MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
August 3, 2010

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on August 3, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Spokely in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Snyder, Worthington, Vitas, and Spokely

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Vitas, Young

STAFF PRESENT: Reg Murray, Senior Planner
Adrienne Graham, Consulting Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLIGIENCE

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

V. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

A. INTENT TO PERMIT DEVELOPMENT IN A MINERAL RESOURCE ZONE IN THE CITY OF AUBURN URBAN RESERVE.

Planner Graham gave her staff report, reviewing the process the City must undertake to consider development in an area that is designated as a mineral resource zone, specifically the Urban Reserve (UR) area in southwest Auburn that's proposed for development with the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan (BRSP) and Study Areas Project. Planner Graham reviewed the different mineral resource zones occurring in the region, specifically in the UR area, and the conditions that the City must consider when allowing development in certain mineral resource zones, including the MRZ-2b zone that is present in the majority of the UR area. Those conditions include whether the mineral resources have regional or statewide importance and whether the City has a mineral resource protection plan. The mineral resources in the UR area are not of regional or statewide importance; however, the City does not have a mineral resource protection plan, so the City must pursue the current process to notify the public of the intent to allow development in the mineral resource zone, and to prepare a Statement

the mineral resource zone, and to prepare a Statement of Reasons detailing why the City would consider doing so. The Statement of Reasons must be adopted by the City and forwarded to the State Board of Mines and Geology for their approval.

Planner Graham reviewed the Statement of Reasons. The Reasons include: the UR area is surrounded by existing residential development with which mining activities would not be compatible; precluding mining activities from the area would not have a significant economic effect; no mining activities have occurred in the area since the 1940's; and the UR area is the last large area available for development, which would provide housing inventory for the next 20-30 years and help the City meet its affordable housing needs. The Statement concludes that it would be appropriate to develop the UR site even though you would lose access to mineral resources that might be there.

Commissioner Worthington asked if the City's mineral resources are a resource that is protected under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Planner Graham noted that mineral resources are evaluated under CEQA and that the BRSP DEIR does so, but it has concluded that that loss of mineral resources is a less than significant impact.

Commissioner Worthington asked if the MRZ process was a separate process from that of CEQA.

Planner Graham confirmed that it was.

Commissioner Worthington asked if there was a reason that the State Geology Board would not approve the City's Statement of Reasons.

Planner Graham stated that the City was not aware of a reason why the Board would deny the Statement of Reasons.

Commissioner Worthington expressed concern that staff concluded that these mineral resources were not of regional significance.

Planner Graham noted that the mineral resources are not of regional significance "on this site".

Commissioner Worthington asked if this was a determination of the California Division of Mines and Geology.

Planner Graham stated that she believed it was the determination of the State Geologist.

Commissioner Worthington inquired why the mineral resource zone boundaries did not match the City's zoning boundaries regarding mineral extraction.

Planner Graham commented that the State's designation follows the resource, while the City's zoning designation follows property boundaries, so they may not always match.

Commissioner Snyder asked about staff's experience with this process on other projects.

Planner Graham indicated that she was aware of other projects going through this process.

Chairman Spokely opened the public hearing and asked if anyone from the public wished to address the Commission.

No one spoke.

Chair Spokely closed the public hearing and indicated that comment on the project was concluded.

Commissioner Snyder asked if the members of the audience understood the nature of the evening's meeting.

One member of the audience asked for clarification.

Commissioner Snyder summarized the issues for the audience.

Kim Dahlin, 590 Rogers Lane, asked if the process reviewed this evening would preclude a property owner from conducting any mining on their property.

Chair Spokely noted that this process is a procedural matter.

Planner Graham commented that the presumption is that if the property is developed with residential uses, the mining uses would not be compatible.

Planner Murray noted that the State's process is separate from the zoning designation for the property.

Commissioner Snyder noted that once the property is developed with residential uses, it is unlikely that the land would be available for mining.

Planner Graham commented that an acceptable consequence of developing the area would be the potential loss of mining these mineral resources.

VI. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

A. City Council Meetings

Mercy Auburn Senior Apartment project at City Council on August 9, 2010

B. Future Planning Commission Meetings

The Commission asked about the schedule for the next BRSP hearing. Staff noted that a specific hearing date has not yet been identified.

C. Reports

None

VII. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

The purpose of these reports is to provide a forum for Planning Commissioners to bring forth their own ideas to the Commission. No decisions are to be made on these issues. If a Commissioner would like formal action on any of these discussed items, it will be placed on a future Commission agenda.

None

VIII. FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

Planning Commissioners will discuss and agree on items and/or projects to be placed on future Commission agendas for the purpose of updating the Commission on the progress of items and/or projects.

None

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg Murray