



PLANNING DIVISION
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT
3015 H STREET
EUREKA, CALIF. 95501-4484 PHONE (707) 445-7541

DATE: July 18, 2007
TO: Humboldt County Planning Commission
FROM: Kirk A. Girard, Director of Community Development Services
SUBJECT: **Staff Report # 6 for July 26th Meeting**

RECOMMENDED COMMISSION ACTION:

It is recommended that the Commission take the following actions:

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Open the public hearing and receive the staff report.
2. Continue taking public input on Group 5 Chapters: 12-Conservation and Open Space; 14-Biological Resources; 15-Cultural and Scenic.
3. Provide Commission direction on Chapters reviewed to date:
 - Chapter 1. Introduction
 - Chapter 2. Public Guide to the General Plan
 - Chapter 3. Governance Policy
 - Chapter 11. Economic Development Element
 - Chapter 12. Conservation and Open Space Elements
 - Chapter 14. Biological Resources
 - Chapter 15. Cultural and Scenic Resources
 - Chapter 16. Mineral Resources
 - Chapter 17. Energy Element
 - Chapter 18. Waste Management
 - Chapter 19. Air Quality
 - Chapter 20. Noise Element
 - Chapter 21. Safety Element

Planning Commission Review Process

At the Planning Commission's fifth meeting on June 21, 2007, the Commission received a staff report and discussed the Conservation and Open Space Elements, Biological Resources, and Cultural and Scenic Resources chapters.

A summary of the public comments received at the June 21, 2007 meeting is included as Attachment A. A summary of the Commissioner comments is included as Attachment B.

Recap of Public Input and Chapter Revisions to Date:

Chapter 1-Introduction, Chapter 2-Public Guide to the General Plan, and Chapter 3-Governance Policy

The Commission discussed and received public input on these chapters at the February 15th and March 15th meetings. Based on this discussion and input, a revised draft of these chapters was prepared and provided in the March 15th packet. The revisions included edits to the Guiding Principles, broadening the range of alternatives presented, and other minor edits.

Chapter 11 Economic Development Element

The Commission discussed and received public input on this chapter at the May 17th and June 21st meetings. A revised draft is in preparation. There was general public support for inclusion of this element, with some comments and criticisms on particular points.

The Board of Supervisors requested that the Plan include an Economic Development Element. The Element as presented reflects the adopted comprehensive economic development strategy, as well as key trends and emerging industries. The policy recommendations support maintenance of existing, traditional industries as well as the growth of new industries. Inclusion of this element helps to coordinate County land use and economic development policy.

Chapter 12-Conservation and Open Space, Chapter 14-Biological Resources, and Chapter 15-Cultural and Scenic Resources

The Commission discussed and received public input on this chapter at the June 21st meeting, and it is expected to continue receiving input on July 26th. A revised draft has not yet been prepared.

Chapter 12-Conservation and Open Space is a coordinating chapter which explains how the Plan addresses the requirements of the State-mandated conservation and open space elements. Chapter 14-Biological Resources and Chapter 15-Cultural and Scenic Resources are topics that are required to be addressed in the conservation and open space elements. The Biological Resources chapter largely follows the 1984 Framework Plan, with some edits based on policy adopted in the McKinleyville Community Plan and others are a result of the adoption of the Streamside Management Area ordinance. The Cultural Resources section also largely follows the 1984 Framework Plan, with updates and edits based primarily on Native American consultation requirements of SB 18. The Scenic Resources section is a rewrite to address the issues of inland scenic policy as directed by the Board of Supervisors.

Chapter 16 Mineral Resources

The Commission received public input on this chapter at the March 15th and April 19th meetings, and briefly discussed it. A revised draft **is attached**, and has been posted on the web. The proposed plan Alternative B largely follows existing County policies, regulations, and permit decisions.

- Some reviewers commented that the Mineral Resources Chapter should not be included in the general plan update as it is optional. However, as noted in section 16.1, the Mineral Resources Chapter is part of the Conservation and Open Space Element, which is one of the required General Plan Elements.
- Reviewers from the Surface Mining companies generally supported continuance of existing general plan policies dealing with mineral extraction and new policies addressing compatibility issues.
- Some reviewers had concerns regarding establishment of the -MR combining zone, while others supported this approach to ensure compatibility of adjacent land uses.
- Some reviewers suggested better coordination with the Air Quality Management District. This concern was addressed through the addition of IM-7 in the proposed Alternative B. This concern was taken further in Alternative A through the addition of IM-8, which calls for the County to develop an ordinance with performance standards addressing dust and naturally occurring asbestos.
- A number of suggested minor editorial changes were accepted.
- Alternative A Policy P20 and Standard S5 were deleted based on comments from the State Mining and Geology Board that these measures were in conflict with State policy.

Chapter 17 Energy Element

The Commission received public input on this chapter at the March 15th and April 19th meetings, and briefly discussed it. A revised draft **is attached**, and has been posted on the web.

This chapter is an optional element for the general plan. The Board of Supervisors directed it be included and be based on the work of the Redwood Coast Energy Authority. Alternatives C and D provide options for less general plan involvement in energy issues. The proposed project Alternative B attempts to sort out land use policy from energy conservation programs which could more effectively be run by an agency such as RCEA.

- Several reviewers commented that the Energy Element should be dropped from the General Plan, as it is optional and would only add additional government regulations. This suggestion is contrary to the Board of Supervisor's decision to include an Energy Element in the General Plan Update.
- Quite a number of reviewers commented in favor of adoption of Alternative A for the General Plan Update. Alternative A remains as an alternative for further consideration at this point. The proposed plan is represented by Alternative B.
- Two individuals commented that references to LEED should be replaced with standards that are not proprietary. This suggestion has been implemented in the revised chapter.
- A suggestion was made that the alternatives comparison chart should have the full text of all policies, standards and implementation measures. This suggestion has been implemented.
- In response to some reviewers comments, an additional policy were added to Alternative A to address wind energy.
- One reviewer's suggestion to delete IM-62 was accepted.
- A number of suggested minor editorial changes were accepted.

Chapter 18 Waste Management

The Commission received public input on this chapter at the March 15th and April 19th meetings, and briefly discussed it. A revised draft has not yet been prepared.

This chapter is not an element but is a topic that is required to be addressed by the general plan. The proposed plan Alternative B directs that the Humboldt Waste Management Authority, a joint powers agency, administer the Integrated Waste Management Plan. It is recognized that the Integrated Waste Management Plan is due for revision, and it is recommended that the Humboldt Waste Management Authority take the lead in the revision process. This may trigger the need for revisions or subsequent amendments to this chapter.

Chapter 19 Air Quality

The Commission received public input on this chapter at the March 15th and April 19th meetings, and briefly discussed it. A revised draft **is attached**, and has been posted on the web.

This chapter is an optional element for the general plan, and the Commission has the discretion to exclude it. Because the area is in non-attainment status for fine particulates, policies to support implementation of the Air District's Attainment Plan can help avoid significant effects and costs associated with project by project CEQA compliance.

- Some reviewers commented that the Air Quality Element should not be included in the General Plan Update as it is optional. Previous direction from the Board of Supervisors was to prepare an Air Quality chapter in the General Plan, so it continues to be recommended as an Element.
- Some reviewers suggested better coordination with the Air Quality Management District. This concern was addressed through the addition of alternative implementation measures in the Mineral Resources Chapter (MR-IM7&IM8).
- Some reviewers suggested leaving things the way they are. They expressed that the Air Quality Management District already regulates air quality, and they didn't see any reason for changing that. In effect, they are expressing support for Alternative D. The proposed policies are intended to mitigate impacts of future development. It is not clear that the existing measures in the Framework Plan would achieve that, so we are not recommending simply retaining those.

- Some reviewers suggested strengthening the language of some of the policies to better improve air quality. These suggestions were for the most part included as revisions to Alternative A.

Chapter 20-Noise Element

The Commission received public input on this chapter at the March 15th and April 19th meetings, and briefly discussed it. A revised draft is in preparation.

Chapter 21-Safety Element

The Commission received public input on this chapter at the March 15th and April 19th meetings, and briefly discussed it. A revised draft is in preparation.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Summary of public comments at June 21st, 2007 meeting.

Attachment B: Summary of Commissioner comments at June 21st, 2007 meeting.

Attachment C: Written comments received between June 21st and July 18th, 2007.

Attachment D: Chapter 16-Mineral Resources - revised draft.

Attachment E: Chapter 17-Energy Element – revised draft.

Attachment F: Chapter 19-Air Quality – revised draft.

Attachment G: Comment Index

Attachment A:

Summary of public comments
at June 21st, 2007 meeting.

**Verbal Public Comments
General Plan Update
Preliminary Hearing Draft
Planning Commission Hearing 6/21/07**

| Index # | Synopsis of comments received during Planning Commission meeting |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | PUBLIC COMMENTS |
| V112 | Gordon Leppig – presented a PowerPoint presentation on the importance of the fish and wildlife resources of Humboldt. |
| V113 | Janet Eidness - Humboldt Heritage Professionals Network - met with staff for collaboration on cultural resources. Intent was to use staff’s formats for a re-write. (They submitted a much more detailed option that was included in the Planning Commission staff report). This option better describes what the applicants are responsible for under the CEQA requirements, and more is clear and consistent among applicants in regards to cultural and historic resource. Discussed establishing a comprehensive historic preservation ordinance. |
| V114 | Linda Disiere – NCHB – Economic Element – quality of life issue. The document makes it seem like there is one definition for quality of life – but my definition is probably different than others. I think this reference should be removed from the General Plan. Prosperity! report is outdated. We do not have the “ground” to supply these emerging industries. We should concentrate on ensuring that there is a sufficient land base before we do the inventory of emerging industries. There is a connection between adequate housing and jobs. When we talk about growth – we are talking about people. Growth is not bad, it is just people. The builders should be partnering with the County and we feel like we have been marginalized. |
| V115 W86 | Johanna Rodoni – Buckeye Conservancy. Reviewed chapters 12, 13 and 14 – see submitted comments. Chapter 12 – Establishing greenbelts is unnecessary as they already exist naturally (such as streams, wetlands, etc) and we currently have the zoning in place that protects them. Also, “working landscapes” and the use of conservation easements should not be used in such a broad brush manner for zoning restrictions. Believes that the Biological Resources chapter is acceptable in the current Framework Plan. Concerned over the proposed CUP5 and CuP7 and concludes that the current General Plan is working well and recommends staying with the existing language as much as possible. |
| V116 W87 | Susan Ornales – JCLT and Arcata Open Space Committee – support Alternative A because it supports Transfer of Development Rights program. We appreciated the idea of community separators (working landscapes may take care of this). We appreciate your existing Open Space Conservation Easement program and support the policies in the General Plan for these. We support the compact development policies in the plan. We appreciate the map sharing program with the county. We would like to explore an opens space district and funding mechanisms in the county. We would like to see some mention of community forests in this plan. Supportive of the trail linkages – in particular between Arcata and Eureka. Submitted comments mirror verbal testimony. |
| V117 | Victoria Copeland – HAR – we would prefer to not to take action on the voting charts because of lack of information; however, because this is the format that the county has chosen, we have submitted responses to the voting charts. We have made suggestions on new information that is needed and revisions. We disagree with the use of the statement “encourages the construction of new development” in the CEQA analysis for the Conservation and Open Space Element. The increase in regulations cannot be characterized as “encouraging” development and may have the opposite effect. Valid concern of Commissioner Emad’s regarding cost of regulations. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>V118 W88</p> | <p>Charles Ciancio – Believes that the proposed policies don’t address the real reasons for maintaining open space such as improper development and inadequate funding of public services. We need to simplify the permitting process so there is not so much illegal activities occurring. There should be a section in the plan that discusses the development process. There should be proper enforcement of non permitted activities and with this will resolve open space issues. Properly serviced development does provide a public benefit (increased taxes, road maintenance, fire fighting, etc). Don’t duplicate regulatory efforts of other jurisdictions. Submitted comments mirror public testimony.</p> |
| <p>V119 W89</p> | <p>Debbie Provolt – (Economic Development) Would like to see policies and goals that encourage and reward economic development that creates jobs. Small businesses are good but we also need to provide for larger employers. We are thinking too small for growth of commercial and industrial employers with the proposed space planned for these businesses. The way Alternative B is written, it currently discourages big box development in the unincorporated areas. The language is also unclear and subject to interpretation. Timely and efficient Also suggested deleting the paragraph entirely when removing a policy, but keeping the numbering system so you would know what was deleted. Submitted comments mirror public testimony.</p> |
| <p>V120 W90</p> | <p>Greg Comptom – Green Diamond – read Gary Rynearson’s written comments into the record. Written comments concerned the “voting charts” – did not support current system in that it should not be by popular vote but by careful consideration of the alternatives and testimony from the public. Also, concerned about the interrelatedness of the Chapters and the difficulty in reviewing them in a “piecemeal” type of a fashion. It is difficult to analyze the impacts of the new policies without understanding the cumulative effects of the entire update process. Had very specific comments on the Conservation and Open Space policies, Cultural and Scenic Resources section and Biological Resources policies.</p> |
| <p>Continued the hearing to July 26th</p> | |

Attachment B:

Summary of Commissioner comments
at June 21st, 2007 meeting.

**Verbal Public Comments
General Plan Update
Preliminary Hearing Draft
Planning Commission Hearing 6/21/07**

| Commissioner | Synopsis of comments received during Planning Commission meeting |
|---------------------|--|
| Kelly | <p>Development in stream channels – “feasible” how is that interpreted? Staff response: There is a specific definition in state law. Read glossary of Framework plan. This is still very subjective and was wondering how staff addresses this? Staff response We do have to do it everyday in response to CEQA</p> <p>Economic feasibility – are there guidelines to use? Staff response: At best “feasible” just gives us some parameters. Doesn’t really provide guidance, a platform to begin the discussion.</p> <p>Page 14.19 – difference between the two wetland buffer alternatives? Staff response: S10a – currently found in our coastal plans and was added to the McKinleyville Plan. Consideration of wetlands that are not just estuarine wetlands but riparian wetlands.</p> <p>BR S10 does defer to DFG and 10a does give more specific guidance – I would like to hear more specific comments from the audience tonight.</p> |
| Herman | <p>What makes the Mill Creek wetland unique to require this policy? Staff response: It is a wide corridor that was studied by resource agencies and came to the attention of the community which requested more specific policies.</p> <p>Page 14.19 #3a – mitigation measures are confusing? 25% impervious services – what does this mean – it is confusing. What constitutes a stream under this plan? Staff response: There is a definition (Page 14.3) of blue line streams on USGS maps and those streams identified during the CEQA process.</p> <p>This could be pretty open as to what constitutes a stream (determined by the CEQA process). Staff response: We are trying to do better mapping to reduce the surprise. It may be appropriate to have a map in the plan so there are no surprises.</p> |
| Kelly | <p>P15.1-12 Certified local government program – please explain the pros and cons. Is this a trend state wide? Staff response: City of Eureka is doing it – very active program. City of Eureka has a large stock to implement this kind of program. The county has not done an inventory to justify this type of program. Not sure if we have the staff resources to warrant this type of program.</p> <p>How is it funded? Does it cost local developers? Staff response: There is funding through the state. Whether we have the staff resources to run it though...</p> |
| Emad | <p>At what point will we be preparing the EIR for the General Plan? Staff response: Once we run through the chapters and have a good range of alternatives, we will begin the EIR process. We need an analysis of cost of these new regulations. How we would understand the implications of these alternatives? Staff response: Under CEQA, we do have to assess how feasible our alternatives are. EIR looks at if we have the authority to do the regulations but not the cost of</p> |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | the regulations. |
| Herman | <p>I want to echo Commissioner Kelly's comments regarding the terms being used in the document that leave a lot of discretion to planning staff. I want to be clear with land owners on what they can do with their land. Do not want vague terms that has many different ways to be interpreted.</p> <p>Staff response: CEQA document is specific regarding historic resource's definitions.</p> <p>One of the biggest complaints I hear about the Planning Department is that they have difficulty understanding the planning regulations. I don not want to have to create another Planning Commission process because on the need for more staff to interpret the regulations.</p> |
| Murguia | <p>I find some sympathy on having to create another PC because of increased regulations and uncertainty of the requirements. However, it should be noted that these requirements did not come out of a vacuum – they often comes out of an initiative process. A public process. Sometimes it is difficult to tell someone what they want to do with their land – they have the right to apply.</p> |
| Kelly | <p>SR-IM8 page 15.2-21 – alternative implementation measure for billboards. What does “prioritize” for enforcement mean? Are we not enforcing now?</p> <p>Staff response: We are not the enforcement agency for billboards along highways.</p> <p>Existing Plan Goals and Policies – are these being replaced by other goals and policies – in particular SR-S3?</p> <p>Staff response: The existing Framework Plan has extensive policies on scenic highways which we are attempting to consolidate.</p> |
| Staff | <p>We are planning an additional PC meeting for July 26th for a continued review of the documents and public comments.</p> |
| Emad | <p>– what is a “community separator”?</p> <p>Staff response: Open space between communities. We are recommending that you include in the General Plan as an alternative. We heard early on that people did not want there communities to grow together. We would expect to have some kind of mapping program to identify those areas. We expect for the most part that the ag and timber designations will provide for that protection.</p> |
| Smith | <p>The numbering system is confusing for the policies. On the 15 year term for amortization of billboards, where did that originate?</p> <p>Staff response: It was found in some of the applications brought before you for billboard approval.</p> <p>Alternative D – how can we cross reference? For example, SR6, we need to cross reference to the Framework Plan so we can see how this is changing.</p> <p>Staff response: Framework Plan policies are at the end of the chart, we could re-arrange these so they are easier to compare. Indicate on framework plan policies the new policies.</p> <p>The more tools that we have to review the better.</p> |

Attachment C:

Written comments received
between June 21st and July 18th, 2007

See Links to Public Comments:

<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/gp/PrelimHearingDraft/CommentList2.htm>

W-91 – Farm Bureau

W-92 – Bernice Huston

W-93 – Northcoast Regional Land Trust

W-94 – State Mining and Geology Board

Attachment D:

Chapter 16-Mineral Resources - revised draft.

See Link to revised draft:

<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/gp/revdraftcom.asp>

Attachment E:

Chapter 17-Energy Element – revised draft.

See Link to revised draft

<http://co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/gp/revdraftcom.asp>

Attachment F:

Chapter 19-Air Quality – revised draft.

Attachment G:
Comment Index

GPU Public Comments

| Index # | Name | Date Received | Chapter | How | Group/Notes |
|---------|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----|--|
| W1 | Julie Williams email | 2-07-2007 | 1-3 | Sup | 1 |
| W2 | HAR | 2-13-07 | 1-3 | Sup | 1 |
| W3 | Ben Luckens | 2-13-07 | 1-3 | Sup | 1 |
| W4 | Healthy Humboldt | 2-13-07 | 1-3 | Sup | 1 |
| W5 | Steve Salzman | 2-13-07 | 1-3 | Sup | 1 |
| W6 | Timber Industry Reps | 2-15-07 | 1-3 | PC | 1 |
| W7 | Redwood Alliance | 2-15-07 | 1-3 | PC | 1 |
| W8 | NCHB | 2-15-07 | 1-3 | PC | 1 |
| W9 | Caltrans | 2-15-07 | 1-3 | PC | 1 |
| W10 | HELP | 3-01-07 | 1-3 | Sup | 1 |
| W11 | Healthy Humboldt | 3-8-07 | 16, 19 | SUP | 2 |
| W12 | Healthy Humboldt | 3-8-07 | 16, 19 | SUP | 2 |
| W13 | HAR | 3-8-07 | 17, 19 | SUP | 2 |
| W14 | Humboldt Waste Mgmt Authority | 3-9-07 | 18 | SUP | 2 |
| W15 | Paul Farnham | 3-9-07 | 17 | SUP | 2 |
| W16 | Chris Rail | 3-12-07 | 17 | SUP | 2 |
| W17 | Granite Construction | 3-12-07 | 16 | SUP | 2 |
| W18 | Eureka Ready Mix | 3-12-07 | 16 | SUP | 2 |
| W19 | Marisa D'Arpino | 3-14-07 | 19 | SUP | 2 |
| W20 | HELP | 3-14-07 | 1-3 | Sup | 1 |
| W21 | Ben Shepherd | 3-15-07 | 1-3 | PC | 1 |
| W22 | Charles Ciancio | 3-15-07 | 1-3 | PC | 1 |
| W23 | NCHB | 3-15-07 | 1-3 | PC | 1 |
| W24 | Virgina Graziani | 3-15-07 | 1-3 | PC | 1 |
| W25 | Jim Zoellick | 3-15-07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W26 | Carlos Quilez | 3-15-07 | 16 | PC | 2 |
| W27 | Center For Env. Econ Dev | 3-15-07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W28 | Farm Bureau | 3-15-07 | 16 | PC | 2 |
| W29 | Green Diamond | 3-15-07 | 16, 16 | PC | 2 |
| W30 | John Schaefer | 3-15-07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W31 | Pacific Builders | 3-15-07 | 16, 17, 18 | PC | 2 |
| W32 | Redwood Alliance | 3-15-07 | 17, | PC | 2 |
| W33 | Plan it Green | 3-15-07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W34 | Mason Materials | 3-15-07 | 16 | PC | 2 |
| W35 | NCHB | 3-15-07 | 16, 17 | PC | 2 |
| W36 | Mercer Fraser | 3-15-07 | 16 | PC | 2 |
| W37 | Friends in Small Places | 3-15-07 | 16 | PC | 2 |
| W38 | Glenn Zeimer | 4-13-07 | 21 | SUP | S-S10-fire regs |
| W39 | Chris Rall | 4-13-07 | 21 | SUP | Traffic noise and auto safety |
| W40 | Healthy Humboldt (A and B) | 4-13-07 | 20, 21 | SUP | 3 |
| W41 | Healthy Humboldt | same | 20, 21 | SUP | 3 |
| W42 | HELP | 4-03-07 | 16,17, 18,19 | SUP | 2 |
| W43 | HAR | 4-11-07 | 21 | SUP | 3 |
| W44 | Maggie Draper | 4-16-07 | 21 | SUP | Sea level rise, flooding, evacuation, CEQA |
| W45 | Robert Bronkall | 4-17-07 | 20,21 | SUP | Airport safety, noise issues |
| W46 | Charles Ciancio | 4-18-07 | N/A | PC | Regulatory philosophy |
| W47 | Jim Zoellick | 4-15-07 | 17 | SUP | 2 |
| W48 | Caltrans | 4-19-07 | 20 | SUP | Traffic noise, barriers |
| W49 | Charles Ciancio | 6/21/07 | 11 | PC | 4 |
| W50 | Bill Peckham | 4/19/07 | 17 | PC | 2 |

GPU Public Comments

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|---------|--------|-----|---|
| W51 | Claire Perricelli | 4/19/07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W52 | Ben Mattio (Attachment A) | 4/19/07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W53 | Lawrence Gann | 4/19/07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W54 | Debbie Provolt | 4/19/07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W55 | Randy Turner | 4/19/07 | 17 | PC | 2 |
| W56 | Dave Spreen | 4/19/07 | 20,21 | PC | Noise from quarries, helicopters, equip. asbestos |
| W57 | Colette Castro | 4/20/07 | 17 | SR | 2 |
| W58 | Josh Brown | 4/24/07 | 17 | SR | 2 |
| W59 | Jessica Doremus | 4/23/07 | 20 | SUP | Alt. trans for safety and noise; cell tower setback |
| W60 | Stephanie Bennett | 4/23/07 | 20 | SUP | Timber ops affect health and safety Elk R. |
| W61 | Jacquelyn Hulsey | 4/20/07 | 20 | SUP | Airports |
| W62 | Chris Crawford | 4/20/07 | 11 | SR | 4 |
| W63 | Jonathan Speaker | 4/25/07 | 11 | SR | 4 |
| W64 | Healthy Humboldt | 5/10/07 | 11 | SR | 4 |
| W65 | Chris Rall | 4/14/05 | 11 | SR | 4 |
| W66 | Virginia Graziani | 5/14/07 | 11 | SR | 4 |
| W67 | Claire Perricelli | 5/15/07 | 17 | SUP | 2 |
| W68 | James Bisiar | 5/17/07 | 21 | PC | Gun club noise |
| W69 | NCHB | 5/17/07 | 20, 21 | PC | Noise, Safety Elements markup |
| W70 | Charles Ciancio | 5/17/07 | 11 | PC | 4 |
| W71 | William Kelly | 5/17/07 | 11 | PC | 4 |
| W72 | Tom Walz | 5/17/07 | 11 | PC | 4 |
| W73 | Dave Spreen | 5/17/07 | 11 | PC | 4 |
| W74 | HAR | 5/10/07 | 11 | SR | 4 |
| W75 | Michael Newman | 5/21/07 | 11 | SUP | 4 |
| W76 | Janet Eidness | 6-13-07 | 15 | SR | 5 |
| W77 | Marisa D'Arpino | 6-19-07 | 21 | Sup | Safety comments |
| W78 | HAR | 6-14-07 | 21 | Sup | 3 |
| W79 | Scott Menzies | 6-07-07 | 11 | SR | 4 |
| W80 | Wendy Rowan (work-life alliance) | 6-21-07 | 11 | Sup | 4 |
| W81 | Mr. Will | 6-20-07 | 11 | Sup | 4 |
| W82 | HAR | 6-19-07 | 12 | Sup | 5 |
| W83 | Nancy Correll | 6-19-07 | 12 | Sup | 5 |
| W84 | HELP | 6-21-07 | 21 | Sup | 3 |
| W85 | Ann Wallace | 6-7-07 | 5 | Sup | 7 |
| W86 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |