



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
Tom Heflin – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Dave Pratt – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Bill Draper – Forestry/Related Industries
Gary Ward – Livestock Industry

MINUTES

August 13, 2008

6:30 P.M.

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

Members Present: Draper, Heflin, Pratt, Walker, Ward

Members Absent: Bacchi, Boeger

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

Staff Members Present: Nancy Applegarth, Clerk to the Ag Commission
Chris Flores, Ag Biologist/Standards Inspector

Pierre Rivas, Development Services/Planning

Others Present: Joyce Aldrich, Mike Alexander, Bob Ash, Ron & Camilla Bixler, Doug Bonett, C.J. Freeland, Bill Kettelkamp, Perry King, John Lomoro, Danica Olivo, Nello Olivo, Nancy Overman Hugh & Barbara Peters, James Sholl, Greg Skidel, Zach Spencer

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Lloyd Walker, Chair Pro Tem

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Pratt to APPROVE the Agenda.

Motion passed.

AYES: Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Ward, Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Boeger

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the July 9, 2008 meeting – approval was continued to the September 10, 2008 meeting due to lack of quorum for the approval of the minutes.

IV. PUBLIC FORUM

- *No comments were received*

V. Ranch Marketing/Winery Ordinance Update

Bill Stephans stated that after reviewing a draft copy of the Initial Study of the Winery Ordinance, it appears that many of the identified mitigation measures were fairly insignificant. Also, much of what has been discussed at past sub-committee meetings has been incorporated into the draft. The draft Initial Study and ordinance combines the September 11, 2007 industry draft into the March 17, 2008 format which should be able to be adopted by a Mitigated Negative Declaration, as requested by the Board of Supervisors.

VI. Agricultural Housing

Bill Stephans stated that at the July 9, 2008 Ag Commission meeting an application for Ag Worker housing was heard by the Commission. At the hearing there were many questions regarding the actual use of the mobile home on the property which led the Commission to direct staff to draft criteria that could be used to establish proof that the occupants of a structure are actually working in the agricultural industry. For clarification, he stated that when reviewing an application, staff would not require that all the listed information be submitted to the department. First staff would review the application and agricultural operation to establish a *need* for Ag Housing and any number of the various listed documents could be submitted as *proof* that the occupants of the housing are Ag workers. The intent of the list was not to require all of the listed documents. The list may not be all inclusive so if the Commission or members of the public have appropriate relevant suggestions, those could also be included in the criteria guidelines.

Mr. Walker commented that the intent of the Commission was not to define Ag Housing, however, when applications regarding Ag Housing are reviewed, they want criteria in place to establish who qualifies for this type of housing.

Mr. Stephans agreed with the intent and explained that the criteria would be used to analyze Ag housing applications for agriculturally zoned parcels. Ag Housing may be allowed on a commercially zoned parcel however, these criteria would be used to analyze applications to ensure the integrity of the agriculturally zoned parcels. The use of the suggested criteria may help prevent the building or placement of an inappropriate structure that may be occupied by non-agricultural workers. Staff recommends that the use of the structure be re-evaluated every two to three years so that the building does not become a rental unit on Ag land. There must be some assurance that the resident(s) living in Ag Housing are actually agricultural workers.

Pierre Rivas added that Planning Services strongly supports the development of these guidelines. Basically, any housing project would be processed through a Special Use Permit and typically through this process staff has not used standardized criteria in which to evaluate the request.

It was moved by Mr. Heflin and seconded by Mr. Ward to APPROVE the use of the Agricultural Housing guidelines drafted by Ag staff for use in analyzing future

Agricultural Housing applications. Motion passed

AYES: Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Ward, Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Boeger

- VII.** S 08-0012 – Rancho Olivo Vineyards (Nello Olivo/Larry A. Patterson): A Special Use Permit request to allow wine making on-site. The project site consists of an eight (8) acre vineyard with a guest house, a residence, a barn and an existing building to be used for wine making. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 109-090-07, consists of 21.00 acres, and is located on the south side of Rancho Road approximately 1/8 miles south of the intersection with Lariat, in the Shingle Springs area. (District 2)

For clarification, Mr. Walker asked staff if a wine tasting facility was included in the application. Staff answered that it was their understanding that no wine tasting facility was requested in the application.

Chris Flores gave a report on her site visit. The application to obtain a Special Use Permit for an on-site winery is consistent with the current winery ordinance. Ordinance 17.14.190 B.2 states, "Wineries shall be permitted, by special use permit, located in the RE-5, Estate Residential 5-acre, RE-10, Estate Residential 10-acre, and all RA, Residential Agricultural zone districts. Wineries located in residential zone districts shall be located on parcels that contain twenty (20) acres or more and have a minimum of five (5) acres of planted wine grapes that are properly maintained and cared for to produce a commercial crop...The operation of the winery shall be conducted concurrently with the sale of wines produced from wine grapes grown on the same parcel." Rancho Olivo Vineyards consists of over 8 acres of wine grapes of six different varieties.

Nello Olivo gave clarification of the project. He stated that he hoped to be able to process their grapes on site. They do not plan to build a tasting room that would be open to the public; however, they hope to have a wine club with up to 75 people visiting the property by invitation only. He stated that they do, however, enjoy having parties, as the property lends itself to this, and there is an abundance of parking. He believes there will be less traffic on the road because the grapes will not be shipped to an established winery for crushing. Mr. Nello offered photographs of the property, which at one time, was used to produce wine. He explained that his property has always been a commercial entity of some sort; a winery, a horse stable and then an ostrich farm. Mr. Olivo's grapes are harvested and shipped to two facilities. Currently, the wine is sold at his restaurant in Placerville. It is his opinion that there will be less traffic on neighborhood roads with on-site processing.

James Sholl, Board President, Cameron Estates Community Services District, read a letter expressing concerns of the project. The community is gated with private roads maintained by the district and not patrolled by either the Sheriff's Department or the CHP. He asked that certain stipulations be set if the Commission approves the Special Use Permit: 1) there should be no tasting room that is open to the public on the parcel; 2) there should be no wholesale and retail sales of wine and grape products on the parcel; 3) no gift shop; 4) no special or wine tasting events; 5) no commercial weddings or large gatherings; and 6) strict compliance with county regulations pertaining to noise restrictions. Mr. Sholl questioned the Commission concerning the regulations regarding the use of water to produce wine, what

was done with the waste and questioned the use of the chemicals used in the winery. (Note: Mr. Sholl also read two letters into the record from Hope Leja & Lynn and Thomas Krogh).

Several neighbors spoke of their concerns regarding traffic, water control, noise and hours of operation. They wanted the Commission to understand the impact the winery could have on their community.

Danica Olivo expressed her appreciation for her neighbors and her intent to not impact the neighborhood. In response to one of the comments read by Mr. Sholl regarding the destruction of a neighbor's fence by an alleged drunk driver coming from a wedding, Mrs. Olivo stated that the accident was caused by a faulty rental car that did not have enough brake fluid to stop the car when the driver swerved to miss wildlife. She stated that she wished the property owner was present because he would verify that all of the damage was paid for by the rental car company. Additionally, currently there are no wine club members and it is only her husband's goal to start a club.

Mr. Pratt offered to answer many of the concerns of the neighbors regarding the operation of wine making. Using a drip irrigation system, very little water is wasted in the vineyard, and water use in the wine making process is very minimal, waste (stems, leaves, pomace, etc.) products are usually hauled away or distributed in the vineyard to enrich the soil, and the noise involved in winemaking is minimal and does not consistently occur. Waste water is regulated by the State Water Resource Board. Chemicals that are used in the winemaking process are fairly benign and minimal.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Heflin to recommend APPROVAL of S 08-0012 Rancho Olivo Vineyards with the condition that wholesale distribution could take place but no other on-site sales or commercial wine tasting events, and with such, the required findings can be made for General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1:

- A. The use will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities;***
- B. The use will not create an island effect wherein agricultural lands located between the project site and other non-agricultural lands will be negatively affected; and***
- C. The use will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands***

AND the required findings can be made for General Plan Policy 8.2.2.2:

- A. The use will not substantially detract from agricultural production in the surrounding area; and***
- B. The use is compatible with and will not have a significant adverse impact on adjacent or nearby neighborhoods beyond that allowed by the Right to Farm Ordinance and other applicable law.***

Motion passed.

AYES: Pratt, Draper, Heflin, Ward, Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Boeger

- VIII.** S06-0017R – Bella Vista Bed & Breakfast (Robert & Kathleen Ash): A Special Use Permit Revision request to allow daytime events with acoustic music, including weddings of 75 people or less, at an existing bed and breakfast facility. No commercial kitchen is proposed. This revision would be a modification of the original condition of approval #6, which prohibits special events. The property, identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number 006-480-31, consists of 5.0 acres, and is located on the east side of Cold Springs Road, southwest of the intersection with Kane Hill Road in the Coloma area. (District 4).

Staff reported on the site visit. The application is for a revision to the original Special Use Permit (which allowed a single family residence to be converted to a Bed and Breakfast). The original application was heard by the Agricultural Commission on February 14, 2007. The Agricultural Commission recommended approval of the SUP as the Bed and Breakfast would not have a negative effect on any agricultural operations in the area. The previous motion, made by the Agricultural Commission on February 14, 2007, is as follows:

“It was moved by Mr. Heflin and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend APPROVAL of Robert and Kathleen Ash’s request for a Bed and Breakfast operation in an Agricultural District (S 06-17) on APN 006-480-31 as the findings can be made for General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1. a, b, and c, which states the proposed use “(a) will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities; (b) will not create an island effect wherein agricultural lands located between the project site and other non-agricultural lands will be negatively affected; and (c) will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands” and General Plan Policy 10.1.6.1, which states “The County shall encourage expansion of the types of local industries that promote tourism including but not limited to Christmas tree farms, wineries, outdoor facilities, Apple Hill and other agricultural-related activities, the County Fairground, bed and breakfast inns, and ranch marketing activities.” Motion passed.

The subject parcel is zoned RE-5 (Estate Residential, Five-Acre), is located along Cold Springs Road just above the town of Coloma, and is surrounded by residential zoning, except for the one RA-20 (Residential Agriculture, Twenty-Acre) zoned parcel along the southern property line. The RA-20 zoned parcel to the south is covered in oak woodland, is split by Peregrine Trail Road, and has a soil type of Auberry Very Rocky Coarse Sandy Loam, 15 to 30% slopes, which have a high erosion factor. There are no apparent agricultural operations on it at this time. It is staff’s opinion that the proposed revision to the Special Use Permit still complies with General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1 a-c.

Robert Ash, the applicant, stated that their plans to use their Bed & Breakfast facilities for weddings, as supplemental income, is necessary because they only have three rooms currently available to rent and that many people have asked to rent their facilities for weddings. There would be daytime events only; weddings would be catered as there is no commercial kitchen on-site; no microphones would be used; no amplified music would be allowed; and parking has been moved further away from neighbors. They will not be hosting more than twenty events per year

A neighbor expressed concerns of the application and asked for a limit to the Bed & Breakfast expansion as he believes it will increase the noise and traffic in the area.

It was moved by Mr. Heflin and seconded by Mr. Ward to recommend APPROVAL of S06-0017R Bella Vista Bed & Breakfast, to allow daytime events of 75 people or less, as

the findings can be made for General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1:

- A. The proposed use will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities; and*
- B. The proposed use will not create an island effect wherein agricultural lands located between the project site and other non-agricultural lands will be negatively affected; and*
- C. The proposed use will not significantly reduce or destroy the buffering effect of existing large parcel sizes adjacent to agricultural lands.*

Motion passed.

AYES: Ward, Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Boeger

- IX.** William C. Kettelkamp – requesting administrative relief from agricultural setbacks for the purpose of constructing a swimming pool adjacent to, and east of the existing single family residence. The pool is proposed to be located 146 feet from the northern property line. The subject parcel is surrounded by parcels zoned Exclusive Agriculture (AE) and therefore subject to special agricultural setbacks in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guidelines adopted June 22, 2006. (The subject parcel is also zoned Exclusive Agriculture.) Since the proposed project does not meet the requirements for the Development Services Director to allow up to a 50 and/or a 75 percent setback reduction, a review by the Agricultural Commission is required in order for administrative relief to be granted. (District 4)

Staff reported on the site visit. The owners would like to place a swimming pool behind/east of their house, which has been built within the 200 foot setback requirements from the AE zoned parcel to the north. According to Planning Services, the house was built in 2002 under a 100 foot agricultural setback and is approximately 137 feet from the northern property line. The house was built on a plateau with the property sloping away from the house site to the north, east and south. The proposed pool would be 146 feet from the northern property line and approximately 29 feet from the east side of the house. There are no apparent agricultural activities occurring on the parcel to the north.

Mr. Kettelkamp was present to answer questions.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Ward to recommend APPROVAL of William Kettelkamp's request for administrative relief from a 200 foot agricultural setback, allowing a setback of 146 feet from the north property line for the construction of a swimming pool, as the following findings can be made:

- A. No suitable building site exists on the subject parcel except within the required setback due, but not limited to, compliance with other requirements of the General Plan or other County development regulations;*
- B. The proposed non-compatible use is located on the property to reasonably minimize any potential negative impacts on the adjacent agricultural zoned land; and*

C. Based on the site characteristics of the subject parcel and the adjacent agricultural zoned land including, but not limited to, topography and location of agricultural improvements, etc, the Commission determines that the location of the proposed non-compatible use would reasonably minimize potential negative impacts on agricultural use.

The Commission also recommends that 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 Setback. 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.

Motion Passed.

AYES: Pratt, Draper, Heflin, Ward, Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Boeger

- X.** Ronald & Camilla Bixler requesting administrative relief from agricultural setbacks for the replacement of a swimming pool to be located 170 feet from the west property line and 30 feet from the south property line. The subject parcel is adjacent to Select Agricultural (SA-10) and Exclusive Agricultural (AE) zoned land and therefore subject to special agricultural setbacks in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guidelines adopted June 22, 2006. The existing swim pond is approximately 160 feet from the west property line and 25 feet from the south property line. The replacement swimming pool will be located further away from the agricultural zoned land than the existing swim pond. The replacement swimming pool 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)

Staff reported on the site visit. The owners would like to replace a deteriorating concrete swimming pond, located on their southern property line, with a new swimming pool that would be 30 feet from the southern property line and approximately 170 feet from the western property line. The parcel is approximately 5 ½ acres and has 200 foot setbacks on all boundaries. The entire parcel is within 200 foot agricultural setbacks. The subject parcel is zoned SA-10 (Select Agricultural – Ten Acre) and is in the Camino/Fruitridge Agricultural District.

Ron Bixler was present for questions and stated he agrees with all of staff's recommended conditions.

*It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Heflin to recommend **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL** of Ronald & Camilla Bixler's request for administrative relief from 200 foot agricultural setbacks, allowing a setback of 170 feet from the west property line and 30 feet from the south property line for the renovation/replacement of a swimming*

pond/pool only if applicant constructs a solid barrier “fence” of no less than six feet in height along the southern property line, adjacent to the non-compatible use. If the barrier is constructed, and based on the parcel size of 5.61 acres, the following findings can be made:*

- A. No suitable building site exists on the subject parcel except within the required setback due, but not limited to, compliance with other requirements of the General Plan or other County development regulations;*
- B. The proposed non-compatible use is located on the property to reasonably minimize any potential negative impacts on the adjacent agricultural zoned land; and*
- C. Based on the site characteristics of the subject parcel and the adjacent agricultural zoned land including, but not limited to, topography and location of agricultural improvements, etc, the Commission determines that the location of the proposed non-compatible use would reasonably minimize potential negative impacts on agricultural use.*

The Commission also recommends that 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 Setback. 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.

Motion Passed.

**It is noted that the non-compatible use involves the re-building of a current use that was lawfully placed and that the non-compatible use will not further encroach into the agricultural setback.*

AYES: Draper, Heflin, Ward, Pratt, Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Boeger

- XI.** Michael Alexander requesting administrative relief from agricultural setbacks for the single-family residence to be located 176 feet from the east property line. The subject parcel is adjacent to Residential Agricultural (RA-20) zoned 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 4)

Staff reported on the site visit. The application is for Administrative Relief from a 200 foot agricultural setback from the RA-20 (Residential Agriculture-20 Acre) parcel to the east. The applicants are requesting a setback of 176 feet from their eastern property line for a single family residence. However, the submitted Plat Map shows a setback distance of 170 feet. The subject parcel is 10 acres, is zoned RA-20 (Residential Agriculture, Twenty Acre), is not in an Agricultural District, has non-choice soils, is wooded and has limited building sites due to its steep topography. Its Land use Designation is LDR (Low Density Residential). The RA-20 parcel to the east is also steep and wooded, does not have an

agricultural operation on it at this time, has non-choice soils, and is not located in an Agricultural District.

Michael Alexander was present for questions and review of the project.

It was moved by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend APPROVAL of Michael Alexander's request for administrative relief from a 200 foot agricultural setback, allowing a setback of 170 feet from the eastern property line for a single family residence, as the following findings can be made:

- A. The proposed non-compatible structure is located on the property to reasonably minimize any potential negative impact on the adjacent agricultural zoned land; and*
- B. Based on the site characteristics of the subject parcel and the adjacent agricultural zoned land including topography, the Commission determines that the location of the proposed non-compatible structure would reasonably minimize potential negative impacts on agricultural use; and*
- C. There is currently no agricultural activity on the agriculturally zoned parcel adjacent to the subject parcel and the Commission determines that the conversion to a low or high intensive farming operation is not likely to take place due to the soil and/or topographic characteristics of the adjacent agriculturally zoned parcel AND the General Plan Land Use Designation of the adjacent parcel is not agricultural but rather residential (Low Density Residential).*

Staff also recommends that 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 Setback. 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, 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. Motion Passed.

AYES: Ward, Pratt, Heflin, Draper, Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Boeger

- XII.** Z08-0027/WAC 08-0005 Bill Snodgrass (Frank Matagrano, Jr.) requesting the establishment of an agricultural preserve of property currently zoned Residential Agricultural-40 (RA-40). The application also includes a request to change the zoning of the site from RA-40 to Agricultural Preserve (AP). (District 4)

Staff reported on the site visit. The parcel, APN 105-100-11, is currently zoned RA-40 (Residential Agriculture, 40 Acre), has a Land Use Designation of RR (Rural Residential), has choice soils (Auberry Coarse Sandy Loan) and is located south of a parcel with AE (Exclusive Agriculture) zoning. WAC 08-0005 required criteria: Capital Outlay exceeds the required \$45,000 at \$190,000. Capital improvements to the property include: 15 acres of wine grapes, 1 acre of olive trees, irrigation pump, drip system, water storage, and 15 acres of deer fencing. Minimum acreage meets the required 20 acres at 80.97 acres. Gross income exceeds the required \$13,500 at \$48,487. The wine grapes were planted in 1991 and are sold

to local wineries. The olive trees were planted in 2000 and are located off of Petersen Lane between the two sections of vineyard.

Bill Snodgrass, representing Frank Matagrano, was present for questions and review of the project.

It was moved by Mr. Pratt and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend APPROVAL of WAC 08-0005 as the minimum criteria for a high intensive agricultural operation has been met:

- 1) Capital outlay exceeds the minimum requirement of \$45,000 at \$190,000.***
- 2) Acreage of the parcel exceeds the minimum requirement of 20 acres at 80.97 acres (acreage of crops is 16 acres).***
- 3) Gross income exceeds the minimum requirements of \$13,500/year at \$48,487.***

Motion Passed.

AYES: Pratt, Heflin, Ward, Draper Walker

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Boeger

XIII. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Bill Stephans reported and distributed a hand-out for discussion of bills that are being tracked by the California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association. AB 844 (Berryhill) will be on the August 19th Board agenda for seeking Board support and AB 977 (Ma) has been pulled by the author. This bill would have repealed the entire Food & Ag code section 11501.1 pertaining to the registration, sale, transportation, or use of pesticides to the exclusion of all local regulation. This section occupies the entire field and provides that no ordinance or regulation of local government may prohibit or in any way attempt to regulate any matter relating to the registration, sale, transportation, or use of pesticides, unless otherwise specifically provided. It also requires the Director of Pesticide Regulation to notify a promulgating entity if the director determines that an ordinance or regulation is preempted by state law.

XIV. CORRESPONDENCE

- No Report

XV. OTHER BUSINESS

- Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks – Gaskins, Bobby
- Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks – Van Der Vijver, Robert & Melissa

- Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks – Heyart, Nicholas
- Notice of Non-Renewal of Agricultural Preserve No. 7 – Albert Harris Ranch
- Notice of Non-Renewal of Agricultural Preserve No. 291 – Sherrie Ellis
- BLA 08-0038 Boundary Line Adjustment – Wilton, Dustin
- Hartwick, Titus and Jennifer – a letter was submitted to the Commission, as a time-line for the work to be done on their property, as requested by the Ag Commission at the July 9, 2008 meeting.

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Lloyd Walker, Chair Pro-Tem, adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

APPROVED: Lloyd Walker, Chair Pro-Tem

Date: October 8, 2008