

1 **NEVADA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **NEVADA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

3
4 **MINUTES** of the meeting of March 23, 2017, 1:30 PM, Board Chambers, Eric Rood
5 Administration Center, 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, California
6

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Aguilar, Vice Chair James and Commissioners Duncan, Heck,
9 and Jensen present.

10
11 **MEMBERS ABSENT:**

12
13 **STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director, Brian Foss; Principal Planner, Tyler Barrington; Deputy
14 County Counsel, Rhetta VanderPloeg; Assistant Planner, Janeane Martin; Senior Planner, Patrick
15 Dobbs; Administrative Assistant, Marianne Mason.
16

17
18 **CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. Roll call was
19 taken.

20
21 **STANDING ORDERS:** Salute to the Flag - Roll Call - Corrections to Agenda.

22
23 **CHANGES TO AGENDA:** None.

24
25 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Members of the public shall be allowed to address the Commission on
26 items not appearing on the agenda which are of interest to the public and are within the subject
27 matter jurisdiction of the Planning Commission, provided that no action shall be taken unless
28 otherwise authorized by Subdivision (6) of Section 54954.2 of the Government Code.
29

30 No public comment.

31 Public comment period closed at 1:31 p.m.

32
33 **COMMISSION BUSINESS:** None.

34
35 **CONSENT ITEMS:** None.

36
37 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

38
39 **1:30 P.M.**

40 **PLN17-0011, 0012, 0014 & 0016 / RAF17-0001, 0002, 0003 & 0004:** Four separate
41 Commercial Rafting Permit applications proposing guided rafting tours pursuant to Sec. G-III
42 8.1 of the Nevada County General Code. The guided rafting tours are proposed on the Little
43 Truckee River and Truckee River from Boca Dam to Floriston. Ingress is proposed just below
44 Boca Dam and egress is proposed near the I-80 Bridge on the west bank of the river. Ingress is
45 also proposed at this I-80 Bridge egress location with egress outside of Nevada County
46 jurisdiction. **LOCATION:** Ingress: just south of Boca Dam. Ingress/egress: Floriston near I-80
47 bridge, west side of Truckee River in State right-of-way. **APNs:** 48-160-03, 48-130-22
48 **RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** Exempt per CEQA Section
49 15061(b)(3) **PLANNER:** Janeane Martin, Assistant Planner

50
51 Planner Janeane Martin gave a presentation on Commercial Rafting: the current guidelines,
52 prohibitions, routes and specific areas of operation. The four applicants are the same four
53 applicants granted 2 year permits in 2015 and for many years prior. She described the required
54 conditions of approval per Nevada County General Code G-III 8.1. Planner Martin noted that
55 she received an email from a local fisherman and resident of Hirshdale objecting to one of the
56 sections of the routes, a copy of that email was added to the Commissioners packets. This
57 fisherman mistakenly believed the rafting operators were requesting approval to utilize a new
58 route along a portion of the river. Planner Martin spoke with the gentleman and explained that
59 this route has historically been approved and permitted but rarely used. He felt better after this
60 conversation and elected to not attend today's hearing.

61 Planner Martin reminded the Commission of a memo added to their packet today concerning
62 revisions to Condition of Approval A. 19.

63
64 At 1:43 p.m. Planner Martin ended her presentation and Chair Aguilar asked for any questions or
65 comments from the Commissioners.

66
67 Commissioner James asked what prevents rafting operations on the route of concern to the local
68 fisherman and who permits routes outside of Nevada County. Planner Martin explained that use
69 of the route north of Floriston is dependent on water flow. Other jurisdictions do not currently
70 require permitting similar to Nevada County but are also not required to notify our county of any
71 changes in their permitting process.

72 Chair Aguilar asked for further clarification of the email received from a local fisherman.
73 Planner Martin explained his concern was about possibly not having a good place to fish along
74 the river due to noise and activity from rafting. He was reassured that this is not a new proposal
75 and, since it has not affected him before, was relieved and had no further issues.

76
77 Chair Aguilar invited any applicants who would like to speak to come forward.
78 A representative from Tahoe Whitewater Tours, Mike Miltner, spoke to the rules and regulations
79 in Nevada County as being more lengthy and complex and restrictive than any other jurisdiction
80 where he has operated over the course of his career. He explained that Nevada does not require a
81 permitting process at all and he works closely and cooperatively with Washoe County in Nevada
82 with no issues.

83 Commissioner Heck asked for further information about what restrictions he feels are too
84 burdensome to the operators and their business.

85 Mr. Miltner responded with his remarks about time of day restrictions which he believes violate
86 a state constitutional protection of public right to access the river at any time of day. He did
87 concede that counties are permitted to impose time of day use restrictions as they relate to public
88 health, safety, and welfare although he believes Nevada County imposed these time of day
89 restrictions to appease fisherman who did not want to share the river with others. He also spoke
90 about the limit to 10 rafts per day per operator as being much more restrictive than Placer
91 County, for instance, which allows 200 rafts per day. In regards to the concern about disruption
92 to fishing, he commented that rafting tours cover six miles in two hours so the impact to fishing
93 is very minimal as the rafts move past any fisherman in a matter of 5 to 10 minutes. These
94 restrictions, he noted, resulted in his company turning away several hundred potential customers,
95 who have a "constitutional right" to be on the river, because they could not be accommodated.
96 He believes this is not fair and limits his, and the other operator's, income. Another objection
97 Mr. Miltner commented on is the user day fee, \$2 per customer, charged by The County which is

98 for monitoring of the river. He believes this fee is imposed in violation of Federal statute which
99 prohibits any jurisdiction from charging user day fees on any navigable waterway.
100 Commissioner Duncan commented that the current regulations were passed almost 20 years ago
101 and maybe there is some room to review the current regulations and perhaps staff could look at
102 them and work with the operators to update and make changes, suggesting that maybe it's time
103 for revisions.
104 Brian Foss stated staff can certainly look at the regulations, speak to County Counsel, and see if
105 they are legally defensible in regards to state and federal law.
106 Commissioner Duncan also commented that maybe the two year length of the permit is too short.
107 Chair Aguilar expressed that possibly Nevada County is being too restrictive. He spoke to the
108 public benefit of having access to the river.
109 Brian Foss reiterated that staff can take a look at the issue in terms of legality, but feels the
110 current regulations were aimed at striking a balance to prevent overcrowding on that stretch of
111 the river. He responded to the question about the two year time limits on permits, explaining that
112 allowing only four operators to obtain permits for longer periods of time might create a
113 monopoly, excluding other operators from the opportunity to offer the same type of business at
114 that site.
115 Chair Aguilar stated that input from the other operators would be valuable. However,
116 modifications would take time and delay rafting operations for this season. So the
117 Commissioners agreed to move forward with the applications today allowing staff to review the
118 issues raised prior to the next two year permitting process.

119
120 End comments at 2:01 p.m.

121
122 Chair Aguilar opened the public hearing at 2:01 p.m.
123 Chair Aguilar closed the public hearing at 2:01 p.m.

124
125 **Motion by Commissioner Jensen, second by Commissioner Duncan to:**

- 126 1. Determine these projects are exempt from environmental review pursuant to Sec.
127 15061(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, finding that
128 they will not, directly or indirectly, result in a physical change to the environment,
129 and that it can be seen with certainty that these permits will not have the potential for
130 causing a significant effect on the environment.

131 **Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**

132 **Motion by Commissioner Jensen, second by Commissioner Heck to:**

- 133 2. Approve a Rafting Permit, as amended at today's hearing, for each of the four applicants,
134 subject to the conditions shown in Attachment "1", and make findings A-H as required
135 by Nevada County General Code Section G-III.

136 **Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**

137
138 Chair Aguilar stated there is a 10 day appeal period on this action.

139
140 Commissioner Jensen added a comment to staff to look at other jurisdictions for direction on
141 updates to the current permit process and regulations.

142
143 **2:06 P.M.**

144 **PLN16-0084; GPA16-0001; RZN16-0001; EIS16-0003:** The project is a recommendation to
145 the Board of Supervisors for General Plan Land Use Map amendments (GPA) and
146 Zoning District Map amendments (Rezone), to change the County's primary land use

147 designation of 19 specific Tahoe National Forest parcels, 18 of which are currently zoned
148 for General Agriculture (AG), and one parcel is currently zoned Residential Agriculture
149 (RA) uses. The proposed GPA/Rezone project would re-designate and rezone all 19
150 parcels, totaling approximately 1,791 acres, to the County's Forest land use designation
151 and zoning. The project is a GPA/Rezone legislative action only and does not include any
152 additional development or disturbance. **PROJECT LOCATION:** 19 parcels, totaling
153 approximately 1,791 acres, are grouped into six different areas of the Tahoe National
154 Forest and unincorporated Nevada County. Visit the project's webpage for more detailed
155 site location information. **APNs:** 60-010-01, 60-020-01, 60-030-02, 60-030-04, 60-330-
156 01 , 60-330-02, 60-330-13, 34-110-04, 34-110-05, 34-120-04, 34-120-05, 34-120-06, 34-
157 360-27, 38-050-02, 64-050-06, 17-020-18, 17-020-19, 48-080-84 and 49-330-08.
158 **RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** Negative
159 Declaration. **PLANNER:** Patrick Dobbs, Senior Planner.
160

161 Planner Dobbs presented the project explaining how each parcel came to be included in the land
162 use changes before the commission today, how it became a stand-alone project, and who the
163 parties are who moved the project forward. The Board of Supervisors identified this as a Priority
164 Project B in 2016. Site #1, with seven parcels, is proposed to be designated as Forest 40 for
165 general land use as well as zoning. Site #2, also seven parcels, is proposed for designation as
166 Forest 40 acre. Two of these parcels have the Scenic Corridor Combining District with an
167 additional layer of regulation that requires scenic review. The proposal retains this designation
168 on those parcels that currently have it. One parcel has the Washington Ridge Conservation
169 Camp on it. Otherwise, the parcels are vacant. Site #3 is the smallest parcel at 2.5 acres with a
170 current designation of Residential-Agriculture 1.5 acre minimum. The proposal is to amend the
171 land use and zoning to be Forest 160 acre minimum. Site #4 includes two parcels with a current
172 General Plan designation of Rural 10, zoning of Ag 10-PD, and Plan Development Combining
173 District. The proposal seeks to amend land use and zoning to Forest 40 and *not* retain the Plan
174 Development Combining District designation. Site #5 is the Prosser Creek parcel currently
175 designated Rural 10, Ag 10. The proposal is to amend to Forest 160. Site #6 is adjacent to the
176 Martis Creek National Recreation Area currently designated as Rural 20, Ag 20. The proposal is
177 to amend to Forest 40.

178 Issues and Concerns were described:

- 179 1. Jurisdiction. Planner Dobbs advised the Commission that their recommendation may or
180 may not actually result in any changes on the ground in the future. National Forest Lands
181 are not subject to County General Plans. Land use jurisdiction rests solely with the
182 Federal Government. The County Land Use designations would not apply to future
183 development or regulations unless the Forest Service were to sell these parcels.
- 184 2. Land Use. Future use of these parcels is most likely to be Forest Uses. A designation of
185 Forest is intended to protect and manage the forest including recreation and timber
186 harvesting. None of the parcels are currently zoned Open Space which is The County's
187 most restrictive land use. Staff believes the proposed Forest Land Use designation stays
188 true to the core purpose of this project which was to provide long term protection of the
189 property's resources values.
- 190 3. Minimum Parcel Size/Development Potential. Staff believes large tracts of land are more
191 suitable for timber production and recreation. Accordingly, Forest Land Use designation
192 has the largest minimum parcel sizes of all the County's land uses. Minimum parcel size
193 affects density and the ability to subdivide so increasing the minimum parcel size reduces
194 some of the development potential.

- 195 4. Coordination with Other Agencies. Staff worked closely with The Forest Service as well
196 as the town of Truckee. Truckee planners have no objections to the zoning change for
197 the parcels within their sphere of influence.
198
199

200 At 2:25 p.m. Planner Dobbs ended his presentation and Chair Aguilar asked for any questions or
201 comments from the Commissioners.

202 Commissioner Jensen asked for clarification of the previous designations and if an individual
203 were to acquire one of these parcels what would the impact? Planner Dobbs answered that any
204 new owner would inherit the adopted zoning.

205 Chair Aguilar asked how this proposal affects timber harvest. Planner Dobbs stated it has no
206 effect.

207 Commissioner Heck asked about the Prosser Creek parcel and the original intent to give it an
208 “Open Space” designation, so why designate Forest 40? Planner Dobbs explained that the
209 project became more comprehensive to include more land. Brian Foss stated that the property is
210 owned by the Forest Service so staff worked with them to accommodate their desire for
211 consistency over all parcels. Planner Dobbs added that the amended designation to Forest 40
212 offers similar protection to the land.

213 Commissioner Jensen commented that the designation of “Open Space” would limit the Forest
214 Service to almost nothing on that land; for instance, a fish hatchery. His opinion is that the Forest
215 Service request for a designation of Forest 40 is sufficient.

216 Planner Barrington reminded the commission that their ruling only applies in the case of any
217 parcel being sold to a private individual. As long as the Forest Service owns the land, they have
218 jurisdiction over it. It belongs to the United States.

219 Commissioner Duncan stated that Open Space is not used for Forest Service property and is
220 typically used as a result of development where there is an agreement of no development in a
221 particular area.
222

223 Tim Cardoza, Land Use Program Manager for the Tahoe National Forest, was asked to address
224 Commissioner Heck’s concerns about the Prosser Creek parcel. He assured the Commission that
225 the chance of this parcel ever being sold is very small. Under current law, the Forest Service has
226 very limited authority to dispose of property. Their intention is to manage the land with minimal
227 impact.
228

229 End comments at 2:38 p.m.
230

231 Chair Aguilar opened the public hearing at 2:38 p.m.

232 Chair Aguilar closed the public hearing at 2:38 p.m.
233

234 **Motion by Commissioner Jensen, second by Commissioner Duncan, to:**

- 235 1. Adopt the attached Resolution (EIS16-0003) approving a Negative Declaration for the
236 USFS GPA/Rezone project, pursuant to Section 15074 of the California Environmental
237 Quality Act Guidelines based on the findings contained in the Resolution (*Attachment 1*).

238 **Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**

239 **Motion by Commissioner Jensen, second by Commissioner Duncan, to:**

- 240 2. Adopt the attached Resolution (GPA16-0001) for the General Plan amendments to
241 change the land use designation of 19 Tahoe National Forest parcels based on the
242 findings contained in the Resolution (*Attachment 2*).

243 **Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**

244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292

Motion by Commissioner Jensen, second by Commissioner Heck, to:

3. Adopt the attached Ordinance (RZN16-0001) amending Zoning District Maps (ZDM) #23, #36, #64, #75, #76, #94, #129, #138 and #139 to rezone 19 Tahoe National Forest parcels to correspond with the amended General Plan land use designations of those parcels, based on the findings contained with the Ordinance (*Attachment 3*).

Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.

Chair Aguilar stated there is no appeal period because this is a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Chair Aguilar called for a five minute break.

2:45 P.M.

PLN17-0021; CUP17-0001: A Use Permit for the site development and operation of a temporary 4.8 acre debris management site to receive and grind trees cleared from utility rights-of-way per Governor’s 10/30/2015 Emergency Proclamation to remove dead and dying trees from high hazard zones. A temporary 100 square foot scales building will be placed on the site during the temporary operation. A grading permit and stockpile permit are in process for the grading of the pad and access road and storage of logs on the site. The Use Permit is to allow processing of the logs including chipping and grinding. An additional 1 acre area of the site that is already paved will be utilized by the Fire Safe Council for community green waste drop off site for a 2 month period during the spring and fall each year. **PROJECT LOCATION:** 12022 & 12270 La Barr Meadows, Grass Valley, CA. **ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (APN):** 22-160-06 &-033. **RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** CEQA Exempt per Section 15269, Emergency Proclamation. **PLANNER:** Brian Foss, Planning Director (530) 265-1256.

Director Brian Foss reminded the Commissioners of the memo provided to them clarifying information in the Staff Report. He described the scope of the project, the development and improvements of the site, hours of operation, and activities to be conducted on the two parcels. He also provided background information and explained why this project is needed. This site would process logs from Nevada County locations only and would be a temporary operation, depending on supply of logs, for 2 to 5 years. Road improvements would be made to La Barr Meadows Road to ease traffic and provide appropriate safe access to the site.

In addition to debris management, space would be provided for a Fire Safe Council green waste drop-off for the public. An existing concrete pad would be used for this purpose and no site preparation is needed. This site would operate for 2 months in the spring and in the fall, likely more on weekends from 9 AM to 2:30 PM. Chipping of dropped off materials would occur at the end of the season after accumulation of materials. All material would be removed and the site cleaned up.

Director Foss addressed concerns about Bark Beetle Translocation. An ecologist was consulted to address this issue. The essential result of that consultation is that Bark Beetle is already present throughout The County, the severity of the infestation is directly related to drought conditions, and this operation would not introduce them.

A noise study was conducted and it was concluded that noise thresholds would not be exceeded and excessive noise would not impact the area.

Director Foss directed Commissioners to the memo regarding traffic and a revised condition #6 to approve routing flexibility to allow trucks to utilize the McKnight/Highway 49 intersection during non-peak hour timeframes.

293 Director Foss addressed the issue of toxic substances found at the site due to mining activity
294 conducted there in the past. There is a voluntary agreement between the Department of Toxic
295 Substances Control and the owners to clean up the site in the future. For this proposed use for
296 debris management, DTSC requires fencing to avoid contact with any contaminated areas. There
297 is a fencing plan included in the proposed site development to keep people out of those areas.
298 DTSC has accepted the plan and has no objection to the project moving forward.
299

300 At 3:07 p.m. Director Foss ended his presentation and Chair Aguilar asked for any questions or
301 comments from the Commissioners.
302

303 Commissioner Duncan asked if this project is related to another site and if both sites would
304 continue to operate. Director Foss indicated they are not related and would both be in operation.
305 Commissioner Heck asked if the property is privately owned. It is owned by Rare Earth. There
306 is an agreement in place for access to the site which is a two year agreement with two 2-year
307 extensions. There are also provisions in place to leave the site cleaned up as necessary for public
308 health and safety.

309 Commissioner Jensen asked if this site was only for trees removed by PG&E. Director Foss
310 affirmed that is correct.

311 Commissioner James asked about regulation of the traffic. Director Foss explained that
312 enforcement would be complaint driven, however, truck drivers will not be outside contracted
313 but will be employees of Phillips and Jordan so the applicant will manage and educate them to
314 follow signage and conditions of the agreement.

315 Commissioner Heck asked how much of the site will be scraped and what happens after this
316 temporary use; who will maintain the site if, for instance, Scotch Broom starts to invade and
317 create a fire hazard?

318 Director Foss stated that provisions are worked into the agreement to leave the site in a non-
319 hazardous condition.

320 Chair Aguilar asked about restricting truck traffic at the intersection during lunch time as well as
321 during morning and evening peak times. Discussion ensued about the intersection in question.
322 Director Foss reiterated the low number of truck trips per day so the impact would be minimal.

323 Chair Aguilar asked about the Fire Safe Council use of the site and if green waste would pile up
324 and only be chipped at the end of two months.

325 Director Foss believes they will chip as needed and deferred to the Fire Safe Council
326 representative to give further details.
327

328 Bob Delp of Benchmark Resources and Philip Jennings, representatives of the applicant, Phillips
329 and Jordan, gave a presentation about the company and how they run their projects. Examples of
330 projects they have been contracted for include debris management of the 9-11 World Trade
331 Center clean-up and Hurricane Katrina disaster clean-up in the gulf coast region. They provided
332 details of their operation specific to Nevada County. The proposed Bear River Debris
333 Management Site in Nevada County is of great importance to reduce haul times and more
334 efficiently process the felled trees. Environmental concerns were addressed. Environmental
335 studies were conducted and it was concluded that the project would not have a significant impact
336 on the environment or on land use issues. The project will operate under a spill prevention,
337 control and counter measure plan for water management with provisions for storm water
338 pollution control. A biological resources assessment was done and found no special status
339 species or habitat on site as well as no wetlands. Noise and emissions would not exceed
340 thresholds with no significant increases for the area. Dust control measures will be in place.
341 Visual impact is not relevant. The community benefits by permanent improvements to La Barr

342 Meadows Road. No significant land use or environmental effects would result from the
343 operation of this site. The applicant assured the commission that the site would be left in a safe
344 and clean condition as is their policy with all sites they utilize throughout the country.

345
346 Chair Aguilar stated that he felt his concern about mid-day traffic was addressed and resolved.
347 He would like to see language in the use conditions on requirements regarding how the site
348 would be left.

349
350 Chair Aguilar invited a representative from Fire Safe Council to speak on the operations of the
351 green waste component of the project. There is no specific timetable for chipping to occur and
352 would be done as needed. This particular site is similar to other sites operated by the Council so
353 they are familiar with the requirements for processing the material.

354 Chair Aguilar asked Fire Protection Planner, Matt Furtado, to address concerns about stockpiling
355 of material. Mr. Furtado stated that this particular site is well under the established fire code
356 limits for the amount of material that the site could possibly produce.

357 Commissioner Heck asked for clarification on vegetation clearance at the site. Mr. Furtado
358 explained that the nature of the site, which has been largely cleared, reduces any fire danger.

359
360 Chair Aguilar opened the public hearing at 3:40 p.m.

361 Chair Aguilar closed the public hearing at 3:40 p.m.

362
363 Chair Aguilar agreed with Commissioner Heck's concern with having language added to address
364 the final state of the site as important. Native plants and trees, for example. Discussion ensued.
365 Director Foss reminded the Commission that this site is projected to be used as a biomass facility
366 eventually and perhaps replanting should be limited to hydro-seeding and not comprehensive
367 landscaping.

368 Commissioner Heck clarified that she meant hydro-seeding in order to make the land more fire
369 safe.

370
371 John Blinder, a representative of the property owners, spoke on the issue of how the site is left
372 after this project. He reiterated that there is an active plan in progress to develop the site in the
373 future. The owners are in a cooperative agreement with Philips and Jordan which they feel is
374 sufficient to remediate the site. He suggested that a stipulation could be made in the future in the
375 case that the biomass facility is not built.

376
377 Bob Delp of Philips and Jordan, as well as Brian Foss, returned to the discussion to introduce
378 language to be added to the conditions regarding remediation of the site.

379
380 Commissioners all agreed the language was acceptable to them.

381
382 End comments at 3:55 p.m.

383
384 **Motion by Commissioner Duncan, second by Commissioner Jensen, to:**
385 1. Find this project exempt from environmental review, pursuant to Section 15269 of the
386 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) due to the Governor's Emergency
387 Proclamation.

388 **Motion carried, as modified at today's hearing, on a voice vote 5/0.**

389
390

391 **Motion by Commissioner Duncan, second by Commissioner Jensen, to:**
392 2. Approve Use Permit CUP17-0001 for the Debris Management Site and Fire Safe Council
393 Drop Off Site subject to the conditions shown in Attachment 1, making findings A
394 through K pursuant to Section L-II 5.7 of the Nevada County Land Use and Development
395 Code.

396 **Motion carried, as modified at today's hearing, on a voice vote 5/0.**

397
398 Chair Aguilar stated there is a 10 day appeal period on this action.

399 Chair Aguilar asked about upcoming hearings.

400
401 There was a brief discussion regarding the Ananda project coming before the Commission on
402 April 27. Commissioner Duncan asked for Director Foss to arrange site visits which he agreed
403 to do.

404
405 Commissioner James asked about the Wildwood Self-storage project.
406 Planner Barrington replied that the project is close to being deemed complete and will most
407 likely come before the Commission in May.

408
409 Commissioner Duncan asked about Dollar General and Planner Barrington gave an update.

410
411 Commissioner Duncan offered to make a report on recently approved projects, with pictures, so
412 the Commission can see what is happening in The County.

413 Chair Aguilar stated his support and feels this would be important for the Commissioners to
414 have this type of follow-up.

415
416 Commissioner Heck asked for an update on the industrial project approved at March 9 hearing.
417 Planner Barrington assured Commission that the added conditions agreed upon were written into
418 the conditions of approval and accepted by the applicant.

419
420 **Motion by Commissioner Heck; second by Commissioner Duncan to adjourn. Motion**
421 **carried on voice vote 5/0.**

422
423 There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 4:
424 08 p.m. to the next meeting tentatively scheduled for April 27, 2017 in the Board of Supervisors
425 Chambers, 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City.

426 _____

427
428 Passed and accepted this day of , 2016.

429
430 _____
431 Brian Foss, Ex-Officio Secretary