




## **ZONING ADMINISTRATOR STAFF REPORT**

**TO:** Tracey Ferguson, Zoning Administrator

**FROM:** Tim Evans, Senior Planner – Extra Help 

**MEETING DATE:** January 14, 2026

**SUBJECT:** Continued Public Hearing from December 10, 2025  
Tentative Parcel Map (TPM)  
Dividing One (1) 39.61-acre Parcel into Two (2) Parcels of 19.73 acres  
and 19.88 acres  
TPM 12-23/24-03

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 1954 Butterfly Valley Road, Quincy, unincorporated Plumas County; APN  
005-130-018; T25N/R9E/Sec. 28, MDB&M.

---

**PLANNING AREA:** Not Within a 2035 General Plan Planning Area

**GENERAL PLAN LAND USE:** Rural Residential and Scenic Area

**PRIMARY ZONING:** Rural ("R-10")

**COMBINING ZONE(S):** Special Plan Scenic Area ("SP-ScA")

**FEMA FIRM** Zone "X" outside 100- and 500- year floodplains

**PARCEL SIZE:** 39.61 acres per application (Assessor's Records show 39.64 acres)

**SEWAGE:** Private Septic System

**WATER:** Private Well

**ELECTRICITY:** Pacific Gas & Electric Company

**FIRE PROTECTION:** N/A

**SUPERVISORIAL  
DISTRICT:** District 2 – Supervisor Kevin Goss

**APPLICANT/OWNER:** Brett and Dana Marty & Peter and Janet Rudholm

---

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The Planning Department received the Development Permit Application on December 5, 2023, for a Tentative Parcel Map TPM 12-23/24-03 to divide the 39.61-acre parcel located at 1954 Butterfly Valley Road, Quincy, APN 005-130-018-000, into two (2) parcels of 19.73 acres and 19.88 acres.

On December 10, 2025, a public hearing was held and the project was heard by Tracey Ferguson, Zoning Administrator. At the public hearing staff gave a presentation as reflected in the December 10, 2025, staff report with particular attention to the comments from Plumas County Public Works and Engineering Departments. Below is an excerpt from the December 10, 2025, staff report that details the comments discussed by Planning staff during the presentation from the Public Works and Engineering Departments:

***“Plumas County Public Works and Engineering Departments:***

*The Engineering Department provided the following comment on June 5, 2025:*

*“It seems some of these comments have been satisfied already. I’ll try to summarize them below, otherwise these should be placed as conditions of recording the FM during the ZA meeting.*

- 1. Engineering is satisfied with the completeness of the TPM and the drafting of such, please see attached map from our 5/13/25 correspondence.*
- 2. Road improvements are not a condition of the TPM, but rather a condition of the FM. Additionally, the comment on number two describes creation of a maintenance agreement, which will also be a condition of the FM, not the TPM.*
- 3. I believe that Cal-Fire coordinated with Planning to work through this item and provide an exemption for the “dead-end road,” is this correct?*

*Further as the bottom of the letter describes there should be a condition added at the ZA meeting that restricts “...building of additional dwelling units...” due the exemption granted by Cal-Fire.”*

*The Engineering Department comments above reference the comments from the Department of Public Works provided on May 23, 2024, below.*

*“1. The Tentative Parcel Map application is incomplete. Please refer to the attached comments provided by the Engineering Department. Once the information requested by the Engineering Department is provided, the Public Works Department will perform an additional review of the new information and may provide additional comments.*

*2. Pursuant to Plumas County Code Section 9-2.607(h), the private roadways providing access to the proposed development, including the road easement and turnaround located on Parcel 1 and 2, shall be improved to the County’s Class 9 Road Standard (PCC 9-4.411).*

*In addition, maintenance of the private roadways providing access to the development shall be provided in accordance with Plumas County Code Section 9-4.802.*

*3. The proposed development is located on a dead-end road which exceeds the County’s dead-end road length limit (PCC 9-4.604(i)). Butterfly Valley-Twain Road is not adequate as a secondary access route as this roadway does not meet minimum design standards for both width, surfacing or vehicle load requirements.*

*It is understood that this development is dividing a lot that has two existing dwelling units. A justification for the granting of an exemption from the dead-end road length limit could be a restriction from the building of additional dwelling units (i.e. guest houses or additional quarters) that would normally be allowed to the respective lot owners. The Public Works Department would support this exemption request based on this restriction.”*

*Concerning comment #1 from the response from the Public Works Department for the incomplete submittal, the application was subsequently made complete per the comment #1 from the*

*Engineering Department on June 5, 2025, due the submittal of the revised Tentative Parcel Map received on May 19, 2025.*

*Comment #2 in the response from the Engineering Department is directly related to comment #2 in the response from the Public Works Department – a condition of approval (Exhibit 15) serves to address these comments.*

*To address comment #3 in the response from the Engineering Department, Planning staff had a discussion with Engineering staff in which it was concluded that after Rob Thorman, Director, Public Works Department, had conversations with Cal Fire staff where Cal Fire staff determined the exemption to the dead-end road length limit would not be required, if a restriction on the properties was required not allowing additional dwelling units on each property. A condition of approval (Exhibit 14) serves to address comment #3 in the responses from the Engineering Department and Public Works Department.”*

Additionally, Planning staff noted the letter (Exhibit 1) provided by the applicant from Frank Carey, Fire Chief, Quincy Fire Protection District, concerning providing structure fire protection to the subject property.

Upon receiving staff’s presentation and discussion occurring with the applicant, the Zoning Administrator opened the public hearing and took the following actions:

1. Continued the public hearing to January 14, 2026, and requested staff further investigate the following:
  - a. Consult with Cal Fire on the overly long dead-end road determination and deed restriction.
  - b. Consult with Frank Carey, Fire Chief, Quincy Fire Protection District, concerning how funding would occur, if at all, to provide structural fire protection to the subject property or whether a waiver was being granted by the Quincy Fire Protection District.

On December 30, 2025, Planning staff met with Joe Walton, Assistant Chief, Cal Fire Lassen-Modoc Unit; Erik Hansen, Battalion Chief, Cal Fire Lassen-Modoc Unit; Rob Thorman, Director, Plumas County Public Works; and Evan Hasse, Senior Engineering Technician, Plumas County Engineering, concerning the deed restriction to not allow further development of dwellings on the property, whether the road was considered an overly long dead-end road, and the road classification. Upon discussion, it was concluded that Assistant Chief Walton would inquire with Cal Fire supervisors to obtain clarification on the road requirements. Additionally, Public Works and Engineering staff indicated that further investigation would occur into the road classification. At the meeting, Planning staff indicated that a response would need to be received by January 7, 2026, from Cal Fire staff to allow staff time for analysis and preparation of a staff recommendation to Tracey Ferguson, Zoning Administrator, for the January 14, 2026, continued public hearing.

On January 6, 2026, Planning staff received a letter (Exhibit 2) from Assistant Chief Walton that included four findings in relation to the State Minimum Fire Safe Regulations and the proposed project – specifically, Finding 1, Fire Safe Regulations; Finding 2, No New Development; Finding 3, Applicability of Article 4 requirements; and Finding 4, Future Development and Fire Safe Compliance. To ensure a clear understanding of the findings within the letter, Planning staff is in the process of establishing a meeting to discuss the letter with Assistant Chief Walton.

On December 31, 2025, Planning staff met with Frank Carey, Fire Chief, Quincy Fire Protection District, in which the following staff-recommended condition of approval from the December 10, 2025, staff report was discussed along with the letter (Exhibit 1) provided by the applicant from Quincy Fire Protection District.

Pursuant to Implementation Measure #10 of the 2035 Plumas County General Plan, which implements Land Use Element Policy 1.5.3, *Provision for Fire and Life Safety Services*, as the subject property is not located in an area served by an organized fire or emergency services provider, annexation into an existing fire district is required or, in lieu of annexation, a funding mechanism shall be established that is appropriate to cover costs associated with the provision of such services at a service level appropriate for the size and scale of the development. Establishment of a funding mechanism may be waived when adequate alternative service levels are provided to the satisfaction of the service district or provider.

Upon Planning staff having a discussion with Fire Chief Carey, it was concluded that the Quincy Fire District would not require annexation of the property into the district to provide structural fire protection and would not require the establishment of a funding mechanism to cover the costs associated with the provision of services as adequate alternative service levels exist and would be provided to the satisfaction of the district. The meeting concluded with Planning staff indicating that a follow up email would be sent requesting a written document confirming the discussion in the following days.

On January 5, 2026, Planning staff followed up with Fire Chief Carey and requested a written document, with a deadline of January 8, 2026, from Fire Chief Carey confirming the establishment of a funding mechanism being waived to provide structural fire protection to the subject property. Planning staff was informed by Tracey Ferguson, Planning Director, on January 7, 2026, that Fire Chief Carey received the email from Planning staff and needed clarification on the letter requested. As of the drafting of this staff report, Planning staff is working with Fire Chief Carey on providing a letter to document the waiving of the funding mechanism to provide structural fire protection.

On January 5, 2026, Evan Hasse, Senior Engineering Technician, Engineering Department, provided an email (Exhibit 3) and the May 23, 2024, Public Works letter to the applicant and stated the following:

*"Unfortunately, the position stated in the Public Works Letter dated 5/23/2024 (see item no. 2) remains unchanged on the subject of roadway improvements."*

On January 7, 2026, Evan Hasse, Senior Engineering Technician, Engineering Department, provided and email (Exhibit 4) to the applicant stating the following:

*"As far as surfacing, yes, Rob and I have discussed the alternative to use road base in place of the "pavement" surfacing described in the code and yes, it would be acceptable to use road base in this case.*

*It would also be perfectly acceptable to bring the Class 9 improvements to the cul-de-sac and the remainder of the access to your residence be improved to a Class 11 (driveway) standard. I've attached a marked up copy of your TPM hoping to illustrate what we are talking about, let me know if this aligns with your proposal."*

Therefore, the road would be required to be improved to the Class 9 standard set forth in Plumas County Code and a condition of approval of the project would serve to address the comment.



## **RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:**

Staff recommends the Zoning Administrator take the following actions:

- I. Hold the continued public hearing for Tentative Parcel Map TPM 12-23/24-03 and receive public testimony.
- II. Due to the applicant being unavailable for a continued public hearing at the regular meeting of the Zoning Administrator on February 11, 2026, continue the public hearing for Tentative Parcel Map TPM 12-23/24-03 to March 11, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. to allow County staff sufficient time to properly address the road classification issue and obtain a written document from Quincy Fire Protection District addressing the waiving of the funding mechanism for the provision of fire protection to the subject property.

## **APPEAL PROCESS:**

Pursuant to Plumas County Code Sec. 9-2.1001, an action by the Zoning Administrator is appealable to the Board of Supervisors within ten (10) days of the decision. If the tenth day lands on the weekend, the end of the appeal period will be the next working day. The appeal will need to be based on relevant information stated or submitted at, or prior to, this meeting by the applicant, any owner of real property within 300 feet of the exterior boundaries of the property involved who was present at the public hearing or who presented written testimony to the Zoning Administrator, or who may be adversely affected by the decision, or such other person whom the Board of Supervisors determines to have been adversely affected by the decision, or any County department head whose department has an interest in the decision. There is a filing fee for the appeal process. Fee information can be obtained from the Planning Department.

## **EXHIBITS:**

1. Letter from Frank Carey, Fire Chief, Quincy Fire Protection District
2. Letter from Joe Walton, Assistant Chief, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, dated January 6, 2026
3. Comment from Evan Hasse, Senior Engineering Technician, Engineering Department, dated January 5, 2026
4. Comment from Evan Hasse, Senior Engineering Technician, Engineering Department, dated January 6, 2026

# QUINCY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

505 Lawrence Street, Quincy, CA 95971 fcarey@qfd.ca.gov (530) 283-0870 Fax: (530) 283-0897



To Whom It May Concern:

Quincy Fire Protection District has and will continue to respond to calls on properties located outside of our District. Calls within the district have priority over those outside of the district but we would respond, nonetheless. We have and will continue to respond to those areas, including Butterfly Valley. QFPD does have a fee schedule for responses to areas not covered by a fire district which is attached.

Our funding mechanism for fire protection is through a ballot measure that was passed by the voters within our district. That amount is billed through the property tax statement and is roughly \$100 per parcel per year. That amount has been an adequate amount per parcel to fund our fire protection services.

In talking with the owner's it is apparent that there is currently separate residences already built and that this split would not further any new development but allow autonomy for the current residences and homeowners. If asked, QFPD would have no objections to this split.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Frank Carey", with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Frank Carey  
Fire Chief  
Quincy Fire Protection District

EXHIBIT 1

## Quincy Fire Protection District

Resolution No.: 23-0914-2

### **A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE QUINCY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT TO ESTABLISH A FEE SCHEDULE FOR OUT OF DISTRICT EMERGENCY RESPONSE.**

**WHEREAS**, the Quincy Fire Protection District (hereinafter the "District") operating under the California Health and Safety Code Section 13910 provide that a fire protection district board of commissioners may raise revenues pursuant to law whenever revenues are inadequate to meet the cost of providing services pursuant to Section 13862 for fire protection, emergency medical services, and hazardous material emergency response services; and

**WHEREAS**, the District is managed and controlled by a Board of Commissioners (hereinafter the "Board"); and

**WHEREAS**, the board is concerned about the related cost to the District for fire equipment and personnel to respond to areas outside the District; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board is in agreement that when the Department responds to areas not covered by a Fire District, that the individual(s) that they respond to will be charged for services rendered

### **NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, DETERMINED AND ORDERED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE QUINCY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT AS FOLLOWS.**

1. Charges: Commencing at the time of dispatch, the following charges will apply for the various types of equipment and personnel per hourly basis with a minimum one-hour charge.

#### **EQUIPMENT**

Type I Engine	141.96	Per Hour	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period)
Type II Engine	133.85	Per Hour	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period)
Type III	128.57	Per Hour	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period)
Type IV-VII	123.14	Per Hour	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period)

(see back →)

Water Tender Tactical Type I	121.17	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period )
Water Tender Tactical Type II	104.11	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period )
Sedan	120.00	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period )
Pickup	127.00	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period )
Van	194.00	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period )
SUV	197.00	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period )
Other (3/4 ton+)	201.00	(16-Hour Max per 24 Hour Period )
POV Rate	0.655	Per Mile

#### **PERSONNEL**

Fire Chief	34.59	Per Hour
Deputy Chief	34.59	Per Hour
Assistant Chief	34.59	Per Hour
Captain	27.77	Per Hour (OT 1.5 41.66 Per Hour)
Engineer	27.77	Per Hour (OT 1.5 41.66 Per Hour)
Firefighter	27.77	Per Hour (OT 1.5 41.66 Per Hour)
Support Personnel	27.77	Per Hour (OT 1.5 41.66 Per Hour)

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS**

Administrative rate 10%

**DURATION:** The Board of Commissioners shall review the Fee Schedule on an annual basis during the budget cycle and the Fee Schedule shall remain in effect until further action of the Board of Commissioners is taken.

**DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION:** This resolution and the policy set forth herein shall take effect on September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2023

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** this 14<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2023





## DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

Lassen-Modoc Unit  
697-345 Highway 36  
Susanville, CA 93610  
530-257-8520



Date: January 6, 2026

Tim Evans, Senior Planner  
555 Main Street  
Quincy, CA 95971

Re: Tentative Parcel Map Application  
Property Address: 1954 Wildwood Path, Quincy, CA 95971  
Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 110-061-019

Dear Planning Staff,

The following findings are found in regard to tentative parcel map application for the property located at 1954 Wildwood Path in Quincy, California (APN 110-061-019).

**Finding 1 – Fire Safe Regulations**

Pursuant to Article 1, Subsection 1270.03(c)(1) of the Board of Forestry Fire Safe Regulations, new parcels are required to comply with the applicable sections of the Fire Safe Regulations.

**Finding 2 – No New Development**

The proposed tentative parcel map does not include the construction of any new qualifying structures, roads, or driveways. As such, the project does not result in additional development impacts related to access improvements or structural construction at this time. The tentative parcel map is limited to the creation of parcels only, with any future development subject to separate review and permitting.

**Finding 3 – Applicability of Article 4 Requirements**

Article 4, Subsection 1275.01 of the Fire Safe Regulations requires that the provisions of this article shall apply in the tentative and parcel map process when new parcels are approved by the local jurisdiction. The proposed Tentative Parcel Map is subject to these requirements.

**Finding 4 – Future Development and Fire Safe Compliance**

In the event new construction or any other qualifying action is proposed in the future, all applicable sections of the Fire Safe Regulations shall apply at that time. Any such future development would be subject to separate review.

Based on the findings above, the tentative parcel map is consistent with applicable Fire Safe Regulations governing new parcel maps.

Respectfully,

Joe Walton  
Plumas County Assistant Chief  
CAL FIRE  
Lassen-Modoc Unit  
Serving Plumas County

**Evans, Tim**

---

**From:** Hasse, Evan  
**Sent:** Monday, January 5, 2026 3:26 PM  
**To:** Brett Marty  
**Cc:** Evans, Tim; Thorman, Rob  
**Subject:** Re: Marty / Rudholm TPM  
**Attachments:** Public Works Comments\_5.23.24.pdf

Hi Brett and Happy New Year to you as well,

Thanks for reaching out on this subject. Planning held a virtual meeting between CalFire and PCPW last week right before New Years. My take away from that meeting is that CalFire is busy working on the subject of the dead-end roadway. Unfortunately, the position stated in the Public Works Letter dated 5/23/2024 (see item no. 2) remains unchanged on the subject of roadway improvements.

Feel free to reach out to Rob Thorman or myself if you have specific questions about the letter.

Thanks!

Evan Hasse  
530.616.5102 Mobile  
530.283.6209 Office

Confidentiality: This message is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately

---

**From:** Evans, Tim <TimEvans@countyofplumas.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 5, 2026 1:30 PM  
**To:** Brett Marty <brett@butterflyvalley.net>  
**Cc:** Hasse, Evan <EvanHasse@countyofplumas.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Marty / Rudholm TPM

Hi Brett –

I recently had a meeting with Cal Fire Lassen-Modoc Unit, Engineering, and Public Works staff. At the meeting, Cal Fire Lassen-Modoc Unit staff indicated to County staff that they have requested direction from their supervisors in Sacramento concerning the project. County staff is awaiting a response from Cal Fire. Cal Fire staff indicated that they would do their best to provide a response to County staff by 1/7/26. For awareness, there is a possibility that if I don't receive a response by 1/7/26, which would allow me sufficient time to prepare a staff report addressing the concerns from the 12/10 hearing, that I would have to write a staff report making a recommendation to Tracey Ferguson, Zoning Administrator, that the project be continued to February to allow sufficient time for staff analysis.

1  
*EXHIBIT 3*

Also, I had a meeting with Frank Carey, Fire Chief, Quincy Fire Protection District, and he indicated that annexation or a funding mechanism wouldn't be required as there is a level of service sufficient to provide fire protection to the property. I have requested a letter be provided by Fire Chief Carey stating that service levels are sufficient, and no funding mechanism is required.

Regards,

**Tim Evans**

**Senior Planner – Extra Help**



Plumas County Planning Department

P: (530) 283-6207

[timevans@countyofplumas.com](mailto:timevans@countyofplumas.com)

**\*\*Confidentiality:** This message is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately.\*\*

---

**From:** Brett Marty <brett@butterflyvalley.net>

**Sent:** Monday, January 5, 2026 9:20 AM

**To:** Evans, Tim <TimEvans@countyofplumas.com>

**Cc:** Hasse, Evan <EvanHasse@countyofplumas.com>

**Subject:** Re: Marty / Rudholm TPM

**CAUTION: This email originated from OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Tim,  
Happy New Year. I am checking to see if you have been able to come up with a succinct list of requirements regarding our parcel split for the upcoming planning meeting which I believe is on the 14th. As Tracy stated she hoped that Frank Carey (fire chief), Joe Walton (of calfire), and Evan Hasse would all be able to attend. Is it my responsibility to reach out to these folks or is your department contacting them?

Cheers,

**BRETT MARTY**

Butterfly Valley Design & Build

---

530.919.4010

[www.butterflyvalley.net](http://www.butterflyvalley.net)

CA Lic. #1024099

---

1954 Wildwood Path

Quincy, CA 95971

On 1/8/2025 8:12 AM, Evans, Tim wrote:

Hi Evan,

**PLUMAS COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

1834 East Main Street, Quincy, CA 95971 – Telephone (530) 283-6268 Facsimile (530) 283-6323  
Robert Thorman, P.E., Acting Director Joe Blackwell, Deputy Director



Memorandum

**RECEIVED**

Date: May 23, 2024

MAY 23 2024

To: Tim Evans, Extra Help

PC Planning+Building

From: Robert Thorman, Acting Director

Re: Response to Preliminary Review & Consultation for a Tentative Parcel Map – Brett & Dana Marty and Peter & Janet Rudholm – TPM 12-23/24-03

The Department of Public Works has reviewed the proposed application and offers the following comments.

1. The Tentative Parcel Map application is incomplete. Please refer to the attached comments provided by the Engineering Department. Once the information requested by the Engineering Department is provided, the Public Works Department will perform an additional review of the new information and may provide additional comments.
2. Pursuant to Plumas County Code Section 9-4.607(h), the private roadways providing access to the proposed development, including the road easement and turnaround located on Parcel 1 and 2, shall be improved to the County's Class 9 Road Standard (PCC 9-4.411).

In addition, maintenance of the private roadways providing access to the development shall be provided in accordance with Plumas County Code Section 9-4.802

3. The proposed development is located on a dead-end road which exceeds the County's dead-end road length limit (PCC 9-4.604(i)). Butterfly Valley-Twain Road is not adequate as a secondary access route as this roadway does not meet minimum design standards for both width, surfacing or vehicle load requirements.

It is understood that this development is dividing a lot that has two existing dwelling units. A justification for the granting of an exemption from the dead-end road length limit could be a restriction from the building of additional dwelling units (i.e. guest houses or additional quarters) that would normally be allowed to the respective lot owners. The Public Works Department would support this exemption request based on this restriction.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Thorman".  
Robert Thorman, Acting Director  
Department of Public Works



**Evans, Tim**

---

**From:** Hasse, Evan  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 7, 2026 7:01 AM  
**To:** Brett Marty  
**Cc:** Evans, Tim; Thorman, Rob  
**Subject:** Re: Marty / Rudholm TPM  
**Attachments:** PCC Sec 9-4.501 Min. Rd Design Stds.pdf; TPM with Highlights\_Class 9.pdf

Hi Brett,

Here is a link the PCC - Article 5 - Min. Design Stds.

[https://library.municode.com/ca/plumas\\_county/codes/code\\_of\\_ordinances?nodeId=TIT9PLZO\\_CH4DEST\\_ART5\\_MIDEST](https://library.municode.com/ca/plumas_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT9PLZO_CH4DEST_ART5_MIDEST)

I've also attached this code section as a PDF with highlights just incase the link doesn't work.

As far as surfacing, yes, Rob and I have discussed the alternative to use road base in place of the "pavement" surfacing described in the code and yes, it would be acceptable to use road base in this case.

It would also be perfectly acceptable to bring the Class 9 improvements to the cul-de-sac and the remainder of the access to you residence be improved to a Class 11 (driveway) standard. I've attached a marked up copy of your TPM hoping to illustrate what we are talking about, let me know if this aligns with your proposal.

Thanks,

Evan Hasse  
530.616.5102 Mobile  
530.283.6209 Office

Confidentiality: This message is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately

---

**From:** Brett Marty <brett@butterflyvalley.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 6, 2026 8:49 PM  
**To:** Hasse, Evan <EvanHasse@countyofplumas.com>  
**Cc:** Evans, Tim <TimEvans@countyofplumas.com>; Thorman, Rob <RobThorman@countyofplumas.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Marty / Rudholm TPM

**CAUTION: This email originated from OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Evan,

1  
*EXHIBIT 4*

Thanks for the response. Can you please send me the class 9 road requirements to see if this is even feasible? Are gravel and road base solutions acceptable?  
Seeing how the "through - road" is not being considered valid, would it be conceivable for the class 9 to go from the eastern property boundary to the turn around at the Rudholms thus demarking the start of our driveway and keeping the class 9 section as short as possible?

Cheers,  
Brett Marty  
Butterfly Valley Design & Build  
530.919.4010

---- On Mon, 05 Jan 2026 15:25:44 -0800 **EvanHasse@countyofplumas.com** wrote ----

Hi Brett and Happy New Year to you as well,

Thanks for reaching out on this subject. Planning held a virtual meeting between CalFire and PCPW last week right before New Years. My take away from that meeting is that CalFire is busy working on the subject of the dead-end roadway. Unfortunately, the position stated in the Public Works Letter dated 5/23/2024 (see item no. 2) remains unchanged on the subject of roadway improvements.

Feel free to reach out to Rob Thorman or myself if you have specific questions about the letter.

Thanks!

Evan Hasse  
530.616.5102 Mobile  
530.283.6209 Office

Confidentiality: This message is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately

---

**From:** Evans, Tim <[TimEvans@countyofplumas.com](mailto:TimEvans@countyofplumas.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 5, 2026 1:30 PM  
**To:** Brett Marty <[brett@butterflyvalley.net](mailto:brett@butterflyvalley.net)>  
**Cc:** Hasse, Evan <[EvanHasse@countyofplumas.com](mailto:EvanHasse@countyofplumas.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Marty / Rudholm TPM

Hi Brett –

I recently had a meeting with Cal Fire Lassen-Modoc Unit, Engineering, and Public Works staff. At the meeting, Cal Fire Lassen-Modoc Unit staff indicated to County staff that they have requested direction from their supervisors in Sacramento concerning the project. County staff is awaiting a response from Cal Fire. Cal Fire staff indicated that they would do their best to provide a response to County staff by 1/7/26. For awareness, there is a possibility that if I don't receive a response by 1/7/26, which would allow me sufficient time to prepare a staff report addressing the concerns from the 12/10 hearing, that I would have to write a staff report making a recommendation to Tracey Ferguson, Zoning Administrator, that the project be continued to February to allow sufficient time for staff analysis.

Also, I had a meeting with Frank Carey, Fire Chief, Quincy Fire Protection District, and he indicated that annexation or a funding mechanism wouldn't be required as there is a level of service sufficient to provide fire protection to the property. I have requested a letter be provided by Fire Chief Carey stating that service levels are sufficient, and no funding mechanism is required.

Regards,

**Tim Evans**

**Senior Planner – Extra Help**



Plumas County Planning Department

P: (530) 283-6207

[timevans@countyofplumas.com](mailto:timevans@countyofplumas.com)

**\*\*Confidentiality:** This message is intended for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately. \*\*

---

**From:** Brett Marty <[brett@butterflyvalley.net](mailto:brett@butterflyvalley.net)>

**Sent:** Monday, January 5, 2026 9:20 AM

**To:** Evans, Tim <[TimEvans@countyofplumas.com](mailto:TimEvans@countyofplumas.com)>

**Cc:** Hasse, Evan <[EvanHasse@countyofplumas.com](mailto:EvanHasse@countyofplumas.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Marty / Rudholm TPM

**CAUTION: This email originated from OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.**

Tim,  
Happy New Year. I am checking to see if you have been able to come up with a succinct list of requirements regarding our parcel split for the upcoming planning meeting which I believe is on the 14th. As Tracy stated she hoped that Frank Carey (fire chief), Joe Walton (of calfire), and Evan Hasse would all be able to attend. Is it my responsibility to reach out to these folks or is your department contacting them?

Cheers,

**BRETT MARTY**

Butterfly Valley Design & Build

530.919.4010

[www.butterflyvalley.net](http://www.butterflyvalley.net)

CA Lic. #1024099

1954 Wildwood Path

Quincy, CA 95971

On 1/8/2025 8:12 AM, Evans, Tim wrote:

Hi Evan,

Sec. 9-4.501. - Minimum Road Design Standards.

(a) For purposes of this section, these terms are designed as follows:

- (1) "Surfaced" means pavement unless otherwise specified.
- (2) "Shoulder" means rocked (class 2 aggregate base) shoulder unless otherwise specified.
- (3) "Total shoulder width" means the sum of the widths of the shoulders on both sides of the road.
- (4) "Clearing limit" means clearing limit measured from the outer limit of construction; or in flat land from the bottom of the ditch.

(b) Minimum road design standards for each class of public and private road defined in Article 4 of this chapter shall be as follows:

*Class 1: Projected traffic + 7,500 ADT*

Surfaced traveled way forty-eight (48') feet (four (4) lanes); total paved shoulder width—sixteen (16') feet, with four (4') feet (total) rocked shoulders. Curb and gutter can substitute for rocked shoulder; roadbed sixty-eight (68') feet; right-of-way eighty (80) feet for parallel parking, ninety-eight (98') feet for diagonal parking; no clearing limit. An additional nine (9) feet of paved shoulder is required for each side where diagonal parking will be placed.

*Class 2: Projected traffic + 5,000—7,000 ADT*

Surfaced traveled way thirty-six (36') feet (three (3) lanes with center lane to be either a passing lane, a left turn lane, or a combination of the two (2)); total paved shoulder width sixteen (16') feet; width four (4') feet (total) rocked shoulder. Curb and gutter can substitute for rocked shoulder; roadbed fifty-six (56') feet; right-of-way eighty (80') feet for parallel parking, ninety-eight (98') feet for diagonal parking; no clearing limit. An additional nine (9') feet of paved shoulder is required for each side where diagonal parking will be placed.

*Class 3: Projected traffic—5,000 ADT*

Surfaced traveled way twenty-two (22') feet; total paved shoulder width sixteen (16') feet, with four (4') feet (total) rocked shoulders. Total shoulder width may be reduced to six (6') feet where no on-street parking is permitted and where no special maneuvering areas are necessary for traffic safety and ADT is less than 1,000. Curb and gutter can substitute for rocked shoulder; roadbed forty-two (42') feet; right-of-way sixty (60') feet for parallel parking, seventy-eight (78') feet for diagonal parking; no clearing limit. An additional nine (9') feet of paved shoulder is required for each side where diagonal parking will be placed.

*Class 4A: Projected traffic + 1,000 ADT*



Surfaced traveled way twenty-four (24') feet; total shoulder width sixteen (16') feet; roadbed forty (40') feet; right-of-way sixty (60') feet; clearing limit four (4') feet.

*Class 4B: Projected traffic 400—1,000 ADT*

Surfaced traveled way twenty-four (24') feet; total shoulder width eight (8') feet; roadbed thirty-two (32') feet; right-of-way sixty (60') feet; clearing limit four (4') feet.

*Class 4C: Projected traffic—400 ADT*

Surfaced traveled way twenty (20') feet (rocked); total shoulder width four (4') feet; roadbed twenty-four (24') feet; right-of-way sixty (60') feet; clearing limit two (2') feet.

*Class 5: Projected traffic + 1,000 ADT*

Surfaced traveled way twenty-two (22') feet; total shoulder width eighteen (18') feet; roadbed forty (40') feet; right-of-way sixty (60') feet; clearing limit four (4') feet.

*Class 6: Projected traffic + 400—1,000 ADT*

Surfaced traveled way twenty-two (22') feet; total shoulder width eight (8') feet; roadbed thirty (30') feet; right-of-way sixty (60') feet; clearing limit four (4') feet.

*Class 7: Projected traffic—400 ADT*

Surfaced traveled way twenty-two (22') feet; total shoulder width four (4') feet; roadbed twenty-six (26') feet; right-of-way fifty (50') feet; clearing limit two (2') feet.

*Class 8*

Surfaced traveled way twelve (12') feet (one-way); total shoulder width eight (8') feet; roadbed twenty (20') feet; right-of-way forty (40') feet clearing limit two (2') feet.

*Class 9*

Surfaced traveled way twenty (20') feet (rocked); total shoulder width four (4') feet, but zero feet if exception is granted under Section 9-9.202 of this Code; roadbed twenty-four (24') feet, right-of-way forty (40') feet; clearing limit two (2') feet.

*Class 10*

Surfaced traveled way twenty (20') feet (graded); total shoulder width four (4') feet, but zero feet if exception is granted under Section 9-9.202 of this Code; roadbed twenty-four (24') feet; right-of-way forty (40') feet; clearing limit two (2') feet.

*Class 11*

Surfaced traveled way ten (10') feet (graded); total shoulder width four (4') feet; roadbed ten (10') feet; right-of-way twenty (20') feet, where right-of-way is needed; unobstructed horizontal clearing limit of fourteen (14') feet and unobstructed vertical clearing limit of fifteen (15') feet.

- (c) Roadway surfaces on classes of public and private roads (Class 1 through Class 10, inclusive), shall be designed and maintained to support an imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 pounds as required by Vehicle Code Sections 5-35250 and 35550 through 35796. Roadway surfaces shall provide an all-weather aggregate base. All bridges, culverts, and other appurtenant structures which supplement the roadway bed or shoulders shall be constructed to carry at least the maximum load and provide the minimum vertical clearance as required by Vehicle Code Sections 35250 and 35550 through 35796. Applicant shall provide engineering specifications to support design, if requested by the County Engineer.
- (d) Class 11 roadways (residential driveways) shall be designed to support an imposed load of fire apparatus weighing at least 40,000 pounds as required by Vehicle Code Sections 35250 and 35550 through 35796. Driveway surfaces shall provide an all-weather base.
- (e) All roadways shall provide a minimum vertical clearance of fifteen (15') feet.

(§ 1, Ord. 87-662, eff. June 4, 1987, as amended by Ord. 87-668, eff. July 9, 1987, § 1, Ord. 91-762, eff. October 3, 1991, and § 1, Ord. 92-783, eff. July 9, 1992, § 1, Ord. 93-802, eff. March 4, 1993, and § 3, 02-975, adopted September 3, 2002; § 1(Exh. A), Ord. 2018-1114, adopted October 9, 2018)

