

*VOTING SUMMARY – PLANNING COMMISSION*

**Butte County General Plan 2030  
Goals and Policies Development (Meeting Series #5-3a and 5-3b)  
November 7 and 14, and December 11, 2008**

**Urban Growth Boundaries and Community Separators**

*Question 1: Should the County implement additional urban growth boundaries, and if so, how?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. The CAC recommendation includes the following:
  - Replace the policies with the following new policies:
    - “Engage unincorporated communities who want to do so, in a community planning process, as resources are available, to set a community vision, with the possibility of developing urban growth boundaries as part of that process.”
    - “Work cooperatively with municipalities to establish urban growth boundaries and revenue sharing.”
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 2: Should Gridley and Biggs have a community separator between them?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation, which is to provide no comment on this topic, and let cities work it out through the resolution to Question 1.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 3: How should the public be involved in setting urban growth boundaries?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Replace policies A, B and C with the following: “Do not change the exiting process to establish urban growth boundaries. However, it should be noted that the public must be involved in that process.”
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 4: What modifications, if any, should be made to the Chico Area Greenline, which establishes a boundary between urban and agricultural uses in the area west of Chico?*

- ◆ Modify the Chico Area Greenline to follow the northwest boundary of Study Area 3 (Bell Muir).
- ◆ Votes: *4 support, 1 oppose (Lambert)*
  - Lambert noted that she would support a motion to review the entire Chico Area Greenline, but does not support a motion to review on the Bell Muir area.

*Question 5: How should the County protect the Neal Road Landfill?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Establish a compatibility zone of appropriate width around landfill that allows uses that are compatible, such as agriculture, light industrial and sewage treatment plants.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

### **County Character, New Development and Housing**

*Question 6: How should the County improve the design and architectural quality of new development?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with two modifications:
  - Modify Policy L by adding “except within cities’ spheres of influence, where the County should adopt the design regulations of the respective cities, but only with respect to nondiscretionary criteria that would not require review by a design review board.”
  - Clarify Policy M as follows: “Avoid development on ridgelines.”
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - No design/architecture regulations. [Note that the Planning Commission added an exception to this within the cities’ spheres of influence, as indicated above.]
  - Policy to encourage development compatible with ridgelines.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 7: How should the County work to provide more affordable housing? (For the purposes of the General Plan, “affordable housing” is defined as housing that is affordable for “very-low” and “low” income households, which are households that earn no more than 50% and 80% of the County’s median income, respectively. “Affordable housing” does not cost more than 30 percent of a household’s income.)*

- ◆ Defer this discussion until the Housing Element meeting series.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

### **Regional and Local Coordination**

*Question 8: How should the County more effectively coordinate its planning efforts with those of the five incorporated municipalities, other Counties and other planning and regulatory agencies?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with one modification:
  - Add “and local Native American tribes” to the list of agency types in the policy question.
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Modify Policy A: Change “annual” to “quarterly”
  - Keep all other policies.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 9: How should the County work with local unincorporated communities in planning for their futures?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with two modifications:
  - Add Cohasset to the list of examples of communities that have conducted or are conducting planning efforts.
  - Add a new policy: “Create a dialog with local Native American tribes for collaboration on tribal land use plans.”
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Policies A through C.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

### **Agriculture**

*Question 10: What, if any, modifications are needed to General Plan Program 2.2 (the Agricultural Buffers policy, which requires a buffer to be established on property proposed for residential development in order to protect, maintain, promote and enhance agricultural uses and resources)?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Continue to encourage defensible buffers and defer modifications to Guidelines.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 11: How should the County help to protect, maintain, promote and enhance its agricultural uses and resources?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with the following modifications:
  - Remove the specificity regarding the South County water needs in Policy F.
  - Delete Policies G and H.
  - Remove the word “migrant” from Policy K, so that it applies to all farmworkers.
  - Remove the word “requiring” from Policy M.
  - Revise Policy O.i as recommended by DC&E, with modification to remove the 1 to 1 reference (so that it can be worked out as part of the ordinance), and to refer to a conversion from agriculture to non-agricultural use, rather than just residential use.
  - Remove Policy O.ii and implement it through the Land Use Map as recommended by DC&E.
  - Revise Policy O.iii to indicate that the existing Policy 2.7 and Program 2.7 in the Agriculture Element should be continued, and that 5-acre lot allowances in agricultural designations should be eliminated. However, if 5-acre parcels are not eliminated, the policies recommended by DC&E should be included.
  - Remove Policy O.v

- Remove Policy O.vi. The Planning Commission recommended that Policy 1.5 of the Agriculture Element continue to be the approach for identifying agricultural lands in Butte County which is: “Conserve Orchard and Field Crops lands and Grazing and Open Lands as designated in the General Plan Land Use Map”.
- Revise Policy O.vii to indicate that cities should be encouraged to adopt an agricultural mitigation ordinance to protect agricultural land on a 1 to 1 basis or pay an in-lieu fee to fund agricultural preservation.

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent from votes taken on December 11, 2008 pertaining to Policy O.vi. and O.vii.)*

*[Note: a number of the policies recommended by the CAC were based on a presentation and were from the Stanislaus County General Plan. DC&E suggested revisions to these policies to tailor them to Butte County and reflect existing County policies and programs; these suggested revisions were considered by the Planning Commission at the November 14 and December 11, 2008 Study Sessions.]*

*Question 12: How should the County help to protect, maintain, promote and enhance its timber uses and resources?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with one modification:
  - In policy A, change “ensure” to “provide for”, so that it reads: “Encourage regulations and outreach practices that would ~~ensure~~ provide for sustainable forest practices in the county.”
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Replace B with the following: “The County should maintain and amend where appropriate existing requirements under the TPZ to conserve and enhance its timber resources, protect water quality and conservation, and improve fire safety.”
  - New policy: “Implement community wildfire protection plans and wildfire fuel load measures in coordination with the Butte County Fire Safe Council.”

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 13: How should the county address the conversion of smaller agricultural parcels to non-agricultural uses?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with the following modifications:
  - Remove Policy J and implement it through the Land Use Map as recommended by DC&E.
  - Remove Policy K and implement it through the Land Use Map as recommended by DC&E.
  - Remove Policy L. Per the November 13, 2008 memo from DC&E: Policies L.i and L.ii have been accomplished by the Preferred Land Use Alternative. Policy L.iii will be accomplished through the Zoning Ordinance and Agricultural Buffer Guidelines. Policy L.iv has been already addressed through the Utilities and Public Services policy area. Policy L.v is prohibited by law since fees cannot be based on anything other than cost to provide services. Policy L.vi has already been accomplished by Policy 11.o.

- Remove Policies M.i, M.ii and M.iv. Rather than providing these specific policies, the Planning Commission provides the following direction to the Board of Supervisors in creating agricultural land use designations in the Land Use Element and Map: Increase minimum lot sizes of the agricultural land use designations to reflect the viability (e.g., 40 acres for cropland, 160 acres for rangeland).
- Replace Policy M.iii with the following: “Require a conditional use permit for residential uses in agricultural zones.”

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*[Note: the policies recommended by the CAC were based on a presentation and were from the American Farmland Trust. DC&E suggested revisions to these policies to tailor them to Butte County and reflect existing County policies and program; these suggested revisions were considered by the Planning Commission at the December 11, 2008 Study Session.]*

*Question 14: How should the County encourage and enhance niche and specialty agriculture, such as organic products, heritage livestock, and heirloom crops?*

◆ Support the CAC recommendation with three modifications:

- Add “and native plant nurseries” to the list of examples of niche and specialty agriculture in the policy question.
- Change “flexible” to “unique” in Policy I (a new policy that was recommended by the CAC), so that it reads: “Allow ~~flexible~~ unique zoning to encourage and enhance specialty agriculture.”
- Add a new policy: “Consider impacts to the traditional Native American landscape when developing additional land, including when developing land for agriculture.”

◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:

- Policies A, B, C and H.
- Modify F: “Support agritourism uses...”

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 15: The Board of Supervisors recently approved changes to the Right to Farm Ordinance to address conflicts between agricultural and non-agriculture land uses. What other strategies should be pursued to address these conflicts, if any?*

◆ Support the CAC recommendation, which is that no additional strategies are needed.

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 16: What strategies should the County use to support the local agricultural economic sector?*

◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:

- Policies A, B, C, D, E, F, G and I.

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

## Water Resources

*Question 17: How should the General Plan protect and enhance Butte County's water supply?*

- ◆ Support the Water Commission recommendations provided to the Planning Commission, as well as any CAC recommendations that are not reflected in the Water Commission recommendations.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 18: How should the General Plan seek to maintain and enhance Butte County's water quality?*

- ◆ Support the Water Commission recommendations provided to the Planning Commission, as well as any CAC recommendations that are not reflected in the Water Commission recommendations.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 19: How should septic systems and package sewage treatment plants be regulated to support water quality?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. The Water Commission did not provide any recommendations for this question. The CAC recommendation includes the following:
  - Policies B, C, F, G and H.
  - Strike Policies A, D and E.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 20: How should the County minimize flood hazards?*

- ◆ Support the Water Commission recommendations provided to the Planning Commission, as well as any CAC recommendations that are not reflected in the Water Commission recommendations.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

## Economic Development

*Question 21: How should the County seek to improve the local economy, attract higher wage jobs, and improve its fiscal health?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Policy A, modified to include identification of lands for uses. Rest of policies should be included in the Strategy.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 22: What strategies should the County use to support the local tourism economic sector?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with the following modifications:
  - Modify Policy M.i: replace "redevelopment" with "preservation and use".
  - Remove Policy M.ii.
  - Modify Policy M.iv by adding "in consultation with local tribes."
  - Modify Policy M.viii to specify that the increase in TOT should be used exclusively to fund tourism development efforts. [Note: the CAC made a similar recommendation, which was

erroneously left out of the revised Policy Alternatives document reviewed by the Planning Commission.]

- Modify Policy M.xiii by adding “Encourage appropriate agencies to...”
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Create a countywide tourism development strategy, with policy options A through L as mandatory components [note that the Planning Commission removed policy option B]. Also modification to option H to say that increase will be applied to tourism development. Also include additional components, as follows:
    - Consider recreation in determining water levels for Lake Oroville and the Afterbay.
    - Add signage on Interstate 5 encouraging travelers to visit Butte County.
    - Involve existing groups such as the Central Sacramento Valley Resource Conservation & Development Area Council and local Chambers of Commerce.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 23: What strategies should the County use to support the local manufacturing, office and commercial sectors?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Develop countywide strategy to support these sectors that shall include policies A through G.
    - Modify A: remove “shovel ready” reference.
    - Modify E: take out “small”
    - Delete F
    - Modify G to say “such as production/distribution of biofuels and other forms of alternative energy”
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

## **Transportation**

*Question 24: How should the County maintain and improve road conditions, and safe traffic flow?*

- ◆ Support CAC recommendation with one modification:
  - Modify Policy I so that it clarifies that the fuel reduction projects will improve both fire safety and visibility.
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Policies B, C (revised to strike “via Highway 162”), D (change “implement” to “continue”), and E.
  - Add new policy: “Identify and maintain roadside fuels reduction on critical access roads.” (Note that the Planning Commission added to this policy, as described above.)
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 25: How should the General Plan address bicycle issues?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Replace Policy A with “Support countywide master planning effort.”
  - Policies B through G.
  - Modify E to add: “provide appropriate bicycle...”
  - Modify D to add “where appropriate.”
  - Add new policy supporting/promoting creation of bike routes to facilitate commuting, and, where appropriate, for recreation purposes.
  - Add new policy coordinating transit with bike routes and ensure adequate bike racks.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 26: How can the County help decrease reliance on automobile travel?*

- ◆ Support Policies AQ 29 through AQ37 in the Model General Plan Air Quality Element prepared by the Butte County Air Quality Management District in January 2008, as well as any CAC recommendations that are not reflected in the Model Air Quality Element recommendations.
- ◆ Add new policy to provide transit incentives for County employees.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 26A: Should the County consider adopting a different level of service (LOS) standard?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. The CAC recommendation was to select Policy B, which allows LOS D in City SOI’s where consistent with the City’s General Plan.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

### **Scenic Highways**

*Question 27: How should the County protect and enhance its network of scenic highways and/or create additional scenic highways?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. The CAC recommendation was to include Policies A through I.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

### **Roadway Improvement Alternatives**

- ◆ Issue A: Support the CAC recommendation for Alternative 2, and modify to add a statement that this improvement be a top funding priority for the County.
- ◆ Issues B, C, D, E, F and G: Support the CAC recommendation to work with federal funding sources to create a funding plan to implement improvements for emergency access, fire protection, public safety, water quality protection, circulation and work with community wildfire protection plans to identify and prioritize projects.
- ◆ Issue H: Support the CAC recommendation to support all alternatives (21, 22, 23).
- ◆ Issue I: Support the CAC recommendation to defer decision until city of Gridley addresses through the GPU.
- ◆ Issue J: Support the CAC recommendation to defer decision to town of Paradise.
- ◆ Issue K: Support the CAC recommendation to defer to City of Chico.

- ◆ Issue L: Support the CAC recommendation to defer this as a longer-term project.
- ◆ Issue M: Support the CAC recommendation to follow the policy recommendation made in response to Question 24 regarding improving access for the movement of goods and services to Interstate 5.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

### Utilities, Services and Airports

*Question 28: How should the County ensure that the infrastructure needs of new development are met?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with one modification:
  - Revise Policy B so that impact fees are set “proportionately to the cost of providing infrastructure” rather than based on distance alone.
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Modify A: Change “and ensure it is adequate prior to approval of new development that the infrastructure is to serve” to “ensure that adequate infrastructure requirements are provided as conditions of project approval.”
  - Modify D: Change “prior to approving” to “for”; and add “and consistent with master plans.”
  - Modify E: Change “assessment... Community Service Agencies” to “special districts”
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 29: How should the General Plan address the provision of sheriff and fire service in rural areas?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with two modifications:
  - Revise Policies I and J so that impact fees are set “proportionately to the cost of providing services” rather than based on distance alone.
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Modify B: Change “Mello-Roos Districts and CSA’s,” to “special districts”
  - Modify C: Change “Encourage” to “Require”
  - Replace Policy D with new Policies I and J (see above for Planning Commission revisions to these policies).
  - Modify E: Change “CAL FIRE” to “Butte County Fire Department”
  - Modify F: Change “Encourage” to “Require”
  - Modify G: Change “Encourage” to “Require”
  - Delete H (because it has already been accomplished)
  - New policy: “Establish an advisory board to provide oversight and support for sheriff services.”

- New policy: “Create communities that are resistant to wildfire by reducing risks through the community wildfire protection plans and fire safe councils.”

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 30: How should the County work with schools to ensure adequate provision of schools and to minimize the impacts of new development on existing school facilities?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Modify E and F: Add “To the extent allowed by law,”

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 31: How can the County most effectively limit land use conflicts around its airports?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Keep Policy A only; delete all others

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

### **Parks, Recreation and Trails**

*Question 32: How should the General Plan address parks and recreation issues?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with the following modifications:
  - Delete the second sentence in Policy L regarding areas not served by park and recreation districts.
- ◆ Add the following new policies, as suggested by the Paradise Recreation and Park District.
  - Allow for the development of public land agreements for the use of public, County-owned land for the development of recreation and park resources.
  - Coordinate master plans and financing among the County, cities and districts.
  - Establish a plan on how to direct federal and State funding.
  - Establish a program to determine how the County will assist with accomplishing park and recreation facilities funding, planning assistance and support.
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Replaces Policies A, B, C, D, E, F and G with Policy L to work with and support master plans adopted by park and recreation districts.
  - Modify I: Add “zoning” between “Allow” and “density”
  - Delete J
  - New policy: “Institute Mello-Roos and/or lighting districts to fund ongoing maintenance and operation of parks and recreation facilities.”

- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 33: How should the General Plan address recreational trails facilities, such as hiking, bicycle, equestrian and off-highway vehicle trails?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Keep all policies
  - New policy: “Provide for appropriate and adequate funding for the creation and ongoing maintenance of trails.”

- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

### **Habitat Conservation**

*Question 34: How should the General Plan address preservation of important habitat areas, including riparian (river and stream) corridors, vernal pools, oak woodlands and deer migration routes?*

- ◆ Support CAC recommendation with three modifications:
  - Replace the word “defer” with “refer” in Policies N, O and P.
  - Delete Policy S regarding a mining resource depletion surcharge.
  - Add a new policy, as recommended by the Mechoopda Tribe, regarding consideration of native tree and plant species where landscaping is required.
- ◆ The Planning Commission did not recommend the following two policies proposed by the Mechoopda Tribe through tribal consultation:
  - When planning open space, give primary consideration to its restoration and maintenance as a native, pre-contact landscape.” (This was a new policy proposed by the Tribe.)
  - Penalize developers who remove special status species or species valued by local Native American tribes. (The modification to add *species valued by local Native American tribes* was proposed by the Mechoopda Tribe.)
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - All deer herd references should be clarified to refer to “migratory deer herds”
  - Delete A, B, E, F, H, K and R.
  - Modify D: Delete “deer migration areas”
  - Modify G: Add “and other sensitive habitat areas”
  - Modify I: Add “and maintain” between “preserve” and “important”
  - Modify J: replace “deer herd” with “sensitive habitat area”; and include a funding mechanism through mitigation fees on new development.

- Modify N, O and P: Add “If and when adopted, defer to the HCP.” (Note that the Planning Commission changed this to “refer to” the HCP.
- Modify Q: replace “rehabilitation” with “protection”

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

### **Green Building, Greenhouse Gases and Energy**

*Question 35: How should the County encourage the development of sustainable communities and energy-efficient and cost-savings buildings?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with three modifications:
  - Remove “expedited permitting” as an example of an incentive in Policy B.
  - Remove the text following “e.g.” in Policy C.
  - Change “require” to “encourage” in Policy J.
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Modify C: Replace “solar paneling” with “renewable heat and power (e.g., solar and geothermal).” (Note that the Planning Commission removed the examples text.)
  - Replace D with the following: “Encourage renewable design and grid-neutral development.”
  - Replace F with the following: “Comply with State green building standards, which are scheduled to be approved in 2010.”
  - Modify G: Replace “Require” with “Encourage”
  - Replace M with the following: “Encourage the use of building design and materials to promote groundwater recharge in development.”
  - Delete O
  - New policy: “Create fire-wise communities through building and landscape design standards.”
  - New policy: “Work cooperatively with the cities to ensure consistent standards for green building codes and other methods to reduce greenhouse gas emissions throughout the county.”

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

*Question 36: In response to Chapter 488 of the California Health and Safety Code (Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act), in what specific ways could the County, and county residents, help to minimize contributions to global warming and depletion of natural resources?*

- ◆ Support Policies AQ20 through AQ22 and AQ38 through AQ41 in the Model General Plan Air Quality Element prepared by the Butte County Air Quality Management District in January 2008, with some modifications.
- ◆ Also support the CAC recommendation, which includes the following:

- Delete all policies and replace them with the following: “In response to Chapter 488 of the California Health and Safety Code (Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act), the County will develop a climate action plan that sets a goal with strategies to achieve it in cooperation with multiple partners.”

◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin and Nelson absent)*

### **Cultural Resources and Tribal Coordination**

*Question 37: How should the County respect Native American culture and planning concerns?*

- ◆ Support the majority of the recommendations provided by the Mechoopda Tribe in the summary of tribal consultation input dated November 4, 2008, with the exception of two proposed new policies: (1) to recognize Native American culture as a traditional living contemporary community, and (2) to recognize the importance of aquatic and riparian habitat management to local Native American tribes. (Note: both of these policies that were not recommended for inclusion are located on page 2 of 3 in the summary of tribal consultation input dated November 4, 2008, from the Mechoopda Tribe.)
- ◆ Support the majority of the recommendations provided by the Butte County Cultural Resources Coalition, as summarized in the meeting notes dated October 28, 2008, with the exception of the following:
  - Item (a), a separate Cultural Resources Element.
  - Item (c), regarding a cultural resources management plan, since it is already included in Policy 37.A.iv. Note that the Planning Commission did not provide specific guidance on the suggestion to implement a historic properties management plan, as suggested as a component of item (c).
  - Item (e), regarding identifying and protecting sites with sensitivity for cultural and historic interest, since the Planning Commission already addressed this issue under policies 37(j) and 37(k).
  - In item (f), regarding identifying and preserving agricultural and historic landscapes, the Planning Commission omitted the word “preserve.”
  - Item (l), regarding the preservation and use of historic sites as tourist destinations, since it was already addressed under Question 22.
  - Item (n), regarding celebrating Native American heritage, since it was already addressed under Question 22.
  - In item (o), regarding preserving local historic records, the Planning Commission eliminated the text regarding the creation of a hall of records for Butte County.
- ◆ Support the CAC recommendations that do not conflict with the revisions based on the above, which include the following:
  - Policy B, with other policy options listed as possible items to include in the Memoranda of Agreement with local Indian tribes.
  - New policy: “Seek to protect significant archaeological and historical resources.”

- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached (Marin absent)*

### **Community Health and Safety**

*Question 38: How should the County address community health and safety?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with one modification:
  - Add a new policy: “Continue to work collaboratively with the Mosquito Abatement District and other agencies to protect public health in Butte County.”
- ◆ The remaining policies as recommended by the CAC would remain. This includes the following:
  - Modify Policy A: indicate that the health information should be available when making land use decision, but that there is no requirement to use it; and remove reference to fast-food restaurants.
  - Include Policies B through H.

- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

*Question 39: How should the County address youth services?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Policies A through H.
  - Modify Policy F to make the role more general to County planning efforts, not just bike safety.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*

### **Noise**

*Question 40: How should the County address noise issues?*

- ◆ Support the CAC recommendation with no modifications. This recommendation includes the following:
  - Policy A, with modification to only to establish a noise ordinance.
  - Delete B.
- ◆ Votes: *Consensus was reached*