

Butte County General Plan 2030
Summary of Input Received at the March 27, 2008 Public Workshop
Oroville/Palermo/Bangor/Biggs/Gridley/Berry Creek Areas

The March 27 General Plan 2030 public workshop included three main components: an Open House, during which participants visited Issue Stations and Study Area Stations; a presentation explaining the General Plan process as a whole and the Alternatives Evaluation process in particular; and a Town Hall Discussion in which participants shared ideas about policy issues that should be considered, resources that should be protected, and specific study areas.

Public input from this workshop is derived from the following sources:

- Verbal comments made during the Town Hall discussion and recorded by facilitator Joanna Jansen
- Written comments submitted on comment cards, which were available throughout the workshop
- Written comments submitted on the large sheets of paper posted at each Study Area Station
- Written comments submitted to the County either before or after the workshop

This summary focuses on study-area specific comments for the following Study Areas, which will be discussed at the April 17 CAC meeting in Oroville:

Study Area 8: Berry Creek

Study Area 21: Thermalito

Study Area 23: Eastern Oroville/Oroville Hills

Study Area 24: Stringtown Mountain

Study Area 25: Thermalito Afterbay Area

Study Area 26: Las Plumas/Southside/Ophir Road

Study Area 27: Pacific Heights Road/Highway 70

Study Area 28: Sothern Oroville

Study Area 29: Palermo

Study Area 30: Bangor

Study Area 31: Biggs Area

Study Area 33: South of Biggs

Study Area 34: North of Gridley

Note: Study Area 22 covers the Existing City of Oroville Limits, and Study Area 32 covers the Existing City Biggs Limits. Since these areas are not within County jurisdiction and will not be part of the County General Plan, we will not be discussing these study areas.

CAC members have been provided with raw data, including transcriptions of the large sheets from the Study Area Stations and the Town Hall discussion comments, scans of the written comments submitted via comment card or communication to County staff, and copies of relevant comments submitted via the County's General Plan 2030 web forum . CAC members will also be provided with a synopsis of the comments that pertain to these study areas.

Input on Study Areas

During the Open House sessions at the March 27 Public Workshop, participants were encouraged to circulate among Study Area Stations, staffed with County facilitators. Each Study Area Station included maps of the three alternatives in a given study area, along with an enlarged copy of the Alternatives Evaluation Report Summary Table for that study area. The Study Area Station also included a large sheet of butcher paper for participants to provide comments. The text below summarizes input received not only from the Study Area Station, but also from workshop comment cards and letters sent to the County.

Study Area 8: Berry Creek

There were no comments regarding Study Area 8.

Study Area 21: Thermalito

Three comments were received, two of which supported Alternative 3. Two commentors also opposed annexation of this area by the City of Oroville, desiring instead the maintenance of low densities and agriculture. There was also a concern raised about traffic issues associated with increased development.

Study Area 23: Eastern Oroville/Oroville Hills

Six comments were received. Most comments supported maintaining existing land uses in this study area, and one specifically expressed opposition to Alternative 1. Two commentors specified that the eastern portion of the study area should remain as rural residential. The presence of deer herd and other habitat was also cited as a reason to maintain very low densities. A representative of a property owner in the Kelly Ridge area did not support any of the alternatives for that region, suggesting instead a designation of Low Density Residential to match existing densities, and noting that the area has access to water and sewer services. Another commentor preferred Alternative 1 with modifications to allow mixed use along Miners Ranch Road and to better match the existing General Plan. A few comments also expressed disagreement with some of the

findings in the Alternatives Evaluation Report related to Economics, Schools, Groundwater Recharge, Wastewater, Biological Resources, Hazards and Cultural Resources.

Study Area 24: Stringtown Mountain

Four comments were received, all of which supported open space preservation. One commentor preferred additional open space and one suggested 5- to 10-acre minimum lot sizes to improve open space. Another commentor preferred Alternative 1 with the requirement of clustered development to maintain open space, and suggested that the study area be expanded to include the Lake Oroville Village Planning Area. This commentor also supported clustered residential development outside of the Stringtown Mountain Specific Plan area.

Study Area 25: Thermalito Afterbay Area

There were no comments regarding Study Area 25.

Study Area 26: Las Plumas/Southside/Ophir Road

Eight comments were received, the majority of which supported commercial and medium to high density residential development. Three commentors preferred Alternatives 2 or 3, one of which requested that Alternative 2 better match the development proposals. There were a few individual comments supporting low density housing and industrial development in the western portion of the study area. One commentor also addressed transportation, suggesting that Lincoln and Ophir Roads be used as arterial access roads and that a Highway be constructed between the Casino and Lake Oroville.

Study Area 27: Pacific Heights Road/Highway 70

Two comments were received. One comment preferred Alternative 2 due to the lack of urban services and the presence of wildlife. The other comment preferred Alternative 3, citing the positive fiscal impacts, availability of public services, habitat preservation, groundwater recharge mitigation and job creation associated with the Rio D'Oro project.

Study Area 28: Sothern Oroville

Five comments were received. The majority of the comments supported Alternative 2, citing the need to maintain open space in this area. One comment requested additional open space east of Power House Hill Road and another requested 5- to 10-acre lot sizes in this area. One comment preferred Alternative 3, noting that there is a fire and sheriff substation proposed for the nearby Rio D'Oro project, which could serve development in this study area.

Study Area 29: Palermo

Ten comments were received. A few comments expressed support for Alternative 2, and others generally supported maintaining rural development levels, agricultural land and resource protection. A few comments addressed the need for improved infrastructure and incentives for business development. Several comments also addressed transportation, noting the need for improved bikeways, public transit and gravel paths for horse travel.

Study Area 30: Bangor

Two comments were received, both of which supported maintaining the rural development levels. One of the comments specifically preferred Alternative 2.

Study Area 31: Biggs Area

Seven comments were received. The majority of the comments addressed transportation, including improvements to Highway 162 to serve as an alternative to Highway 99 and a connection to Interstate 5, and improvements to transportation routes for tourism and recreation. The Thermalito Afterbay and Gray Lodge Wildlife Refuge were cited as major recreational opportunities, and a commentor suggested that a recreational element address these resources. One commentor preferred Alternative 1, citing the need to preserve agriculture. Another comment suggested that the study area be expanded.

Study Area 33: South of Biggs

Seven comments were received, one of which preferred Alternative 1. Several comments expressed a desire to maintain open space and agricultural land, as well as mixed uses close to the existing town centers. Another comment stated that the historic nature of the Biggs and Gridley downtowns should be enhanced. One commentor opposed any development along the railroad that is not industrial or tourism-related. There was also a suggestion to reconfigure the boundaries of Study Areas 31 and 33. Several commentors made suggestions related to specific elements that pertain this area, including circulation, water and recreation.

Study Area 34: North of Gridley

Five comments were received, one of which preferred Alternative 1 in order to maintain agricultural land. A few comments identified possible growth areas, including the area to the south of the study area, citing existing right-of-ways, and the area north of the Gridley city limits on both sides of the railroad. As mentioned in Study Area 33, other comments expressed a need to support and enhance the historical nature of the existing City downtowns and a need for a recreational element to address the Thermalito Afterbay and the Gray Lodge Wildlife Refuge.