



## Plan Alternatives Comparison Chart

### Chapter 14 Safety Element **Final PC markup – 12-15-11**


Plan Alternative				Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<b>14.4 Goals</b>		
A	B	C		<b>S-G1. Minimize Loss.</b> Communities designed and built to minimize the potential for loss of life and property resulting from natural and manmade hazards.		R
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
A	B	C		<b>S-G2. Prevent Unnecessary Exposure.</b> Areas of geologic instability, floodplains, tsunami run-up areas, high risk wildland fire areas, and airport areas planned and conditioned to prevent unnecessary exposure of people and property to risks of damage or injury.		R
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
A	B	C		<b>S-G3. Natural Drainage and Watershed Protection.</b> Natural drainage channels and watersheds that are managed to minimize peak flows in order to reduce the severity and frequency of flooding.		R
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
A	B	C		<b>S-G4. Fire Risk and Loss.</b> Development designed to reduce the risk of structural and wildland fires supported by fire protection services that minimize the potential for loss of life, property, and natural resources.		R

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>                      C. <b>Kreb</b> was concerned with the parcel fee from the state for fire suppression and the impact on local fire districts and their ability to raise funds because of this. \$150 per house – regardless of value of structure.</p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-G5. Airport Safety.</b> Land use and development in the vicinity of airports that minimizes exposure to unsafe levels of noise and aircraft hazards consistent with the applicable Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.</p>		R
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-G6. Industrial Safety.</b> Well managed industrial development regulated by performance standards and supported by land use plans that minimizes risk and exposure of the population to industrial hazards.</p>		R Straw Vote 6-0
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>                      C. <b>Disiere</b> – what does “well managed” mean? And performance standards?                      TH – performance standard could be something like “doesn’t produce light and glare”.                      C. <b>Disiere</b> – I just wanted to make sure that they are specific and that they understand upfront. I would like to strike “well managed” - any industrial park should be well managed.                      KG – this is a function of accounting – business plan – how do you manage hazardous materials on site? Mostly regulated by state law but the environmental health division does monitor.  <b>Come Back</b></p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      The Commission questioned the need for the inclusion of the phrase “well managed” in the goal, and again asked what the performance standards were.                      Staff provided examples of performance standards in Attachment A of the Staff report. Staff continues to support the above wording for this goal.  <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>approved as written 6/0</b></p>		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<b>S-G7. Response Preparedness.</b> Interagency readiness and capacity to respond to emergencies to reduce loss of life and property, support the population, and facilitate recovery.		R
			<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
A	B	C	<b>S-G8. Cascadia Event Preparation.</b> A community prepared to withstand and recover from a high magnitude, long-duration local earthquake along the Cascadia subduction zone.		R
			<b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b> <b>C. Kreb</b> – what does withstand and recover mean? <b>TH</b> – may need to change to “survive and recover” for a cascadia event. <b>C. Faust</b> – what policies, standards or IM implement this goal? <b>TH</b> – we will illustrate as we move through the policies. <b>Approved as written</b>		
		D	<b>3290.1.</b> To reduce public exposure to natural and manmade hazards.		D
		D	<b>3290.2.</b> To ensure the continuity of vital services and functions.		D
		D	<b>3290.3.</b> To educate the community.		D
			<b>14.4 Policies</b>		
			<b>General</b>		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P1. Reduce the Potential for Loss.</b> Plan land uses and regulate new development to reduce the potential for loss of life, injury, property damage, and economic and social dislocations resulting from natural and manmade hazards, including but not limited to, steep slopes, unstable soils areas, active earthquake faults, wildland fire risk areas, airport influence areas, <u>military operating areas</u>, flood plains, and tsunami run-up areas.</p>	<p>Prog, QJ, Min, S1-16,  </p>	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Straw Vote</b>  <b>6-0</b></p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      Staff requested revisions based upon input from the US Navy. The commission approved the recommended changes.  <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>approved as re-written 6/0</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P2. Coastal Zone.</b> Development within the Coastal Zone shall minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard; assure stability and structural integrity; and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding areas or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.</p>	<p>Prog, QJ, Min, S S1-16,  </p>	<p><b>R</b></p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P3. Hazard Education.</b> Encourage the education of the community regarding the nature and extent of hazards and community disaster preparation and response.</p>	<p>Prog, IM2</p>	<p><b>R</b></p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P4. Disaster Response Plans.</b> The County shall prepare and maintain current disaster response plans. The County shall support and participate in the preparation of disaster response plans by community organizations, companies, cities, and state and federal agencies.</p>	<p>Prog, IM6-9</p>	<p><b>R</b></p>


Plan Alternative				Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-P5. Hazard Mitigation.</b> The County shall actively seek opportunities to reduce <u>the impacts of disasters risks</u> through <del>pre-disaster planning and</del> hazard mitigation <u>planning</u> .	Prog, IM6-9 Changed wording for clarity.	R
				COMMENTS:		
D				<b>3291.1 General</b> A. Regulate land use to ensure that development in potentially hazardous areas will not preclude preserving and promoting public safety. Potentially hazardous areas include, but are not limited to, steep slopes, unstable soils areas, on active earthquake fault lines, in wildland fire hazard areas, in airport flight path zones, and in flood plains and tsunami runup areas. B. Development within the coastal zone shall minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood and fire hazard, assure stability and structural integrity and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability or destruction of the site or surrounding areas or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs. C. Encourage the education of the community regarding the nature and extent of hazards. D. Continue to provide for the maintenance and upgrading of disaster response plans.		D
				COMMENTS:		
				<b>Geologic/Seismic</b>		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P6. Structural Hazards.</b> The County shall protect life and property by applying and enforcing state adopted building codes and Alquist-Priolo requirements to new construction. <del>The County shall assist property owners in making upgrades to existing structures to mitigate structural hazards.</del></p>	<p>Prog, QJ, Min, S1-4, IM10</p> 	<p><b>M</b> <b>Straw vote</b> 5-0</p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>Commissioner Kreb</b> – what are Alquist-Priolo requirements?  <b>T. Hofweber</b> – requires that structures for human occupancy are not placed on earthquake fault.  <b>Commissioner Kreb</b> – how will the county assist homeowners to improve their structures?  <b>T. Hofweber</b> – program similar to what City of Eureka has in place to assist masonry structures. Should be included in implementation measures.  <b>Approved as written.</b>  <b>The Commission requested that staff move the last sentence and re-write as an IMPLMENTATION MEASURE – IMX3</b></p>		
A	B		<p><b>S-P7. Improved Information.</b> Encourage and support more detailed scientific analysis of Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake risks, probabilities, and anticipated effects.</p>	Iss	<b>R</b>
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
A	B		<p><b>S-P8. Preparation.</b> The potential for a local earthquake in excess of magnitude <del>8.4</del> <u>9.0</u> (Richter scale) shall be considered in disaster planning, risk assessment, and pre-disaster mitigation efforts.</p>	Prog	<p><b>M</b> <b>Straw vote</b> 5-0</p>

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Kreb</b> – how do you implement this and why magnitude 8.4?  <b>TH</b> – certain standards in UBC code to address this. If you’re building a two story house you need engineering calcs to meet the standards. Stress calcs. The 8.4 may be out of date – USGS cascadia subduction event scenario and calculated the maximum credible earthquake along the fault as the probably worse case event. It could be higher than this. Lori Dengler (HSU professor) would probably recommended 9.0. Humboldt County is in the highest category in the nation-wide designations.  <b>Director Girard</b> – we are in the most severe hazard zone; building codes require that structures be designed to they don’t fall down.                      Commissioner Disiere – where did the number 8.4 come from?  <b>T. Hofweber</b> – it came from the USGS Cascadia Subduction Zone calculations. It may be outdated now. We may want to change to “ on the order of 9.0”                      Commissioner Faust – agreed that the number should probably be 9+.</p> <p><b>All supported revising the magnitude to 9.0</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P9. Cascadia Event Disaster Response.</b> The County shall maintain readiness for a comprehensive response to a major earthquake consistent with the nationwide emergency management hierarchy and the adopted Emergency Response Plan for the Humboldt Operational Area.</p>	Prog, IM8-9	R
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
A			<p><b>S-PX1. Site Suitability.</b> New development may be approved only if it can be demonstrated that the proposed development will neither create nor significantly contribute to <u>or be impacted by</u> geologic instability or geologic hazards.</p>		M Straw vote 6-0

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Faust</b> – requested adding 4 words in the first sentence (“<b>or be impacted by</b>”).  <b>TH</b> – this is straight out of the coastal act, I don’t see any harm of adding that phrase.  <b>C. Faust</b> – it seems that the language has to do with the impact of development on geologic instability. It may increase the likelihood of landslides. I wanted to get at making sure that we were concerned about the instability of the hazards on the impacts to new development.  <b>TH</b> – I agree that this is an issue.  <b>Return with new language</b></p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      The Commission discussed the phrasing of Standard S-PX1 that Commissioner Faust suggested during the 11-10-11 meeting. After review of current inland and coastal provisions, staff supports the revision as suggested.  <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>approved as re-written 6/0</b></p>		
		<b>D</b>	<p><b>3291.2. Geologic</b>                      A. Provide for the identification and evaluation of existing structural hazards.                      B. Provide for more detailed scientific analysis of natural hazards in the County.                      C. Provide for implementation and periodic review of the Seismic Safety and Public Safety Element</p>		<b>D</b>
			<b>Flooding</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<p><b>S-P10. Federal Flood Insurance Program.</b> The County shall participate in the Federal Flood Insurance Program <u>and maintain Flood Damage Prevention regulations in the County Code</u> to regulate land uses in flood hazard areas in order to minimize loss of life and property and public flood-related expense.</p>	Prog, Language adds prevention regulations	<b>R</b>




Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Nelson</b> – underline – does staff want to eliminate that? (No – that is the name of the Flood Ordinance). Should we put that in the Land Use Element?  <b>TH</b> – this is the place that FEMA is going to look for in our Hazard Mitigation Program.  <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>approved as revised by staff.</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P11. Flood Plains.</b> Agricultural lands that are in mapped floodplains shall be retained for use in agriculture.</p>	<p>QJ, Min, S5-8, IM3  </p>	R
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Faust</b> – were the lands that we were talking about in Phillipsville were prime ag lands. Does this policy address that?  <b>TH</b> – the lands are not mapped as agricultural lands in the Soils of Western Humboldt, however there has been ag use here. Part of the Phillipsville floodplain did get included in the arable lands survey.  <b>John LaBoyteaux</b> – certain areas of the county aren't covered by the soil survey. Farm Bureau actually tested this area because of the motocross project and it was prime soils.  <b>TH</b> – we are not recognizing this land as agricultural lands. There is some art to this term.  <b>C. Faust</b> – I really support the suggestions of the NCGA to protect ag lands in the County for ag use. We need to deal with how these fill decisions are made. Land owner may realize that he can improve his property with the fill and the public interest in not protected. Caltrans always looks for the cheapest option, but may not serve the public interest.</p>		
A			<p><b>S-PX2. Prohibition of Residential Subdivisions within Floodplain.</b> The creation of new parcels that increase residential density wholly within the <u>100 year</u> floodplain as identified in the most recent FEMA flood insurance rate maps <del>or dam failure inundation areas as delineated in dam failure emergency response plans</del> shall be prohibited.</p>		M Straw Vote 6-0


Plan Alternative	Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b></p> <p><b>C. Gearheart</b> - What does "wholly within the floodplain" mean? Can you figure out another way to say this?</p> <p><b>C. Disiere</b> - what are we talking about here - property rights being infringed on? Is this consistent with the HE? Flat prohibition on new housing in the flood plain. I cannot support as written.</p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> - I agree in part with C. Disiere - we need to specify what we mean by floodway; I would eliminate the word "wholly". There are no constitutional right to subdivide your property. What do we mean by floodplain? We should not be creating any new parcels there? Clarify by what is meant by floodplain.</p> <p><b>TH</b> - we mean the 100 year floodplain. Many parcels have minor corners in the floodplain. Disagree with you on this. Some land is out of the floodplain. If you took out the word "wholly" - everything in the floodplain would be open space.</p> <p><b>Faust</b> - this is the creation of new parcels. Do you want development in the floodplain? If not, don't have a policy that allows it.</p> <p><b>TH</b> - as long as you have a building site out of the floodplain, you would be okay.</p> <p><b>C. Gearheart</b> - why don't you separate out the dam failure?</p> <p><b>TH</b> - I would agree on that - emergency response and is a different issue - not a risk that is expected to happen at any timed interval. Not a probability that the dam will fail. Move to strike "<del>or dam failure inundation areas as delineated in dam failure emergency response plan</del>".</p> <p><b>C. Nelson</b> - if you build a foot above the floodplain, how does this affect this policy?</p> <p><b>TH</b> - this is an A policy, it would eliminate the possibility of building a structure with FEMA building standards.</p> <p><b>KG</b> - this would cover you approval of subdivisions (not building - that is done through the building department). If a parcel is wholly in a floodplain - we do not want to create new lots.</p> <p><b>C. Gearheart</b> - need to re-write.</p> <p><b>RETURN</b></p>		

Plan Alternative		Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
		<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      The Commission discussed various aspects of S-PX2, an Alternative A policy, and expressed some confusion regarding its wording. The term "floodplain" could be clarified as the "100-year floodplain". Other clarifying edits are less evident. The 100-year floodplain covers almost all of the Eel River delta area and much of the Arcata Bottoms area. The dam inundation areas are mostly within the 100-year floodplain areas except near Blue Lake where half the town and a substantial number of lots on the other side of the river are in the inundation area.                      Staff continues to recommend Alternative B, which does not include this policy.  <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>Commissioners Nelson, Edmonds, Gearheart, Faust, Kreb support modified Alternative A (from 11-10-11 meeting discussion strikethrough) ;</b>  <b>Commissioner Disiere supports Alternative B (no additional policy)</b></p>		
A	B	<p><u>S-PX3. Construction Within Special Flood Hazard Areas . Construction within a floodplain identified as the 100-Year Flood Boundary on FEMA's Flood Insurance Rate Map:</u>  <u>A. Require elevation of the habitable portions of residential structures to be 1-foot above the Base Flood Elevation, (100-year flood level) where constructed within a floodplain.</u>  <u>B. Require flood-proofing or elevation of non-residential structures constructed within the 100-year floodplain to 1-foot above the Base Flood Elevation .</u>  <u>C. Require that new foundations constructed within the 100-year floodplain not cause floodwater displacement except where necessary for flood-proofing.</u>  <u>D. Substantial alteration and repair of buildings located in the 100-year floodplain shall require mitigation measures, including but not limited to raising lowest floor elevations to one-foot above the 100-year flood level, to reduce flood impacts on the development to a less-than-significant level.</u>  <u>E. Septic systems shall be designed in a manner as to prevent instability and dislodgement during flood events.</u>  <u>F. Fill shall only be allowed if it can be demonstrated that the fill will not have cumulative adverse impacts on or off site and such fill shall not be placed on prime</u></p>	<p>NEW POLICY added by staff!                      Required to be a part of the FEMA FLOOD INSURANCE Program.                      Currently contained in Humboldt County Code Section 335-1-5</p>	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Straw</b>  <b>Vote</b>  <b>6-0</b></p>

Plan Alternative	Chapter 14 Safety Element			Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><u>farm land</u>. A net increase of fill shall not be allowed in the floodway.</p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Kreb</b> – recommend RLWG’s suggestion on F.  <b>TH</b> – originally we supported this but on retrospect, we thought about the Salt River project that fill will be placed. Alternative wording “discretionary review” or “no impacts to soil quality” add some exceptions or findings – not detrimental to soils.  <b>C. Faust</b> – I favor the suggestion by Humboldt Bay Keepers.  <b>C. Nelson</b> – I don’t believe sediment (from Salt River) and fill is a fair comparison. Good soil quality.  <b>Staff to return</b></p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      The Commission discussed the provisions of S-PX3, in particular edits suggested by the Resource Lands Working Group and Humboldt Bay Keeper to items “E” and “F”.                      Humboldt Bay Keeper suggested the following edit to item “E”:                      E. Septic systems shall be designed in a manner as to prevent instability, <u>contamination of flood waters</u>, and dislodgement during flood events.                      The Resource Lands Working Group suggested the following edit to item “F”:                      F. Fill shall only be allowed if it can be demonstrated that the fill will not have cumulative adverse impacts on or off site <u>and such fill shall not be placed on prime farm land</u>. A net increase of fill shall not be allowed in the floodway.                      Staff noted that the Salt River project is proposing to place fill on prime farm land, so the proposed RLWG wording was a concern. After further discussion staff was directed to return with revised wording for “F”. Staff recommends the following revision to “F”:                        F. Fill shall only be allowed if it can be demonstrated that the fill will not have cumulative adverse impacts on or off site <u>and such fill will not be detrimental to productive farm land</u>. A net increase of fill shall not be allowed in the floodway.</p>		


Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>Straw vote:</b>                      Keep subsection E unchanged, and use the version from Resource Lands Working Group for subsection F (second version) 6/0</p>		
A			<p><b>S-PX4. Development on or Adjacent to Coastal Bluffs and Beaches.</b> Allow development in areas immediately adjacent to coastal bluffs and beaches only if it can be demonstrated by a certified engineering geologist that wave action, storm swell, <del>and</del> tsunami inundation, <u>and projected sea level rise using the best available scientific information and at the time of review</u>, are not a hazard to the proposed development. <del>or that such hazard can be adequately mitigated.</del></p>		M Straw Vote 5-0
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Faust</b> – I would support the addition of the Humboldt Bay Keepers language and place a period after “development” in fourth line.  <b>C. Disiere</b> – I would hate to see that taken out completely, I think an engineer may be able to mitigate the hazard.  <b>C. Kreb and C. Gearheart</b> – support C. Faust’s suggestion.  <b>TH</b> – finding that it isn’t a hazard is a good finding and it doesn’t matter how they get there.  <b>C. Disiere</b> – based upon staff’s explanation, I can support.  <b>All support as revised by Commissioner Faust.</b></p>		
		D	<p><b>3291.3. Flood</b>                      A. The County shall participate in the Federal Flood Insurance Program to regulate land uses in flood hazard areas in order to minimize loss of life and property, and in order to minimize public flood-related expense.                      B. Agricultural lands which are in flood plain areas shall be retained for use in agriculture.</p>		D
			<p><b>Fire Hazards</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P12. Joint Planning and Implementation.</b> The County shall plan collaboratively with local fire agencies and companies, CAL FIRE, and federal fire organizations on countywide fire prevention and response strategies. Implementation shall be coordinated to maximize</p>	Prog, IM6-7	R

Plan Alternative				Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				efficiency and ensure efforts are complimentary.		
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
A	B			<b>S-P13. Subdivision Design in <del>State Responsibility Areas (SRA) High and Very High Fire Hazard Zones</del>.</b> Subdivisions within <u>State Responsibility Area (SRA) high and very high fire severity classification areas shall explicitly consider designs and layout to reduce the risks of wildfire hazards and improve defensibility; for example, clustering of lots in defensible areas, irrigated green belts, water storage, perimeter roads, roadway layout and design, slope development constraints, fuel modification plans, and vegetation setbacks.</u>	OJ, Min  Changed wording to focus the application of the policy	R
				<b>COMMENTS</b>		
A	B	C		<b><del>S-P14. Adequate Water Supplies in State Responsibility Areas (SRA).</del></b> Proposed development within SRA high and very high fire severity classification areas shall be serviced by adequate water supplies for fire protection consistent with state or local fire protection agency requirements.	No state or local standards currently exists for high and very high severity zones.	D
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		



Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P15. Conformance with State Responsibility Areas (SRA) Fire Safe Regulations.</b> Development shall conform to Humboldt County SRA Fire Safe Regulations.</p>	<p>QJ, Min, S9</p> 	R
			<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B		<p><b>S-P16. Level-of-Service Standards.</b> Support the development of a level of service standard by the Humboldt County Fire Chief’s Association for all emergency response services (fire, EMS, HazMat, and rescue) in the county, and make such information such standards public so that landowners and residents understand the distribution and quality of service.</p>	<p>Prog, IM6</p> <p>Changed Wording to clarify intent</p>	R
			<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B		<p><b>S-P17. Fire District Boundary Maps.</b> The County shall maintain and publish fire district boundary maps.</p>	<p>Prog, IM7</p>	R
			<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B		<p><b>S-P18. Hazardous Fuel Reduction Prescribed Burning.</b> Encourage land management activities that result in the use of prescribed burning as a management tool for the reduction of hazardous fuels reduction and also support timber management purposes, livestock production, and the enhancement of wildlife habitat, through the use of prescribed burning, hand or mechanical methods, firewise plants, biomass utilization, and animal grazing.</p>	<p>Iss</p> <p>Broadens application of the policy</p>	<p>M</p> <p>straw vote</p> <p>5-0</p>
			<p>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</p> <p>C. Krieb’s supported the recommendations from Healthy Humboldt.</p> <p>Straw vote: approved as revised by C. Krieb</p>		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<del>S-P19. Fire Safe-Prevention Education.</del> Expand fire prevention and <del>fire safety mitigation</del> education capacity in the county. <del>to include fire risks and methods of prevention.</del>	Prog, IM2, IM6 "Fire Safe" includes mitigation and prevention	R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B	C	<del>S-P20. Fire Service Organization and Ratings Provider Support.</del> Make information available to fire service <del>organizations providers</del> about creating districts, increasing organizational capacity, developing funding streams, and improving Insurance Services Office (ISO) ratings for reduced insurance costs.	Prog, IM6-7 More accurate title	R
			COMMENTS:		
A			<b>S-PX5 Protection of Native Plants.</b> The County shall promote fire-safe practices that maximize conservation of native plants and native plant ecosystems, while protecting citizens, firefighters, and property.		R
			COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Chair Gearheart – what do you mean by "native plants". KG - Conserve native plants. <b>All support as written</b>		
A			<b>S-PX6 Alternative Owner Builder High and Very High Fire Severity Zones.</b> Alternative Owner Builder (AOB) permits for construction of new dwellings in high and very high fire severity zones shall be required to comply with the materials and construction methods for exterior wildfire exposures of the California Residential Code (CRC) and chapter 7-A of the California Building Code (CBC) as amended.		R Straw vote 5-0



Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Faust</b> – this would add to the AOB regs? This does not exempt from state requirements.  <b>KG</b> - Yes – must meet state standards.  <b>Kreb</b> – you had testimony on the Oct 12 meeting on amnesty. This just appears to me would drive people away. Did the FSC request this?  <b>TH</b> – yes.  <b>All support as written.</b></p>		
		D	<p><b>3291.4. Fire</b>  A. Humboldt County should encourage the use of prescribed burning as a management tool for timber management purposes, livestock production, and enhancement of wildlife habitat.  B. Use the appropriate sections of the California Department of Forestry "Fire Safe Guides" as guidelines for review of residential development in rural areas, to be applied consistent with other plan policies.  C. Actively support and pursue the implementation recommendations of the Humboldt County Fire Chief's Association (see Fire Hazards Implementation, Section 5-3200.3).</p>		D
			<b>Airport Safety</b>		
A	B	C	<b>S-P21. Development Compatibility.</b> Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) shall be prepared to define planning areas around airports and establish land use policies and standards appropriate for the public safety and protection of airport operations.	Prog	R
			<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
A	B	C	<b>S-P22. Airport Land Use Compatibility Criteria.</b> Regulate and plan land use around airports according to the Airport/Land Use Safety Compatibility Criteria (Table 14-A, as amended).	QJ, Min, S14 	R

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>STAFF WILL RETURN TO ADDRESS THE NAVY'S CONCERNS</b></p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      See Comments under S9</p>		
	B	C	<p><b>S-P23. Obstruction-free Approach Surfaces.</b> The maintenance of obstruction-free approach surfaces at all airports identified on the Approach and Clear Zone plans consistent with FAA requirements shall be principally permitted.</p>	QJ, Min	R
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-P24. Airport Safety Combining Zone.</b> Utilize an airport safety combining zone within airport influence areas to ensure consistent application of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Criteria matrix.</p>	QJ, Min, S14	R
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
		D	<p><b>3291.6. Airport Safety</b>                      A. The County should establish the maintenance of obstruction- free approach surfaces at all airports as a high-priority project, annually monitoring the status of potential obstructions identified on the Approach and Clear Zone Plans.                      B. The County's current Airport Approach Zone Building Height Regulations (County Code Section 333) should be revised to bring the standard into conformance with Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Regulations. (A recommended ordinance has been prepared by the Consultant and submitted to the County as a separate task in the Master Plan Study).                      C. Regulate and plan land use around airports according to the Airport Land Use Compatibility criteria matrix.                      D. Specific land use zoning, appropriate for the areas around the County's airports, should be adopted as soon as practical.</p>		D

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			E. Ensure that future development within the community is compatible with the airport and its associated noise and hazard nuisances.		
			<b>Industrial Hazards</b>		
A	B		<p><b>S-P25. Hazardous Industrial Development.</b> Hazardous industrial development may be permitted when <del>either</del>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. It includes mitigation measures sufficient to offset increased risks to adjacent human populations <u>and the environment</u>; <del>or and</del>,</li> <li>B. Increased risks to adjacent human populations <u>and the environment</u> have been adequately mitigated by approved disaster response plans. (See definition of "hazardous industrial development" in Standards Section below).</li> </ul>	<p>QJ, Min, S15-16</p> 	<p><b>M</b> <b>Straw Vote</b> <b>5-0</b></p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Faust – I’m in favor of the revisions recommended by the Humboldt Baykeeper</b>  <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>Approved with Humboldt Baykeepers amendments included</b></p>		
	B		<p><del><b>S-P26. Hazardous Waste.</b> Encourage new development that may generate significant quantities of hazardous wastes to provide a plan for disposal that emphasizes on-site treatment, neutralization, and recycling.</del></p>	<p>QJ, Min, S15</p> 	<p><b>D</b> <b>Straw Vote</b> <b>3-2</b></p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Faust, Kreb and Gearheart supports alternative A version</b>  <b>C. Disiere, Nelson supports B</b></p>		
A			<p><b>S-P26. Hazardous Waste.</b> Eliminate the use of toxic materials within Humboldt County where possible, and require the reduction, recycling, and reuse of such materials, to the greatest extent possible, where complete elimination of their use is not feasible. Require new development which may generate significant quantities of hazardous wastes to provide a plan for disposal which emphasizes on-site treatment, neutralization, and recycling.</p>		<p><b>R</b></p>

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
		<b>D</b>	<p><b>3291.7. Industrial Hazards</b>                      A. Hazardous industrial development shall be permitted when either:                      1) It includes mitigation measures sufficient to offset increased risks to adjacent human populations; or,                      2) Increased risks to adjacent human populations have been adequately mitigated by approved disaster response plans. (See definition of "hazardous industrial development" in Standards section.)                      B. Require new development which may generate significant quantities of hazardous wastes to provide a plan for disposal which emphasizes on-site treatment, neutralization, and recycling.</p>		
			<b>Emergency Management</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>S-P27. Pre-disaster Planning and Mitigation.</b> The County shall proactively reduce known hazards through pre-disaster planning and mitigation efforts.	Prog, S17-18, IM18-19	<b>R</b>
			<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>S-P28. Hazard Mitigation Plan.</b> The County incorporates by reference into this Safety Element the Humboldt Operational Area Hazard Mitigation Plan for unincorporated areas (Volume I and the Humboldt County Annex and the Appendices of Volume II) as adopted and amended by the Board of Supervisors, in accordance with the Federal Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and California Government Code, Section 65302.6.	Prog, IM18-19	<b>R</b>

Plan Alternative				Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-P29. Emergency Operations Capability.</b> The County shall maintain the ability to implement the nationwide National Incident Management System (NIMS), statewide Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), activate the Operational Area Emergency Operations Center (EOC), coordinate responders, and implement other tactical response measures as required. Emergency operations shall conform to the Humboldt County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan.	Prog	R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-P30. Tsunami Ready Program.</b> The County shall support efforts of low-lying coastal communities to attain TsunamiReady™ status, as developed by the National Weather Service.	Prog	R
				COMMENTS:		
				<p><b>New policies as recommended by Healthy Humboldt:</b></p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> – what is staff’s recommendation on these?</p> <p><b>TH</b> - it depends on the age of the landslide – we do have landslide areas mapped, but some are dormant. I think we do this now.</p> <p><b>KG</b> – if you look at S1 it is covered and addresses what is required in a Geologic Report regarding landslides.</p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> – second new policy that addresses AP zones?</p> <p><b>TH</b> – I believe this is covered in state law. S3. I would rather let our policy follow the state law.</p>		No support for HH addition-al policies
				<b>14.5 Standards</b>		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<b>Geologic</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<b>S-S1. Geologic Report Requirements.</b> Site specific reports addressing geologic hazards and geologic conditions shall be required as part of the review of discretionary development and ministerial permits. Geologic reports shall be required and prepared consistent with land use regulations (Title III, Land Use and Development, Division 3, Building Regulations, Chapter 6—Geologic Hazards.)		<b>R</b>
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<b>S-S2. Landslide Maps.</b> Utilize California Division of Mines and Geology, North Coast Watersheds landslide mapping as information to assist in review of developments.		<b>R</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<b>S-S3. Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones.</b> Utilize California Mines and Geology Board Policies and Criteria for Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zones (Special Publication #42) as standards of implementation within zones.		<b>R</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<b>S-S4. Tsunami Emergency Response Plan.</b> The Tsunami Emergency Response Plan shall guide interagency response efforts.		<b>R</b>
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>D</b> <b>3292.1.</b> Require geologic reports according to the Geologic Hazards Land Use Matrix as follows:</p> <p>A. R1 Report Requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A preliminary engineering geologic report and a preliminary soils engineering report shall be prepared for the classes of development and hazard areas indicated by "R1" in the Geologic Hazards Land Use Matrix.</li> <li>2. The preliminary engineering geologic report shall be prepared by a certified engineering geologist and shall provide a geological reconnaissance and evaluation of the project site and surrounding terrain. The preliminary report shall identify areas or issues which either do or do not require further engineering geologic and/or soils engineering evaluation.</li> <li>3. The preliminary soil engineering report shall describe the nature of the subsurface soils and any soil conditions which would affect the design and/or layout of the proposed development. The report shall include the locations and logs of any test borings and percolation test results if on-site sewage disposal is proposed. The report shall recommend areas or issues of concern which require additional engineering or geologic evaluation.</li> <li>4. The additional information that is recommended by the preliminary reports shall be provided or the proposed development shall be modified to avoid the identified areas of potential instability. The proposed development shall be sited and designed in accordance with the recommendations of the reports in order to minimize risk to life and property on the project site and for any other affected properties.</li> </ol> <p>B. R2 Report Requirements</p> <p>NOTE: A report prepared by a registered geologist is required in the fault rupture Special Studies Zone unless waived pursuant to the Alquist-Priolo Act.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A preliminary engineering geologic report and a preliminary soils engineering report shall be prepared for the classes of development and hazard areas indicated by "R2" in the</li> </ol>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>Geologic Hazards Land Use Matrix. These reports shall be prepared by either a registered geologist or a registered civil engineer experienced and knowledgeable in the practice of soil engineering. These reports shall provide a geologic reconnaissance and evaluation of the project site and surrounding terrain. (Res. 85-126, 12/17/85)</p> <p>2. A soils engineering analysis may meet the preliminary geologic report requirement for developments where the primary concerns are soils mechanics and appropriate structural design. In such cases it is incumbent upon the engineer to consult a registered geologist should it become apparent that an adequate structural solution requires additional geologic input. If, after preliminary investigation of the project site and the surrounding terrain, no geological consultation is felt by the engineer to be required, the engineer shall certify that such an evaluation is not required. It is incumbent upon the geologist to recommend that a soils engineer be consulted when it becomes apparent that soils mechanics analyses are needed.</p> <p>3. The applicant shall either provide additional information as recommended by the preliminary geologic or soils report or modify the application to avoid identified areas of potential instability. The proposed development shall be sited and designed in accordance with the recommendations of the report(s) in order to minimize risk to life and property on the project site and for any other affected properties.</p> <p>C. The above required geologic reports, "R1" and "R2", shall be prepared in accordance with the California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) Note #44, "Recommended Guidelines for Preparing Engineering Geologic Reports". CDMG Notes #37, 43, and 49 shall be utilized as applicable when seismic or fault rupture hazards are identified as concerns.</p> <p>D. The report requirement may be waived when an adequate geologic assessment at a suitable scale already exists for the site proposed for development.</p> <p>E. The criteria for determining whether or not a report is required when it is discretionary include the following; however, where evaluation of items 1-6 is inconclusive, a statement is</p>		



Plan Alternative	Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>required by a registered engineer that a geologic report is not required for the safety of the project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the site inspection of the building inspector;</li> <li>2) geologic maps and reports covering the area;</li> <li>3) the potential for the development to affect adjacent property or improvements;</li> <li>4) the degree to which public exposure to risk may be a factor;</li> <li>5) the size and scale of the proposed development;</li> <li>6) for development within the Coastal Zone, the policies of certified local coastal plans.</li> </ol> <p>F. Waivers of the R1 report requirements as indicated in the Land Use Geologic Hazards Matrix, but not within critical Watersheds, may be provided for by ordinance where consistent with protection of the public health, safety, and welfare and with the County's certified coastal plans.</p> <p>G. Utilize California Department of Forestry (CDF) series of 15 minute geologic maps and 7 1/2 minute landslide maps as information to assist in review of developments. (Res. 85-126, 12/17/85)</p> <p>H. Utilize California Mines and Geology Board policies and Criteria for Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones as standards of implementation within zones</p>		
	<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
	<b>Flood Management</b>		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<b>S-S5. Flood Regulations.</b> Regulatory standards for flood mitigation shall be based on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps and regulations and local ordinances. (Humboldt County Ordinance 1541).		R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B	C	<b>S-S6. Flood Plains.</b> No new essential facilities that would be rendered inoperable by flooding shall be permitted to locate within the 100-year flood plain.		R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B		<del>S-S7. Tsunamis. New development below the level of the 100-year tsunami run-up elevation shall be limited to public access, boating, public recreation facilities, agriculture, wildlife management, habitat restoration, and ocean intakes, outfalls, pipelines, and dredge spoils disposal.</del>		D Straw Vote 5-1

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>  <b>C. Disiere</b> – I am concerned about the lack of mapping.  <b>TH</b> – this is actually in the Coastal Zone (referred to CA policy). We are hoping that the state will finish the work of the probability mapping.  <b>C. Disiere</b> – I support Alt D.  <b>C. Faust</b> – I am concerned that there is no meaningful runup zone elevation mapping. We now know that runup zones are really determined by the size and location of the event. I recommend that staff talks with Lori Dengler and figure out what an appropriate run up zone actually is. Also, the idea is that the activities allowed would be temporary in nature (not where people were living). The one exception that I find here is public recreation facilities – especially those camping overnight. Tension here between giving people public access to the coast and protecting them.  <b>C. Gearheart</b> – what about the replacement of homes?  <b>TH</b> – not sure about the coastal regulations.  <b>BRING BACK</b></p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      During the 11-10-11 meeting, the Commission discussed the provisions of S-S7 and had various concerns. Staff was asked to check whether the policy would prohibit the replacement of homes. Staff reviewed the non-conforming provisions and a structure destroyed by casualty in the coastal zone may be approved by special permit if all necessary findings can be made, which include that it will not be detrimental to the public health and safety. Therefore, it would be discretionary. Because of pending amendments to the County’s LCP, staff recommends this policy be deleted.  <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>Commissioner Faust objects to the “100-year” wording; supports keeping this section.</b>  <b>Commissioner Kreb, Disiere, Gearheart, Edmonds, Nelson support staff recommendation to delete. 5/1</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<p><b>S-S8. Flooding and Drainage Management Activities.</b> Flooding and drainage management shall be principally permitted in all zones when consistent with applicable state, federal, and local regulations.</p>		<b>R</b>

Plan Alternative	Chapter 14 Safety Element			Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			COMMENTS:		
			<p><u>S-Sx9. Military Operating Areas. Provide notification and project information to the military for discretionary development projects within military operating areas as may be required by the California Government Code.</u></p>	<p><b>NEW Standard</b> recommend by PC</p>	<p>M Straw Vote 6-0</p>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      At the November 10th meeting, the Commission received correspondence from the Department of the Navy regarding California Government Code provisions that require the County to consider military operations in the amendment of the general plan and to provide notice and project information for discretionary development near training areas and facilities. In addition, Public Works submitted an edit to the airports narrative. Attachment B of the staff report contained a markup of the Safety Element narrative for these issues, as recommended by staff. The strikeout wording is wording suggested by the Navy that staff is not recommending be included because it is policy, not background. With respect to policy revisions, staff recommends adding a new standard SSx9, as shown below.  <b>New Standard:</b>  <u>S-Sx9. Military Operating Areas. Provide notification and project information to the military for discretionary development projects within military operating areas as may be required by the California Government Code.</u>  <b>Straw vote:</b>  <b>approved as written 6/0</b></p>		
		D	<p><b>3292.2. Hydrologic Hazards</b>                      A. Flood Insurance Maps (County Ordinance 1541)                       B. Tsunami Run-up Report: H-78-26, Army Corps of Engineers.</p>		D

Plan Alternative				Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				Fire Hazards		
A	B	C		<b>S-S9. SRA Fire Safe Regulations.</b> Development within SRA shall conform to SRA Fire Safe Regulations (Humboldt County Code, Division 11 of Title III, <u>as amended</u> ).	Allows updates to regulations	R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-S10. California Building Codes.</b> New construction shall conform to the most recently adopted California building codes.		R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-S11. California Fire Code.</b> The California Fire Code shall be applied to all applicable development.		R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-S12. Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps.</b> The County shall use the most recently adopted CALFIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps for fire planning and local land use and <u>development review purposes</u> .	Expands policy to include development review	R
				COMMENTS:		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<b>S-S13. Master Fire Protection Plan.</b> Utilize the Master Fire Protection Plan for countywide fire prevention and response strategy and implementation.		R
			<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
		D	<b>3292. 3. Fire Hazards</b> A. Wildland Fire and Flood Map		D
			<b>Airport Safety</b>		
A	B	C	<b>S-S14. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.</b> Development within the jurisdiction of Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCP) shall conform to the policies and standards of the ALUCP.		R
			<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
		D	<b>3292. 5. Airport Safety</b> A. Airport Master Plan		D
			<b>Industrial Hazards</b>		
A	B	C	<b>S-S15. Hazardous Materials Handling and Emergency Response.</b> The County shall condition new development that handles toxic, flammable, or explosive materials in such quantities that would, if released or ignited, constitute a significant risk to adjacent human populations or development to conform to the applicable state or federal materials handling and emergency response plans.		R

Plan Alternative				Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-S16. Transport of Nuclear Materials.</b> Transport of nuclear materials shall conform to the prohibitions of Ordinance #1403; Humboldt County Code, Title III, Division 8, Chapter 3, <u>as amended.</u>	Allows updates to regulations	R
				COMMENTS: 11-10-11 C. <b>Kreb</b> – can we transport material out of Humboldt County? (yes). I’m okay with it then. <b>All support as amended by staff</b>		
			D	<b>3292.7. Industrial Hazards</b> A. Hazardous Materials Spills Contingency Plan.  B. Chlorine Accident Contingency Plan.  C. Humboldt Bay Nuclear Reactor Contingency Plan.  D. Prohibition on Transport of Nuclear Materials (Ordinance #1403; Humboldt County Code, Title III, Division 8, Chapter 3).  E. Define "Hazardous industrial development" as any development that handles toxic, flammable, or explosive materials in such quantities that would, if released or ignited, constitute a significant risk to adjacent human populations or development.		D
				<b>Emergency Management</b>		
A	B	C		<b>S-S17. Humboldt County Operational Area Office of Emergency Services (OES).</b> Local emergency management and response operations shall be consistent with Humboldt County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan and Humboldt County Ordinance 2203.		R

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			COMMENTS:		
A	B	C	<b>S-S18. Consistency with State and Federal Framework.</b> County emergency response efforts shall be consistent with the California Emergency Services Act (California Government Code, Section 8550 et seq.) and the federal National Response Framework (effective March 2008, as amended) and the <u>National Incident Management System (NIMS)</u> .	County uses NIMS system	R
			COMMENTS:		
			<b>14.6 Implementation Measures</b>		
A	B	C	<b>S-IM1. Code Review.</b> Review and amend as needed the land use code and subdivision regulations for consistency with fire protection policies of the General Plan.		R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B	C	<b>S-IM2. Hazard Planning Information on the Internet.</b> Maintain countywide hazard land use planning data—such as fire district boundaries, State Responsibility Areas (SRA), hazard areas, and plans on the internet.		R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B	C	<b>S-IM3. Drainage Ordinance.</b> The County shall implement drainage course flood mitigation policies through the adoption of a drainage ordinance.		R Straw Vote 6-0



Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>                      C. Disiere – doesn't the grading ordinance cover this? (yes) Can we just say "amend" the ordinance?                      TH – we will get back to you to make sure that this is a part of the grading ordinance.  <b>Return</b></p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      Based on the Commission's question about whether or not this would fit into the grading ordinance, staff checked the provisions. While this topic may well fit into the grading ordinance, the Commission has already approved an implementation measure in the Water Resources Element calling for a new drainage ordinance (WR-IM25). In light of this, staff continues to recommend S-IM3 as written.</p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-IM4. Update County State Responsibility Areas (SRA) Fire Safe Regulations.</b> Humboldt County SRA Fire Safe regulations should be updated <del>to identify specific hazard zones, where necessary,</del> to ensure that fire mitigation is proportional to risk <u>as identified in State Fire Hazard Severity Maps.</u> <del>These zones may specify special measures for implementation including: irrigated green belts, perimeter roads, roadway layout and design, slope development constraints, fuel modification zones, vegetation setbacks, and enforcement.</del></p>	Omitted reference to County created hazard zones	R
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-IM5. Coordination with CAL FIRE on State Responsibility Areas (SRA) Exception Requests.</b> The County shall maintain efficient and timely procedures for processing SRA Exception Requests to CAL FIRE.</p>		R
			<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
A	B	C	<p><b>S-IM6. Master Fire Protection Plan (MFPP).</b> Actively support and pursue the implementation recommendations in the MFPP. Periodically update the MFPP. The risk assessment portion of the MFPP shall be updated at least every five years.</p>		R

Plan Alternative				Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-IM7. Funding Fire Planning Activities.</b> The County shall pursue state and federal funding sources to support the coordination and planning needs of local fire safe councils and fire agencies.		R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		<b>S-IM8. Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.</b> Participate in FEMA’s pre-disaster mitigation program by developing, maintaining, and implementing a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.		R
				COMMENTS: 11-10-11 Add the growers request of new flood elevation markers. Come back with new IM to address this.		
				<u>S-IM8X. Flood Elevation Markers. To increase public awareness of flood hazard levels, seek funding to place flood elevation markers along roadways in flood-prone communities.</u>	New IM added by the Commission	M Straw vote 6-0
				COMMENTS: 12-15-11 The Northcoast Growers Assn. suggested a revision to S-IM8 to add a program to place new flood elevation markers in communities to increase public awareness of flood levels. Staff felt this should be a stand-alone measure, and recommend the following new implementation measure: <b>S-IM8X. Flood Elevation Markers.</b> To increase public awareness of flood hazard levels, seek funding to place flood elevation markers along roadways in flood-prone communities. Straw vote - approved as written 6/0		
A	B	C		<b>S-IM9. Emergency Operations Plan.</b> The County shall maintain a Humboldt County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan consistent with FEMA standards.		R

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			COMMENTS:		
A	B	C	<b>S-IM10. Geologic Reports Correction.</b> Correct errata in the Geologic Hazards Land Use Matrix contained in the grading and building regulations (Title III, Land Use and Development, Division 3, Building Regulations, Chapter 6—Geologic Hazards.)		R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B		<b>S-IMX1. Probabilistic Tsunami Inundation Mapping.</b> <u>The County shall seek funding to conduct studies and prepare probabilistic tsunami hazard mapping for the unincorporated areas and prepare and publish a 100-year probabilistic tsunami run-up maps for use in ministerial and discretionary project review.</u>	New recommended implementation measure	M Straw vote 6-0
			<p>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> – I don't think it is appropriate to refer to the 100 year run-up zone without the mapping. Maximum credible tsunami?</p> <p><b>K. Girard</b> – we want the state to continue on their efforts on determining this zone, not to put this on the backs of the county to determine.</p> <p><b>C. Faust</b> – I think we are over the 85% of a Cascadia event occurring and should plan for that.</p> <p><b>K. Girard</b> – we can talk about this and have an expert to discuss, but it is currently being deliberated on by the CCC and is still a moving target.</p> <p><b>Come Back</b></p>		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-15-11</b>                      The Commission discussed the "100-year" reference and questioned whether that might be too specific. Staff agreed and recommended the following revised measure:</p> <p><b>S-IMX1. Probabilistic Tsunami Inundation Mapping.</b> The County shall seek funding to conduct studies and prepare probabilistic tsunami hazard mapping for the unincorporated areas and prepare and publish a 100-year <u>probabilistic</u> tsunami run-up maps for use in ministerial and discretionary project review.</p> <p><b>Straw vote - approved as re-written 6/0</b></p>		
A	B		<p><b>S-IMX2. Firewise Plants.</b> The County shall provide a list of acceptable "Firewise" plants suited to and/or native to the local area. This list should be developed with the cooperation of the County and fire authorities having jurisdiction <u>and botanical experts</u>, and made available at the Humboldt County Planning Department and include information about how to maintain plants to maximize fire resistance.</p>	New recommended implementation measure	M Straw vote 6-0
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 11-10-11</b>                      C. Gearheart read the Native Plants Society's recommendation into the record.  <b>All support as revised.</b></p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R, M, D
	<p>Healthy Humboldt suggested IM's: 12-15-11                      In comments dated October 6, 2011, Healthy Humboldt suggested the following two additional implementation measures:</p> <p><a href="#">S-IM?. Impervious Cover Limits. Develop Impervious Cover Limits in flood-prone watersheds. Impervious cover includes buildings, roads and other surfaces which do not absorb storm water.</a></p> <p><a href="#">S-IM?. Zero Net Fill. Develop a "zero net fill" ordinance to address areas of the unincorporated County that are located within the 100-year FEMA flood hazard zones.</a></p> <p>The Commission directed staff to review these suggestions and return with a recommendation. Regarding the impervious cover limits, the Water Resources Element already contains similar implementation measures:</p> <p><b>WR-IM25. Drainage Ordinance.</b> The County shall develop and maintain an ordinance that regulates stormwater drainage consistent with the policies and standards of the Element.</p> <p><b>WR-IM26. Low Impact Development Methods.</b> Require projects to utilize best management practices for Low Impact Development to meet surface water run-off standards. <del>in</del> watersheds with known significant cumulative impacts from stormwater runoff.</p> <p>With respect to the zero net fill measure, the County's flood regulations essentially call for a zero or non-significant effect. Both proposed measures would be stricter and more prescriptive, and the Commission may select them as an "A" Alternative. Staff believes these issues are adequately addressed by existing proposed measures, and recommends they not be included.</p> <p><b>Straw vote:</b>                      Commissioner Faust supports both S-IM?1 and IM?2 (HH recommendations) and IM25, IM26;                      Commissioners Kreb and Gearheart support S-IM-?1, IM25, IM26;                      Commissioners Disiere Nelson Edmonds supports IM25, IM26 only</p>		<p>Split Vote for S-IM?1 3-3</p> <p>D Split Vote for S-IM?2 5-1</p>

Plan Alternative	Chapter 14 Safety Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><u>S-IMx3. Structural Hazards. The County shall assist property owners in making upgrades to existing structures to mitigate structural hazards.</u></p>	<p><b>NEW IM!</b> See discussion under P6</p>	<p>M Straw Vote 6-0</p>