



AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

311 Fair Lane
Placerville, CA 95667
(530) 621-5520
(530) 626-4756 FAX

eldcag@edcgov.us

Greg Boeger, Chair – Agricultural Processing Industry
Lloyd Walker, Vice-chair – Other Agricultural Interests
Chuck Bacchi – Livestock Industry
Bill Draper, Forestry/Related Industries
Ron Mansfield – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
John Smith – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Gary Ward – Livestock Industry

MINUTES

May 12, 2010

6:30 P.M.

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

Members Present: Bacchi, Boeger, Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker

Members Absent: Ward

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

Staff Members Present: Charlene Carveth, Deputy Ag Commissioner/Sealer
Chris Flores, Senior Agricultural Biologist
Nancy Applegarth, Clerk to the Agricultural Commission

Others Present: Ed Akins, Maryann Argyres, Bill Bacchi, Josh Bendick,
Mark Cribbs, Ron Pizer, Lloyd Lagerstrom, Connie
Lagerstrom, Dave Price, Suzanne Price, Stephen Stinson,
Jim Wainscott, Judee Wainscott, John Woods, Wilma
Woods

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Boeger called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Bill Stephans requested additions to Item XII. Other Business; (1) to discuss the Agricultural Commissioner position and (2) to report on the General Plan Five-Year Review.

It was moved by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Mansfield to Approve the Agenda with the requested additions.

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger
NOES: None
ABSENT: Ward

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes of April 14, 2010

It was moved by Mr. Bacchi and seconded by Mr. Smith to Approve the Minutes as submitted.

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

IV. PUBLIC FORUM

Maryann Argyres, Chairman of the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC), reported on EDAC's recent presentation to the Board of Supervisors to update them on the diligent work being done by their sub-committee (the Regulatory Reform group) regarding the Draft Zoning Ordinance. It is their plan to bring in as much expertise as possible to create a document that will work efficiently. The BOS are allowing this committee to come before them on a bimonthly basis to give them an update on EDAC's progress and the Regulatory Reform process. She suggested that they also routinely present their proposals before the Ag Commission and the Planning Commission and feels that an open dialogue between all groups involved would be very constructive. EDAC would also like to receive any suggestions that members of both Commissions may have to offer.

Bill Stephans agreed that the presentations would be very helpful and suggested that Maryann Argyres provide a document including the suggestions of EDAC for the Ag Commission to review before making their presentation, allowing time for the Commission's consideration of any Ag issues that may need to be addressed.

V. RANCH MARKETING

Bill Stephans reported that discussions continue to take place with Peter Maurer, Development Services/Planning Department, who has been "cleaning-up" and formatting the final draft of the Ranch Marketing Ordinance. It is Bill Stephans' understanding, that Mr. Maurer is nearing completion of the document along with the re-write of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Commission requested copies of the final draft of the Ranch Marketing Ordinance, as soon as possible, to allow them adequate time to study it and consider any further recommendations.

VI. Z 10-0001 – TPZ to RE-10 and Roll-out (James E. Wainscott): Timberland Preserve Zone District (TPZ) to Estate Residential District (RE-10) and ten year roll out of the Timberland Preserve Zone District (TPZ). The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 096-120-45, and 096-120-46, consists of 21.7 acres, and is located on the south side of Fort Jim Road approximately 1.25 miles east of the intersection with Newtown Road, in the Placerville Periphery area. (District 2)

Staff reported on the site visit conducted April 29, 2010. The property is located at 3439 and 3441 Fort Jim Road (13.4 and 8.3 acres respectively) in the Newtown area. The parcels are currently zoned TPZ, and are surrounded by parcels zoned RE-5, RE-10 and RA-20. The subject parcels have land use designations of Rural Residential and are surrounded by Rural Residential and Low Density Residential land uses. The parcels are located at approximately 2300 feet elevation. The predominant soil type is Mariposa-Josephine Very Rocky Loams, 15 to 50% slopes (McE); woodland suitability group 5. The two TPZ parcels appear to have a primary use of residential. Both parcels have existing residences.

The applicant was available for questions regarding the project but had no further

information to add to the discussion.

A neighbor to the subject parcel asked how the project would affect his property.

Bill Stephans explained that TPZ zoning requires a 200 foot setback on adjacent parcels for non-compatible uses/structures whereas RE-10 zoning reduces the setback to 30 feet. The rezone would also allow, without a Special Use Permit, a smaller Granny Flat (1,200 square feet) without coming to the Ag Commission for a recommendation. As this project is for a TPZ roll-out, the TPZ zoning and requirements will still be imposed for nine years until the tenth year when it is rolled out. Based on State law, an immediate rezone and roll-out of TPZ is more difficult to obtain.

It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Walker to recommend APPROVAL of Mr. Wainscott's request to rezone APN: 096-120-45 and 096-120-46 from Timber Production Zone (TPZ) to Residential Estate Ten-Acre (RE-10) with a ten year roll-out, as the parcels are primarily residential, are not being used for commercial timber production, are surrounded by residentially zoned parcels, and are more consistent with the RE-10 zoning standards.

Motion passed.

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- VII. Stephen J. Stinson – Requesting Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks** for a second single-family dwelling to be located 150 feet from the west side of the property and 50 feet from the north side of the property. The subject parcel is adjacent to property zoned Exclusive Agricultural (AE) and therefore subject to special agricultural setbacks in accordance with the Interim Interpretive Guidelines.

Pursuant to the administrative relief criteria and procedures adopted by the Board of supervisors on April 17, 2007, the applicant does not qualify for Development Services Director approval and Agricultural Commission Review is requested as described in Section B, Subsection 3. (District 2)

Ron Mansfield recused himself from this item as he manages the adjacent vineyard.

Staff gave the following report: The subject parcel is 10.5 acres, zoned Estate Residential Ten-Acre (RE-10), has a land use designation of Rural Residential (RR), is in the Pleasant Valley Agricultural District, has choice soils (Jrd & JrC), and has 200 foot setbacks against the northern and western property lines. The surrounding zoning is Exclusive Agricultural (AE), Estate Residential Ten-Acre (RE-10) and Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5). The surrounding land use is Agricultural Land (AL), Rural Residential (RR) and Low Density Residential (LDR)

Findings for Administrative Relief of Agricultural Setbacks:

The Agricultural Commission may approve a reduction of up to one hundred percent of the special agricultural setback when it can be demonstrated that a natural or man-made barrier already exists such as, but not limited to, topography, roads, wetlands, streams, utility or other easements, swales, etc., that would reduce the need for such a setback, or the Commission finds that three of four of the following exists:

- 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; (In staff's opinion, this finding can be made – proposed building site is relatively flat and may not require the removal of trees. The other potential building sites of the property contain a well, leach field and utility easement)...
- b) The proposed non-compatible use/structure is located on the property to reasonably minimize the potential negative impact on the adjacent agricultural or TPZ zoned land; (In staff's opinion, this finding can be made – proposed building site is 150 feet from, and approximately 70 feet above, the existing vineyard and 50 feet from an undeveloped ravine/drainage)...
- c) Based on the site characteristics of the subject parcel and the adjacent agricultural or TPZ 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/structure would reasonably minimize potential negative impacts on agricultural or timber production use; (In staff's opinion, this finding can be made)...
- d) There is currently no agricultural activity on the agriculturally zoned parcel(s) 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(s) or because the General Plan Land Use Designation of the surrounding or adjacent parcels is not agricultural (Light/Medium/High Density Residential). (This finding cannot be made as the adjacent agriculturally zoned land contains a vineyard and a General Plan Land Use Designation of Agricultural Land (AL).

Discussion took place regarding the proposed location of the residence. The Commission questioned Ron Mansfield, who manages the neighboring vineyard, about the setback area. Mr. Mansfield described the distance from the project site to the vineyard property line. He said the area along the north property line is extremely steep, and although there has been discussion of the potential of planting in the area he feels it would take intense terracing to use this portion of land. There are northern and southern facing slopes in this horseshoe shaped section. He said there has been some conflict with neighbors over noise, dust and hours of operation as a result of spraying at night to avoid wind.

Stephen Stinson explained that he has owned the property for 30 years and has always

dreamed of having a residence built on top of the hill. He said the location of the proposed project is approximately 70 feet above the vineyard. Mr. Stinson also mentioned that he has never noticed any drift from spray and has never been bothered by events held at the winery.

He said that at the time the winery was proposed he supported the winery as there was only a 100 foot setback against his property at that time. He stated that the winery owners have no problem with his building site, as stated in a letter sent to the Ag department, and he has no problem signing a Notice of Restriction which they have requested, as a condition of approval, in the letter.

Josh Bendick, representing the winery owners, Tom and Holly Cooper, and speaking as a member of Holly's Hill Vineyards, LLC, offered support of Stephen Stinson's project.

John Smith stated that 70 feet is a very substantial barrier in combination with a tree line between the vines and the property line at that location. If vines were planted to the north of this area there would be a problem but given the topography, in his opinion it will most likely never be planted.

It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend APPROVAL of Stephen Stinson's request for administrative relief from 200 foot agricultural setbacks, allowing a setback of 50 feet from the north property line and 150 feet from the west property line for a proposed single family residence, 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/structure is located on the property to reasonably minimize the potential negative impact on the adjacent agricultural or TPZ 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 structure 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 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.

Motion passed.

AYES: Smith, Walker, Bacchi, Draper, Boeger

NOES: None

RECUSED: Mansfield

ABSENT: Ward

VIII. AG DISTRICT REVIEW – Contested Parcels

Staff gave a brief overview of the General Plan Policies which require staff to analyze and amend the Ag Districts. On June 30, 2009 the Board adopted a five-year plan with a twelve month scope which included direction for Ag staff to update the Ag Districts.

Ag District Statistics 09/10

Ag District	Parcels Identified for Addition				Parcels Identified for Removal			
	# of Proposed Additions	Acres	# of Contested Parcels	Acres	# of Proposed Removals	Acres	# of Contested Parcels	Acres
Camino-Fruitridge	25	990	4	294	0	0	0	0
Gold Hill	7	316	0	0	27	108	3	16
Oak Hill	9	360	2	41	0	0	0	0
Pleasant Valley	27	650	0	0	1	20	0	0
Coloma	15	1706	7	543	0	0	0	0
Garden Valley-Georgetown East	65	3291	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fair Play-Somerset (1 st half)	81	3100	9	333+	71	25	0	0
Fair Play-Somerset (2 nd half)	259	5904	3	100	0	0	0	0
Total	488	16,317	25	1,311	99	153	3	16

Each Ag District was discussed separately and public comment was encouraged for each:

Camino-Fruitridge Contested Parcels: 043-011-25, 043-011-34, 043-011-35, 043-011-37

The acreage, land use designation and zoning, was provided on each contested parcel. Aerial maps, soil maps, and zoning maps were shown and the Suitability of Land score was given for each parcel. After discussion by the Commission Members, Chair Boeger opened up the item for public comment.

Dave Price, the property owner of APN 043-011-37, stated that he was not totally contesting the agricultural district designation for his parcel. He has split zoning (SA-10 and RE-10) on the parcel that conforms to the soils on it. He would favor the SA-10 portion of his property for inclusion into the Ag District, but requests that the portion of his property with the RE-10 zoning be excluded.

Ron Pizer, the owner of APN 043-011-25, feels that his parcel is not adjacent to the existing Camino-Fruitridge Ag District, and stated that his parcel would be better suited to support growth along the Highway 50 corridor. Mr. Pizer stated that he does not have an agricultural area of “extreme value” on his property. He reiterated that he feels his parcel would not make a good candidate for inclusion into the existing Ag District and asked that his parcel be excluded from consideration.

Edio Delfino spoke in favor of including the four contested parcels into the Camino-Fruitridge Ag District. Mr. Delfino gave a brief history of the parcels, stated he has walked these parcels, and estimated that 80% of the four parcels combined, would be suitable for planting an agricultural commodity. He added that the south facing slope, and elevation would be ideal for any type of crop. Mr. Delfino explained that a past proposal to develop one of the parcels with a vineyard and winery was abandoned due to the lack of access from Highway 50, although he felt that agricultural production and ranch marketing at that location would add a much needed exposure to the Apple Hill area (currently not seen from the highway). Mr. Delfino stressed the rarity of these parcels, especially the soil, and reminded the Commission that once it’s paved over, it’s gone.

Greg Boeger stated that these parcels have some of the highest ag suitability scores of any of the parcels that the Commission has reviewed (up to a score of 97) and as such, he would be inclined to include these parcels.

Chuck Bacchi asked if it was wise to set up an “adversarial” situation with agriculture by including properties that the owner did not wish to be included.

Bill Stephans answered that it is the Commission’s responsibility to identify potential ag lands that may be included into an Ag District and that in his opinion, these are the best undeveloped potential ag lands in the Camino area and maybe in all of El Dorado County. He does not believe that an adversarial relationship should occur because they have been identified as suitable for inclusion. The reason he believes this is because the Commission is only a recommending body, with the final decision being made by the Board of Supervisors.

It was moved by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Smith to recommend all contested

parcels, with the exception of the RE-10 portion of APN 043-011-37, for inclusion into the Camino-Fruitridge Agricultural District

Motion passed

AYES: Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger

NOES: Bacchi

ABSENT: Ward

Oak Hill Contested Parcels: 046-032-02, 046-032-13

A map showing the two contested parcel's, was shown, along with the Suitability of Land chart. The Commission discussed the soil scores, of zero, and the topography of the parcel's. Chair Boeger opened up the item for public comment.

Lloyd and Connie Lagerstrom asked that their parcel be excluded from Ag District consideration and stated that their neighbors, the Cardwells, had asked them to represent them as well, also requesting to not be included in the Ag District.

Mr. Walker confirmed the steepness of the parcels. Mr. Smith stated that the parcels did not seem to be suitable for Ag District inclusion due to their cumulative scores of 57 points. It was agreed upon that the two contested parcels (APN's 046-032-02 and 046-032-13) and the parcel between the two (APN 046-032-14) would not be suitable for inclusion into the Oak Hill Ag District.

It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend that the contested parcels (APN's 046-032-02 and 046-032-13), and APN 046-032-14, be EXCLUDED from consideration for inclusion into the Oak Hill Agricultural District

Motion passed

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

Coloma Contested Parcels: 074-050-33, 074-050-34, 105-010-64, 105-010-65, 105-010-66, 105-050-14, 880-374-81

Chuck Bacchi recused himself from this Ag District discussion because he and his family own parcels that are recommended for inclusion with some being contested.

Parcel sizes, land use designations and zoning were presented for all contested parcels. A map, identifying the locations of the contested parcels, was shown. The Suitability of Land chart, showing the parcel scores, was provided, as well. Due to the soil types, the parcel's scored between 27 and 67 total points. Chair Boeger opened up the item for public comment.

Chuck Bacchi stated that he would like his parcel with the TR (Tourist Recreation) land use

designation and south of Highway 49 (APN 105-050-14), to remain outside of the Ag District. He has 6 other parcels, in Williamson Act Contract, that have been recommended for inclusion into the district.

Bill Bacchi reiterated that his family would like to keep their parcels out of the Coloma Ag District at this time because the best uses of the parcels have not been identified. He stated that there are areas on the parcels that have good soils which may support intensive farming such as a vineyard. As these areas are developed, he may wish to add them into the Ag District in the future.

Discussion ensued regarding the limited ag soils and the marginal ag suitability scores on the contested parcels. Since the contested parcel scores were low to marginal, the Commission agreed to not include the contested parcels.

It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend that all contested parcels be EXCLUDED from consideration for inclusion into the Coloma Agricultural District

Motion passed

AYES: Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger

NOES: None

RECUSED: Bacchi

ABSENT: Ward

Fair Play-Somerset North Contested Parcels: 093-021-38, 093-021-71, 093-021-72, 093-250-23

The parcel sizes, land use designations and zoning for each parcel was given. Maps, showing the location of the parcels, were also shown. Staff noted that parcel number 093-021-38 was just contested the day of the meeting, and the letter had just been distributed to the Commission members.

Wilma and John Woods were present to contest their parcel (APN 093-250-23). Mrs. Woods stated that they own the top of a mountain. She added that they have a cell tower on their property. Their property is 20 acres in size, has a Natural Resource (NR) land use designation and Residential Estate Ten-Acre zoning. It was discussed that due to the land use designation of the parcel, it could not be split into anything smaller without a General Plan Amendment to change the land use. Mrs. Woods asked why her parcel was given a land use designation of NR. Bill Stephans read the description of Natural Resource from the General Plan which stated that parcels may have one dwelling unit per 40 acres in certain situations. Also, it appears that the entire area surrounding this parcel has an NR land use designation. Based on this information, the Commission felt that there would be no impacts to this parcel.

It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend that the four

contested parcels (APN's 093-021-38, 093-021-71, 093-021-72, and 093-250-23) be INCLUDED into the Fair Play – Somerset North Agricultural District

Motion passed

AYES: Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger

NOES: Bacchi

ABSENT: Ward

Fair Play-Somerset East Contested Parcels: 040-011-35, 040-011-36, 041-960-08, 095-011-40, 095-011-80, 095-011-81, 095-011-82, 095-030-44, 095-030-45

The parcel sizes, land use designations and zoning for each parcel was given. Maps, showing the location of the parcels, were also shown.

It was noted that a Sierra Pacific Industries representative, at the last public hearing on the Fair Play – Somerset Ag District, had seemed unsure about the inclusion of their parcels into the Ag District. At that time, staff requested a written notice from SPI if they wanted to contest inclusion into the Ag District, and to date, the Ag Department had not received anything. Staff noted that the parcels have been included in the Contested Parcel list even though no written objections had been received. Mr. Walker questioned whether the parcels should be included on the list or not. Discussion ensued, regarding these parcels.

It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend that the above questionably contested parcels be INCLUDED into the Fair Play – Somerset East Agricultural District

Motion passed

AYES: Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger

NOES: Bacchi

ABSENT: Ward

- **Low Density Residential (LDR):** 041-960-01, 041-960-03, 095-100-21, 095-100-32

John Smith provided site visit information. Having looked at the parcels, Mr. Smith stated that the parcels should not be included into the Fair Play-Somerset Ag District, especially because of the Low Density Residential land use designation.

It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend that the four parcels with Low Density Residential land use designations, although NOT contested, be EXCLUDED from consideration for inclusion into the Fair Play – Somerset East Agricultural District

Motion passed

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

IX. FUTURE BUSINESS/ISSUES

- Zoning Ordinance Update (Relating to Agriculture)

Bill Stephans asked the Commission members if they would like a separate workshop to discuss the draft zoning ordinance relating to agriculture. He also suggested that a final draft be provided to the Ag Commission members for their review and analysis before deciding if a workshop is necessary.

- Winery Ordinance Review

Mr. Bacchi asked if by reviewing the Winery Ordinance, if the entire Ordinance would have to be reviewed or if it could be reviewed in sections. Bill Stephans stated that Ag Department staff would contact County Counsel regarding Mr. Bacchi's question.

- Federally Proposed NPDES Permit (Federal EPA) information provided:

As stated in the Western Farm Press: The federal Environmental Protection Agency is expected to issue a proposed National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process next month for pesticides used in and around water. It will impact 5.6 million annual pesticide applications by 365,000 applicators using 500 different active ingredients. The proposed permit will have profound implications for American farmers; U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Thomas Vilsack wrote EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson last month as the agency drew up the proposed permits. Failure to comply with the new EPA permitting process will result in a fine of \$32,000 per day.

X. LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

- AB 1721 as amended, Swanson, Pesticides: safe school zones. Existing law generally regulates the application of pesticides. Existing law provides that violation of these provisions is a crime. This bill would provide, subject to exceptions, that pesticides shall not be applied by aerial applications likely to cause off-site movement of pesticides for purposes of commercial agriculture or a State agricultural pest eradication or control program within ¼ mile of a school, as defined, and as provided. The bill would exempt from these provisions the State Department of Public Health, local vector control agencies, and mosquito abatement and vector control districts, as provided.
- AB 2595, as amended, Huffman. Irrigated agriculture: pesticide use: operator

identification number: water quality: waste discharge requirements. Existing law regulates pesticide use, as specified, and provides that a pesticide use report shall be submitted to the county agricultural commissioner or the Director of Pesticide Regulation, as specified, for use in the setting of priorities for, among other things, pesticide use enforcement and pest control research, environmental monitoring, and public health monitoring and research. Existing regulations provide that prior to the purchase or use of pesticides for the production of an agricultural commodity, the operator of the property, as defined, or the operator's authorized representative, shall obtain an operator identification number for pesticide use from the county agricultural commissioner of each county where pest control work will be performed. This bill would codify that requirement relating to the operator identification number and, on and after January 1, 2012, would require the county agricultural commissioner to withhold the issuance of an operator identification number for pesticide use if an operator of the property is found to be in violation of specified water quality requirements after the exhaustion of all administrative proceedings and appeals, except as provided. The bill would authorize a county agricultural commissioner to levy a civil penalty, as specified, on an operator who obtains an operator identification number by means of fraud. By imposing new requirements on county agricultural commissioners, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

XI. CORRESPONDENCE

- None received

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

- Bill Draper – Sustainable Forest Action Coalition update – no recent activity
- Suitability of Land Category I Chart and Vineyard Soils Report – pending County Counsel direction
- Agricultural Commissioner/Sealer Position Update
- General Plan 5-Year Review Process and EDAC Updates

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

- The meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

APPROVED: Greg Boeger, Chair

Date: June 9, 2010