



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
PLANNING DIVISION
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/CDS/Planning>

DATE: August 1, 2007
TO: Forestry Review Committee (FRC)
FROM: Martha Spencer, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: Meeting of Wednesday, August 8, 2007

**FORESTRY REVIEW COMMITTEE
AUGUST 8, 2007 @ 7:00 P.M.
BOARD CHAMBERS, COUNTY COURTHOUSE
825 5th Street, Eureka**

I.	Attendance	Page
II.	Public Appearances	
III.	Approval of Minutes from June 27, 2007 FRC Meeting	2
IV.	Old Business	
	A. General Plan Update – Continued discussion of the Draft Forest Resources Policies (Policy document distributed prior to June 14 FRC meeting)	4
V.	Adjournment	

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. Ryneerson 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 Ryneerson, 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, 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 Ryneerson, 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 Ryneerson, 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.

AGENDA ITEM IVA

For Meeting of August 8, 2007

DATE: August 1, 2007

TO: Forestry Review Committee (FRC)

FROM: Kirk Girard, Director of Community Development Services
Prepared By: Martha Spencer, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Draft Forest Resources Policies for the General Plan Update – Continued agenda item

Staff Recommendations

1. Continue review of the proposed draft Forest Resources Policies,
2. Provide recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors on the draft Forest Resources policies concerning forest related issues.

Discussion

During the meeting of June 27th Committee members requested additional information regarding the cluster development program, in particular, would the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) support this program on TPZ lands? Staff has forwarded this document to the Sacramento office for their comments and is hoping to bring additional information to the Committee regarding this issue (Allen Robertson with CALFIRE will be providing comments). Also, Andrea Tuttle will be attending the meeting and will be available for questions regarding implementation of these policies. Ms. Tuttle has been hired by the county as a consultant during the development of the Forest Resource Policies for the General Plan Update process. Ms. Tuttle was the director of CALFIRE for over 5 years possesses a doctorate in environmental planning from UC Berkeley and has also served on the California Coastal Commission. Ms. Tuttle may also be able to shed some light on the planned rural development program and how similar programs have been implemented throughout the state.

There was also discussion regarding rezoning land outside of TPZ and who could initiate this – the landowner or the County? Following is brief summary of the rezoning process as outlined in state law:

Immediate Rezoning: § 51131 states, "A timberland production zone may not be immediately rezoned except pursuant to a request by a landowner, and as provided in this article (emphasis added)." The last part of the sentence, "and as provided in this article" simply means that the landowner's request must be processed according to the statute, specifically Article 4 - the immediate rezoning section of the Timberland Productivity Act. Article 4 talks about the need for a 4/5ths vote, written findings that the rezone is in the public interest, involvement of CDF, etc. Bottom line, only a landowner can initiate an immediate rezone.

Rezoning: §§ 51120 and 51121 describe the requirements for rezoning out of TPZ. § 51120 is titled, "Desire of owner to rezone parcel; procedure" and it tells an owner what has to be done to rezone a parcel from its current TPZ to a new zone.

§ 51121 is titled, "Intent not to extend the term of zoning; procedure" and it describes a separate process. It states, "If the board or council after a public hearing and by a majority vote of the full body desires in any year not to extend the term of zoning, the county shall give written notice of its intent to rezone following the procedures established by § 51113 (b). If this notice is not given at least 90 days prior to the anniversary date of the initial zoning, the zoning term shall be deemed extended. Upon receipt by the owner of a notice of intent to rezone from the county, the owner may make a written protest of the notice and may appeal to the board within 30-days of notice, and the board may at any time prior to the anniversary date withdraw the notice of intent to rezone."

§ 51113 (b) (referenced in the statute above) requires that the Board, on or before March 1, 1977, by resolution, shall adopt procedures for initiating, filing, and processing petitions for timberland production zoning and for rezoning. Our local procedures are reflected in the sections for Amendments to the Zoning Regulations and Zoning Maps and a special section for Timberland zoning procedures. Unfortunately, those Timberland zoning procedures describe in detail the process of getting into TPZ (how an owner may apply to zone land as TPZ) but the procedures for rezoning out are simply that rezoning "shall be in conformance with the requirements of the Timberland Productivity Act, "in addition to the requirements of these zoning regulations."

Therefore, by following local procedures and the procedures in State law, the County can initiate zoning out of TPZ. The County would have to hold a public hearing, be able to make the requisite findings, (i.e. public interest, General Plan consistency, etc.) and the approval of our request would result in a 10-year non-renewal period. And, of course, the property owner could protest and appeal.

Staff Recommendations:

During the last meeting, motions were made by the Committee regarding the Merger Ordinance, the JTMP process, cluster development and regulatory burden. The minutes with these motions and the summary discussions will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review prior to the August 16th Planning Commission meeting. The draft policy documented forwarded to the Planning Commission included a new implementation measure based upon these motions, 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.

The motion regarding the merger ordinance will be forwarded; however, 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.

During the previous meeting, the Committee provided very thoughtful discussions on seven issues identified earlier in the staff presentation (Compatible density in TPZ areas, Creation of

new parcels, patent parcels, merger ordinance, clustered development, JTMP process and policies for regulatory relief); however, motions by the Committee were only forwarded on four of these issues. The committee may choose to continue this discussion during this meeting and provide additional recommendations to staff and the Planning Commission regarding these issues and how they relate to the draft forest policies.

Finally, as mentioned in an earlier staff report, the draft Forest Resources policy document is a decision-making document to be used by the public, the Forest Review Committee and ultimately the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. As a first step, staff will capture recommendations for changing this document so that it contains a reasonable range of viable policy alternatives. Once finalized, the document will be used to guide deliberations on the policy alternatives. Staff will record these deliberations and the policy recommendations expressed by the public, the Forest Review Committee and finally, the Planning Commission. Minority and majority recommendations from the Forest Review Committee and the Planning Commission will be presented to the Board of Supervisors to make the final policy decisions and approve the final text for the Forest Resources section of the General Plan.

Attachment A: Summary Comments from FRC members and the public for the meeting of June 27, 2007

Attachment A
Synopsis of Comments
Forest Resources Chapter Review
Forestry Review Committee Meeting June 27, 2007

Forestry Review Committee Questions and Comments and Staff Responses
Clarify when a special permit is required. <i>Response from staff:</i> It's not – it's recommended in Alternative B
What is the charter of the Forestry Review Committee (FRC)?
Can't really separate the technical aspects of forestry and the politics of forestry.
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.
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 devilmnt – it's for timber production, so I'm puzzled why we would want to increase residential density in TPZ areas.
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.
Role of the FRC – both technical and more general
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
How are residences allowed in TPZ lands? What does it mean to be "accessory". <i>Response from staff:</i> 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.
List of 7 key issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compatible density in TPZ areas - Creation of new parcels - Patent parcels - Merger ordinance - Clustered development - JTMP process - Policies for regulatory relief
We are subject to the Brown Act. Notice of all TPZ owners did not occur, and is not required by the Brown Act.
Merger: 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 <i>Response from staff:</i> 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. <i>Response from staff:</i> we need to develop a range, so you don't need to modify Alternative A.

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 land owners 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 period 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 the 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 noticing 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 do 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 Ryneerson, second by Able, motion carried unanimously.

Public Comments

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. Homesite 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.

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.

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.

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.

Joe Russ. Owns 12,000 acres of TPZ & 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.

<p>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.</p>
<p>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</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Bill Blackwell. Sierra Pacific Industries. We've done some wordsmithing to make Alternative B acceptable. Rescind merger. Maintain value of ownership. JTMP 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.</p>
<p>Dan Opalach. Green Diamond. Agrees with the above comments. Alternative D is working pretty well.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Kay Backer. Concerned about property rights. Some in County are trying to take away property rights. Our flyer is based in fact.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Ernie DeCarli. I've got 160 ac of TPZ that's totally timbered. I'd like it to be left alone.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>