



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
Dave Pratt – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Tom Heflin – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Gary Ward – Livestock Industry

MINUTES

June 11, 2008

6:30 P.M.

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

Members Present: Boeger, Draper, Heflin, Pratt*, Walker, Ward
(*absent for Items I.-VII.)

Members Absent: Bacchi

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
Gina Hunter, Development Services/Planning

Others Present: Mark Cafaro, G. Arthur Cort, Beth DeCaprio, Elaine Hoyt,
Art Marinnacio, Mike McDougal, Ray Nutting, Bruce
Wade, Claudia Wade, Ted Woessner

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6: 34 p.m. by Greg Boeger, Chair

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

*It was moved by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Heflin to APPROVE the Agenda.
Motion passed.*

AYES: Draper, Heflin, Walker, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Pratt

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of May 14, 2008

*It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Walker to APPROVE the Minutes of
May 14, 2008. Motion passed.*

AYES: Draper, Heflin, Walker, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Pratt

IV. PUBLIC FORUM

- *No comments were received*

V. Ranch Marketing/Winery Ordinance Update

Bill Stephans stated that Development Services had received two proposals for the EIR for the Winery Ordinance. From a quick reading of the proposals, one appears to incorporate a more detailed analysis of the Ranch Marketing program and its cumulative impacts with the Winery Ordinance. The proposals may be brought to the Board of Supervisors in August.

VI. Agricultural Grading Permits – discussion of cost off-set implementation

Bill Stephans explained that with the adoption of the General Plan in 2004 the Agricultural Department was directed to administer Agricultural Grading permits and/or applications for agricultural grading that incorporate Best Management Practices. Several applications have been submitted which has expended a great amount of staff time to visit and analyze the specific properties and projects. In all grading projects, there is a need for follow-up visits to insure Best Management Practices are being implemented and continued throughout the life of the project. Currently, the inspection costs are being supported by the General Fund. The proposed multiple stage fee proposal would help off-set some of these costs while limiting the costs to the applicants. The Commission was given a draft fee schedule titled, *Suggested Agricultural Grading Application Fee Schedule* (for Agricultural Commission discussion purposes only) for comment and review (see Attachment A).

Art Marinnacio stated that as a member of an Ad Hoc committee, they have discussed the wide range of new tasks that have been mandated as part of the General Plan. The committee is questioning the intent and benefit of some of these tasks, adding that his preference is to study those tasks that take a huge amount of staff time and discuss whether or not they should be done at all, rather than just implementing a fee or fee increase in order to provide them. He gave several suggestions on how, he believes, this could be achieved.

Mr. Boeger commented that as staff is required to oversee Ag grading it would be better to utilize Agricultural staff expertise rather than staff from DOT.

Although this is in the draft stages, the basic logic of the proposal is to keep the fees lower by increasing the application fee as the size of the graded acreage increases and add an additional fee if a permit is required or if the project is planned on highly erodible soil types. The third stage of fees would be initiated if a project requires approval by the Agricultural Commission. Timber Harvest Plans are exempt from obtaining an agricultural grading permit.

In general, the Commission thought the tiered approach was a valid procedure worth exploring if the General Plan continued to require an agricultural grading application/permit.

- VII.** TMA 08-0009 Baiocchi, Greg & Sharon – the owner of the subject parcel is applying with Development Services to convert an existing permitted hardship mobile home into a temporary agricultural employee housing unit on the parcel. Planning Services requested written approval from the Agricultural Commission that the site and activity on the above mentioned property satisfies three of the four criteria established by the county to qualify as an agricultural preserve in order to approve and process the associated Temporary Mobile Home Application (TMA 08-0009). A Williamson Act Contract (WAC 06-0014) was approved on the above referenced parcel on February 8, 2007. (District 2)

Staff reported on the site visit. Greg and Sharon Baiocchi entered their parcel into a Williamson Act Contract with the County of El Dorado, on February 8, 2007. At that time, the property had met all of the required criteria for a high intensive agricultural operation. The Capital outlay exceeded \$45,000 at \$183,000. Minimum parcel size of 20 acres was exceeded at 35.22 acres. Gross income was projected at \$34,286, by the year 2008, exceeding the requirement of \$13,500. The Baiocchi's have a 12 acre vineyard on their property, and would like to convert their established hardship mobile home into agricultural employee housing. The mobile home is located at the northeast corner of the property, with the vineyard to the west and south. The parcel is located in the Fairplay/Somerset Ag District, is zoned AP (Agricultural Preserve), has a Land Use Designation of AL (Agricultural Lands), and has choice soils (Shaver Coarse Sandy Loam, Holland Coarse Sandy Loam, and Wet Alluvial Land). Staff has determined that the minimum criteria for the Williamson Act Contract, is still being met.

A neighbor spoke in opposition to the application with concerns that the mobile home has not been used for Ag employee housing, and in her opinion, is not currently used for this purpose. She questioned the intent and the integrity of the application.

Greg Baiocchi distributed to the Commission members a handout describing a few of the responsibilities and duties of the current residents. He stated that when he purchased the property the mobile home was already on the site. After recently receiving a notice from Code Enforcement stating that he was not in compliance, he submitted the subject application to the Planning Department to correct the problem. He stated that he was willing to do whatever is necessary to comply with Code Enforcement and the county regulations.

Several Commission members expressed their concern that the housing was not really being used for agricultural workers but in actuality was being used as a rental unit. The handout seemed to only list "watering of the vineyard" as an agricultural duty. Concerns were expressed regarding whether or not the tenants actually worked for Mr. Baiocchi and questioned if the tenants were on the payroll. Mr. Baiocchi stated that they were not paid by him and were not on his payroll but that some of the rent for the trailer was being offset by the work the tenants performed.

Discussion ensued regarding the appropriate length of the allowable agricultural worker

housing permit. The Commission initially recommended only a one year permit because tenants and responsibilities may change over the course of the year. Upon further discussion, the length of the permit was reduced to six months and then 3 months because criteria regarding the actual residency of the agricultural housing have not been developed to properly analyze the request. Mr. Baiocchi agreed to employ the tenants and pay them to work in an agricultural capacity.

The Commission directed staff to begin drafting criteria that can be used to verify the need for agricultural housing and ensure that the actual tenants are employed for agricultural purposes.

It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Walker to recommend a PROVISIONAL APPROVAL of TMA 08-0009, Greg and Sharon Baiocchi's request for temporary housing for agricultural employee(s) as the property is currently in a Williamson Act Contract and continues to meet the criteria to qualify as such; the criteria for the agricultural operation is satisfied and consists of a 12 acre vineyard; the housing may be needed for and incidental to the agricultural production and related uses on the site, and; the placement of the agricultural housing meets the Principles of Compatibility (Section 51238.1 of the California Government Code); (1) The use will not significantly compromise the long-term productive agricultural capability of the subject contracted parcel(s) or on other contracted lands, (2) The use will not significantly displace or impair current or reasonably foreseeable agricultural operations on the subject contracted parcel(s), and (3) The use will not result in the significant removal of adjacent contracted land from agricultural use. Based upon these findings and the information presented, the Commission directs the applicants to submit further proof of the agricultural duties of the tenants, payroll records, etc., and to return to the October 8, 2008, Ag Commission meeting. Motion passed.

AYES: Draper, Heflin, Walker, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi, Pratt

- XIII.** S 08-0008 – Grace Foundation SUP (MJ318 A CA LP; Deer Creek 608 LP/Beth DeCaprio, Grace Foundation): A special use permit to allow horse riding lessons and horse therapy for up to 12 special needs children, as well as rescuing and rehabilitating abused and neglected animals. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 118-110-03, consists of 376.82 acres, and is located on the north side of Ryan Ranch Road northeast of the intersection with Latrobe Road, in the El Dorado Hills area. (District 2)

Staff reported on the site visit. The Grace Foundation of Northern California is a non-profit organization. The parcel is zoned RA-40 and has a Land use Designation of Rural Residential. The Grace Foundation is housed on a 376 plus acre ranch and provides a home and critical care for abused and neglected horses, cows, goats and sheep. Some of the rescued horses are utilized for equine assisted therapeutic programs for youth. The Foundation would like to expand their programs and offer their services and opportunities to more children.

Gina Hunter informed the Commission that the Planning Department has been refining the

project description. The site will have up to a maximum of 200 animals of various types, daily operations will have up to 20 volunteers on the site, buses will be utilized to transport a maximum of 80 school aged children to the site six times per month, and there will be two fundraising events per year.

Beth DeCaprio explained that in addition to helping children with special needs, they plan to utilize the open environment to help educate children, from more urban areas, in Life Science and hopefully, be a proto-type for similar projects.

Ray Nutting, who has visited the Grace Foundation several times, voiced his support of the project.

Mike McDougal, representing the property owners, related that they are very pleased to have the Grace Foundation leasing part of their property. He explained that the property is also used for grazing of cattle.

It was moved by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Walker to recommend APPROVAL of S08-0008, to allow instruction of 4 or more children on the Grace Foundation site, as the use will not substantially detract from agricultural production in the surrounding area, and the use is compatible with and will not have a significant adverse impact on adjacent or nearby neighborhoods. The proposed use will help preserve the land and act as a buffer between encroaching urbanization and the agriculturally zoned land to the south. Motion passed.

AYES: Pratt*, Heflin, Walker, Draper, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi

**Mr. Pratt arrived for the discussion of this item.*

- IX.** WAC 08-0001 – Paul & Alice Clary: Establishment of a new Williamson Act Contract consisting of one parcel of a multi-parcel contract which is currently in a 10-year rollout (Agricultural Preserve No. 11). The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 093-032-72, consists of 39.82 acres (proposed to be 50.4 acres), and is located on the north side of Perry Creek Road approximately ½ mile east of the intersection with Fairplay Road, in the Fairplay area. (District 2)

Mr. Walker recused himself from hearing this item as he is related to the applicants.

Staff reported on the site visit conducted on May 20, 2008 with Agricultural Commission member Gary Ward. The parcel is currently zoned AE, has a Land Use Designation of AL (Ag Lands), is currently part of AG Preserve #11, which is in a ten year roll out, and is in the Fairplay/Somerset Ag District. The owners have applied for a separate WAC for their 50.4 acre parcel. The applicant's have met 2 of the 3 requirements for establishing a Williamson Act Contract for a low intensive agricultural operation. Capital outlay has exceeded \$10,000

at \$69,300 (per application), and fencing (5-strand barbed wire) was being installed during the site visit. Minimum parcel size of 50 acres has been exceeded with the BLA, creating the

new parcel of 50.4 acres. The Clary's stated in their recently received Supplemental letter that they plan to keep "4 or 5 year-old heifers/steers" on their property with a gross income of at least \$2000.00 a year for the cattle. Staff spoke to Alice Clary regarding the application. She clarified that they were planning on "4 to 5 Angus cattle" on the property. Mr. Ward and staff have reservations about the ability of the land to support livestock. The cattle will have supplemental feed, and one of the better grazing areas on the property is the walnut orchard, which the Clary's state will be harvested for green walnuts used to produce wine and liquor. Alice Clary also stated that there is a natural spring on the property, on the northern finger of land, with a concrete basin, in addition to a well and three water tanks, for the livestock's water supply.

After reading the staff recommendation for their project online, the Clary's submitted a Cattle Marketing Plan which was provided to each of the Commission members and also read into the record by staff for audience information.

Bill Stephans stated that as the Clary's plan to purchase cattle in July, staff will revisit the site in August or September to ensure:

- The cattle have been purchased and are on the site, and
- That the fencing has been completed.

In addition, staff will verify the agricultural production/ harvesting of a walnut orchard for additional agricultural income.

It was moved by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Heflin, to recommend APPROVAL of WAC 08-0001. In general, the parcel identified as APN 093-032-86 is being fenced to contain livestock. The parcel exceeds the minimum requirement of 50 contiguous acres; water is available from a well, three holding tanks and a natural spring; the capital outlay is in excess of \$10,000 and the income level has been clarified through a marketing/work plan. In addition, the Commission advise that the walnut orchard and any other agricultural pursuits be included as part of the overall agricultural marketing plan. Motion passed.

AYES: Heflin, Draper, Pratt, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

RECUSED: Walker

ABSENT: Bacchi

- X.** AO7-0008, Z07-0022, P07-0023 Michigan Bar Road (David Cort) request for a General Plan Amendment to remove approximately six (6) acres from High Density Residential (HDR) in Latrobe Rural Center and re-designate that portion as Rural Residential (RR), moving the Rural Center boundary to the HDR portion of the property; rezone to change a portion of the property zoned Residential Estate-10 acre minimum (RE-10) designated as HDR to One-Family Residential (R1), and change a portion zoned Residential Agricultural 40-acre

minimum (RA-40) to RE-10; and a Tentative Parcel Map to create four (4) parcels ranging from 5 to 10 acres. (District 2)

Staff reported on the site visit. The subject parcel consists of 37.8 acres and is located along Latrobe Road, just north of the intersection with South Shingle Road. The majority of the parcel is zoned RA-40 and is in a historic grazing area. The Land Use Designations for the parcel include RR (Rural Residential) and HDR (High Density Residential). The HDR portion of the parcel is in the Latrobe Rural Center. The applicant would like to: 1) change 6 acres from HDR to RR and move the Latrobe Rural Center boundary, which arbitrarily crosses the property, to the HDR boundary line (creating a 5 plus acre parcel with an R1 zoning), and 2) create three, 10 acre parcels, with RE-10 zoning and RR Land Use Designations. The project parameters appear to be in compliance with General Plan Policies 8.1.3.1 (minimum 10 acre parcel size adjacent to agriculturally zoned land), 8.1.3.2 (minimum setback of 200 feet for incompatible uses adjacent to agriculturally zoned land) and 8.2.2.5 (newly created parcels adjacent to agriculturally zoned land must be large enough to allow for an adequate setback for any incompatible uses). General Plan Policy 8.1.2.2 (grazing lands may be protected with a minimum of 40 acres) would not apply, as the parcel size is less than 40 acres. If the project is approved, residential uses (RE-10) that are established adjoining grazing land shall have agricultural fencing per County standards (General Plan Policy 8.2.2.6).

Gina Hunter explained that although this proposed project is adjacent to the Rancho Victoria project, they have no relationship to one another. Rancho Victoria is still going through the process and has not been permitted.

G. Arthur Cort, father of the applicant, explained the boundaries of the project and the historic boundaries of the Latrobe Rural Center.

Ted Woessner, Carlton Engineering, presented Land Use maps for the Commission's review of the project boundary lines.

There was discussion and questions from the Commission regarding the fencing of the project. Bill Stephans explained that adequate livestock fencing is required by the General Plan whenever a residential use is established adjoining grazing land (GP Policy 8.2.2.6).

It was moved by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend APPROVAL of A07-0008, Z07-0022, and P07-0023, as the proposed changes will create parcels consistent with the General Plan, and the proposed parcels will act as a buffer between higher density land uses of the Latrobe Rural Center and agricultural land uses of the surrounding area. It can be found that the proposed changes: A.) Will not intensify existing conflicts or add new conflicts between adjacent residential areas and agricultural activities; and 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. If approved, the project must comply with General Plan Policy 8.2.2.6; Residential uses that are established adjoining grazing land shall have

agricultural fencing per County Standards and General Plan Policy 8.1.3.2 which requires that a 200 foot setback be imposed on parcel adjacent to agriculturally zoned lands.

Motion passed.

AYES: Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Walker, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Ward

ABSENT: Bacchi

- XI.** Bruce & Claudia Wade – requesting Administrative Relief from Agricultural Setbacks for the proposed replacement of a single-family residence to be located 30 feet from the southeast property line and 115 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.

Staff reported on the site visit. The subject parcel is not in an Agricultural District, has non-choice soils, is wooded and has limited building sites due to its steep topography. The RA-20 parcel to the south, was at one time, a mobile home park and has a Land Use Designation of HDR (High Density Residential). This adjacent parcel is at the bottom of the canyon on Highway 193, along the South Fork of the American River and is now owned by the County of El Dorado.

Claudia Wade explained that due to the steep slope of the property, she and her husband have chosen the only flat sight available on the parcel for building the home.

It was moved by Mr. Heflin and seconded by Mr. Pratt to recommend APPROVAL of Bruce and Claudia Wade's request for administrative relief from a 200 foot agricultural setback, allowing a setback of 30 feet from the RA-20 zoned parcel to the southeast, as the following findings can be made: A.) The proposed non-compatible structure is located on the property to reasonably minimize any potential negative impacts on the adjacent agriculturally zoned land; B.) Based on the site characteristics of the subject parcel and the adjacent agriculturally 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 because the General Plan Land Use Designation of the adjacent parcel is not agricultural, it is High Density Residential. The applicant must 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: Ward, Heflin, Pratt, Walker, Draper, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi

- XII.** Mark Cafaro – requesting administrative relief from a 200 foot agricultural setback in order to construct a detached residential office/storage structure. If approved, this structure would be located 145 feet from the east property line, adjacent to land zoned Residential Agricultural, 40-acre minimum (RA-40).

Staff reported on the site visit. The Ag zoned parcel, to the east, is 480 acres, is covered in oaks, buckbrush, and Manzanita, slopes steeply down to the American River, and does not have any visible signs of an agricultural operation near the subject parcel. During the site visit the detached office building was almost complete. Mr. Cafaro stated that the building would have electricity, but no plumbing, and would be used as an office. The RA-40 parcel to the east is not in an Agricultural District, has a Land use Designation of RR (Rural Residential), and has non-choice soils.

It was moved by Mr .Ward and seconded by Mr. Pratt to recommend Approval of the request to reduce the agricultural setback from the eastern property line from 200 feet to 145 feet, as the following findings can be made: A.) The proposed non-compatible structure is located on the property to reasonably minimize any potential negative impacts on the adjacent agriculturally zoned land; B.) Based on the site characteristics of the subject parcel and the adjacent agriculturally 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. The applicant must 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, before finalized, 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: Draper, Pratt, Heflin, Walker, Ward, Boeger

NOES: None

ABSENT: Bacchi

XIII. LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

- AB 2763 (Laird), SB 1723 (Maldonado), AB 2968 (Jones), AB 2760 (Leno) and AB 2860 (Mendoza) are still active. No amendments have taken place on any of the bills.

XIV. CORRESPONDENCE

XV. OTHER BUSINESS

- Request for Agricultural Commissioner Concurrence of Ag Setback Relief – Andrew and Susette Gee (APN 093-032-53)
- Request for Agricultural Commissioner Concurrence of Ag Setback Relief – Todd Marsh (APN 043-170-21)
- El Dorado County Board of Supervisors approved and certified the Notice of Non-Renewal for a portion of Agricultural Preserve No. 172/Penelope Hocking (APN 087-021-57)
- Guy Shaver – update on Williamson Act Contract (WAC 07-0003) – Chris Flores and Bill Stephans visited the site on May 23, 2008. Fencing and clearing are taking place. Approximately 10 Highland cattle are residing on the property.
- The Oak Woodland Management Plan was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on May 6, 2008. The definition of Agricultural Cultivation has retained consistency the State Public Resources Code Section 21083.4 which includes producing and processing.

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Boeger adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

APPROVED: Greg Boeger, Chair

Date: July, 9, 2008

***EDC Suggested Agricultural Grading Application Fee Schedule**

Soil type (level of erodibility - slight, moderate, high); Percentage of highly erodible soils within project parameters
 Acreage of crop (1-3.99 acres, 4-10.99 acres, 11-20.99 acres, 21 + acres)
 Change of natural contour

Stage I = 1 to 3.99 acres (\$125.00)
 Stage II = 4 to 10.99 acres (\$150.00)
 Stage III = 11 to 20.99 acres (\$200.00)
 Stage IV = 21 plus acres (\$250.00)

*When an application is submitted, a site visit will be conducted (more than one site visit may be necessary depending on the project).

\$150.00** Permit is required if the natural contour of the land is changed)

**If a Permit is required, the fee will help cover additional site visits and administrative costs.

\$250.00*** Hearing

***Projects requiring Agricultural Commission approval.

Highly Erodible Soils:

Acidic Rock
 Ahwahnee very rocky coarse sandy loam (9-50% slopes)
 Auberry very rocky coarse sandy loam (15-50% slopes)
 Auburn extremely rocky silt loam (3-70% slopes)
 Boomer very rocky loam (30-70% slopes)
 Chaix very rocky coarse sandy loam (9-70% slopes)
 Delpiedra very rocky loam (3-50% slopes)
 Diamond Springs very fine sandy loam (15-50% slopes)
 Diamond Springs gravelly sandy loam, grayish sub-soil variant (30-50% slopes)
 Gullied Land
 Holland rocky coarse sandy loam (5-15% slopes)
 Holland coarse sandy loam (9-30% slopes)
 Holland very rocky coarse sandy loam (15-70% slopes)
 Horseshoe gravelly loam (30-50% slopes)
 Hotaw very rocky coarse sandy loam (15-50% slopes)
 Iron Mountain very rocky sandy loam (3-50% slopes)
 Josephine very rocky loam (15-50% slopes)
 Josephine silt loam (30-50% slopes)

Josephine very rocky silt loam (9-70% slopes)
 Mariposa very rocky silt loam (3-70% slopes)
 Mariposa-Josephine very rocky loams (15-70% slopes)
 Maymen very rocky loam (15-70% slopes)
 McCarthy cobbly loam (9-50% slopes)
 Musick sandy loam (15-30% slopes)
 Musick rocky sandy loam (5-15% slopes)
 Rescue sandy loam (15-30% slopes)
 Rescue very stony sandy loam (15-50% slopes)
 Rescue extremely stony sandy loam (3-50% slopes)
 Shaver coarse sandy loam (9-30% slopes)
 Shaver very rocky coarse sandy loam (15-50% slopes)
 Sierra sandy loam (15-30% slopes)
 Sierra very rocky sandy loam (15-50% slopes)
 Sites loam (30-50% slopes)
 Sites stony loam (30-50% slopes)
 Sites very rocky loam (15-70% slopes)
 Sites clay loam (30-50% slopes)
 Whiterock gravelly silt loam

*** For Agricultural Commission Discussion Only**