckwourth's establishment of the Beckwourth-Genesee wagon route?

I also wish to address a statement, which was followed with a letter to the editor in the Indian Valley Record. Someone from the other side of the county made the assertion that some of us are paranoid and delusional. Paranoia is a fear of the unknown, an unfounded fear, a fear of something that doesn't exist. When the threat is real it cannot be dismissed as paranoid! And we are not the ones who are suffering delusions.

One threat which might have been taken too lightly was the spotted owl. There were three sawmills in full operation in the Crescent Mills/Greenville area before

the spotted owl was listed as an endangered specie, in 2013 the most productive use is storage. Another threat was a huge increase in the state water master fee. I believe that ranchers took action and narrowly averted that threatened increase in taxes. Were we just paranoid about the Cal-fire tax? I certainly remember seeing that bill. If you consider the \$150 or \$115 as a percentage of average income in Plumas County compared to average income in Malibu canyon (another fire-prone area) you start to get the impression that the government in Sacramento is not exactly fair and equitable toward the residents of Plumas County.

In my viewpoint, the absolute last thing we should ever do, is approve a general plan which provides the state with a protocol which can be used to force Plumas County further down a deep dark hole. Thank-you for your consideration of my thoughts.

Gene Nielsen  
Crescent Mills