

**Siskiyou County Planning Commission**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**November 19, 2025**

The Siskiyou County Planning Commission meeting of November 19, 2025, was called to order by Chair Fowle at approximately 9:00 a.m. in the Siskiyou County Meeting Chambers, 311 Fourth Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Yreka, California.

**Present:** Commissioners Hart, Melo, Lindler, Veale and Chair Fowle

**Absent:** None

**Also Present:** Rick Dean, Director, Community Development Department; Hailey Lang, Deputy Director of Planning; Rachel Jereb, Senior Planner; James Phelps, Senior Planner; Bernadette Cizin, Associate Planner; William Carroll, Assistant County Counsel; Dianne Johnson and Katie Howell, Commission Clerks

**Approval of Minutes**

It was moved by Commissioner Lindler and seconded by Commissioner Melo to approve the October 15, 2025 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**Unscheduled Appearances:** None

**Conflict of Interest Declaration:** None

**Presentation of Documents; Availability of Public Records; Public Hearing Protocol:** The Chair directed those present to refer to the Agenda for these items.

**Right of Appeal Statement:** The Chair read the Right of Appeal Statement.

**Changes to the Agenda:** Moved by Commissioner Veale and seconded by Commissioner Melo to take New Business Agenda Item 1: Williams Pit Reclamation Plan and Use Permit Amendment (RP-00-04-1M / UP-00-11-1M) and relocate the item to New Business Item #3, shifting the other items up to New Business Item #1 and #2 respectively.

**Old Business:**

**Agenda Item 1: Yreka Union Telecommunication Use Permit (UP-25-01) / Categorically Exempt**

The project site is located at 943 Highway 263, Yreka; APN: 013-530-290; Township 45N, Range 7W, Section 15, MDBM; Latitude 41.7480°, Longitude -122.6362°. The applicant is requesting use permit approval to develop the project site with the installation of a new, unmanned telecommunications facility within a fenced 50-foot by 50-foot lease area. The telecommunication facility would primarily include a 100-foot-tall faux windmill lattice tower with twelve antennas, 12 remote radio units, one microwave dish, and accessory equipment. At the base of the tower, equipment cabinets and a generator are proposed. Space on the tower and on the ground is intended for co-location by other telecommunication providers in the future.

**Staff Report:** Senior Planner Rachel Jereb presented the staff report, explaining that the project was previously heard during the October 15 Planning Commission meeting and was continued due to the unavailability of documents for public view online. The proposal for a 100-foot faux windmill lattice telecommunications facility is located at 943 Highway 263, just north of the city of Yreka. She described the equipment, zoning consistency, CEQA exemptions, and agency comments. Cal Fire and Air Pollution Control comments resulted in additional fire and air quality conditions being added to the project. Staff recommended adopting the categorical exemption and approving the use permit for this project.

**Agency Input: None**

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

**Public Comments:**

Public testimony was provided by Bill Lewis, representing the applicant, Vertical Bridge. He presented a Power Point presentation and discussed coverage needs, emergency services reliability, faux windmill design and co-location. He stated the facility will allow Verizon to provide more reliable service and improve access to additional wireless services for the benefit of nearby residences, businesses, visitors and first responders, including emergency 911 calls throughout the area.

The Chair closed the Public Hearing.

**Commission Questions/Discussion:** Commissioners questioned power supply, generators, vegetation removal, fire safety, and coverage reliability. Chair Fowle expressed concerns regarding service priorities.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Melo, seconded by Commissioner Lindler, to adopt Resolution PC 2025-019 approving the Use Permit.

**Voted** Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**New Business:**

**Agenda Item 1: Galland Tentative Parcel Map (TPM-25-02) / Categorically Exempt (Originally Agenda Item 2)**

The project site is located at 2405 N. Old Stage Road, Mount Shasta, CA 96067; APN 036-060- 060; Township 40 North, Range 4 West, Section 6, MDB&M; coordinates 41°20'05.5"N 122°21'03.9"W. The subdivider is requesting approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to divide an existing 6.36-acre rural-residential parcel into two parcels of 3.41 acres and 2.95 acres. The existing single-family residence, well, septic system, and accessory outbuildings will remain on proposed Parcel A (3.41 acres). Proposed Parcel B (2.95 acres) would be available for future single-family residential use consistent with R-R-B-2.5 zoning. No new development, grading, or tree removal is proposed as part of this subdivision.

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 19, 2025

**Staff Report:**

Senior Planner James Phelps presented the staff report detailing the proposed two-parcel subdivision consistent with applicable regulations. He stated the owner is proposing to divide an existing 6.36-acre rural-residential parcel into two parcels of 3.41 acres and 2.95 acres, with no additional development proposed. Staff recommends approval.

**Agency Input: None**

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

**Public Comments: None**

There being no comments, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

**Commission Questions/Discussion:**

Commissioner Veale questioned whether there was a leach field on proposed Parcel B, 2.95 acres, noting the square showing on the map. In response, Community Development Director, Rick Dean, addressed his concerns stating it is Environmental Health's obligation to prove out a new parcel for sewage disposal, to establish an area that is approved for a leach field.

The Chair reopened the Public Hearing.

**Public Comments:**

Surveyor Terry Curry stated he can answer any questions on behalf of the project owner.

Seeing no further comments, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

**Commission Questions/Discussion:**

Commissioner Lindler questioned whether the 60-foot easement was going to be a shared driveway. Senior Planner Phelps stated he believes the existing driveway is closer to the single-family dwelling, which is next to Old Stage Road, where they pull right off onto the road. In response, Commissioner Lindler asked if the easement is where the new driveway would go. Senior Planner Phelps confirmed. Commissioner Lindler also asked if they would be getting a Timberland Conversion Permit. Senior Planner Phelps stated that as part of the conditions of approval that they would have to comply with 4290 and any other regulations required by the agency.

Chair Fowle asked if there was a test for water for new proposed parcel B. His general concern was related to the questions that were brought up by Commissioner Veale. He stated that maybe we might want to do a better job of determining whether or not that parcel is realistically developable. He stated he just wanted to put it out there as we are continuing to work on the General Plan update.

Commissioners Lindler and Melo also discussed their individual concerns regarding the issue raised by Chair Fowle.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Veale, seconded by Commissioner Melo, to adopt Resolution PC 2025-022, approving the Tentative Parcel Map.

**Voted** Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**Agenda Item 2: McCloud Partners Tentative Parcel Map (TPM-25-04) / Common Sense Exemption (Originally Agenda Item 3)**

The project site is located at 909 Mill Road, McCloud, CA 96057; on APNs 028-240-320, 028-440-430, 028-440-550, 028-530-010; Township 40N, Range 2W, Section 31, MDBM; 41°15'54.8"N 122°07'21.5"W. The subdivider is requesting approval of a Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide an existing 60.23-acre industrial site in the Community of McCloud into three parcels plus a remainder as follows: Parcel 1 – 7.44 acres; Parcel 2 – 8.10 acres; Parcel 3 – 13.41 acres; Remainder – 31.28 acres. Total project area: 60.23 acres. No new development, grading, or tree removal is proposed as part of this subdivision.

**Staff Report:**

Senior Planner James Phelps stated that this project is a subdivision of an existing 60-acre industrial site in McCloud, California, into three parcels and a remainder. Staff stated there is no new development, vegetation removal or grading proposed. He stated there is currently a PacifiCorp substation on proposed parcel one, proposed parcel two is undeveloped and proposed parcel three is developed with private connector roads. There are some older industrial buildings on the remainder parcel. Senior Planner Phelps stated this project is consistent with the General Plan and exempt from CEQA under the Common Sense exemption. He also stated there were no adverse comments from other agencies.

**Agency Input: None**

Chair Fowle brought up a question regarding the colors on the map on page three – parcel one in green, parcel two in red, parcel three in blue, and the remainder in yellow. He stated it appears the yellow portion is split in two by a solid black line, asking if that was an accident. Senior Planner Phelps stated that the shape of the remainder has changed over time and it is now going back to the original remainder. Chair Fowle stated he would clarify with the project surveyor.

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

**Public Comments:**

Surveyor Terry Curry spoke on behalf of McCloud Partners. He stated the original project was four and a remainder, and they decided to eliminate parcel four, which is north of the line in question. It was just left on the exhibit, and the entire yellow portion of the map is the remainder.

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 19, 2025

Chair Fowle asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak in favor of the project. A hand was raised, and an audience member stated he had questions but was unaware of the process. Chair Fowle indicated he would be able to ask questions after public comments were addressed. Chair asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the project. No hands were raised. Chair asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the project. No hands were raised. Seeing no additional comments, he asked the audience member to come to the podium to speak.

Troy Frisbee stated he lives right across the street from the project and is concerned with access in and out of the neighborhood. He asked if they are going to try to open Haul Road again because someone has blocked that off. He stated this area has been open for 100 years and his family has been a property owner there for 80 years and he feels as though his rights are being taken away by continued development.

Bruce Berlinger addressed the commission and stated he lives near Mr. Frisbee, and he was not the one who blocked off Haul Road. He stated that McCloud Partners is concerned about the log blocking the road too and that he spoke with Deputy Director Hailey Lang about his concerns. He stated it is a civil matter at this point and they are also concerned. He also wanted to make it clear they are rezoning for commercial purposes, and no houses will be built. The log is too heavy for it to be removed easily, but it is currently on McCloud Partners' property.

**Commission Questions/Discussion:**

Chair Fowle asked for clarification regarding access. Additionally, Commissioner Lindler wanted to make sure it is clear that a Timberland Conversion Permit is needed.

Chair Fowle asked for any further questions or comments from commissioners. Seeing none, he stated he would entertain a motion.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Lindler, seconded by Commissioner Melo to adopt Resolution PC 2025-021, determining the project exempt from CEQA and approving the tentative parcel map, subject to the recommended findings and conditions of approval.

**Voted** Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**Agenda Item 3: Williams Pit Reclamation Plan and Use Permit Amendment (RP-00-04-1M / UP-00-11-1M) (Originally Agenda Item 1)**

The project site is located in an unincorporated part of Siskiyou County approximately 1.75 miles north and east of the city of Montague, off of Wilder Lane. The APN associated with this project is 013-360-020. The project is proposing to amend the existing Use Permit and Reclamation Plan to expand the quarry excavation area and allow continued mining activities at the site for an additional

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 19, 2025

20 years. The proposed project would allow for the continued removal, crushing and stockpiling of aggregate onsite. The amendment is necessary as a previous operator did not mine according to the approved reclamation plan, making the approved final slopes unachievable.

**Staff Report:**

Associate Planner Bernadette Cizin stated that Southern Oregon Ready Mix, operator of the Williams Rock Pit is requesting an amendment to the existing use permit and reclamation plan for the active service mine located north of Montague, east of Airport Road.

Commissioner Lindler stated she didn't recognize the representative Keith Hamlin, and she needs to recuse herself.

Planner Cizin continued her staff report stating the amendments address boundary changes, slope reconfiguration, extension of mining activity, updated reclamation measures, and compliance with SMARA. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated.

Planner Cizin stated "when the MND was posted, a public comment was received from Fish and Wildlife regarding a concern for a potential habitat for Western burrowing owls. In response and at the request of the applicant, Vestra Resources conducted a field study finding the area does not support burrowing owls or their burrows. This response and field study is what was handed to you when you arrived. Two adjacent property owners, each of which Wilder Lane goes through their property, reached out to staff regarding the use of Wilder Lane. They expressed concern of impacts on the road and legal easements. Staff provided them contact information for the applicant as use of the private road is between the landowners."

Staff recommended approval.

**Agency Input: None**

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

**Public Comments:**

Extensive public testimony was given by Mark Peacemaker, a nearby resident, regarding private road access, safety, truck traffic, noise, and legal easement concerns.

Commissioner Veale disclosed that he had personally visited the project site and traveled along Wilder Lane to better understand existing conditions. He noted that several occupied residences are located along the access route. Commissioner Veale stated that while he was generally supportive of the project and its economic benefits, he shared the concerns of the residents along Wilder Lane.

Veale asked if there was a resolution to the issues addressed by Mr. Peacemaker and was referred to County Counsel for comment.

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 19, 2025

**Commission Questions/Discussion:**

Following the closing of the public hearing, the commissioners engaged in an extensive discussion regarding the Williams Pit Reclamation Plan and Use Permit Amendment, with particular focus on access, traffic impacts, historical use of the site, and the relationship between the proposed project and surrounding residential properties.

The chair and staff discussed the long operational history of the Williams Pit, noting that mining activities at the site dated back several decades, with intermittent use extending into the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. It was acknowledged that the mine pre-dated the construction of the residential use of the nearby homes.

Commissioners questioned staff regarding the legal status of access of the site.

Bill Carroll of County Counsel explained that while references to access appears in historical documents and prior approvals, a planning approval does not itself confer private access rights. Counsel noted that if the mining parcel is legally landlocked, access may exist through prescriptive easement or easement by necessity, but such determinations must be made by a court and fall outside the authority of the Planning Commission.

The Commission explored whether alternative access routes could be feasible to reduce impacts to nearby residences. Staff and the applicant's representative responded that topography, property boundaries, and ownership constraints could limit the feasibility of such alternatives.

**Motion:** Moved by Commissioner Veale, seconded by Commissioner Melo, to continue the Williams Pit Reclamation Plan and Use Permit Amendment to a date uncertain, in order to allow the applicant, property owner, and affected neighboring property owners additional time to evaluate and potentially resolve access concerns, including ingress and egress to the site, and to allow staff to return with the item when it is deemed ready for further consideration. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Melo.

**Voted** upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

**Agenda Item 4: General Plan – Noise Element (GPA-25-03)**

Senior Planner James Phelps presented the Draft Noise Element of the Siskiyou County General Plan, which was prepared by the County's outside consultant. Mr. Phelps explained that the Noise Element identifies existing noise sources in the county, establishes compatible noise levels for various land uses, and provides policy guidance for evaluating noise impacts associated with further discretionary development projects.

Mr. Phelps outlined the structure of the Noise Element, noting that it categorizes noise sources into transportation-related noise, stationary noise sources, and temporary or event-related noise. He stated that transportation noise represents the primary noise source within Siskiyou County. He further explained that the element includes an overview of how noise is measured in decibels, along with tables illustrating common noise levels and land use compatibility standards derived from state

General Plan guidelines.

Commissioner Lindler raised several detailed questions regarding the application of proposed noise thresholds, particularly in residential and rural contexts. She expressed concern that certain decibel limits appeared lower than common household or operational noise levels and questioned how such thresholds would be applied in practice. Commissioner Lindler also voiced significant concern regarding references to sensitive wildlife habitats and the potential for new noise-related restrictions on agricultural and forestry activities, noting that these industries already operate under extensive regulatory frameworks and limited operating periods.

Deputy Director Hailey Lang responded to these questions, explaining that the Noise Element is a policy guidance document rather than a direct enforcement tool. Ms. Lang stated that noise thresholds identified as “clearly unacceptable” would not automatically prohibit uses but instead would signal the need for mitigation measures or further analysis during discretionary project review. She emphasized that the Noise Element is intended to provide local control and flexibility when evaluating projects, rather than creating rigid standards.

Commissioner Lindler further questioned language in the draft referencing agricultural truck traffic and expressed concern about potential regulatory “creep” that could negatively impact agriculture, forestry, and timber operations. She stressed that agricultural operations often require early morning starts, extended work hours, and the use of heavy equipment and truck traffic that could exceed typical noise thresholds.

Ms. Lang acknowledged these concerns and agreed that references to agricultural truck traffic should be revised or removed to avoid unintended impacts on agricultural operations protected under the county’s Right to Farm ordinance. She noted that agricultural noise issues are more appropriately addressed through existing CEQA review processes rather than through the Noise Element.

Commissioner Melo questioned the necessity of a Noise Element given the county’s rural character and low population density. He also asked how noise standards would be enforced and monitored, expressing concern that additional regulation could burden farmers and ranchers without meaningful benefit.

Ms. Lang responded that the Noise Element is required under state law as part of the General Plan and clarified that enforcement mechanisms would be developed separately through future ordinances. She reiterated that the Noise Element would primarily guide discretionary project review rather than regulate ongoing agricultural operations.

Chair Fowle raised concerns regarding specific language identifying large geographic areas—such as national forests and river headwaters—as sensitive wildlife habitats. He noted that these broad designations could be misleading and overly restrictive, given the vast size and varied uses of such areas. Chair Fowle also questioned the appropriateness of highlighting agricultural truck traffic in the Noise Element, emphasizing that future agricultural viability will depend on increased processing and transportation activity.

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 19, 2025

Ms. Lang agreed to review and revise this language and to ensure that wildlife habitat considerations are addressed through established environmental review processes rather than the Noise Element.

The Commission generally expressed support for the development of a Noise Element as part of the General Plan update but provided clear direction to staff to revise the draft to improve clarity, remove or modify references that could negatively affect agricultural and forestry operations, and ensure the document remains flexible and consistent with existing county ordinances.

**Agenda Item 5: General Plan – Circulation Element (GPA-25-04)**

Senior Planner James Phelps presented the draft General Plan Circulation Element, explaining that the element establishes the county's long-term framework for transportation planning and is intended to guide future decisions related to roads, traffic, and mobility. Mr. Phelps stated that the Circulation Element evaluates the existing transportation system and aligns county policies with state requirements while recognizing Siskiyou County's rural character.

Mr. Phelps explained that the Circulation Element addresses roadway classifications, circulation patterns, and transportation infrastructure throughout the county. He noted that the document considers local roads, collector roads, arterials, and highways, as well as the relationship between land use decisions and transportation demand. He emphasized that the element is designed to support safe and efficient movement of people and goods while maintaining compatibility with rural land uses.

Commission discussion focused heavily on the rural nature of the county and the importance of flexibility in transportation planning. Commissioner Lindler raised concerns about applying urban transportation standards to rural road systems. She emphasized that many county roads are unpaved or lightly improved and serve agricultural, forestry, and residential uses rather than high-volume commuter traffic. Commissioner Lindler cautioned against policies that could unintentionally require costly upgrades or impose design standards that are unrealistic for rural areas.

Chair Fowle echoed these concerns, noting that Siskiyou County's circulation system is fundamentally different from urban counties. He emphasized that paved roads, sidewalks, and urban-style improvements are not appropriate or feasible in many areas and that the Circulation Element should clearly reflect the county's rural context. Chairman Fowle also stressed the importance of maintaining access for agricultural and resource-based industries, particularly heavy truck traffic associated with farming, ranching, timber, and mining operations.

Commissioner Veale discussed the need to balance safety considerations with practicality, particularly on rural roads shared by residents, farm equipment, and commercial trucks. He emphasized that the circulation system must function for existing users and that policies should not discourage economic activity or create conflicts between residential development and long-

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 19, 2025

established transportation routes.

Commissioners also discussed references in the Circulation Element to multimodal transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle, rail, and public transit considerations. Several commissioners noted that while these modes are important in certain areas, they should not be overemphasized in locations where they are impractical due to distance, terrain, climate, or low population density.

Staff clarified that the Circulation Element is intended to provide guidance rather than mandate specific infrastructure improvements. Mr. Phelps stated that transportation improvements would continue to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis and that the element allows the county to prioritize safety, maintenance, and functionality over expansion. He further noted that the element is consistent with the county's Local Transportation Plan and state planning requirements.

Commissioners expressed support for the overall goals of the Circulation Element but directed staff to ensure that the final document clearly reflects Siskiyou County's rural conditions, avoids urban-centric assumptions, and preserves flexibility for agricultural, forestry, and industrial transportation needs. Staff indicated that the Commission's comments would be incorporated into a revised draft for future consideration.

**Items for Discussion/Direction:**

**1. Ongoing Staff Update Regarding the General Plan Update**

Deputy Director Hailey Lang stated that the Table of Contents for the zoning code had been finalized, and she is scheduled to meet with consultants next week to talk about zoning code updates for each section.

**Miscellaneous:**

**1. Future Meetings:** The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, December 17, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. Deputy Director Hailey Lang stated that since there were no items set on the agenda for the meeting, it potentially should be cancelled. The Commissioners agreed.

**2. Correspondence: None**

**3. Staff Comments:**

Community Development Director Rick Dean notified the Planning Commission that it would be his last meeting, as he planned to retire at the end of December.

Planning Commission thanked Director Dean for his many years of service and wished him the best of luck in his retirement.

**4. Commission Comments:**

Planning Commission Meeting  
November 19, 2025

Chair Fowle wished all staff and Commissioners and their families a very Happy Thanksgiving and Merry Christmas.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was concluded at approximately 12:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Hailey Lang, Secretary

\kh

DRAFT