



AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

311 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5520
(530) 626-4756 FAX
eldcag@co.el-dorado.ca.us

Greg Boeger, Chair – Agricultural Processing Industry
Lloyd Walker, Vice-chair – Other Agricultural Interests
Chuck Bacchi – Livestock Industry
Bill Draper, Forestry/Related Industries
Tom Heflin, Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Dave Pratt – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Gary Ward – Livestock Industry

MINUTES

March 12, 2008

6:30 P.M.

Board of Supervisors Meeting Room
330 Fair Lane – Building A, Placerville

Members Present: Bacchi, Boeger, Draper, Heflin, Pratt, Walker

Members Absent: Ward

Ex-Officio Members Present: William J. Stephans, Ag Commissioner/Sealer

Staff Members Present: Nancy Applegarth, Clerk to the Ag Commission
Chris Flores, Agricultural Biologist/Standards Inspector
Patricia Gaylord, Department of Transportation
Peter Maurer, Development Services/Planning

Others Present: Tom Ashmead, Harold Bowers, Janine D’Agostini, Jeff Malm, Judy Mathat, Joshua McCann, Robynn McCann, Virginia Murphy, Danielle Peterson, John Smith, Ronald Smith, Edward Stanton, Ann Wofford, David Wofford

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m. by Chair Boeger. Mr. Boeger gave his regrets at the passing of Steve Burton, Assistant Agricultural Commissioner, and spoke of how much he will be missed by the Commission members and Ag staff.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Walker to approve the agenda. Motion passed.

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Walker, Boeger
NOES: None
ABSENT: Ward

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of February 13, 2008 meeting

Mr. Bacchi asked that a modification be made on the February 13, 2008 agenda to include his Aye vote on Item X. P 74-0360C Nuss Map Amendment (Michael John Nuss/David Waddell). It was then moved by Mr. Bacchi to approve the minutes with the change to Item X, seconded by Mr. Heflin. Motion passed.

AYES: Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Walker, Bacchi, Boeger
NOES: None
ABSENT: Ward

Minutes of February 19, 2008 meeting

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Heflin to approve the Minutes of February 19, 2008. Motion passed.

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Walker
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Boeger
ABSENT: Ward

IV. PUBLIC FORUM

No comments were received

V. Ranch Marketing/Winery Ordinance update and discussion.

Bill Stephans informed the Commission that the Winery Ordinance was on the Planning Commission agenda for March 13, 2008. A scoping meeting will take place regarding the Notice of Preparation for the ordinance. The Ranch Marketing committee is meeting later this month working toward a draft of the ordinance.

VI. Oak Woodlands Management Update

The Planning Commission will be hearing the Oak Woodlands Management Plan (Final Draft) Strikeout Version on March 13, 2008

VII. Agricultural Grading – Presentation by Patricia Gaylord, El Dorado County Storm Water Coordinator/Department of Transportation.

In recent years, federal and state regulations have been created to protect stormwater quality by requiring local jurisdictions to implement stormwater management programs. These programs must include education outreach to inform the public and businesses of the effects of their activities on stormwater quality. Local ordinances are being put into place to prohibit the disposal of anything except clean rainwater into storm drainage systems.

The El Dorado County's Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) includes a plan to reduce pollutants in stormwater to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) with six minimum control measures, 1) Public education and outreach; 2) Public involvement and participation; 3) Illicit discharge detection and elimination; 4) Construction site runoff controls; 5) Post-Construction runoff controls and; 6) Pollution prevention/Good housekeeping measures. A draft ordinance is now circulating internally which will prohibit all non-stormwater discharges, includes enforcement actions, citations and fines. The target date for adoption of this ordinance is June 2008.

The Agricultural Department is responsible for administering agricultural grading activities that require a permit pursuant to Policy 7.1.2.7 of the County General Plan (i.e. grading that involves the conversion of one acre or more of undisturbed vegetation to agricultural

cropland). This responsibility does not extend to any grading related to development of structures. Ag staff has been working with Patricia Gaylord in implementing this process. The current Stormwater Management Plan contains Best Management Practices that should also be incorporated into the Agriculture website.

VIII. Affordable Housing/Agricultural Worker Housing – Presentation by Peter Maurer, Development Services/Planning

Mr. Maurer provided a handout to the Commission and public which contained the policies and provisions of the General Plan that apply to agricultural employee housing. He asked the Commission members and public to provide any feedback pertaining to the “need” for supplying affordable housing and agricultural worker housing; the type of housing and amount; and, the need for year-round or seasonal employees. The Planning Commission will incorporate this information into the draft Affordable Housing document which will be submitted to the Board of Supervisors next month. At issue may be the requirement in General Plan Policy 8.2.3.1 which requires that a Special Use Permit be obtained for additional dwellings over and above those allowed by right for permanent and seasonal agricultural employees. Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6 states “no conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves 12 or fewer employees and is not required of any other agricultural activity in the same zone.”

The following items were identified as issues that should be addressed for affordable agricultural employee housing:

Needs of agriculturalists:

- Not just housing, but employees – primarily a local work force
- Housing for families as well as individuals
- Single family dwellings and dormitory style housing
- Commuting from valley is a problem
- Need for employees comes at same time – competition between growers for workers
- Employees work at several different sites during the year

Constraints:

- Affordability for employees and land owner
- Fees (TIM, other)
- Lots more land in agriculture than 10 years ago (at least vineyards) but housing has not increased to accommodate need
- Regulations (SUP, time for approval and construction)

Suggestions:

- Reduce fees for Ag employee housing
- Allow RV park type arrangement
- Create a specific section in the Housing Element to address Ag employees
- Prepare study to determine true need (number of workers needed per acre of specified crop, acreage by crop type, transient employees versus permanent residents)
- Conform zoning to state law

An estimate of the actual amount of worker housing may help to identify the true need for this type

of affordable housing within El Dorado County.

IX. Agricultural Buffers – Presentation by Peter Maurer, Development Services/Planning

On October 11, 2007, the Planning Commission, after hearing from a number of speakers during public forum, directed staff to return with a discussion of General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 and a Resolution of Intent to possibly amend the policy. Policy 8.1.3.1 requires that no parcel shall be created less than 10-acres on lands adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands. This was a policy that was carried over from the prior policies contained in the area plans, which were adopted beginning in the mid-1970s through 1984. Policy 8.1.3.1 reads as follows: *“Agriculturally zoned lands including Williamson Act Contract properties shall be buffered from increases in density on adjacent lands by requiring a minimum of 10 acres for any parcel created adjacent to such lands. Those parcels used to buffer agriculturally zoned lands shall have the same width to length ratio of other parcels.”* A concern was raised that this policy conflicts with the intent of the Community Regions and Rural Centers (CR/RC) which is to provide for areas of higher intensity and greater density in land uses.

Peter Maurer explained that Rural Centers and Community Regions are areas designated for future urban development. The regions outside of these areas should be protected for resource uses and the rural ambiance of the County. The Planning Department would like to see some modifications to this policy of the General Plan which will ultimately be decided by the Board of Supervisors.

Chris Flores gave a PowerPoint presentation showing the various maps of the Community Regions and Rural Centers and the zoning of the adjacent parcels. According to the analysis presented, the percentage of acreage affected by Policy 8.1.3.1 in and adjacent to the Rural Centers is approximately 11%; the percentage of acreage affected in the Community Regions is approximately 8.5%.

Bill Stephans stated that after looking at the preliminary analysis, Policy 8.1.3.1 may not be as big of a problem as originally perceived. He suggested something similar to the Administrative Relief procedure from Agricultural Setbacks with specific criteria and findings be used rather than proposing and adopting a blanket amendment to the General Plan policy where one size fits all. If specific criteria were adopted, a site specific analysis could be completed which may satisfy CEQA. A tiered approach could be recommended that would allow Development Services to reduce the adjacent parcel size for some parcel splits while more complex impacts to agriculture for other requests would come before the Ag Commission for further analysis and possible size reductions.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Heflin to recommend that the Agricultural staff work with Planning staff to craft language that would give certain relief in instances that are appropriate and to return to the Ag Commission for approval.

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Walker, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- X. Z 07-0033, PD 07-0020 & TM 07-1448 – McCann Subdivison (Michael, Robynn & Joshua McCann/Timothy Schad): A request for a rezone from PA-20 (Planned Agricultural 20 Acre) to R1-PD (One-Family Residential – Planned Development) and development plan and tentative map to create 72 residential lots ranging in size from 6,002 to 16,809 square feet with a 7.5-acre open space lot. Design waivers are requested to permit variations from Volume II, Sections 2.B.4, 2.B.5 and 2.B.7 of the El Dorado County Design Improvement Standards Manual for lot widths, frontage and to allow flag-shaped lots. The property, identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number 331-420-12-1, consists of 24.30 acres, and is located approximately 1,600 feet east of the intersection of Truscott Lane and Union Mine Road, in the El Dorado area. (District 3)

Staff reported on the site visit. The subject parcel is between Union Mine High School and a 25 acre parcel owned by Lake Oaks Mobile Home Community. The parcel, and adjacent parcels (north, south, east and west), have agricultural zoning, although the General Plan Land Use Designation for the parcels are HDR (High Density Residential). The subject parcel is also in the El Dorado/Diamond Springs Community Region. General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 states that “Agriculturally zoned lands...shall be buffered from increases in density on adjacent lands by requiring a minimum of 10 acres for any parcel created adjacent to such lands.” Although the Land Use Designation for the subject parcel is HDR, until such time as the adjacent parcels are rezoned from Agricultural zoning to something other than Agriculture, the Agricultural Commission must support General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1 as stated. General Plan Policy 8.1.2.2. states that there are lands within Rural Regions of the County that have historically been used for grazing and “...if they were not assigned urban or other nonagricultural uses in the Land Use Map for the 1996 General Plan, those lands shall be protected with a minimum of 40 acres unless such lands already have small parcels...” Although this parcel may have historically been used for grazing, this policy should not apply to this project, as the parcel is not in a Rural Region. As defined by the General Plan Land Use Map of 2004, the 24.29 acre parcel is in a Residential Area. If the subject parcel is developed for residential use, General Plan Policy 8.2.2.6 may be applicable. The policy states, “Residential uses that are established adjoining grazing land shall have agricultural fencing per County Standards.” General Plan Policy 8.2.2.5 states that “New parcels adjacent to parcels zoned for agriculture shall not be created unless the size of the parcel is large enough to allow for an adequate setback from the surrounding agricultural parcels for any incompatible uses.

Robynn McCann was present to give further explanation of the application.

A neighbor to the subject parcel spoke of the zoning conflicts in this area, also stating that she would go before the Planning Commission to find out why this land was originally designated as a Community Region with an HDR land use since the majority of the parcels in this area are large, 5 acre parcels with only one residence.

A member of the public spoke of the inconsistencies in the General Plan, stating that he feels

this is not a minor problem as stated earlier in the presentation since the Commission often faces these problems with the General Plan when forming a recommendation.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend DENIAL of Z070033, PD 07-0020 & TM 07-1448 – McCann Subdivision (Michael, Robynn & Joshua McCann/Timothy Schad) request for a rezone from PA-20 (Planned Agricultural 20 Acre to R1-PD) (One-Family Residential – Planned Development). Although the requested rezone from PA-20 to R1-PD appears to be consistent with the General Plan land use designation which is High Density Residential (HDR), other General Plan policies that are fundamental, mandatory and specific such as 8.1.3.1, 8.1.3.2 and 8.2.2.5 require that newly created parcels adjacent to Agricultural land must be ten acres or larger and be of such size as to allow for an adequate setback. Until such time as the Agricultural parcels that have a land use designation such as HDR, including the parcel containing the Union Mine High School (PA-20 zoning) are rezoned to something other than Agricultural, a recommendation to approve this project cannot be made, and recommend that this parcel and all adjacent parcels zoned Agricultural with HDR land use designations and in a Community Region be rezoned for consistency with the General Plan Land Use Designations. Additionally, the Commission finds this parcel contains approximately 10-12 acres of choice soils which will be lost to agricultural production once residential development takes place.

AYES: Walker, Bacchi, Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- XI.** P 07-0022 Jeff & Judy Malm/Nicole Young request for a General Plan Amendment from Rural Residential (RR) to Low Density Residential (LDR), and a parcel map to create four parcels ranging in size from 5.0 to 5.5 on a 20.5-acre parcel. The parcel is identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 092-440-01 on the east side of Mica Street approximately 750 feet north of the intersection with Crystal Boulevard in the El Dorado area. It should be noted that the current single-family residential unit was recently approved in the current location with building permit 178310 which was finalized in June of 2007. (District 2)

Staff reported on the site visit. The applicants would like to change the Land Use Designation of the parcel from RR (Rural Residential) to LDR (Low Density Residential). The parcel is zoned RE-5 (Estate Residential Five-Acre). They are also proposing to split the property into 4 parcels, ranging in size from 5.0 acres to 5.5 acres. Current zoning and land use designations around the parcel consist of residential zoning to the west and east and agricultural zoning (RA-20) to the north and south, although the 2 parcels to the south, are 4.76 and 5.03 acres, and the parcel to the north is 10 acres. The area consists of non-choice soils and is primarily a residential area. Due to the Agricultural zoning of the parcels to the north and south, a minimum parcel size created next to such parcels has to be a minimum of 10 acres. General Plan Policy 8.1.3.1. states that "Agriculturally zoned lands...shall be buffered from increases in density on adjacent lands by requiring a minimum of 10 acres for any parcel created adjacent to such lands."

It was discussed that the Commission has not been given the authority by the Board of Supervisors to use broad discretion when formulating their recommendations. Additionally, clearly written policies such as this leave little to be interpreted.

Jeff Malm stated that the project would not only benefit his family but benefit the Community as well, by providing the use of an additional exit through an existing fire road in the area that intersects with Highway 49. He plans to improve this existing road to allow safer ingress and egress for the community.

Staff commented that if the zoning was more appropriate on these parcels the application would not have needed to be before them, however, the subject parcel is between Ag zoned parcels.

It was moved by Mr. Walker, seconded by Mr. Draper , to recommend DENIAL of P 07-0022 Jeff & Judy Malm/Nicole Young request for a General Plan Amendment from Rural Residential (RR) to Low Density Residential (LDR), and a parcel map to create four parcels ranging in size from 5.0 to 5.5 acres on a 20.5 acre parcel because the parcel is bordered both on the north and south boundaries by sub-standard RA-20 zoned parcels. Several of the RA-20 parcels are approximately 5 acres in size which are inconsistent with the General Plan land use designation of Rural Residential (10-160 acres per residence) and also the minimum parcel sizes for RA-20 zoning. The sub-standard RA-20 parcels should be required to be rezoned to a more appropriate non-agricultural zoning prior to approving any projects in this area. No agricultural activities were operating on the adjacent parcels at the time of the site visit. Piecemeal approval of projects in this area will only further exacerbate and continue the problems into the future. If all of the parcels are rezoned then this project would not come before this Commission; if some of the adjacent parcels are rezoned, the Commission can make the required findings contained in General Plan policy 8.1.4.1. If the adjacent parcels are not rezoned, General Plan policies 8.1.3.1, 8.1.3.2 and 8.2.2.5 apply.

AYES: Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Walker, Bacchi, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- XII.** Adrienne Robison - request for administrative relief from agricultural setbacks to allow the construction of a single family dwelling. The southwest corner of the subject parcel is adjacent to Exclusive Agricultural (AE) zoned land and therefore subject to special agricultural setbacks in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guidelines adopted June 22, 2006. The proposed single family dwelling does not meet the requirements for the Development Services Director to allow up to a 50 and/or a 75 percent setback reduction and therefore requires the Agricultural Commission review for administrative relief. (District 3)

Chris Flores gave a report on the site visit. The application is for Administrative Relief from a 200 foot Agricultural Setback from the AE (Exclusive Agriculture) parcel to the west. The applicants are requesting a 30 foot setback from their eastern property line for a single family residence, although according to the submitted Site Plan, the proposed building site would be

approximately 120 feet from the southwest corner and the AE zoned parcel. The subject parcel is zoned R3A (Single Family Three-Acre Residential), is in the Camino/Fruitridge Agricultural District, has non-choice soils, is wooded and has limited building sites due to its topography. Due to the parcel's size of 1.44 acres, and its shape, a 200 foot setback from the AE zoned parcel would make the subject parcel un-buildable. The proposed location for the residence is closer to Cable Road than the AE zoned parcel to minimize any potential negative impacts. The AE zoned land is not in a current Williamson Act Contract, and adjacent to the subject parcel, the AE land is covered in Himalayan blackberries.

After reconsideration by the representative for the applicant the request for administrative relief was amended to 75 feet from the AE zoned parcel and 30 feet from western boundary of the parcel. The application with an attached map indicated that the building site was approximately 120 feet from the AE zoned parcel.

It was moved by Mr. Heflin and seconded by Mr. Bacchi, to recommend APPROVAL of Adrienne Robison request for administrative relief from a 200 foot agricultural setback, allowing a setback of 75 feet from the AE zoned parcel and 30 feet from the western boundary of the parcel as the following findings can be made: a) no suitable building site exists on the subject parcel except within the required setback, b) the proposed non-compatible structure would be located on the property to reasonably minimize the potential negative impact on the adjacent agricultural zoned land, and c) the topography of the subject parcel and the location of the proposed non-compatible structure minimizes the negative impacts on the Agricultural land. The Commission also requires the applicant comply with Resolution No. 079-2007 Exhibit A of the Board of Supervisors pertaining to the adoption of the Criteria and Procedures for Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks. Section B.5 requires the following action by the applicant: In all cases, if a reduction in the agricultural setback is granted for a non-compatible use/structure, prior to the issuance of a building permit, a Notice of Restriction must be recorded identifying that the non-compatible use/structure is constructed within an agricultural setback and that the owner of the parcel granted the reduction in the agricultural setback acknowledges and accepts responsibility for the risks associated with building a non-compatible use/structure within the setback.

AYES: Pratt, Heflin, Walker, Bacchi, Draper, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- XIII.** Janine D'Agostini, or Virginia L. Murphy, agents for Ronald Smith, requesting administrative relief from agricultural setbacks for the proposed single-family residence to be located 75 feet from the south property line. The subject parcel is adjacent to Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) land and therefore subject to special agricultural setbacks in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guidelines adopted June 22, 2006. The proposed single-family residence does not meet the requirements for the Development Services Director to allow up to a 50 and/or a 75 percent setback reduction and therefore requires the Agricultural Commission review for administrative relief. (District 2)

Staff related findings of the site visit. The application is for Administrative Relief from a 200 foot Agricultural Setback on the south side of the applicant's property, from a parcel zoned TPZ (Timberland Production Zone). The applicant would like to reduce the setback to 75 feet, for a residential building site. The subject parcel is zoned RE-5 (Estate Residential – Five Acre) and is 5.93 acres. The TPZ zoned parcel, to the south, is owned by Sierra Pacific Industries, and is covered in oaks, foothill pine, Ponderosa pine, and Douglas fir. The proposed building site was marked by white flags: Applicant is requesting a setback relief for a building site at the southern portion of the subject parcel where there is an existing well, electricity, and the land is relatively flat. The area to the north of the lawn could be a possible building site, outside of the agricultural setback, but the site is closer to a vineyard on the neighboring parcel to the west. Although the request is to reduce the setback to 75 feet, General Plan Policy 8.4.1.2 only allows the Ag Commission to reduce the setback to a minimum of 100 feet.

The representatives for the applicant were present for questions and review of the project. It was stated that a recent survey established that the southern corner marker, which they were previously unable to locate, revealed the southern boundary to be 18 feet further to the north than stated on the application which makes the approval of the request for a 75 feet setback very important to the requirements of building the project.

Bill Draper gave a report of his visit to the property. There is approximately 300 acres of timber next to the project which will eventually be utilized by Sierra Pacific Industries. He stated he could not support anything less than a 200 foot setback.

The adjacent vineyard to the west is on RE-10 zoned land and the placement of the residential structure at the minimum 100 foot setback from the southern boundary would give protection to both the TPZ land and the adjacent vineyard.

The representative for the applicant expressed her wish to have the 75 foot setback but understood the limitations contained in the General Plan for the Agricultural Commission to establish a minimum 100 foot setback from the TPZ parcel. This being the case, the representative stated they would be satisfied with the 100 foot setback if approved.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend APPROVAL of Janine D'Agostini, or Virginia L. Murphy, agents for Ronald Smith, request for administrative relief from agricultural setbacks to a reduction to the agricultural setback from the TPZ zoned land to the south, to 100 feet per General Plan Policy 8.4.1.2 which states, "A permanent setback of at least 200 feet shall be provided on parcels located adjacent to lands identified as timber production lands...or lands zoned Timberland Production Zone (TPZ)...The Agricultural Commission may recommend a lesser setback to a minimum of 100 feet." With a reduction in the setback from the TPZ parcel, a building site could be placed further away from an active agricultural operation (a vineyard) on the parcel to the west and according to General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1, the following findings can be made: a). The proposed use will not be detrimental to adjacent

parcels for long-term forest resource production value or conflict with forest resource production in that general area; b). The proposed use will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent proposed uses and timber production and harvesting activities; c). The proposed use will not create an island effect wherein timber production lands located between the project site and other non-timber production lands are negatively affected; d). The proposed use will not hinder timber production and harvesting access to water and public roads or otherwise conflict with the continuation or development of timber production harvesting; and e). The proposed use will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to timber production lands. The Commission also requires the applicant comply with Resolution No. 079-2007 Exhibit A of the Board of Supervisors pertaining to the adoption of the Criteria and Procedures for Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks. Section B.5 requires the following action by the applicant: In all cases, if a reduction in the agricultural setback is granted for a non-compatible use/structure, prior to the issuance of a building permit, a Notice of Restriction must be recorded identifying that the non-compatible use/structure is constructed within an agricultural setback and that the owner of the parcel granted the reduction in the agricultural setback acknowledges and accepts responsibility for the risks associated with building a non-compatible use/structure within the setback..

AYES: Walker, Pratt, Bacchi, Boeger

NOES: Draper, Heflin

ABSENT: Ward

XIV. Community Regions & Rural Centers

The Agricultural staff Powerpoint presentation on Community Regions & Rural Centers was presented under Item IX.

XV. LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

There have been at least seven bills introduced from the Bay Area to stop or place additional requirements on CDFA regarding the aerial application of pheromones for the Light Brown Apple Moth. If any of these bills become law, it will greatly reduce CDFA's ability to eradicate any serious exotic infestation such as Med fly in the future.

XVI. CORRESPONDENCE

- El Dorado County Farm Bureau letters to Senator Dianne Feinstein and Congressman John Doolittle from Carlan V. Meyer, President, regarding the proposed closure of the Auburn Farm Services Agency

XVII. OTHER BUSINESS

- BLA 08-0004 Boundary Line Adjustment application – Charles Mitchell

- BLA 08-0008 Boundary Line Adjustment application – Chaim Gur-Arieh
- Request for Agricultural Commissioner Concurrence – Mark Cafaro
- PD 08-0004 & TM 08-1464 – Serrano Village A14 (Serrano Associates, LLC/R.E.Y. Engineers)
- WAC 07-0003 – Guy Shaver/Sarah Rump contacted for status of meeting the Williamson Act Contract land leasing requirements made in a motion at the September 12, 2007 Ag Commission meeting. An agreement has not been established at this time. Staff will watch this closely and if no information is forthcoming by June, it will be agendaized for the July Ag Commission meeting for possible action.

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Boeger adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

APPROVED: _____

Date: _____