



State of California
Governor's Office of Planning and Research

California Joint Land Use Studies Beale JLUS

Public Forum #1

August 9, 2006

Yuba County Government Center
915 8th Street, Marysville, CA 95901

Meeting Summary

OPR Staff Present:

Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse
Ned McKinley, JLUS Program Manager
Julia Lave Johnston, Senior Planner and Beale JLUS Task Leader
Jennifer Driemeyer, Program Support

Consulting Staff Present:

Rick Rust, Matrix Design Group
Celeste Werner, Matrix Design Group
Mike Hrapla, Matrix Design Group
Jenny Fong, Katz & Associates

Public:

45 members of the public signed in.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Terry Roberts of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) introduced herself and welcomed everyone in attendance. Ms. Roberts explained that OPR provides technical assistance in the areas of land use planning and environmental regulations. She provided an overview of OPR's role in the Joint Land Use Studies (JLUS) program. Ms. Roberts introduced the OPR staff members who are working on the JLUS project. Ms. Roberts stressed the importance of everyone filling out the sign-in sheet to make sure they receive future project announcements, and highlighted the informational materials available at the sign-in table.

Ms. Roberts reviewed the public forum agenda, which was as follows:

1. Project Overview & OPR Objectives
2. Open House

3. Project Approach
4. Role of the Public
5. Group Discussion
6. Next Steps

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW AND OPR OBJECTIVES

Mr. Ned McKinley provided an overview and brief history of the Department of Defense's JLUS program, including a discussion of the California JLUS program. The program includes two project areas: the Beale Air Force Base (AFB) JLUS, and the R-2508 JLUS, which covers portions of Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and Tulare Counties. Mr. McKinley emphasized that the preparation of a JLUS is a collaborative process between government officials and community stakeholders, and that everyone's input is critical to developing a successful study.

3. OPEN HOUSE

Mr. Rick Rust, Project Manager for Matrix Design Group (the primary consultant working with OPR on the California JLUS program), explained the open house component of the public forum. Three stations were located around the room and were staffed by representatives from Beale Air Force Base, Yuba County, and OPR. Guests were provided time to tour the stations so they could ask questions and become familiar with the organizations and their activities.

4. PROJECT APPROACH

Mr. Rust gave an overview of how the study process. The first round of data collection has been completed and these materials, including GIS mapping information, are being reviewed. Some missing data has been identified and arrangements to collect this data are on-going with various agencies. An analysis of existing conditions and trends is underway. The JLUS report outline and format has been finalized and some initial work has been done on issue identification.

The current target date to publish the draft JLUS document is December 2006 or early 2007. The draft JLUS will be made available to the public through a number of outlets including the project website (www.cajlus.com). There will be a 30-day public review period to allow members of the community to comment on the draft document via written comments, telephone calls, and the project website. The public can also discuss the document and provide comments at the second public forum, which is scheduled for January/February 2007 and will occur during the public comment period. Comments can also be directed to Ms. Lave Johnston. All comments will be considered and a final JLUS document will be published in February/March 2007.

Mr. Rust explained that the objectives of the California JLUS program are to address the full range of compatibility issues that are of concern to local jurisdictions, agencies, the public, and the military; and to develop an implementation strategy for preventing and mitigating encroachment. Mr. Rust stated that this first public forum will help provide further insight into the issues and opportunities that should be addressed in the Beale JLUS.

Mr. Rust reviewed the broad objectives for the Beale JLUS from both the community and military perspectives.

Community objectives include:

- To protect the health, safety, and welfare of residents and maintain local quality of life;
- Plan for compatible land uses in the vicinity of Beale AFB;
- Provide for community growth in an economically, environmentally, and socially sustainable manner; and
- Maintain the economic vitality of the community and region.

Military objectives include:

- Protect the health, safety, and welfare of the military and civilian personnel living and working at or near the military installation; and,
- Ensure the ability of the installation to achieve its mission, maintain military readiness and support national defense objectives.

Mr. Rust also presented a map of the preliminary JLUS study area. (A map was included with the materials handed out at the meeting.) The study area is meant to capture the area where compatibility issues may arise. Earlier in the day, the Beale JLUS Advisory Committee met and agreed that the study area's eastern boundary should be expanded to include portions of Nevada County that might be affected by compatibility issues such as traffic and aircraft overflight.

5. ROLE OF THE PUBLIC

Ms. Lave Johnston said one of OPR's objectives is to increase public awareness of the project and inform the public of the JLUS' goals and objectives. Ms. Lave Johnston invited public input throughout the JLUS process. A goal of the JLUS program is to garner public support for the final Study recommendations.

An advisory committee and a technical committee have been established to advise OPR during the JLUS process. The advisory committee focuses on policy concerns and informs OPR on current issues. Its membership includes local and state government officials; and representatives from the military, and business, environmental and tribal organizations.

The technical committee provides technical input and expertise on specific issue areas, and supports the advisory committee and the project team. The technical committee includes planning and engineering staff, and technical experts.

Ms. Lave Johnston emphasized the importance of both the advisory and technical committees; they are composed of individuals from the local community who know and understand the community. As such, committee members can provide valuable information about the community and assist with outreach in the community.

6. GROUP DISCUSSION

Attendees were randomly divided into groups, to develop responses to four activities:

Group #	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
# of Participants	7	6	7	7	9

(Note: A detailed listing of all the comments from these groups is provided at the end of these minutes)

ACTIVITY 1

Mr. Rust asked the groups to individually answer the following question– ***What are the current and future encroachment factors?*** Using a provided worksheet, attendees were asked to review 26 compatibility factors and mark if they felt a factor was a current issue or a potential future issue. They were also asked to indicate if they felt a factor was currently being adequately addressed. Individuals also had the option to mark a factor as “not applicable.” If attendees thought an issue was both currently an issue, as well as a potential future issue, they were instructed to mark it as a current issue. The most frequently selected factors are listed below.

Question: What are the current and future encroachment factors? (33 responses)

- **Current Encroachment Factors (percentage that identified factor)**
 1. Roadways (82%)
 2. Land space/Land use compatibility (73%)
 3. Infrastructure extensions (58%)
 4. Air quality (62%)
 5. Local housing availability (48%)

- **Potential Future Encroachment Factors (percent that identified factor)**
 1. Airspace (local) (48%)
 2. Frequency (impedance) (48%)
 3. Frequency (interference) (45%)
 4. Communications (45%)

- **Currently Adequately addressed (percent that identified factor)**
 1. Endangered species (42%)

- **Not Applicable (percent that identified factor)**
 1. Alternative energy development (wind, etc.) (21%)

ACTIVITY 2

Mr. Rust asked the participants to answer the following question – ***What are the three key compatibility issues that you think the JLUS should address?*** Attendees were instructed to write down the top three compatibility issues for the JLUS program. Then each table was asked to review everyone’s issues and then, as a group, to come to a consensus on the top three. The following summarizes the top issues for individuals and the groups.

Question: What are the three key compatibility issues you think the JLUS should address? (90 responses)

- **Top Individual Responses**
 1. Land use/compatibility
 2. Roadways
 3. Environmental concerns

- **Top Group Responses**
 1. Land use/compatibility
 2. Roadways
 3. Environmental concerns
 4. Infrastructure issues
 5. Housing

ACTIVITY 3

Ms. Celeste Werner, of Matrix Design Group, introduced the following question – *What community are you from, and what is your vision of your community 20 years from now?*

Responses came from the following areas: Browns Valley, East Linda, Grass Valley, Gridley, Marysville, Nevada City, River Highlands, Smartsville, Yuba City, and Yuba County.

The following bullets summarize the responses to the question..

Question: What community are you from, and what is your vision of your community 20 years from now? (34 Responses)

- **Maintain rural, small-town feel**
 1. Preserve uniqueness of area
 2. Preserve environment and appearance
 3. Provide affordable housing

- **More diverse, sustainable economy that is not dependant on Beale AFB**
 1. Develop around major arterials but preserve open space in residential and environmentally sensitive areas
 2. Provide local employment opportunities for residents

- **Buffer around Beale AFB**
 1. Preserve its mission
 2. Allow for future missions

ACTIVITY 4

Participants were asked to use their worksheets to answer the following question:

Question: Do you support limiting development adjacent to Beale AFB to prevent encroachment? (31 Responses)

Only three (10%) of the responses opposed limiting development adjacent to Beale AFB. Additionally, two responded with “maybe” answers. The majority (84%) of the responses favored some degree of limited development in order to prevent encroachment on Beale AFB. Common concerns are listed below:

- Needs of the base should come first to preserve its mission
- Encroachment on the base might jeopardize the base’s mission, which would jeopardize the area’s economic well-being
- Future availability of water resources in the area
- Commercial development should be allowed around the base but residential (incompatible) development should be limited

Those that opposed limiting development believe the area near the base is prime for development and ought to be allowed to develop if the base doesn’t use the land.

The project team collected all the worksheets and participant input. Mr. Rust told participants that all the comments from the activities would be compiled and posted on the project website at: www.cajlus.com.

7. NEXT STEPS

Ms. Roberts thanked everyone for attending. She reminded participants that a draft Beale JLUS document will be available for public review and comment sometime during the December 2006/January 2007 timeframe. The general public and local community members will be invited to attend the second public forum in January/February 2007 to discuss and comment on the draft JLUS. Ms. Roberts encouraged attendees to discuss the JLUS project with friends, neighbors, and local elected officials. OPR will continue to meet with the technical and advisory committees to develop the draft JLUS document.

Attendee Ms. Mary Knapp asked if the advisory committee meetings were open to attendance by the public. Ms. Roberts said that the advisory committee meetings are not required to be public meetings. However, the meetings are not closed to the public. Advisory committee members need a chance to brainstorm and fully discuss the issues before they are presented to the public for review. OPR prefers that members of the community do not attend advisory committee meetings. Instead, OPR encourages members of the public to discuss their issues with the advisory committee members and their local elected officials, and participate in the project’s public forums. Community members can also use the project website or contact OPR directly with their comments. (Note: A list of the advisory committee members was distributed at the public forum and can be found on the project website.)

ADJOURN – The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Beale-PUB-1 Minutes-2006 08 22 RRR



State of California
Governor's Office of Planning and Research

California Joint Land Use Studies Beale JLUS

Public Forum #1
August 9, 2006
Yuba County Government Center
915 8th Street, Marysville, CA 95901

Meeting Summary

Appendix

Activity #1: What are the current and future encroachment factors (33 responses)?

Encroachment Factor		Current Issue	Potential Future Issue	Adequately Addressed Now	Not Applicable
		Amounts below indicate the total number of responses received for each topic listed.			
1	Land space/Land use compatibility	24	5	3	0
2	Airspace (local)	7	16	7	0
3	Airspace (operation areas and routes)	10	11	11	0
4	Communications	7	15	5	0
5	Roadways	27	6	0	0
6	Frequency (interference)	9	15	6	1
7	Frequency (impedance)	7	16	5	1
8	Legislative initiatives	14	10	2	2
9	Interagency coordination	13	6	9	0
10	Safety zones (air operations)	12	8	11	0
11	Safety zones (explosives safety)	12	10	10	0
12	Safety zones (other)	7	8	11	0
13	Vertical obstructions	7	12	11	2
14	Local housing availability	16	10	5	0
15	Infrastructure extensions	19	11	2	0
16	Anti-terrorism force protection requirements	15	8	6	1
17	Noise	10	13	6	0
18	Vibration	5	14	8	3
19	Dust	7	7	11	2
20	Light and glare	7	8	9	5
21	Alternative energy development (wind, etc.)	5	11	6	7
22	Air quality	17	7	7	0
23	Public trespassing	10	11	10	2
24	Cultural sites	9	9	11	4
25	Water quality	14	9	7	0
26	Threatened and endangered species	8	10	14	1
27	Flood Plain	1			
28	Water Shed	1			
29	Environmental Restoration	1			
30	Future air operation	1			

Activity #2: What are the three key compatibility issues you think the JLUS should address (90 responses)?

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES: Each row below represents one comment card received. Categories have been added; however, comments are provided verbatim and have not been edited, in order to preserve author's original opinion.

Card Number	Respondent Comment
1	Frequency Interference. The radars and communications equipment involved with military operations are likely to interfere with the domestic electronic equipment normally found in homes (TV, radio, wireless control or communication devices [Bluetooth, computer networking])
2	Noise. Current and future noise from base operations are likely to evoke complaints from nearby residents.
3	Roadways. Congestion caused by military traffic, convoys, etc.
4	Airspace Infringement. Future Beale missions could be jeopardized.
5	Escape routes during fires, floods, earthquakes.
6	Land use
7	Roadways
8	Water Quality
9	Roadways. Need more as land develops.
10	Communications. Between Yuba Co and Beale to allow development of residential and commercial.
11	Land use. Important to open up areas for development, especially in South Yuba County (Marysville south to Wheatland). MOST developable area in impoverished Yuba County and has most infrastructure to support, nearest employment centers.
12	Infrastructure extensions. New roads, water lines, power, services, etc.
13	Airspace (operating areas and routes). Maintaining local general aviation use and military use.
14	Land Use. Maintaining an appropriate buffer to residential development.
15	Buffer zones. Maintain adequate buffer zones for now and for long term future to insure base remains.
16	On Base Housing.
17	Proposed new housing developments.
18	Future Air Operations and Compatibility. Are there more autonomous vehicles in Beale's future? If so, how do they fit into an equation of addressing the issues of today when not sure of their requirements or impacts of tomorrow.
19	Noise.
20	Land use.
21	Maintenance of levees and roads
22	Roads and Traffic. The roads are full of pot holes!
23	Levee for flood protection and exit routes in case of a levee break.
24	Development. Limit development that would encroach upon the base airspace.
25	Roads. All of the roads leading to Beale AFB are in need of updating to handle the traffic: South Beale, North Beale, Hammerton/Smartsville

Activity #2 (continued): What are the three key compatibility issues you think the JLUS should address (90 responses)?

Card Number	Respondent Comment
26	Noise. As planes get larger and possibly noisier. How do we insure that planes/trucks/troops aren't actively doing maneuvers during late hours of the night
27	Housing. How do we insure adequate available in future?
28	Roadways. As population increases, roads should be built to accommodate this.
29	Airspace (operating areas and routes). Assure that the base's mission is not in jeopardy!
30	Land Use/Space Compatibility. Assure mission not in jeopardy.
31	Safety. Overlapping concerns.
32	PAVE PAWS
33	Air Traffic
34	Base Closure
35	Roads and Traffic.
36	Air and Water.
37	Land Use/Space Compatibility.
38	Environmental Concerns. How does Beale's past and current practices present a threat to its neighbors.
39	Development. How does development near Beale threaten its continued use by USAF.
40	Threatened/Endangered Species. Wild life migration areas. Quality of water with added pollution of cars and people.
41	Air Quality. Increased transportation. Limited airspace around new buildings and space.
42	Safety Zones.
43	Air Quality.
44	Land Use/Space Compatibility. Develop land area preserving the nature, history and growth of area in foothills.
45	Roadways, Develop plan to manage traffic: Existing trucks, Future tourism along river, maintain roads to/from base to town and housing areas, plan future growth and roads to accommodate flow.
46	Alternative Energy. Develop plans to make base more self-sufficient: solar, wind, hydro power.
47	Land Use Compatibility. In particular residential development.
48	Safety Zones. Both air, explosives, trespassing, accidents.
49	Interagency Coordination.
50	Economic Co enhancement.
51	Land Use. Development encroachment.
52	Habitat Conservation. In conjunction with Spencerville Wild Life Area.
53	UXO Mitigation.
54	Noise in area's within new AICUZ.
55	Explore Joint Benefits.
56	Natural Infrastructure.
57	Environment.
58	Quality of Life.
59	Land Use.

Activity #2 (continued): What are the three key compatibility issues you think the JLUS should address (90 responses)?

Card Number	Respondent Comment
60	Noise.
61	Compatibility of Land Uses. Potential future residential uses could adversely impact Beale.
62	Future Development of Yuba County Airport.
63	Encroachment by dense housing around the base.
64	Water Quality around area.
65	Noise. Future residential development complaining about airport noise.
66	Housing Availability. Affordable housing for persons associated with Beale.
67	Land Use. As it applies to the economics of the immediate area.
68	Infrastructure extensions. Lack of infrastructure, water, roads, etc.
69	Noise. Firing range.
70	Infrastructure extensions.
71	Housing. Affordability.
72	Roads.
73	Infrastructure extensions.
74	Roadways.
75	Land Space/Land Use Compatibility.
76	Agricultural Area maintained.
77	Roadways. Fixed.
78	Anti-Terrorism. Force Protection requirements.
79	Roadways. Congestion.
80	Lack of Infrastructure Extensions.
81	Water Quality. Ground water and surface water.
82	Roadways.
83	Land Use Compatibility. Not to get too close to base and force closure.
84	Anti-Terrorism. Protection of area.
85	Traffic Circulation. Circulation around base to permit easy use of land "blocked" by base property.
86	Balance. Community's ability to develop and grow economically with <u>need</u> of Air Force , not desires of base employees.
87	Land Use. Realistic control of land use under flight paths and in safety zones and realistic ability to use land around base for community needs.
88	Community Development near a first strike target.
89	Noise. Hosing development near air force base.
90	Water Quality. Cleaning planes and well contamination.

Activity #2: What are the three key compatibility issues you think the JLUS should address?

GROUP RESPONSES: Comments are provided verbatim and have not been edited, in order to preserve author’s original opinion.

Group Number	Issue Number	Comment
One	1	Water contamination from Beale
	2	Encroachment on Base possible limiting future missions on Base
	3	Traffic Congestion/Mitigation
Two	1	Land use / land use compatibility new housing and on base housing
	2	Roadways
	3	Air Quality
	4	Water Quality & availability
	5	Communications county/military
	6	Buffer zone
		Infrastructure extensions
	7	Noise
	8	Future air operations @ Beale
		Global Hawk impacts
	9	Preserving natural history
	10	Alternative energy
11	DoD opportunities for Beale	
12	Surrounding County impacts / cooperation Placer/Nevada/Sacramento	
Three	1	Land use --Three agriculture Roadways and congestion -- balance communities ability to grow with the need of the Base and not the Base personnel
	2	Base security -- anti-terrorism
	3	Roadways Infrastructure extensions anti-terrorism realistic controls on flight paths and the safety zones and the reasonable ability of the community to use land adjacent traffic circulation around the base
	4	Agricultural needs maintained water quality -- ground and surface agricultural concerns

Question #2 (continued): What are the three key compatibility issues you think the JLUS should address (Group Responses)?

Group Number	Issue Number	Comment
Four	1	Compatibility Land Use residential, economical opportunities, encroachment, preserving wildlife and farmland
	2	Infrastructure extensions roadway extensions, safety zones
	3	Economic co-enhancement Beale as a good neighbor provides job protection, habitat conservation (Spenceville), noise, infrastructure (health and safety), interagency coordination
Five	1	Roads and Traffic Roads Volume
	2	Housing Development would be a problem to build houses too close to the base (don't want to jeopardize base)
	3	PAVE PAWS necessary for early warning, national security but contributed to cancer risk, very high in Yuba County
	4	Affordable Housing and Community Character there should be more housing built on the base that provides community amenities which make it more attractive to live on base

Activity #3: What community are you from and what would you like to see as the vision of your community 20 years from now? (34 Responses)

Each row below represents one comment card received. Comments are provided verbatim and have not been edited, in order to preserve author's original opinion.

Card Number	Location of Respondent Residence (if any given)	Comment
1	Grass Valley/Nevada City	Affordable housing for everyone working in the community
2	Grass Valley/Nevada City	"small town" appearance and environment preserved
3	Grass Valley/Nevada City	economic opportunities for all residents
4		diversified economic and industry Base; affordable housing; good recreational and relaxation activities; good transportation system
5		20 years from now: continue to update Base without interrupting rural area around property boundaries. Develop economic relationship with Base and community that balances needs and resources.
6	Nevada City	maintain that aspect of Nevada County that is rural, with local employment -- resist the move to become more of a bedroom community of the greater Sacramento area
7	Yuba County	a mixture of uses -- I would like to see the areas close to highways/major arterials developed with commercial office, higher density residential with the foothill and environmentally sensitive areas developed with low density residential, a few neighborhood services, permanently protected open space.
8		activities through the recreation department for all ages -- preschool thru retired ages -- we are well on our way
9	Gridley	a bypass around Gridley preserving it as a walkable community
10	River Highlands Community	a rural community that is balanced with economic, social, and environmental properties
11	East Linda	In 20 years I would like to see the Air Force Base gone. I also would like to see a new town in its place.
12	Marysville	Would like a city of unique shops and business -- small town feel but uniqueness to bring tourists -- playing our rich history, museums, theaters, upscale living
13		a community that balances jobs and housing while maintaining Beale -- currently Yuba City is the greatest beneficiary of Beale -- more effort need to be made to looking at ways Beale can help generate more private

Activity #3 (continued): What community are you from and what would you like to see as the vision of your community 20 years from now? (34 Responses)

Card Number	Location of Respondent Residence (if any given)	Comment
		sector jobs
14	Marysville	I would like the community to retain Beale as an integral part of this region's economy. If retaining Beale forces this community to make more intelligent land use decisions, so much the better.
15	Wheatland	a freeway by pass (on the west side of town NOT the east) -- more access to public transportation for everyone -- military and civilian living off Base to Base facilities and larger shopping areas
16		a rural residential with buffer zone around Beale -- encourage technically oriented industry that supports Beale's mission in close proximity to the Base -- encourage bringing more missions to the Base -- residential development usually costs government more than they receive through taxes, allowing the real estate industry to work with surrounding counties for residential development while discouraging such encroachment on Beale and setting policies to preserve agricultural land in Yuba County is probably our best choice (with technical industry)
17	Linda	Growth should be spread further from Beale so that Beale AFB can be a viable entity unto it's own. Beale has always been a good neighbor especially during times of emergencies (floods and fires)
18	Marysville	would like to see Marysville develop into an upscale version of community -- would like to see Beale have an iron clad buffer zone that can't be encroached on for twenty years
19		balanced land use -- Beale maintained and expanded with new technologies
20	Dobbins / Foothills	I certainly would want our community to grow with Beale -- continuing to be an integral part of it. Though I prefer a rural atmosphere, I understand that future will bring growth. I would prefer that growth be kept to a minimum as much as possible. Many of us have moved from the urban areas.
21	Linda	slum area torn down -- north Beale Road made more attractive -- more business to employ people -- traffic re-routed

Activity #3 (continued): What community are you from and what would you like to see as the vision of your community 20 years from now? (34 Responses)

Card Number	Location of Respondent Residence (if any given)	Comment
22	Yuba City	maintain small town feel -- no more housing -- improve entertainment elements (theater, boat ramps on rivers, another public pool, etc.)
23	Wheatland	would like to keep our city small and people friendly
24	Smartsville	would like to retain Beale and all of its missions and perhaps increase missions -- would like surrounding area to remain rural, with country-like homes and atmosphere
25	Smartsville	preserve Beale -- rural lifestyle to continue with 5 acre minimum lots
26		maintain an agricultural area on prime land -- economic development in other areas (50/50 mixture) -- more manufacturing or warehouse development
27	Browns Valley / Yuba City	continued BAFB operations -- smart growth that does not continue to convert prime agriculture land into rooftops (build on the marginal land) -- improved transportation (roads, freeways)
28		smart growth -- residential and economic growth
29	Marysville (farmer)	integrate ecology and a higher end development in foothills exogenous to income levels of Beale -- improve infrastructure and sewer and water for whole county -- get research and development industry into Yuba County to offset farming Base and balance land use
30	Marysville / Yuba City	Beale retained -- community moved out of floodplain and land returned to agricultural uses
31		reduce the dependency of Beale on Yuba County's economy trying to create a more diverse and sustainable economy
32		light growth not like Lincoln or Rockland or Yuba County -- at least one stop light in town, there are more -- stronger community involvement and all ages, teen and seniors
33		levies all have 200 year flood protection and maintenance well funded -- develop land around sleep train and (unreadable) with high end motels and entertainment -- develop land around Algodon interchange with power center Gallelli property and Town Center on Nordic property -- allow land east of highway 65 east side with mix use residential retail and commercial adequate roads
34		maintain rural residential around Beale with a buffer zone to Base

Activity #4: Do you support limiting development adjacent to Beale AFB to prevent encroachment (31 Responses)? Please explain.

Each row below represents one comment card received. Comments are provided verbatim and have not been edited, in order to preserve author's original opinion.

Card Number	Support	Explanation
1	Yes	Anything that will interfere with the missions or potential mission of Beale AFB are unacceptable. Our military people sacrifice much for service to their Country. Their needs should come first.
2	Yes	Any more development in the rural areas around the Base could impact the groundwater (availability and quality). With more development the landfill will reach capacity at a faster rate than projected. Then what? Where to next? What is Beale doing to help with electrical requirements being increased?
3	No	The highlands are above the fog area and out of the flood area -- a good spot to build homes and schools after the roads are added for traffic.
4	Yes	We moved to the area partly because of Beale AFB location. My husband is retired military and our income is sufficient but modest. I feel we are also living in threatening times -- it is encouraging to know our military is close and receiving good training. They have proven to be good community neighbors and bring income and employment to our community.
5	Yes	As the largest employer north of Sacramento, I believe development around Beale should be closely scrutinized. I also believe Beale's past environmental practices may pose a threat to current residents in Yuba County.
6	Yes	Land development too close to the Base will become a problem for continued and future Base operations.
7	Yes	To limit future court costs. Federal government has had problem in the past being truthful and protecting public concerns
8	Yes	Each time development has occurred around a military installation - that base closes because of complaints from those residents that reside nearby. If Beale were to close it would cause an economic hardship on many businesses in Yuba, Sutter, Butts, Nevada and Placer counties. We should not encourage any growth near Beale AFB.
9	Yes	We don't need housing in Yuba County. There is no guarantee water will be available as River Highlands has no water to use.
10	Yes	Base security for the Air Force to safely continue its mission. To also provide joint task force training with other branches of the service. To maintain a buffer zone for the base.
11	Yes	We need to keep Beale space around the base open for future missions.
12	Yes	Against all development next to base that would be detrimental to base operation.

Activity #4 (continued): Do you support limiting development adjacent to Beale AFB to prevent encroachment (31 Responses)? Please explain.

13	Yes	If development were to get closer and closer to Beale, not only would agricultural land be lost, but terrorist threat would also go up. People who did live closer to the base would soon be complaining about noise, dust, water quality, safety, roadways, etc.
14	Yes	Beale. based on Air Force analysis and scoring in BRAC 2005, is not encroached. It is also 4 - 5 times larger than most Air Force bases which provides a significant buffer against future encroachment, if possible with smaller, quieter weapon systems being acquired/developed for the military.
15		This is not a yes or no question. Too simplistic. Where adjacent to the base - what about conservation easements - have properties outside the AICUZ treated differently than those within the boundaries.
16	Yes	Limiting development adjacent to Beale will help conserve the sustainability of the installation and its current and future missions.
17	Yes	It is important to regulate land uses adjacent to Beale especially residential, to avoid adversely impacting uses at Beale.
18	Maybe	Primarily residential. I believe some industrial and commercial may be compatible.
19	Yes	Especially health and safety must be addressed. There apparently is a buffer area - a positive thing for Homeland security.
20	Yes	Beale has great national security, economic, and natural history values that will only increase over time. Many other installations have been compromised over time by physical developmental encroachment. Beale must be protected.
21	Yes	I would also like to see the base protected and allowed to continue its mission without encroachment.
22	Maybe	Encroachment versus economic opportunities, obviously some creative thoughts will need to go into balancing these two concepts. This study area is probably larger than it needs to be. Use Highway 20, Highway 65, Marysville, and Nevada County line as the study area!!
23	Yes	Develop area away from base. There is plenty of land for housing development that does not have to surround base. If development does take place... design housing and development to enhance beauty and rural area to preserve its scenic beauty. History has shown most bases that have building near has been closed. Yuba County needs this income, but also needs communication and collaboration with the base.
24		Does Beale want to participate in solutions for Yuba County? Example: If Yuba Co. asked Lockheed to consider putting a manufacturing plant close to the base; they probably wouldn't. If Beale asked Lockheed to build a plant near the base in Yuba County; Lockheed would seriously consider it. Yuba County's employment force is represented by Beale as the biggest employer (35%). We must spread our economics to a wider variety of employment.

Activity #4 (continued): Do you support limiting development adjacent to Beale AFB to prevent encroachment (31 Responses)? Please explain.

25	Yes	I went to many other bases that have been closed as people and buildings encroached on the land at various bases in the USA. Many people have been made to change locations of homes due to bases being closed. We need to look at around the base that are major military needs and are we encroaching on their needs. Encroachment means less new missions and less importance of base staying.
26	No	Land is already designated for human habitat. The ecology of situation already passed by if military does not use then it becomes prime for civilian use. Area well suited - if water resource OK, assuming it is. I would like to see research and development sector improved.
27	Yes	We need to do everything we can to insure that Beale not be put into a position to go into another round of BRAC. Secure a bugger zone that can't be moved in on.
28	Yes	Limiting residential development. Commercial and industrial uses are appropriate from our perspective.
29	No	Area should be allowed to develop with adequate infrastructure. It is most prime for development. Too much environmental protection now.
30	Yes	There are other areas that would be better used for development other than Yuba Highlands/Spring Valley.
31	No	no comment