DATE: August 9, 2007

TO: Humboldt County Planning Commission

FROM: Kirk A. Girard, Director of Community Development Services

SUBJECT: Staff Report #7 for August 16, 2007 Meeting

RECOMMENDED COMMISSION ACTION:
It is recommended that the Commission take the following actions:

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:
1. Open the public hearing and receive the staff report.
2. Take public input on Group 8 Sections: Agricultural Resources and Forest Resources
3. Provide Commission direction on suggested modifications.

SUMMARY

Planning Commission Review Process

At the Planning Commission's sixth meeting on July 26, 2007, the Commission received a staff report and discussed the proposed revisions to the Group 1-4 Chapters. These chapters included:

Chapter 1. Introduction
Chapter 2. Public Guide to the General Plan
Chapter 3. Governance Policy
Chapter 11. Economic Development Element
Chapter 16. Mineral Resources
Chapter 17. Energy Element
Chapter 18. Waste Management
Chapter 19. Air Quality
Chapter 20. Noise Element
Chapter 21. Safety Element

Also, additional public comments were received regarding the Conservation and Open Space Elements, Biological Resources, and Cultural and Scenic Resources chapters.

A summary of the public comments received at the July 26, 2007 meeting is included as Attachment A. A summary of the Commissioner comments is included as Attachment B.

Chapter 5 - Forest and Agricultural Resources Policies

The Planning Commission reviewed a draft Agriculture and Forest Resources Land Use Element for agricultural and timberlands in June of 2005 prepared based upon direction given by the Board of Supervisors. The June 2005 Draft included policies that proposed a Ranchlands (AGR) land use classification and an Industrial Timber (IT) land use classification. The proposed AGR designation made residential uses at a density of one unit per 600 acres maximum, and provided an "exit strategy" allowing
clustered development on portions of the land that might be suitable for residential development, with the remainder retained for agricultural production. The proposed IT designation made residential uses conditionally permitted, where necessary for timber management, at a density of one unit per 600 acres maximum, and allowed clustered development on portions of the land that might be suitable for residential development, with the remainder retained in timber production.

During the June 2005 meeting where this document was considered, the Planning Commission and members of the public questioned several aspects of the draft Element including whether the resource land base was in fact threatened by putting houses on timberlands. In response to input received on the Draft Land Use Element, the Planning Commission subsequently requested planning staff to:

- "re-visit forestry issues with the public and the FRC, providing more opportunities for stakeholder input;"
- "provide a discussion of the impacts of residential development on the resource land base; and"
- "provide a broader range of alternatives for resource lands which would include an alternative that provides a greater supply of developable lands for residential development."

Subsequent meetings with stakeholders, as discussed below, and the development of the draft Agricultural and Forest Resource policy documents (distributed during the July 26, 2007 Planning Commission meeting) fulfill this Planning Commission request.

Draft Agricultural Resource Policies

The draft Agricultural Resource policy document now contains a broader range of policy options including an alternative that provides greater supply of developable lands for housing (Alternative C) as requested by the Planning Commission during the June 2005 meeting (a one-page matrix has been included as Attachment C that highlights the major differences in these four alternatives).

Planning staff also met with representatives of the Farm Bureau, Cattleman’s and Buckeye Conservancy on June 12 to review the draft Agricultural Resource policies. Concerns were raised regarding cross-referencing policies that impact resource lands such as policies contained in the open space and conservation element with those in Chapter 5. There was a request for a definition of “entitlements” and an explanation as to how the proposed policies are different than the existing Framework Plan. Members of the Farm Bureau also suggested that a policy be included in the plan that supports a “no net loss of agricultural lands” from acquisition by public agencies. This policy option is intended to be included in the “Public Lands” section within Chapter 5. The Farm Bureau submitted written comments concerning the agricultural resources section that were distributed during the July 26 Planning Commission meeting.

Draft Forest Resource Policies

California Government Code Section 65302 requires that a general plan “designate a land use category that provides for timber production for those parcels of real property zoned for timber production pursuant to the California Timberland Productivity Act of 1982.” Sections 51101 and 51102 of the California Timberland Productivity Act provides specific policy guidance in developing the land use designation associated with timberlands, at least those timberlands classified as TPZ. Also, California Government Code Section 65302(e) requires that a general plan include an open-space element, as provided in Article 10.5, commencing with Section 65560. Section 65560(b) describes open-space land as including “open space used for the managed production of resources, including but not limited to forest lands.”

It should be noted that managing timber harvest practices is primarily the domain of the State and frustrations regarding specific regulations are best addressed by the agency that administers those regulations. In the context of the General Plan update, the County's role in timberlands management lies largely in ensuring a continuing stable land base, limiting incompatible uses, and managing land uses generally where houses meet or intermingle with undeveloped forestlands (currently identified in the attached policies as the Forestland-Residential Interface).

During the 2005 Planning Commission meeting, there was much discussion regarding the impacts of residential uses on timberlands and the timber industry as a whole. The Commission requested that this item be given further treatment and a range of policy options be provided for discussion by both the stakeholders and the Forestry Review Committee (FRC). Staff has provided a discussion in the policy
document and a range of alternatives that addresses this request. Staff has also meet with representatives of the industrial timber operators (PALCo, Green Diamond, Barnum Timber, Sierra Pacific and Bill Kleiner representing large TPZ landowners) and held three meetings with the FRC to specifically discuss the draft forest policies. The minutes of these meetings are included as Attachment D (please note that the minutes from the August 8th meeting have not been approved). The comment letters submitted to the FRC are included as Attachment E.

During the June 13th FRC meeting, the majority of time was spent on the staff presentation of the draft policies and public comments. The members were able to delve more deeply into the issues during the June 27th meeting. At this meeting, the Committee members identified seven key issues for discussion regarding the draft forest resources policies. These included:

- Compatible density in TPZ areas;
- Creation of new parcels;
- Patent parcels;
- Merger ordinance;
- Clustered development;
- JTMP process; and
- Policies for regulatory relief.

Much discussion on these items by the committee members ensued during both the June 27 and August 8th meetings (Attachment D).

The FRC took the following actions on these topics during the June 27, 2007 meeting:

**Merger:** “Motion to recommend the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors modify proposed Alternatives A and B to include rescinding the merger ordinance”. Motion by Rynearson, seconded by Fassler, motion passed unanimously.

**JTMP’s:** “Motion to recommend the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors support the continued use of the Joint Timber Management Plan process for subdivisions less than 160 acres in size, and to direct the Forestry Review Committee be directed to review standards and guidelines for consideration”. Motion by Rynearson, seconded by Able, motion passed unanimously.

**Clustered Development:** “Explore the clustered development option pending some clarification of the process and legal issues pertaining to TPZ lands and recognize that it may be an attempt to facilitate orderly development and protection of resource lands. We also request the final language of the clustered development policies be brought back to the Committee for review”. Motion by Valachovic, seconded by Able, motion passed unanimously.

**Reduce the Regulatory Burden:** “Motion to support reduced overlap of regulations, maintain property values, implement a Right to Harvest Ordinance, support the JTMP process, and support longer THP’s.”. Motion by Rynearson, seconded by Able, motion passed unanimously.

**Other Topics in the Forest Resources Chapter:** “Move to let the Commission know that if we aren’t able to meet and complete our review of the chapter before they have a hearing on it, we will be providing additional comments”. Motion by Rynearson, seconded by Able, motion carried unanimously.

The FRC took the following actions on these topics during the June 27, 2007 meeting:

**Second Units:** “Second units should be taken off the list of permitted uses on substandard TPZ parcels and should only be allowed provided that the second units are within the 3 acres conversion area already, or area intended to be converted.” (Motion by Mark Andre, seconded by Jim Able and approved unanimously)

Chair Steve Launi made the following motion, which died for lack of a second:
“Housing density on any TPZ parcel shall not be increased without proponent demonstrating feasibility of producing a continuous and or periodic supply of high quality forest products; or orderly progress toward that goal.”

Staff reviewed the FRC motions and have made revisions to the draft policy documented forwarded to the Planning Commission on July 26th. This included a new implementation measure for the JTMP process, as follows:

FR-IM7. Review Standards and Process of Joint Timber Management Plans (JTMP). Direct the Forestry Review Committee to review and provide recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on the standards for Joint Timber Management Plans and Guides for subdivisions of TPZ lands below 160 acres. Establish a process for review of all previously approved JTMP’s every 5 years for compliance.

Staff did not remove the implementation of the Merger Ordinance from Alternative A as recommended by the FRC as it was requested by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to provide a range of alternatives for the decision makers to review. It has been recommended for rescission in Alternatives B and C.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Summary of public comments at July 26th, 2007 meeting.
Attachment B: Summary of Commissioner comments at July 26th, 2007 meeting.
Attachment C: “Cheat sheet” matrix comparing the alternatives for ag and timber policies.
Attachment D: FRC minutes for the June 13, 27 and August 8, 2007 meetings.
Attachment E: Public comments submitted to the FRC.
Attachment A:

Summary of public comment recorded during the July 26, 2007 meeting.
### Verbal Public Comments
#### General Plan Update
##### Preliminary Hearing Draft
Planning Commission Hearing 7/26/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index #</th>
<th>Synopsis of comments received during Planning Commission meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V121</td>
<td>Janet Eidsness – Cultural Resources Chapter is inadequate in a number of ways. Submitted written comments on June 13. Chapter needs to clearly enforce laws required by State. Make County’s records accessible to the public. Be more of a partner. Good faith consultation with tribes. Submitted suggested revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V122</td>
<td>Tina Christensen – HAR. Conservation and Open Space. Doesn’t support recreation and conservation easement program. Not clear. There are existing programs that already work. TDR is supported, but it’s not practical. Needs to be defined better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V123</td>
<td>Bernie Haroldson – Biological Resources. Protection of natural resources is important, but it needs to be balanced with economic and social needs. Comparison chart needs to include a comparison to the existing plan. Much of this chapter is redundant with other ordinances, including State and federal requirements. There are enough protection measures in place already.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V124</td>
<td>Marianne Bithell. Waste Element. Revised chapter doesn’t include any revisions, which isn’t acceptable. New restrictions on pressure treated wood disposal. HWMA plan was supposed to be revised in 2005, and it still hasn’t been. The items I suggested earlier should be put into the Element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V125</td>
<td>Debbie Provolt. HAR – Cultural Resources chapter. Voting chart does not allow comparison with existing plan policies. Need glossary of terms. What does “enhancement” mean? Notification of buyers of cultural significance. Should be a part of the title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V127</td>
<td>Gordon Leppig – Fish and Game. July 17th letter submitted. Highlighted concerns in letter. County has lots of important biological resources. Many streams and rivers are impaired. Need to revise SMA buffers – they are narrower than DFG recommended buffers. May result in take of listed species. Include a clear set of wetland buffer standards where development would not be allowed. Wetland banking – there’s a need for it in Humboldt Bay and Eel River. County should work toward establishing one. Development within floodplains is mostly not compatible with biological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V128</td>
<td>Helene Rouvier – Likes rewrite of Humboldt Heritage Professional Network. Supports strong language for protection of our heritage. Will submit comments from the tribe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V129</td>
<td>Christine Champe – Biological Resources – protection of streams and wetlands is important. Act as wildlife corridors. Buffer widths are too narrow. Shouldn’t allow for removal of vegetation or snags. Also important for educational experience for kids. Supports comments of earlier speakers on strong cultural resource protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V130</td>
<td>Kay Backer – Safety Element. Should also consider Housing Element, Land Use, and Transportation. We have high crime rates – how is that addressed? Forcing housing into urban areas would cause higher crime. New roads are not going to be constructed. Who decided that? Selection of sites by commercial uses depends on access. Low crime rates are a part of the quality of life. Listed the factors that are most important for location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kathleen Stanton – Cultural Resources. Involved with putting Old Town and Ferndale on Historic register. Policies leave it up to staff to identify significance of cultural resources. An historical consultant needs to be hired to evaluate projects. Need more cooperation between Planning staff and the North Coast Information Center. Need to share information with realtors selling property. Just because something isn’t in a book, it doesn’t mean it’s not significant. Old tax assessors records are available – could be used to help identify resources.

Kermi Thobaben – Guiding Principles #9 – Re-clarity. #2 has been watered down to encourage development. There’s no definition of affordable housing. We need to have goals for each economic sector. Infill development will create more affordable housing. If you have to put in new roads, less likely to make affordable housing.

Jack Surmani – Habitat for Humanity. Likes incorporating models from other jurisdictions. Important to secure urban boundaries. Master of the Grange. We are an agricultural based group. We support infill. Important to protect ag lands, biological resources.

Thomas Gates – North Coast Information Center. Cultural Resources chapter. He’s available for consultation. P 15 1-2 recognizes importance of cultural resources – supports that language. We only know about records that have already been documented. We miss things where they haven’t been surveyed and there is no information – need to fill that gap. We need a historic resources commission. Certified status requires it. Could add historic preservation seats on the Planning Commission as an alternative. Tribe will be submitting additional comments.

Jim Zoellick – Revised Energy Element. Staff did a good job integrating public comments into revised draft. Supports Alternative A. Alternative B is my second choice. We need an Element. State is increasingly recognizing the importance of energy elements. Greenhouse gas emissions limits are tied to an energy element. Land use decisions have impacts on energy uses. Smart growth is part of the States energy reduction goals. EP-1 – Energy Authority – needs to be fully implemented.

Joyce King. Health care professional. Open space is important to mental health – recommends the open space element reflect that. Our patients responded best to climax ecosystems. Sustainable, garden like quality. Artists are attracted to them. We’re losing those places. Mental health patients should visit them once a day. Watershed based open space plan would allow for that accessibility.

Suzanne Guerra. Has lots of historic preservation credentials. Supports Plan A. Certified Local Government Program. The policies that would be involved are implemented widely outside the County. There is a State program to help local jurisdictions to tailor its historical preservation program to meet its needs. Preservation of structures have multiple benefits – not only for cultural resource protection, also for waste reduction energy conservation. County needs to take a leadership role in the preservation of historical resources.

Charles Ciancio. RPF. Submitted written comments. There are problems that need to be address. Here’s a short list. No sense in Ch 14 to do all the things done b other agencies. Pen space and development concerns. Illegal building and lack of enforcement. Less production of resources will result as a result of these policies. TDR and clustered schemes need to be researched. Flowchart shows how to protect open space by not running off the land owners. Shutting down agriculture will cause more importing of food. Submitted written comments.

Dan Opalach. Submitted a letter from Green Diamond. Impacts on TPZ land owners. It will be difficult to comprehend all of the policies because they are scattered throughout all the chapters. Need an analysis of the comprehensive
| V140 | Nick Angeloff, Bear River Band. Needs clear policies regarding coordination with tribes. Needs to clearly reflect federal and State law. Early consultation is important. County should become a certified local government. Supports a historic preservation commission. Cultural, tourism, educational values. |
| V141 | Michael Winkler. Energy Element. Rising gas prices are going to impact the County. County could be more proactive. Generation of renewable energy resources. Supports compact development, Alternative A. Supports Alternative B if Alternative A is not chosen. |
| V142 | Jennifer Kalt. Botanist and Basket Weavers Association member. I've heard from other speakers that we don't want duplicative regulations. From what I understand, part of the purpose of the General Plan is to clarify what State laws apply. The County often approves projects that aren't consistent with State law. For example, there was a mini storage structure built on top of a wetland, which is not consistent with CEQA. I support the County hiring a biologist. The Coastal Commission does have laws that are duplicative. |
| V143 | Bob Bronkall – Public Works. Need to have policies that allow for public roads to gain access to areas, including open space. |
| V144 | Jim Hoff – Ch 14 – Biological Resources. Policies which encourage infill development. But there are policies that would make infill development impossible. Wetland buffer policy – “significant” buffer – not clear, but could apply to marginal wetlands. No policies to allow for mitigation of wetland impacts. Need clear and concise policies that allow development in wetland areas if 1 ½ mitigation provided onsite, offsite, or in mitigation banks. Infill development policies will be hollow otherwise. Parcels with public water, sewer and roads should have special allowances to encourage development. |
Attachment B:

Summary of Commissioner comments recorded during the July 26, 2007 meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Synopsis of comments received during Planning Commission meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gearheart</td>
<td>Put comments in a separate notebook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Should we go through chapter by chapter?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Response: Some chapters reviewed by your Commission only had light treatment in terms of your review. There was a fair amount of discussion on Chapters 1 – 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We hear a lot of public comment comparing the proposals with the existing framework plan – is there a problem with that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: In some of the comparison charts, staff failed to include the existing framework plan policies. We can put that in. We can put notes such as “modified from the Framework Plan”. It wouldn’t work well in some of these Elements to do a markup from the Framework Plan because they are so different. Biological Resources we could do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gearhart</td>
<td>Cultural and Scenic Resources. Interested in designating scenic routes. Particularly the corridor between Eureka and Arcata. Work with CalTrans, State Scenic Highways. Even without that though, the views should be protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman</td>
<td>How far do we want to go with the Plan – it’s supposed to be a general plan. What’s the proper level of detail? We can’t solve all the County’s problems in a general plan, which is supposed to be focused on land use. Future amendments. The more detailed we make it, the longer it will take to create it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I concur with a lot of that, but we have to meet requirements of State law and reflect the results of all the scoping. Looking forward to comments from Dr. Gates. Heard a lot of concerns from developers. Support of more environmentally friendly alternative will result in less intrusion from the state. Take for instance, initiatives that will lock up all the commercial timberland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murguia</td>
<td>Comments on energy plan. A &amp; B will cause less trips that will result in less energy use. But there are other factors that come into play. Price of gasoline, for instance, may result in fewer trips regardless of the alternatives we select. Look out for terms like “significantly significant”. Quantity of material is difficult to deal with. Hope we make something that will be useful. Should be modified regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Ch 18 – Waste management. Looking for waste reduction goals – particularly construction waste. Not only should we require reduction, but also programs to encourage recycling of that material. Are there policies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: the Waste Management Plan is an attachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I saw that, but I didn’t see anything that will help a contractor reduce their construction waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R: two programs –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe these programs are ok and I don’t know enough about them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Kelly | Ch 21 – Safety. This was brought up at a previous meeting – doesn’t address road safety. Needs to be integrated with transportation element policies.  
R: that would be a unique approach  
But we deal with Airport safety…  
R: we’ll look at it |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Kelly | Ch 12. Open Space – Conservation easements can they be handled through the Williamson Act?  
R: The Williamson Act involves a contract that has specific requirements.  
Couldn’t do a Williamson contract on a riparian area. They are both incentive programs – tax benefits for ag. |
| Kelly | Open Space – Recreation. I want a goal for acquiring a public forest near community centers. We need public recreation forests. Relieves private forests. Provide a resource that’s in high demand, and would accommodate mental health needs. Would provide a buffer. Arcata Community Forest is a good example, can be managed sustainably. |
| Kelly | Wetlands bank – there aren’t any good ones, is that something the County could take on?  
R: the County has looked at it in the past. Fish and Game is now supportive of it, which is different than in the past.  
It would encourage more efficient development.  
R: Mad river bridge replacement is a good example of how it could work well.  
I’m not interested in a reduction of wetlands, and the ratio of areas needs to be looked at. |
| Kelly | Cultural resources. Glossary comments make sense. Needs more information about the certified local government program – pro and con.  
R: a certified program is possible. The cities have one, in the County, the buildings are more dispersed, so it may be more difficult. |
| Smith | As demand for cork wanes, the cork forests of Spain will put more pressure for development of the forests. If we don’t want beef, we don’t need cows.  
The more we try to protect some resources, the less protection they will receive. Forestland, ag lands protection policies could result in the conversion of those lands. The policies could have the opposite effect of the goal. We’ve heard many people say our policies maybe redundant with State policies. Those concerns have merit. Sometimes it might not be such a bad thing of be redundant, but we need to have our eyes open. Would like an analysis of overlap of policies with other jurisdictions policies. Does our policy add value? Compile it as we go along, maybe. It’s something the Commission should be looking at. |
| Herman | Conservation and open space. Recreation and conservation easement program. Is this something new? Or is it existing.  
R: The County does have a small program. It’s a requirement of State law to have an action plan. County’s program helps with appraisal cost of easement, and we’ve participated with the conservation of 46,000 acres. It |
seems to be working pretty well. We’re not forcing the owners to do it, they are sometimes getting millions of dollars in return, and the County gets continued production of resource lands. There are instances where in exchange for ag protection easements, densities that would have not been allowed. In Sonoma, they offer development incentives in exchange for protection of ag lands. It’s a form of mitigation, then.
R:
What are tax benefits?
R: Property tax benefits.
But the County is losing tax revenue.
Meeting continued to the 16th of August.
Attachment C:
Matrix Comparing the Alternatives for the draft Ag and Timber policies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Framework Plan</th>
<th>Existing Framework Standards</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO clustering program</strong></td>
<td>GEP findings can be made. L.L.A’s allowed regardless of existing environmental conditions.</td>
<td>Adjustments: Local Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County to follow up with amendment and zone.</td>
<td><strong>PRD Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90% project (environmental)</td>
<td><strong>CRD Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing environmental when</td>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% project (environmental)</td>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing environmental when</td>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
<td><strong>B.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Yes - Make density findings** | C. Recognize that for cluster housing, a) zoning may be necessary at the front of an existing development, or b) in the case of an unzoned area, a) a zoning change may be necessary, or b) a separate rezoning notice is required. |
| | C. Recognize that for cluster housing, a) zoning may be necessary at the front of an existing development, or b) in the case of an unzoned area, a) a zoning change may be necessary, or b) a separate rezoning notice is required. |
| | Yes - No density findings | C. Recognize that for cluster housing, a) zoning may be necessary at the front of an existing development, or b) in the case of an unzoned area, a) a zoning change may be necessary, or b) a separate rezoning notice is required. |
| **Yes** | **B.** | **B.** |

Revised date: 6/13/07

Alternate Compliance Matrix - AG Policies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Framework Plan</th>
<th>Subdivision Standards</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support conversion of agricultural lands of special scenic resources, etc. (AG-P19)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>AE lands might be eligible for conversion to non-agricultural uses</td>
<td>AE lands</td>
<td>AE lands plan, AG-P21, AG-P23, AG-P24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export of water (AG-P19)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AE lands plan, AG-P21, AG-P23, AG-P24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelts (AG-P19)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AE lands plan, AG-P21, AG-P23, AG-P24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District open space (AG-P19)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AE lands plan, AG-P21, AG-P23, AG-P24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE lands use conversion (AG-P19)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>AE lands</td>
<td>AE lands</td>
<td>AE lands plan, AG-P21, AG-P23, AG-P24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revised draft 6/19/07**

**Alternatives Comparison Matrix - AG Policies**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Framework Plan</th>
<th>Existing Framework Plan</th>
<th>No Existing Framework Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No density</td>
<td>Yes - make density findings</td>
<td>Yes - make density findings</td>
<td>No - make density findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CUP</td>
<td>No CUP</td>
<td>No CUP</td>
<td>No CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 160 acres</td>
<td>160 acres</td>
<td>160 acres</td>
<td>160 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 acres</td>
<td>160 acres</td>
<td>160 acres</td>
<td>160 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework Plan</td>
<td>Option C</td>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>Option A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revised: 6/13/07
Alternatives Comparison Matrix - Forest Policies
Forestry Review Committee  
June 13, 2007 Meeting Minutes

DATE: June 15, 2007
TO: Forestry Review Committee (FRC)
FROM: Martha Spencer, Planning Staff
SUBJECT: Draft Minutes for the Forestry Review Committee (FRC) Meeting of Wednesday June 13, 2007

I. Attendance

FRC Members Present: Chris Carroll, Yana Valachovic, Steve Launi, Mark Andre, Jim Able and Joe Fassler (FRC Members Absent: Gary Rynearson)
Staff Present: Martha Spencer, Tom Hofweber and Michael Richardson (Planning) and Linda Hill, Assessor (non-voting member)

II. Public Appearances

The public members present indicated that they were attending primarily to participate in the discussion of the items on the agenda.

III. Approval of December 20, 2006 Meeting Minutes

On a motion of Jim Able seconded by Chris Carroll, the Minutes were approved as written by a vote of 4-0 (Mark Andre and Joe Fassler were not in attendance for the December 20th meeting and therefore abstained from voting).

IV. New Business - General Plan Update – Draft Forest Resources Policies

Chairman Launi asked staff to present the staff report. Martha Spencer presented the Preliminary Draft Forest Resources Chapter of the General Plan. Committee members asked questions of staff and suggested several minor revisions. The public meeting was opened to receive comments from the public on the draft chapter. The public provided testimony (See attached list of speakers and summary of comments), and after hearing from all the public that wanted to speak, Chairman Launi brought the item back to the FRC for consideration. He passed out recommended draft policy statement language for
consideration by the FRC. The other FRC members and the public commented on the proposed language and asked questions. The FRC members present requested additional time to review the draft language prior to any committee action and that the meeting be continued to another time.

On a motion by Yana Valachovic and a second by Chris Carroll, all the members present unanimously voted to continue the meeting to June 27, 2007 in the Board of Supervisors Chamber.

V. Old Business: None

VI. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm.

The next meeting was tentatively scheduled for June 27, 2007 at the Board Chambers in the County Courthouse.
Synopsis of Comments
Forest Resources Chapter Review
Forestry Review Committee Meeting June 13, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Forestry Review Committee Questions and Comments and Staff Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division of forest lands into more than 4 parcels would be a major subdivision, correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: yes. We're not sure if the Board of Forestry is going to accept the policy or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where did the 90%/95% standard for forest land protection in the Planned Rural Development policy come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: It was developed by staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do we have examples of the clustering program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: There have been conservation easements in exchange for subdivision allowances, but they haven't been done to the extent proposed here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would monitoring occur?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: Monitoring would be done at the building permit issuance stage. We hope to have support from persons or groups involved with forest conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Open Space Element, there are land use considerations of forest lands – there’s some overlap then between the Forest Resources policies and the Open Space Element?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: Yes, there are 4 types of open space defined by State law, and in forest lands you have all those happening, so there’s a lot of overlap. The Open Space Element refers to the Forest Resources Chapter for handling the forestry related issues. The County doesn’t get involved much in forest practices because the State retains most of the regulatory jurisdiction. Policies in the Open Space Element were designed to be consistent with the Forest Practice Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many parcels would meet the criteria for clustered development? There are a lot of criteria that have to apply, and it doesn’t seem like many areas will qualify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: We don’t expect there to be high demand for this program. There are some clustered development policies in the Eel River Area Plan that have never been used. It may apply well to old mill sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New homes will be allowed “in areas of lowest productivity”. Most of the lowest value timberland have other constraints like steep slopes and wetlands. How is that factored in?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: This part of the policy is consistent with the Timber Production Zone (TPZ). We recognize there may be a conflict, but the policy needs to be consistent with the TPZ zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there currently a policy that ties subdivision of forestland with infrastructure costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How detailed do you want us to get in our review of the chapter? Response: Get into it in as much detail as you feel appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca Division of Forestry – should be changed to California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to add terms to the glossary, such as “working lands”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy FR-P1 – What are the strategic planning efforts to create a regulatory system that encourages the continued productivity of timberlands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: We’re going to support CDF’s ongoing strategic planning effort regarding fire planning, fuel reduction, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5-3.6 “Biomass conversion” should be changed to “biomass to energy conversion”. Also had a comment about fuel loading. Page 5-3.5 Don’t need “voluntary” in the policy language– all conservation easements are voluntary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR-P7 Whose program is innovative? Seems like a judgment. Also mentioned P-10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestland Residential Interface (FRI) is a major policy area for us. Overlay zone – what does it mean, how does it work to minimize conflicts? Response there’s an implementation program that would have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to prescribe specific standards.
Does that mean the County is going to go through all theses areas to find out where the haul routes should be? That’s a big job.
Response: No we’d just define the standards.
So how would this zone be implemented then? Is a permit required?
Response: Each of the alternatives would have different areas with the overlay zone. Alternative A would have the most land with the FRI zone, and Alternative C would have less. When the County requires a permit for timber harvesting, we’d require conformance with those standards. The County could also get involved with review of timber harvest plans reviewed by CDF. And a Right to Harvest policy would apply in these zones.
Did we decide this is something the County should do? Timber Harvest Plan (THP) rules are pretty involved, so it seems duplicative.
Response: This would be an implementation measure for one of the goals to reduce conflicts between timber production and other land uses.
Is this something that would show up in the Joint Timber Management Plan (JTMP) process?
Response: The zones would be mapped. Notice of Right to Harvest would occur with each title change. We’d be involved with CDF in THP operations to minimize complaints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ali Freeland:</strong> When does public comment period end?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: not until the Board of Supervisors (BOS) acts on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will it go back to the FRC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response: it’s up to the FRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the 160 acre minimum parcel size. Mostly I like Alternative A, and some of Alternative B. Concerned about the Zone amendments criteria. The clustered Planned Rural Development program – I have issue with the B-7 zoning – it needs to be permanent protection. No issue w/ 90 – 95% criteria. There are lots of illegal subdivisions on TPZ lands. How does the General Plan deal with that? There should be a full disclosure law to apply to TPZ lands. Lots of little things – will follow up with a letter for those. Public services to support timber production. We need County subsidy of mills to keep them running. County could pass supportive legislation or direct financial subsidy. Zone amendments – expansion of existing community. What is the limit that can be considered under this policy? It should be stated. How many of these clusters are there going to be? When combined with fuel reduction programs and other cumulative conversions, there could be more conversion of forest lands under this program than anticipated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Max Kaufman:** I’m for Alternative A. In the matrix, Alternatives B and C are too similar, and they have more environmental impacts. If you allow rezoning 10% per year under the PRD program, you’d lose the whole forest in 10 years. Zone amendments – what does it mean to allow “expansion of the community”. We should limit that. Read quote. People come to Humboldt because of the forests. Allowing conversion of forestland would be a mistake. |

| **Maggie Herbelin:** She printed something and read it into the record. The Humboldt Bay Watershed Council comments. Spoke of the fact that the headwaters to the streams and rivers that flow into Humboldt Bay occur on forestland. We need to prevent soil erosion to minimize impacts to salmonids from timber production. |

| **Charles Clancio:** Passed out a letter and summarized for the FRC. |
| We are just concerned with lands zoned TPZ. right? (Response from FRC members - yes). Then I don’t understand why we’re here. There hasn’t been any significant forest conversion in the past. There’s duplicating regulations all over the place. There’s no Registered Professional Foresters (RPF) on County staff, so it’s going to cost a bundle to implement these policies. Forest land isn’t going to be converted because of all the constraints – slope, etc. Really what we’re here for is for the open space |
values of forestland. The County's going to insert themselves when there is no problem in the first place. Drop the idea of "economic viability". I've got a 13 acre parcel that I've logged 3 times. The open space focus doesn't fit. Illegal subdivisions are a problem. You need to enforce the existing rules. Those that benefit from public services need to pay their fair share. Development isn't paying it's fair share. They raise tax base, but they're not paying their fair share. You are affecting land use. We don't know where the numbers are coming from. Conservation easements, carbon sequestration units - there are problems that need to be recognized. They reduce resource use. You lose the resource, you lose the infrastructure. There's a ripple effect. Residential development of forest land can be a good thing: increased storage of water, more eyes on the land. Clustering policy scares me. Stick with Option D. More regulation adds to reduction of open space.

**Larry Evans:** The development pressures seen in Santa Cruz and Mendocino County are coming here. I support Option A. Consistent with 1982 Timber Productivity Act. Need a glossary and definitions. FR-P4 needs to specify acreage. Supports Cooperative Plans. P-10 should be credible, not greenwash. P12 - use "shall" instead of "should". P14 should only support rezoning in the case of errors. P15, 19, 20 & 21 - these sections are ambiguous. Not adequate protection. P26 Secure revenues - state how this will occur. S2 - "significant improvements" - need to define those better. S3 - it remains unresolved. S4 needs clarification. Dropping industrial timber zoning is a mistake. Proposed revisions by the Industry group will gut the forest land protections of the proposed alternative.

**Liz Finger:** The County is going to see development pressure in timberlands that will have a cumulative effect on water, septic, inadequate fire protection & public safety. Non Industrial Timber Management Plan (NTMP) oversight doesn't adequately address conflicts between timber production and residential uses. Concerned about the policy that allows conversion of forest land to provide for the expansion of communities. Don't support conversion of timberland. I support Option A. There's going to be a lot of pressure on the County to allow conversion of timberland. Economic viability - who defines it? Define sensitive habitats. Who's going to pay for long term cost of infrastructure needed for timber production? Roads, safety of roads, water, sewer?

**Bob Morris:** Passed out a letter. Read it into the record. Staff is submitting the same document over and over again. The chapter wasn't prepared by an RPF. It shows ignorance of staff to the important issues. The biggest concern is treated last in the chapter. The top 3 issues aren't even addressed. Common thread is - you can be a landowner, but don't assume you have any property rights. There are other incentives that could be brought in. Substandard TPZ parcels...the County made most of them when it adopted the 160 acre TPZ zoning. The answer is to allow substandard parcels to be rezoned to something like Forest Recreation. There are government policies that are taking lands out of timberland base. There are fewer pulp mills now, which impacts the amount of timber harvested. The Headwaters forest purchase didn't result in adequate compensation for the loss in timber revenues. Fragmentation & parcelization - land ownership policies are dynamic. Market forces apply. Can the County stop it? I doubt it. CUP requirements would be a new requirement in TPZ lands. I don't think any of them will be allowed. Affordable housing will result with more residences in TPZ lands due to supply and demand. On-site residence and caretaker are a positive for timber production. We don't need more regulation, we need reduced regulations and policies to make public forest lands more productive. No removal of lands from tax base, such as purchase by public agencies.

**Jennifer Culp.** California Native Plant Society representative – 300 members. Open space, habitat protection, clean water are the big issues. Want the chapter to allow the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) for people that want to get out of the timber business, but don't want to convert forest lands to non timber uses. What happened to recreational opportunities in forest lands? I don't see it addressed in here. Hills outside of McKinleyville & Fieldbrook would be prime for TDR programs. Another concern is fire safe zones required. Cleared areas are invaded by non native invasive species. We need requirements controlling the landscaping put into these areas. P-1A Seems to be in state law already. Supports Alternative A because it follows State Law. Supports clustered subdivisions, but protections need to be permanent.
Tom Waltz: Representing the industrial timberland managers - We got together and sent a copy of edits. Summary: Our proposal should be made Plan B. It’s important to not limit it to TPZ land, the policies should also apply to small (10 ac) working forests. Rural residences are out there now. We want the plan to allow for orderly growth. Density credits should be given for the length of time a property is maintained as open space. Longer duration = more credits. It should be in 20 year intervals. The forest land protections under the PRD program should change every 20 years just like General Plan changes every 20 years. Subdivision policies – we added language. FRI should apply to residential side, not the forest side.

Steve Horner: Represent the Barnum Timber Co, a family forest owner. Seconded Tom Waltz comments. Wants minutes of merger meeting to be incorporated into this record. Need more data for recommendations. Clustering may not be allowed by CDF. Needs to be checked. Attachment A needs more analysis. FRC needs to comment. Don’t abdicate your responsibility to staff. Need to continue this meeting to allow for more time to review the material and comments.

Dan Opilach: Green Diamond. Options A and B are a catastrophe – taking away property rights and adding regulatory hurdles. Environmentally protective Alternative A – I challenge the conclusion that Alternative A is more environmentally protective than Alternative C. There are diminishing returns. Doesn’t believe that conversion is an issue. Regulatory costs are crushing the timberland owners. Where are the incentives, where are the benefits to timberland owners? Seconds Chuck Ciancio and Bob Morris. Cannel is not appropriate for clustered homesites – safety issues. We would not put houses next to our major haul route.

Mark Lovelace. Overlapping regulations are a problem. General Plan doesn’t really deal with that much because it’s mostly related to land use, not regulating timber production. Forest landowner’s interest is not necessarily aligned with the role of the FRC. The strategy for keeping land in timber production shouldn’t involve allowing subdivision of timberlands. I have problems with clustering, including land use conflicts, service costs, reduction of forest land base. Substitute Transfer of Development Rights program. Has lots more information. Will submit more detailed comments.

Julie Williams. (Private citizen) Not comfortable with staff drafting the chapter. The FRC should draft it. You are affecting property rights. Need glossary and definitions. General Plan amendments aren’t a loophole, they are required by State law. Infrastructure impacts of rural residential developments are bunk. There aren’t any. TDR programs look nice, but don’t work because there are no receiving areas. Staff analysis should stay in the Plan. It’s up to the General Plan to deal with overlapping regulations. There’s too many of them. With the proposed policies, BOS approval will be required for refinancing forest lands even for things such as college tuition. You need to go directly to the Planning Commission.

Final Forestry Review Committee Questions and Comments and Staff Responses

Steve Launi - Some of our advice got dropped out. Acreage isn’t a good way to judge productivity. This has been a 7 year process. This committee is charged with the maintenance of forest land and forest land productivity. I’ve prepared a draft forest policy statement for consideration;

“For any unit of land area (defined as an Assessor’s Parcel), currently zoned, or proposed to be zoned TPZ; there shall be no subdivision, lot line adjustment, consolidation of contiguous parcels, or residential development deemed compatible on subject parcel, unless it can be clearly demonstrated that, subsequent to the action, a periodic and/or continuous revenue stream from forest products production shall be maintained.”

“For any such unit of land area, a history of forest products production, including operations within the past 3 years, shall be deemed as meeting the above criteria. Possession of an approved timber harvesting plan (THP, or NTMP), specifying a selective or intermediate harvesting system, or an SYP, for each subject future assessor’s parcel, shall likewise be deemed as meeting the above criteria.”
Discussion of the proposed statements among the FRC members followed:
Question about Assessor’s Parcel versus legal parcel.
What are you going to do with a tan oak forest with 4 fir on it?
I’m not sure if any JTMP properties have generated logs. I’m trying to close loopholes in the existing policy.
Past performance doesn’t indicate future productivity.
THP’s and NTMP’s are indicators of productivity. They show us you’re in business. We need to incentivize those that have demonstrated past productivity.
How do you assess future productivity?
Who makes the call?
CDF would.
Yes, but it doesn’t say that.
What are the other criteria?
Photos, growth and yield tables, other things… it’s a little subjective. JTMP’s just aren’t successful.
We don’t need to recommend the staff prepared forest resources chapter, do we? We can change it, right? Staff response: yes, you can recommend whatever you want. What would be most helpful to us is feedback on whether we’ve got a good range of alternatives.
DRAFT

Forestry Review Committee
June 27, 2007 Meeting Minutes

DATE: July 2, 2007
TO: Forestry Review Committee (FRC)
FROM: Martha Spencer, Planning Staff
SUBJECT: Draft Minutes for the Forestry Review Committee (FRC) Meeting of Wednesday June 27, 2007

I. Attendance

FRC Members Present: Chris Carroll, Yana Valachovic, Mark Andre, Joe Fassler, Gary Rynearson and Jim Able (FRC Members Absent: Steve Launi)
Staff Present: Martha Spencer, Tom Hofweber and Michael Richardson (Planning)

II. Public Appearances

The public members present indicated that they were attending primarily to participate in the discussion of the items on the agenda.

III. Approval of June 13, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The Vice Chairman noted that there was no real action taken at the last meeting, so they questioned whether the minutes needed to be put to a vote. None of the members present expressed the need for changes to the minutes.

IV. New Business - General Plan Update – Draft Forest Resources Policies

Vice Chairman Andre asked staff to present the staff report. Martha Spencer talked about the review of the Draft Forest Resources Chapter of the General Plan Update that occurred at the June 13, 2007 meeting. She reiterated some points about what staff would like the FRC to provide direction on, and what the role of the FRC is. Committee members asked questions of staff, and presented their views and expressed what they would like the public testimony to focus on.

The public meeting was opened to receive comments from the public on the draft chapter. The public provided testimony (See attached list of speakers and summary of comments),
and after hearing from all the public that wanted to speak, Vice Chairman Andre brought the item back to the FRC for consideration. He identified seven key items for the FRC to address in the Forest Resources Chapter of the General Plan Update:

- Compatible density in TPZ areas;
- Creation of new parcels;
- Patent parcels;
- Merger ordinance;
- Clustered development;
- JTMP process; and
- Policies for regulatory relief.

The FRC took the following actions on these topics:

**Merger:** Motion to recommend the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors modify proposed Alternatives A and B to include rescinding the merger ordinance. Ryneanson motion, Fassler second, motion passed unanimously.

**JTMP's:** Motion to recommend the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors support the continued use of the Joint Timber Management Plan process for subdivisions less than 160 acres in size, and to direct the Forestry Review Committee be directed to review standards and guidelines for consideration. Motion by Ryneanson, seconded by Able, motion passed unanimously.

**Clustered Development:** Explore the clustered development option pending some clarification of the process and legal issues pertaining to TPZ lands and recognize that the it may be an attempt to facilitate orderly development and protection of resource lands. We also request the final language of the clustered development policies be brought back to the Committee for review. Yana motioned, Able seconded, motion passed unanimously.

**Reduce the Regulatory Burden:** Motion to support reduced overlap of regulations, maintain property values, implement a Right to Harvest Ordinance, support the JTMP process, and support longer THP's. Motion made by Ryneanson, seconded by Able, motion carried unanimously.

**Other Topics in the Forest Resources Chapter**
Move to let the Commission know that if we aren't able to meet and complete our review of the chapter before they have a hearing on it, we will be providing additional comments. Motion by Ryneanson, seconded by Able, motion carried unanimously.

**V. Old Business: None**

**VI. Adjournment:** Meeting adjourned at 10:30 pm.

The next meeting to discuss the Preliminary Draft Forest Resources Chapter was not scheduled.
## Synopsis of Comments
### Forest Resources Chapter Review
### Forestry Review Committee Meeting June 27, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forestry Review Committee Questions and Comments and Staff Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify when a special permit is required. <em>Response from staff:</em> It’s not – it’s recommended in Alternative B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the charter of the Forestry Review Committee (FRC)?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t really separate the technical aspects of forestry and the politics of forestry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t see how making smaller Timber Production Zone (TPZ) lots is going to increase productivity. Increased regulations are a problem, but our concern is increased productivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for TPZ zoning is in Government code. There is some information being distributed re: devaluing TPZ property. There are ways to get out of the TPZ lands. TPZ land isn’t for residential devilment – it’s for timber production, so I’m puzzled why we would want to increase residential density in TPZ areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the last meeting, there was testimony that you can have a good 10 acre timber producing parcel, and there are benefits to more residents on adjacent lands, but we can’t control who owns neighboring lots. We are looking at lot size and tax benefits. I’m interested to hear testimony on those.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of the FRC – both technical and more general</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis of the Forest Resources Chapter is on TPZ lands. Supposedly there’s not been a whole lot of land taken out of TPZ. There’s a lot of illegal homes out there. Building homes is a hard task. If those people who built them illegally had done it with a permit, chances are the homes wouldn’t be there because it is so difficult. You have to put in roads, water systems, sewer, all that. There can be timber production on small parcels. There are some advantages to residential use in TPZ lands – have to bring roads up to code, for one. Problem is with enforcement of existing rules. Small parcels in other states still provides for timber production. If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How are residences allowed in TPZ lands? What does it mean to be “accessory”. <em>Response from staff:</em> Presently there is no connection between allowing residences and a demonstration that timber production is occurring. That’s why we are suggesting a special permit or use permit be required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>List of 7 key issues:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compatible density in TPZ areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creation of new parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Patent parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Merger ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clustered development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- JTMP process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Policies for regulatory relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>We are subject to the Brown Act. Notice of all TPZ owners did not occur, and is not required by the Brown Act.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merger:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’ve got a motion to rescind merger on the table from a previous meeting. We also are supposed to be the lead group for developing the Forest Resources. The merger ordinance is confusing, poorly written, it would be a financial burden, and it is unfair to people. <em>Response from staff:</em> The motion was “don’t enact it”, it wasn’t “rescind the ordinance”. Rynearson motion, Joe second. Modify A and B to include rescinding merger. <em>Response from staff:</em> we need to develop a range, so you don’t need to modify Alternative A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Merger: (continued)

What does it mean “to make findings for consistency with the General Plan“? Response from staff: On substandard parcels, you may not be able to get a building permit if issuing the permit would be inconsistent with the policies of the Open Space Element.

What is a substandard parcel? Response from staff: Right now parcels less than 40 acres in size are substandard.

The County created those substandard parcels. There was a 20 acre option, but it was never enacted.

The Joint Timber Management Plan (JTMP) process was put in place in 1982, something like that.

What is the advantage of merging parcels? What are the benefits?

Larger parcels would lead to increased productivity.

But that depends on the ownership.

How would it affect me if I had a 30 acre TPZ parcel?

It would reduce your entitlements.

Call the question (motion was unanimously approved)

JTMP’s

Plans may or may not be updated as they are supposed to. The County doesn’t have funding to update those. The mapping required of applicants has improved.

People who own timberland don’t know what they’re doing. The purpose of the JTMP is to give consultant advice to landowners. It’s evolved such that it isn’t being used for that.

There’s a basic need for an affidavit that the property owner signs that he agrees to manage the timber resource on their property according to the JTMP. Could the JTMP serve as that vehicle?

We need to make them more specific and direct, to give people a better idea of techniques for managing the timber resources, so they can become better stewards. Could we heavily encourage new property owners to talk to professionals? We need to get them to be more attached to the land. For those that aren’t practicing good timberland management, they should get notices prompting them into action. We need more of a consultation and referral process

If I start from a 160 acre parcel and subdivide to 4 parcels with a JTMP, what do I need to do to build a home? Response from staff: Just a building permit. You could limit the entitlements as part of the subdivision process. With a conveyance of development rights, for example, you could create a parcel only for timber production.

How do new landowners get noticed of a JTMP on their property? Response from staff: It shows up in the title report and the Codes, Covenants and Restrictions (CCR’s) that would show up on the property deed.

There are State requirements for a JTMP. We were saying the JTMP needs to be able to adapt over time. We called it a “Guide” to make it more adaptable, and to get around State requirements.

Can we continue this item and do some more research? Response from staff: You could recommend the FRC be directed to review standards and guidelines for consideration. Motion by Rynearson to support the continued use of the JTMP for subdivisions less than 160 acres in size, and to direct the FRC to do that. Second by Able.

Do we want to include a discussion? (Motion was unanimously approved without being amended)
Clustered Development

What is it (the clustered development policies) trying to prevent? Response from staff: You’re trying to keep larger lots for better timber management. In Alternative A, it would be in lieu of (required). And there’s an incentive with clustering. Also get smaller parcel sizes, maybe less development costs.

Right now it’s a 40 acre minimum parcel size.

What does CDF say? (Everyone looked at committee member Joe Fassler from CDF)

CDF may not allow it. The code says 160 acre minimum. It didn’t envision this.

Response from staff: The plan would have to support it, and we’d need to do a rezone out of TPZ as part of the subdivision process.

Right now I’m allowed to do a conversion of 3 acres.

Response from staff: If the homesites are converted, the County is going to want to rezone it.

It sounds complicated and confusing and it hasn’t been figured out all the way, I’m not sure its going to result in increased timber production. It’s ahead of our time.

But then a planned subdivision through this is better than unplanned — look at southern Humboldt for the unplanned option results.

This would also require a JTMP for all the parcels.

In theory it could work well. It may work better for agricultural use. There’s opportunity with it.

I think you’d go through a lot of trouble, without much participation. We need to get some answers from CDF.

How would the process be different? Response from staff: We’d have trained staff, and they’d get increased entitlements by doing the clustering.

The FRC called on an industry representative to answer questions: (Bill Blackwell) The industrial timberland owners want more entitlements and shorter time periods for protection of remainder property. Concentrate development nearer to roads. Residential value of a 2 acre building site is about as much as a 40 acre building site. We see people moving into the forestland area, and we can’t compete with residential land values. We’re looking to try to control growth. Buildout on every parcels with an entitlements would be a nightmare, so we are looking for an alternative. Need some legal consultation before it gets implemented.

It’s a complex topic, not sure the committee is ready.

But large parcels are easier to manage than smaller parcels. I think the FRC should explore it; we should talk about lot sizes and incentivising the program.

I’d be ok with leaving it as an option. I don’t agree with the statement that bigger is better.

But what about the Southern Humboldt example?

That’s a problem with enforcement.

But from a water quality management and forest management policy…

I’ve seen some good examples of small owners with productive timberlands.

We’re not talking about requiring it.

It’s got positives and negatives.

What is the tax benefit from smaller parcels? How do we justify subsidizing small TPZ parcels?

The regulatory process is the problem.

Is orderly development better facilitated through clustering?

It sounds like we’re ok with the concept, but we’ve got some questions about implementation and legality. In theory it would work well. We need to answer these questions before we support it.

I think it should stay in the range of options.

There’s a separate issue about parcel sizes. That’s for a separate discussion.

I have seen some problems with the ability to do continued timber production in urbanizing areas.

Don’t make it “in lieu of” (required).

Any idea of how many parcels we’re talking about? Response from staff: There’s no inherent limit.
Clustered Development (continued)
We should put a motion forward to explore the clustered development option pending some clarification of the process and legal issues pertaining to TPZ lands and recognize that it may be an attempt to facilitate orderly development and protection of resource lands. We request the final language of the clustered development policies be brought back to the Committee for review. (Yana). (Seconded by Jim)
It's optional to other methods of planned development.
Do we want to see this again?
I want to see the result of the research.
Response from staff: The process is going to move forward.
Right, and do we want to require that we take a look at it again?
Are you (staff) going to modify the plan, or just present our views? Response from staff: Both.
I'd like to see the changes before you bring them to the Commission in August.
Response from staff: You're not going to be able to see it before it gets posted.
(motion carried unanimously)

Regulatory Burden
How is the County going to deal with regulatory burden on timber owners? What can the County do? A policy sounds good, but if you can't implement it, it's worthless.
Increased regulation devalues the appraisal value for timberland... takes a 60% cut... so much duplication by agencies. A culvert replacement takes 4 different agencies to review it. They all charge fees. It's not helping to preserve the natural resources. The County has its own enforcement of timber regulations.
To make sure the County isn't making it worse.
The best we can do is to provide trust to the timber owner the value of timberland is going to be retained.
You've got to feel good about owning the property. Conversion happens when property is sold, so we need to keep the existing property owners. Don't set up another regulatory framework. Forested hillslopes, greenbelt, heritage landscapes protection in other chapters are examples. Too much uncertainty.
FR-P3 is the policy we're looking at.
I'd like to encourage Non-industrial Timber Management Plan's. (Joe Fassler described the applicability of the NTMP, the advantages and disadvantages.). Response from staff: Policy P4 - The County could increase the minimum size of parcels allowed in NTMP's
Can we deal with the Right to Harvest policy?
Support reduced regulations, keep property values, implement a Right to Harvest Ordinance, support JTMP's, support longer Timber Harvest Plans
I'm all for the right to harvest law, but so what? Is there something else we could do?
It's one of many things we could do.

What would the Realtors think of it? (The committee looked to the audience.)
Richard Dorn from the audience spoke: The Humboldt Association of Realtors supports it. Personally, I'd say it needs to be just like the right to farm ordinance. It serves a valuable purpose. Public notice provisions per Forest Practice Rules for THP's doesn't apply to NTMP's, so there's potential for property owners to not know about an NTMP on a property.
Question from audience. How would the Right to Harvest requirement relate to the existing public notifying and disclosure requirements of CDF? Response from the committee: (Gary and Joe) The Right to Harvest wouldn't duplicate something that CDF is doing already.

Question from audience: What about the 200' buffer required for harvesting on TPZ lands that is adjacent to non TPZ zoned land in the CDF rules?
I support placing the buffer on the non-TPZ property.
Support reduced overlap of regulations, maintain property values, implement a Right to Harvest Ordinance, support the JTMP process, and support longer THP's. Motion by Gary, second by Jim (I think) (Motion carries unanimously).
Recognition of Patent Parcels
Should there be a difference with the entitlement to build on a patent parcel? A patent doesn’t give you right to access, or a building permit, right? How is it related to Assessor’s parcels? Response from staff: The interpretation of the Assessor is if you break an Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) by selling a patent parcel, you have to file a JTMP. This goes back to our merger discussion. How does the patent parcel diminish the productivity of the timberland? You still have to get a building permit. Response from staff: It may have an impact in terms of enforcement. If you’ve got two 80 acre patents, and the minimum parcel size is 160 acres, you would only get one building permit. I believe we ought to recognize them as parcels. That’s what people expect they have. I feel better about controlling future subdivisions, not existing ones. If we’re going to encourage people to manage timberlands, we shouldn’t change the rules. But we’re going to create less manageable parcels.
I need a clearer picture before I’m ready to make a recommendation on this.

Density
Should the County support rezoning of TPZ land to allow for expansion of an existing community? Isn’t that what we’re doing now? It’s what has been done in the past. There aren’t other places for these communities to expand. Do you need to have consent from the property owner to rezone them out of TPZ? Response from staff: No. It’s part of the police power the County has. The County would have to follow due process in rezoning property, but in the end it is an exercise of legitimate police power. We are generally opposed to conversion of timberland for non timber use, but we recognize there are times when communities need to expand and timberlands are the only place to do it, and we may be taking the pressure off of more outlying TPZ areas by allowing it. We need to minimize conversion of TPZ, we need to develop guidelines to minimize impacts to adjacent TPZ parcels.
How much land division to you have to do need to have?
For the last 20 years, the only areas we’ve seen divided up is the land that has little current value. Low Site III, Site IV, Tan Oak, not land owned by industrial timberland owners. Only Barnum, but that was in a deal with Save the Redwoods.
Lot line adjustments are treated like subdivisions – why is that?
We need to meet again before July 19th?
Yes.
We need to look at the other chapters and do a line by line review Move to let the Commission know that if we aren’t able to meet and complete our review of the chapter, that we will be providing additional comments. Motion by Rynearson, second by Able, motion carried unanimously.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Caldwell. Small timberland owner. (Submitted written comments.) If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it. Existing policies work. Mast conversion is from public agencies. What is meant by “unregulated transfer of parcels.” Building permits should continue to be allowed on substandard parcels. The County created the substandard parcels in the first place. Improvement of roads. Sheriff costs: rural areas don’t require as much sheriff services. Expand the Right to Farm notice to include timber harvesting. Rescind the merger in Alternatives A and B. Don’t create land use designation for Industrial Timber owners. State law doesn’t require minimum parcel sizes for TPZ lots. By establishing minimum parcel sizes for TPZ lots, the County would discourage small parcels being zoned into TPZ. Distance to road shouldn’t be used as subdivision criteria – use criteria that makes more sense, like the capacity of the road. Parcel sizes of 20 acres or more should be allowed. Recommends Alternative C. Second Dwelling Units should be allowed in TPZ areas. Define criteria for being zoned TPZ “in error”. Clarify what is meant by “adjacent to existing communities”. Clustering is intended to protect timberlands in large parcel sizes, but it will have the opposite effect. Should be an alternative. Homsite development is never necessary for timber production. Subdivisions will never be allowed under A and B. Water withdrawal – the County should require rainwater collection and storage tanks for a 3 month supply of water. More residential development in forest lands can result in increased timber production. Map substandard parcels and timber plans. If there’s no correlation, the property should be rezoned to Forest Recreational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Kinn. Received a flyer from HELP that includes false information. Right now there is no rush to take lands out of TPZ, but looking forward, that may change. Previous speaker would create estate lots “Headwaters Estates.” NTMP on my property to improve the stand. Conversions are happening – Sierra Pacific, Palco, others. I don’t want more homes on adjacent timberlands because it will take away from my ability to produce timber.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Lovelace. Committee’s role is to protect timberland, and in protecting the timberland, you may not necessarily be protecting the economic interest of the timberland owner. Enabling subdivisions of TPZ lands won’t improve or maintain timber production. The owner will get a one-time infusion of cash. Subdivisions and sale of timberland as residential home sites won’t work to improve productivity. How come a pro development group is lobbying for increased residential development in TPZ areas? Questions their interest in timber production. TPZ laws include a high standard for conversion - the property has to not be viable for production. Through the reduced taxes on TPZ lands, the public isn’t intending to subsidize residential subdivisions, it’s intending to subsidize timber production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dorn: NTMP on our land in Southern Humboldt. The property has been in the family for 110 years. Forest products have changed over the years. We use to have 4 neighbors, now we have 14. Now there’s an industrial site next door. One neighbor pushed dirt in a stream with a tractor and caused impacts to the watershed. They don’t know better. These new neighbors cause impacts to the streams. We need to help educate timberland owners how to take care of the land. Right to farm ordinance should be applied to TPZ lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Russ. Owns 12,000 acres of TPZ &amp; AE lands, has an NTMP on his property. AE lands intermixed with TPZ lands. Served on Board of Forestry. If it ain’t broke don’t fix it. We put a lot of energy when we developed the Plan in 1985 in going out and talking to the TPZ property owners. I’m concerned not enough public outreach has occurred. Disagrees w/ 600 ac minimum parcel size. Doesn’t like buffers. Buffers should be the responsibility of the home owner, not the timberland owner. Recommends some improvement of Alternative D. Timber production has been reduced by State and federal government acquisition of public lands. We worked on a no net loss policy. We should do that again. There should be no net loss in tax revenue from State and Federal land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steve Horner, Manager of Barnum Timber. We’ve been meeting with staff over the years. We want our comments incorporated into Alternative B. Recommend repeal of merger. Maintain 160/40 acre minimum parcel size. Recognize existing substandard parcels. Continue to allow housing by right. Alternative D would be our second choice with repeal of the merger ordinance. Other chapters being reviewed by PC include forest related policies, the FRC needs to look at those too. We’re not asking for density increase. Just to stay the same. Alternative B would take away development rights, and you’d have to earn them back. Disagrees with that. It’s not about conversion, it’s about compatibility. Residential uses can be compatible with timber production.

Frank ____ NTMP owner. We’re being imposed upon with more rules and regulations, and I don’t like it. I feed you and put a roof over your head. I am the heart of America. Consider that.

Bill Meagher. Representing Jeff & Carol Silver. Intend for a 65 year THP. Want to be allowed to put 1 house on it. Not sufficient public notification. Possible Brown Act problems. We want to keep what we have, and we want to put a house on it. State agencies have plenty of rules; we don’t need any more.. Housing on a parcel is a must. Don’t want to have increased taxes, which is what this is all about.

Bill Blackwell. Sierra Pacific Industries. We’ve done some wordsmithing to make Alternative B acceptable. Recind merger. Maintain value of ownership. JITMP process needs to stay in place. Supports Alternative B with these edits. Otherwise, Alternative D, with no new merger. Other chapters in the General Plan Update overlap, and the FRC needs to be involved with those too.

Dan Opalach. Green Diamond. Agrees with the above comments. Alternative D is working pretty well.

Chuck Ciancio. Passed out a letter. 30 years in timber production. Dealing with TPZ lands. Hasn’t been much conversion. Thirteen acres can be a productive timber property. New rules aren’t necessary. Problem is illegal activity and not servicing what’s out there. Need to look at how to fund enforcement and providing public services. Forest Practice Act conversion policy would solve a lot of the problems. Carbon sequestration problems: uses tax dollars, takes away control from land owners, reduces tax base. Transfer of Development Rights program is untested. Development of rural lands needs to be done right – roads and sewer are key issues. Restrictions are reducing timber production, and replacing it with unhealthy products made in third world countries that use unhealthy resource practices.

Kay Backer. Concerned about property rights. Some in County are trying to take away property rights. Our flyer is based in fact.

Ray ____ I wasn’t informed about the meeting. Nothing being said about the little guy. Concerned about the change in minimum parcel size from 40 acres to 60 acres. Has a house and a trailer house on his property.

Ernie DeCarli. I’ve got 160 ac of TPZ that’s totally timbered. I’d like it to be left alone.

Don Comstock. 80 acre TPZ parcel. Doesn’t approve of merger. Agrees with Mr. Caldwell. Questions TPZ zoning – thinks it was in error. In coastal zone, probably won’t be any timber production because of all the regulations. Don’t approve of Alternative A and Alternative B. Want my kids to be able to build a house on it.

Otis Scaggs. Have a NTMP. Timber production is the primary issue. Not aesthetics. Average logging cost range from $25 - $300 per mbf, Smaller parcels cost less to harvest. Used to be involved in conservation – advocated placing agricultural lands back into timber production. More regulations make timber harvesting more discouraging.

Stan Krupke. Owns 40 acres. An adjacent lot was logged 3 times. It was converted. Don’t want that to happen to my property. Over harvesting made it so not a tree is going to be able to be taken off the property in 60 years.
DATE: August 8, 2007

TO: Forestry Review Committee (FRC)

FROM: Martha Spencer, Planning Staff

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes for the Forestry Review Committee (FRC) Meeting of Wednesday August 8, 2007

I. Attendance


Staff Present: Martha Spencer, Tom Hofweber and Michael Richardson (Planning), Andrea Tuttle, former director of Cal Fire

II. Public Appearances (meeting was not opened for public comments)

III. Approval of June 27, 2007 Meeting Minutes

The Minutes were approved as written by a vote of 4-0 (motion to approve by Mark Andre seconded by Joe Fassler).

IV. New Business - General Plan Update – Draft Forest Resources Policies

Vice Chairman Andre asked staff to present the staff report. Martha Spencer presented information regarding the Draft Forest Resources policies of the General Plan Update. She spoke of her conversation with Allen Robertson of CalFire, and noted that an immediate rezoning would not be supported by CalFire for clustering of housing on TPZ lands. Generally, Mr. Robertson was supportive of clustering home sites outside of the resource areas. There were a number of scenarios discussed. A 10 year slideout seemed like the best option. There aren’t many jurisdictions using clustered development policies for timberlands, but there are many other jurisdictions using it for protection of agricultural lands.

Ms. Spencer discussed the differences between immediate rezoning and the 10 year slideout process as was presented in the staff report. Ms. Spencer then noted that the draft Forest Policy document had been posted to the county’s website on July 18, 2007 and forwarded to the Planning Commission. The draft included an additional
Implementation Measure based upon the FRC's motion regarding the use of Joint Timber Management Plans. The Merger Ordinance was recommended to remain in Alternative A. The public comments and recommendations of the FRC will be forwarded to the Commission by Friday, August 10th for review during the August 16th Planning Commission meeting.

Andrea Tuttle then gave a presentation as to how she became involved in the review of the document and her qualifications as a consultant for the County. As Director of CDF, she did not enjoy signing off on timberland conversion permits, and felt that they go against State timberland policies. She spoke to some of the misunderstandings expressed in the previous FRC meetings regarding private property rights and the powers granted to the County by the State to protect public health, safety and welfare. The threshold is whether or not the action is considered a taking. The County has a legacy of parcels that if they were built on, would dramatically change the productivity of the timber resources of the County, and would lead to development that would have an adverse impact on the quality of life. She spoke of transfer of development rights programs offered by other jurisdictions and recommends that the FRC express an interest in retaining productivity of our timberlands, and discouraging residential development in the remaining large tracts of timberlands.

Chairman Launi brought the item back to the FRC for consideration. He identified the three remaining key items that were identified during the June 27, 2007 for discussion (see attached summary of comments). These included:
- Compatible density in TPZ areas;
- Creation of new parcels; and
- Patent parcels.

The FRC took the following actions on these topics:

"Second units should be taken out of the list of permitted uses on substandard TPZ parcels and should be allowed provided the second units are within the 3 acres converted already, or intended to be converted." (Motion by Mark Andre, seconded by Jim Able and approved unanimously)

Chair Steve Launi made the following motion:
“Housing density on any TPZ parcel shall not be increased without proponent demonstrating feasibility of producing a continuous and or periodic supply of high quality forest products; or orderly progress toward that goal."

Discussion ensued regarding the implementation of this policy. This motion died for lack of a second.

V. Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 9:40 pm.
The next meeting to discuss the Preliminary Draft Forest Resources Chapter was not scheduled.
Synopsis of Comments
Forest Resources Chapter Review
Forestry Review Committee Meeting August 8, 2007

Forestry Review Committee Questions and Comments and Staff Responses
What other "cluster" programs are out there?

Andrea Tuttle: El Dorado County is interested in preventing canopy reduction. Set aside 30% for open space if there is a canopy of 50% coverage. Sonoma County is looking at carbon credits and Placer County is looking at developing a Habitat Conservation Plan tied to residential development. Planned developments may be appropriate if you can pre-permit with a Non-Industrial Timber Management Plan, and indicate future timber productivity.

Timber mitigation bank - how does that work? Are there examples?
Andrea Tuttle: There are areas where mitigation banks work. Central Valley has some programs. Also you can impose high development impact fees to pay for public services, roads, etc. You’d have to identify what the appropriate ratio is.
It’s a non-committed TDR program.
Andrea Tuttle: It could be explored. Another program in other areas is credits for carbon credits. Conservation easements typically begin with the owner wanting to protect the land. The real test is whether there is a secondary market for these lands.
Are you a forester?
Andrea Tuttle: No.
Were you hired by the Planning Department
Andrea Tuttle: Yes
Were any foresters consulted with drafting this report?
Staff response: No. You are as close as we’ve got to that.

(Chair Launi) Do you have any questions of the policy statement I put forward?
I’d like to go back to the unfinished discussion items, I see the policy you put forward fitting into the item regarding JTMP

Compatible density in Timber Production Zone – second units on TPZ lands.
Motion Andre, second by Rynearson.
“Second units should be taken out of the list of permitted uses in TPZ lands uses with substandard TPZ parcels as presently allowed.
What are the current allowances?
Staff response: Second units have to meet the density standard, so they wouldn’t be allowed on a substandard.
What is a substandard parcel?
Staff response: 40 acres and above are considered standard.
Timberland conversions are only allowed one time in one contiguous area.
Staff response: The second unit ordinance doesn’t really encourage second units on TPZ lands, so we require the Plan density be met, and a special permit is required.
Under Option B, would you be redefining what is considered a substandard parcel?
Staff response: Under the zoning, 160 acres is the minimum. The general plan density would still be 40 acres.
I thought our motion last time was to support JTMP’s for subdivisions below 160 acres. That was my intent.
When is density established?
Staff Response: Through the general plan update.
How do you discourage second units in TPZ lands? My point is that they should be allowed only as long as the second units are within the 3 acres converted already, or intended to be converted or in close proximity to the existing developed area. Let’s add that to the motion.

Revised motion: “Second units should be taken out of the list of permitted uses on substandard TPZ parcels and should be allowed provided the second units are within the 3 acres converted already, or intended to be converted.”

Compatible density in Timber Production Zone

Chair Steve Launi made the following motion: “Housing density on any TPZ parcel shall not be increased without proponent demonstrating feasibility of producing a continuous and or periodic supply of high quality forest products; or orderly progress toward that goal.”

What review time frame?
Would it apply to a 40 acre parcel? Yes.
How would you demonstrate that? It would have to be reviewed by this committee. This is for each individual parcels.
It would be a part of issuing a permit for any house on any TPZ land.
Staff Response: What that motion speaks to is the findings that we’d need to make to permit subdivisions or building permits. It doesn’t really get at the density issue.

Doesn’t the County require demonstration of continued timber production? I have a problem with requiring the land owner harvest under a prescribed timeframe.
We’re trying to maintain the productivity....
Are you talking about vacant parcels?
Yes.
What you’re looking for is a guarantee that the property is going to be used for timber production. I don’t see that productivity is tied to density. I just want to make sure there is a continued flow of timber products. The existing plan and zoning limitations would continue to apply.
What about the takings issue? I don’t see a problem. Residences are only allowed in support of timber production.
Staff Response: You could add that to the list of criteria for subdivisions. I’m not sure if you want to take it to the level of requiring JTMP’s for building permits.

I’m not sure it’s necessary. TPZ law already requires the land be used for timber production. I don’t think it’s going to result in any additional timber coming off of the property.

Question from the audience: Is the County going to pay for the studies needed to that?

The Motion died for lack of a second.

Discussion of JTMP motion from the meeting of June 27, 2007. I want to clarify that this motion addresses density in TPZ areas. Our motion is to have JTMP’s be required for subdivisions less than 160 acres. Also those JTMP’s need to be reviewed every five years, which never happens. We need to review the JTMP review process.
It’s a problem that the County isn’t monitoring the result of the JTMP process.
Yes, but do you want to penalize the property owner for that?
No.
There are a couple reasons for JTMP’s – to ensure continued timber productivity, to help the land owner with some guidance from an RPF.
The smaller the parcel size, the more difficult it is to produce timber. I think we need to establish better criteria for compatibility of subdivision of TPZ lands.
Tree farm program might be good to reinstate. We need to include something to ensure continued productivity of the timberland. I think it's already in the ordinance. But it doesn't include a demonstration of improvements over time. Maybe that's what we need to put into the motion. How would you do that? There are a number of ways. But maybe we should table the discussion of the specifics.

**Creation of new parcels.**

Have we dealt with this already? It seems like we did. **Staff Response:** We don't think you've given us sufficient advice on the appropriate density of timberland. There's a lot of TPZ land out there, and we think there's a lot of development potential that could be a problem. But those parcels, if they are less than 160 acres, would need to meet all those criteria in the Framework Plan, including review by this committee. **Staff Response:** This is a 20 year plan. There's a lot of volatility in the timber industry. Our recommendation is to protect the large blocks of timberland. I support the PRD program; I think it would provide an opportunity for some planning.

We need a line by line review of the document. Question about minority viewpoints and how they will be represented to the Planning Commission. Meeting adjourned at 9:40.