



AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

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

eldcaq@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
Ron Mansfield – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
John Smith – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry
Gary Ward – Livestock Industry

MINUTES

July 8, 2009

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: Nancy Applegarth, Clerk to the Agricultural Commission
Chris Flores, Agricultural Biologist
Jason Hade, Development Services/Planning

Others Present: Ed Akin, Bill Bacchi, Chris Beauchamp, Van L. Dossey,
Jim Johnson, Toni Johnson, Robert Laurie, Kevin Long,
Art Marinaccio, Linda Neal, Liz Phillips

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was moved by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Smith to Approve the agenda

Motion passed

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes of June 10, 2009

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

Motion passed

AYES: Bacchi, Draper, Mansfield, Smith, Walker

NOES: None

ABSTAINED: Boeger

ABSENT: Ward

IV. PUBLIC FORUM

Art Marinaccio stated that the Forest Service is starting up a new effort to completely rewrite all of the Management Plans in California beginning with the Sierra's. He feels it is critically important to the economy of the county to be informed of these plans so that the current administration does not turn our forests into a non-economic resource.

V. Ranch Marketing

Bill Stephans told the Commission that Christa Campbell had sent an email requesting specific dates for a meeting with him and Roger Trout to discuss the Christmas Tree Growers comments and concerns regarding the Ranch Marketing draft. Several dates were provided however, none of the dates resulted in a meeting. Bill Stephans said that they will continue to try to set a meeting prior to next month's Ag Commission meeting.

VI. Z 07-0040, TM 07-1454 & S 09-0012 – Sundance Subdivision (Christopher Beauchamp/Carlton Engineering, Inc.): a request for a rezone to change zoning from Exclusive Agriculture (AE) to Estate Residential 10-Acre (RE-10), a tentative subdivision map to create 29 lots ranging in size from 10.0 to 12.6 acres and a special use permit to authorize a metal gate across proposed road "A" where it intersects with Pilot View Drive.

The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 104-520-04, -05, & -06, consists of 298.19 acres, and is located on the south side of Rattlesnake Bar Road approximately 0.25 miles west of the intersection with State Route 49, in the Pilot Hill area. (District 4)

Chris Flores reported on the site visit conducted on June 23, 2009. The project was described as 1) Rezone 298 acres from Exclusive Agriculture (AE) to Estate Residential 10-Acre (RE-10); 2) a tentative subdivision map, creating 29 ten to twelve acre lots; and 3) a Special Use Permit to authorize a metal gate across the proposed road "A" where it intersects with Pilot View Drive. The three project parcels (APN's 104-520-04, -05, & -06) consist of 298.19 acres and can be accessed off of Pilot View Drive, Rattlesnake Bar Road, or Starling Lane. The parcels have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Rural Residential (RR) and are not within an Agricultural District. The request to rezone to RE-10 with the creation of a Planned Development was heard by the Agricultural Commission on October 10, 2007. The plan, at that time, was to create 40 lots, ranging in size from 5.0 acres to 7.95 acres with a 90 acre open space parcel.

There was discussion regarding the grazing capabilities of the land. Mr. Bacchi stated that he had leased the Garland Ranch, to the north of the subject parcels, for grazing. The parcels, were at one time, a part of the Garland Ranch. A motion was made, by the Agricultural Commission to recommend denial of the project, as the parcels were historically used for grazing, and as such, should be protected, as described in General Plan Policy 8.1.2.2 with a 40 acre minimum parcel size.

Bill Stephans provided a list titled *Soil Descriptions Located on Sundance Subdivision*, with information from the 1974 *Soil Survey of El Dorado Area, California*. The information shows that the soils on this property are important rangeland soils: AwD, AxD, BkE and RfC. He also mentioned that the 2006 California Department of Conservation Land Designations map shows a portion of the property contains Farmland of Local Importance that appears to follow the RfC soils located on the southern property (APN 104-520-06). Additionally, it appears from the soils map that the majority of the property is between 2-30% slopes with only the west/northwest portion of APN 104-520-05 as being 30-50% slopes. All of the listed soils are designated either Range site 1 (total air dry production is 3,000 pounds per acre in favorable years and 1,000 pounds in unfavorable years) or Range site 2 (total air dry production is 3,500 pounds per acre in favorable years and 1,200 pounds in unfavorable years). In general, many people think that cattle are the only grazing animals used for commercial production; however this is not the case. There are other commercially viable animals such as goats, Llamas, alpacas, etc., that can be grazed commercially.

Robert Laurie, representing the applicant, gave a brief history of the project and stated that the current proposal, to subdivide the subject property into 10-12 acre parcels, was developed for compatibility with surrounding land uses. Mr. Laurie also submitted a letter to the Commission outlining his comments in writing.

General Plan Policy 8.1.2.2 states, "Some lands within Rural Regions have historically been used for commercial grazing of livestock and are currently capable of sustaining commercial grazing of livestock. If they can be demonstrated to be suitable land 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 smaller parcels or the Board of Supervisors determines that economic, social, or other considerations justify the creation of smaller parcels for development or other nonagricultural uses..."

Mr. Laurie argued that although the applicant acknowledges that the property has been utilized for grazing in the past, it is the County, not the property owner, who must provide proof, through findings, that certain lands are a) suitable for grazing and b) capable of sustaining commercial grazing.

Chris Beauchamp, the owner of the project parcels, added that he wanted to subdivide his property into lot sizes no less than what the surrounding parcels are (although the property to the north, the Garland Ranch, has not been split), and described the property as steep, covered with brush, and without irrigation. He stated he did not believe that the property would support a sustainable ranching operation.

Mr. Bacchi, in response to Mr. Laurie and Mr. Beauchamp's comments, stated that "sustainable" does not necessarily mean "profitable". He also stated that the property has historically been used for commercial grazing and therefore, by reason, is capable of sustaining commercial grazing of livestock, and is suitable land for grazing. As a notice of full disclosure, Mr. Bacchi also mentioned that his family leases Garland Ranch for grazing of their livestock.

A neighbor, to the southwest of the property, spoke in opposition to the project, expressing concerns that if the parcels are approved, it will deplete existing wells in the area, increase noise, pollution and traffic. Also, she stated that the original support for the parcel split was predicated on the promise of bringing water into the area from GPUD. With this new configuration of the parcels, water will not be brought in by the project applicant so therefore, all of the neighbors are opposed.

Discussion took place regarding the historical grazing on these parcels. It was also again mentioned that livestock is not only cattle, but includes goats, llamas, alpacas, sheep, etc.

It was moved by Mr. Bacchi and seconded by Mr. Smith to recommend DENIAL of Z 07-0040, TM 07-1454 & S 09-0012 as the parcels (APN's 104-520-04, -05, and -06) should continue to be protected as historic grazing land as recommended by the Agricultural Commission on October 10, 2007. Based on the site visit of June 23, 2009 and the site visit of September 18, 2007, no changes were observed in the land use of the subject parcel or surrounding parcels. The Commission also requests it be noted, that based on current information, the soils on the property are officially recognized as being able to sustain grazing and that they are listed in the 1974 Soil Survey of El Dorado Area as Range site 1 & 2 which is suitable for grazing. Additionally, if the project is approved, the Commission recommends that all parcels created adjacent to agriculturally zoned land, be required to incorporate the 200 foot agricultural setback on the tentative and final parcel maps.

Motion passed.

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- VII.** S 09-0013 – Phillips TPZ Caretaker SFD (Elizabeth Phillips): A request for a special use permit to allow the construction of a, plus or minus, 1,200 square foot caretaker residence on a parcel zoned Timberland Production (TPZ). The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 061-100-29, consists of 11.969 acres, and is located on the east side of Syd Road approximately 370 feet east of the intersection with Sliger Mine Road, in the Greenwood area. (District 4)

Staff reported on the site visit conducted on June 23, 2009. The subject parcel is being intensively managed as a Christmas Tree Farm. The property is fenced and the trees are irrigated. The elevation of the parcel is less than 2400 feet. Over 5,800 Christmas trees are growing on the property. Tree species include Douglas Fir, Incense Cedar, and White Fir. The first harvesting of Christmas trees occurred in 1981, per the applicant. The property has a gravity fed watering system, as well as ½ acre of electrically irrigated trees. The surrounding parcels are zoned RE-5 and RE-10. The subject parcel has a Land Use Designation of Rural Residential (RR) with surrounding parcels designated either Rural Residential (RR) or Low Density Residential (LDR).

Relevant General Plan Policies:

General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1 states, “The County Agricultural Commission shall evaluate all discretionary development applications involving identified timber production lands which are designated Natural Resource or lands zoned Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) or lands adjacent to the same and shall make recommendations to the approving authority...the approving authority shall make the following findings:

- A. The proposed use will not be detrimental to that parcel or 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.”

El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance, Section 17.44.050 Criteria for residential use in a TPZ District:

- A. Residential use of timberland is in general inconsistent with growing and harvesting of timber. However, it is recognized that in certain situations such as intensively managed minimum size acreages, nurseries, etc., in private ownership, living quarters and outbuildings are necessary in connection with the management and protection of the property. Therefore, by recommendation of the agricultural commission acknowledging that three consecutive years of intensive management of his/her lands have been shown by the landowner, the zoning administrator may grant a special use permit for construction of one owner or caretaker occupied single-family detached dwelling or mobile home on an approved foundation.
- B. The following criteria will aid the agricultural commission in determining what constitutes intensive management and must be in any case considered in granting a special use permit for a residence.
- C. Where a landowner has:

1. A timber inventory of his stand;
2. Conducted commercial harvesting operations;
3. Provided legal and physical access to his property so commercial operations can be carried out;
4. Made a reasonable effort to locate the boundaries of the property and has attempted to protect his property against trespass;
5. Conducted disease or insect control work;
6. Performed thinnings, slash disposal, pruning and other appropriate silvicultural work;
7. Developed a fire protection system or has a functioning fire protection plan;
8. Provided for erosion control on existing roads and skid trails and has maintained existing roads; and
9. Planted a significant portion of the understocked areas of his/her parcel.

Bill Stephans stated that the size of the caretaker unit appears to be reasonable and would not impact the growing areas of the parcel.

Elizabeth Phillips was available for questions and review of the project. As the owner of the Christmas Tree Farm, she will be living in the caretaker home if approved.

It was moved by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend APPROVAL of S 09-0013, the request for a Special Use permit to allow the construction of a 1200+/- caretaker cottage on APN 061-100-29, as the findings have been met for General Plan Policy 8.4.2.1 and the criteria for residential use in a TPZ District have been met in accordance with Section 17.44.050 of the El Dorado County Zoning Ordinance.

Motion passed.

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- VIII.** SPR 09-0005/Neal Winery – Planning Services is requesting a recommendation regarding this Site Plan Review. Consistent with Section 17.14.200.E.5a of the Winery Ordinance, the subject Site Plan Review shall only be approved with a recommendation from the Agricultural Commission as the subject site is accessed by a non-county maintained road. (District 2)

Staff reported on the site visit of June 9, 2009. Chris Flores and Bill Stephans met with the applicant, Linda Neal. The property is located at 2979 Mellowood Drive in Somerset. The parcel is 25 acres, has nine acres of producing grapes and is zoned RE-10. The parcel is in the Fairplay/Somerset Agricultural District, has choice soils, and a Land Use Designation of Agricultural Lands (AL). Planning Services has requested a review and recommendation of SPR 09-0005 by the Agricultural Commission consistent with Section 17.14.200.E.5.a of the Winery Ordinance. Although a parcel zoned RE-10, larger than 10 acres with over 5 acres of planted grapes, in an Agricultural District, is allowed a winery “By Right,” the property is

accessed by a non-County maintained road and as such, is subject to a Site Plan Review. Enclosed in the application packet was a letter, written by Ms. Neal to Chief Robert Gill of the Pioneer Fire Protection District. The letter identified requirements by the fire department, for road access and fire protection. According to the letter, the requirements have already been met, or are included in the plan. The letter is signed by Chief Gill for the purpose of confirming that the applicant is aware of the fire departments requirements. The access road is paved and terminates into another neighboring residence. The applicant has plans to convert an existing barn to a winery and tasting room which would be a benefit to the agricultural economy of El Dorado County. Currently, per the applicant, the grapes grown on the property are being transported out of the county and processed by a winery in Napa County.

Discussion took place regarding road accessibility and possible easements. Linda Neal was available for questions and review of the project. She explained that the road is entirely on her property and she maintains it.

A neighbor submitted an email in support of the project. Copies were provided to the Commission.

As a matter of disclosure, Mr. Smith mentioned that he buys grapes from the adjoining property.

It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Smith to recommend Approval of SPR 09-0005, Linda Neal's request for a winery/tasting room, as the project will not have a negative affect on the agricultural operations on the subject parcel or adjacent parcels, and will enhance the economic viability of the agricultural operation.

Motion passed.

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- IX.** Z 08-0032 – Weber Quarry Rezone (Eric Brunius/Art Marinaccio): A request for a zone change from Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5) to Industrial (I). The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers 102-150-16, -25, -28, 317-120-08, consists of 95.0 acres, and is located on the east side of Lotus Road at Weber Creek, in the Rescue area. (District 4)

Staff conducted a site visit on June 23, 2009. The four parcels have a General Plan Land Use Designation of Industrial (I). The application is for a rezone from RE-5 to Industrial; a zoning consistent with its Land Use Designation. The current zoning around the subject parcels consist of Estate Residential Five-Acre (RE-5), Estate Residential Ten-Acre (RE-10), Industrial (I), Residential Agriculture Twenty-Acre (RA-20), and Planned Development (PD). The current land use designations around the parcels consist of Low Density Residential (LDR), Rural Residential (RR), Industrial (I) and Open Space (OS). The property has been an active rock quarry in the past and mineral extraction is considered a

compatible use adjacent to agricultural zoning.

Bill Stephans stated that the only reason the Ag Commission is hearing this item is because the northern project parcel is touching a corner of RA-20 zoned land. Currently, there is no agricultural activity on the RA-20 zoned parcel.

Art Marinaccio gave an explanation of the application and stated that there are really no “agricultural issues” involved with the project. He stated that the zone change would be in compliance with the General Plan Land Use Designation of the parcels.

A neighbor questioned how the zone change would affect her property.

Jason Hade, from Planning Services, explained that it would be a rezone to bring the subject property into General Plan compliance and would not involve any physical change to her property.

Another neighbor gave a brief history of the local opposition to the project and stated that he feels the request could be a Trojan Horse for this “deceptively simple” request for a zone change since there does not appear to be any reason to change the zoning at this time. He suggested that a zone change should be considered when a specific project is proposed.

Greenstone Country Owners Association President, Van Dossey offered reasons for their opposition to the project. The association members are opposed to rezoning the quarry property to industrial usage because they are concerned it would provide the quarry owners with the basis to expand their operations to include activities that could have a negative impact on the quality of life of the Greenstone residents. He also submitted a letter of opposition from the association members and a letter of opposition from Bob Ayrest, President of Greenstone Country Community Services District.

A neighbor living within 500 feet of the property voiced her strong opposition to the rezone request. She feels that the applicants want the zone change for a use they are not actually stating. Several years ago the owners of the property wanted to site an asphalt batch plant on the property. If the zone is changed to Industrial now, then the owners could place the plant there by right. As a point of clarification, Bill Stephans stated that an asphalt batch would require a permit from the Air Quality Management District (AQMD) which would trigger a notice and hearing so the batch plant probably would not be able to be sited by right.

As a point of clarification, Bill Stephans reminded those in attendance that the findings that were made by staff were specific to agriculture and that many of the concerns expressed by the public are not pertinent to the Ag Commission’s responsibilities. Also, in the 2004 General Plan, Policy 2.2.1.2 states, “. . . Industrial lands in Rural Regions shall be constrained to uses which support on-site agriculture, timber resource production, mineral extraction, or other resource utilization.” Staff interprets this to mean that the quarry owners would be constrained to mineral extraction or resource utilization.

Jason Hade, Planning Services, concurred with Bill Stephans' interpretation of Policy 2.2.1.2.

It was moved by Mr. Walker and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend APPROVAL of the request for a zone change from Estate Residential Five-Acre (Re-5) to Industrial (I), for APN'S 102-150-16, -25, -28, and 317-120-08, as the rezone is consistent with the existing Land Use Designation and all of the findings can be made for General Plan Policy 8.1.4.1 which states, "...the proposed use:

- 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."*

Additionally, the Commission wishes to make it clear that this motion pertains only to Agricultural Issues.

Motion passed.

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

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ward

- X. Ag District Review** – Discussion and recommendations under consideration by the Ag Commission to include and preclude certain parcels from the following existing Ag Districts:

Camino-Fruitridge

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (25) be **added** to the Camino-Fruitridge Ag District:*

043-011-25, 043-011-32, 043-011-33, 043-011-34, 043-011-35, 043-011-36, 043-011-37, 043-480-22, 043-480-23, 043-480-30, 043-480-33, 043-480-39, 043-480-40, 043-480-41, 043-480-46, 043-480-47, 084-200-12, 084-200-17, 084-200-57, 085-570-25, 100-060-37, 100-060-40, 100-060-41, 100-140-01, 100-140-22

Coloma

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (14) be **added** to the Coloma Ag District:*

074-050-28, 074-050-13, 074-050-33, 074-050-11, 105-010-06, 105-010-65, 105-010-66, 074-050-27, 074-050-34, 074-050-08, 105-010-41, 105-010-64, 105-050-19, 880-374-81

Fairplay

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (7) be **added** to the Fairplay Ag District:*

046-740-01, 046-052-66, 046-090-78, 095-060-01, 046-740-02, 046-071-21, 095-040-26

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (70) be **omitted** from the Fairplay Ag District:*

095-011-17, 095-011-18, 095-011-19, 095-011-33, 046-840-59, 046-840-61, 046-840-57, 046-840-57, 046-840-56, 046-840-53, 046-840-68, 046-840-51, 046-840-52, 046-840-53, 046-840-49, 046-840-63, 046-840-58, 046-840-45, 046-840-44, 046-840-42, 046-840-41, 046-840-40, 046-840-43, 046-840-35, 046-840-36, 046-840-34, 046-840-54, 046-840-39, 046-840-58, 046-840-38, 046-840-31, 046-840-37, 046-840-33, 046-840-32, 046-840-30, 046-840-20, 046-840-58, 046-840-18, 046-840-16, 046-840-70, 046-840-22, 046-840-47, 046-840-06, 046-840-66, 046-840-60, 046-840-21, 046-840-19, 046-840-17, 046-840-15, 046-840-25, 046-840-07, 046-840-27, 046-840-23, 046-840-08, 046-840-05, 046-840-09, 046-840-65, 046-840-12, 046-840-29, 046-840-64, 046-840-24, 046-840-28, 046-840-14, 046-840-10, 046-840-26, 046-840-11, 046-840-13

Fairplay-East

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (75) be **added** to the Fairplay Ag District:*

095-011-21, 095-011-22, 095-011-23, 095-011-24, 095-011-27, 095-011-28, 095-011-29, 095-011-31, 095-011-32, 095-011-65, 095-011-64, 095-011-30, 095-011-66, 095-280-01, 095-280-02, 095-280-05, 095-280-06, 095-280-03, 095-280-04, 095-011-67, 095-280-07, 095-280-08, 095-280-11, 095-280-12, 095-280-13, 095-011-40, 095-011-39, 095-280-14, 095-280-19, 095-280-17, 095-280-10, 095-280-16, 095-280-18, 041-960-01, 095-011-47, 095-100-32, 095-100-21, 095-011-41, 095-011-42, 095-011-46, 041-960-03, 095-011-43, 095-011-82, 095-011-80, 095-011-81, 041-191-04, 041-960-08, 095-030-28, 095-030-45, 095-030-26, 095-030-44, 040-011-01, 095-030-33, 095-030-34, 095-030-06, 095-030-36, 040-011-07, 040-011-35, 040-011-36, 095-021-22, 095-021-24, 095-021-23, 095-190-01, 095-040-37, 095-190-21, 095-190-19, 095-190-18, 095-190-03, 095-190-20, 095-050-39, 095-040-33, 095-040-30, 095-050-37, 095-070-26, 095-070-02

Garden Valley South

Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission does not recommend any parcel additions to the south of the Garden Valley – Georgetown Ag District.

Garden Valley – Georgetown East

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (105) be **added** to the Garden Valley - Georgetown Ag District:*

060-021-47, 060-021-46, 060-021-48, 060-021-49, 062-420-34, 062-420-18, 062-420-22, 062-090-59, 060-041-02, 060-650-25, 060-650-26, 062-111-02, 060-650-27, 060-650-28, 062-111-79, 062-111-81, 062-111-04, 062-111-03, 060-650-29, 062-111-06, 062-111-05, 062-111-61, 062-111-07, 062-330-04, 062-330-05, 060-660-07, 062-111-08, 060-660-02, 062-111-09, 062-330-03, 062-111-10, 062-111-12, 062-111-13, 062-330-06, 060-660-08, 060-660-01, 062-330-07, 062-111-11, 062-111-14, 062-111-15, 062-290-10, 060-660-27, 062-111-16, 062-111-20, 062-450-17, 062-450-14, 062-450-10, 062-450-12, 062-450-11, 062-290-09, 062-290-06, 062-290-08, 062-290-11, 062-111-17, 062-111-21, 062-111-22, 062-111-19, 062-111-23, 062-290-05, 062-450-19, 062-450-07, 062-450-16, 060-660-05, 062-290-12, 062-450-18, 062-450-20, 062-111-18, 062-290-01, 062-290-03, 062-450-15, 062-450-01, 062-450-09, 062-111-26, 062-111-25, 062-111-24, 062-111-27, 062-111-28, 084-011-01, 084-011-02, 062-090-02, 062-090-65, 062-090-01, 062-090-20, 062-090-66, 062-090-28, 062-090-27, 062-090-50, 062-090-25, 062-090-30, 062-090-16, 062-090-39, 062-090-55, 062-09-08, 062-090-17, 062-090-40, 062-090-41, 062-090-64, 062-090-63, 062-090-42, 062-090-56, 062-090-57, 062-090-61, 062-090-37, 062-090-58, 062-420-23

Georgetown North

Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission does not recommend any parcel additions to the north of the Garden Valley – Georgetown Ag District.

Gold Hill

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (7) be **added** to the Gold Hill Ag District:*

089-010-43, 089-010-27, 089-010-45, 089-010-47, 089-010-44, 089-120-31, 317-030-09

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (26) be **omitted** from the Gold Hill Ag District:*

006-301-12, 006-480-30, 006-301-11, 006-480-33, 006-301-09, 006-311-04, 006-301-05, 006-480-32, 006-480-31, 006-301-07, 006-480-11, 006-480-12, 006-470-37, 006-470-38, 089-110-02, 089-110-03, 089-110-04, 089-110-37, 089-110-36, 089-110-35, 089-110-34, 089-110-32, 089-110-28, 089-260-05, 089-110-20, 089-110-54

Oak Hill

*Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (9) be **added** to the Oak Hill Ag District:*

046-820-21, 046-032-51, 046-820-23, 046-820-22, 046-820-06, 046-032-01, 046-032-02, 046-032-14, 046-032-13

Pleasant Valley

Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (27) be **added** to the Pleasant Valley Ag District:

078-240-37, 078-230-32, 078-240-23, 078-240-24, 078-240-31, 078-240-17, 078-240-30, 078-240-16, 093-050-46, 093-050-06, 093-050-51, 093-050-12, 093-050-22, 093-050-21, 093-050-48, 093-050-54, 093-050-53, 093-050-50, 093-050-56, 093-050-63, 093-050-43, 093-050-30, 093-050-36, 093-050-62, 046-270-17, 093-050-03, 046-022-11

Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Number (1) be **omitted** from the Pleasant Valley Ag District:

046-250-20

Pleasant Valley East/Fairplay Northeast

Recommendation: The Agricultural Commission is considering to recommend the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (230) be **added** to the Fairplay Ag District:

093-021-17, 093-090-11, 093-100-18, 093-230-29, 093-310-25, 093-310-23, 093-230-24, 093-230-13, 093-310-24, 093-230-21, 093-310-15, 093-230-26, 093-230-12, 093-310-16, 093-230-27, 093-230-25, 093-310-17, 093-230-01, 093-220-52, 093-230-11, 093-220-41, 093-220-53, 093-230-04, 093-230-03, 093-230-02, 093-040-46, 093-040-45, 093-250-01, 093-250-02, 093-250-03, 093-040-43, 093-270-01, 093-270-84, 079-010-12, 079-010-13, 079-010-14, 093-070-55, 093-021-10, 093-080-10, 093-040-46, 093-040-45, 079-010-11, 079-010-79, 079-270-06, 079-270-20, 079-010-80, 079-010-12, 079-010-13, 079-270-07, 079-270-08, 079-270-09, 079-270-10, 078-200-50, 079-010-78, 079-270-21, 079-010-14, 079-280-03, 079-280-04, 078-200-51, 079-280-02, 079-010-08, 079-010-51, 079-280-01, 079-010-52, 079-270-12, 079-270-11, 079-190-28, 079-010-09, 079-010-50, 079-190-35, 079-190-34, 079-010-17, 079-010-20, 079-010-21, 079-010-22, 078-210-13, 078-210-20, 078-210-12, 079-010-28, 078-220-06, 079-190-33, 079-190-32, 078-220-05, 079-190-29, 079-190-06, 079-190-03, 079-190-02, 079-190-01, 079-190-30, 079-190-05, 079-010-76, 079-190-04, 079-010-55, 078-210-14, 078-210-10, 079-190-21, 079-190-20, 079-190-18, 079-190-08, 079-010-10, 078-210-15, 079-190-22, 079-190-09, 079-190-24, 078-210-11, 079-190-12, 079-190-13, 079-190-11, 079-190-14, 079-190-15, 093-021-02, 093-021-04, 093-021-01, 093-080-15, 093-021-03, 093-021-08, 093-021-09, 093-080-08, 093-080-09, 093-070-55, 093-021-05, 093-021-06, 093-080-07, 093-070-54, 093-080-16, 093-080-10, 093-021-07, 093-090-10, 093-090-06, 093-090-02, 093-021-11, 093-021-12, 093-021-13, 093-021-14, 093-021-15, 093-021-16, 093-090-03, 093-021-19, 093-021-18, 093-021-20, 093-021-21, 093-021-22, 093-021-23, 093-021-24, 093-021-25, 093-021-26, 093-021-28, 093-021-70, 093-021-30, 093-021-69, 093-021-27, 093-021-29, 093-021-38, 093-021-35, 093-100-15, 093-021-37, 093-021-36, 093-090-05, 093-021-34, 093-100-14, 093-021-45,

093-021-73, 093-021-41, 093-021-42, 093-021-43, 093-021-49, 093-240-32, 093-240-14, 093-240-33, 093-100-17, 093-240-23, 093-100-16, 093-021-44, 093-240-34, 093-240-38, 093-240-22, 093-100-24, 093-240-13, 093-240-36, 093-240-20, 093-240-12, 093-240-21, 093-240-35, 093-021-46, 093-240-11, 093-021-47, 093-100-19, 093-240-07, 093-240-09, 093-240-05, 093-240-06, 093-240-10, 093-021-48, 093-240-37, 093-240-31, 093-240-30, 093-240-08, 093-240-28, 093-240-29, 093-220-28, 093-230-18, 093-310-01, 093-230-09, 093-021-54, 093-021-55, 093-230-17, 093-021-56, 093-021-72, 093-021-51, 093-021-71, 093-230-10, 093-021-52, 093-230-15, 093-230-28, 093-230-29, 093-230-23, 093-230-20, 093-230-22, 093-220-27, 093-021-53, 093-021-57, 093-021-62, 093-021-63, 093-021-64, 093-040-01, 093-250-22, 093-040-19, 093-040-39, 093-250-23, 079-010-77

XI. LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

- AB 443 (Gagliani) – Apple Pests: Pest & disease prevention – Referred to Senate Appropriations
- AB 580 (Huber) – Onsite sewage treatment systems – Stuck in Assembly Appropriations
- AB 905 (Assembly Ag Committee) – 200# exemption for produce – In Senate Food & Ag Committee
- SB 715 (Wolk) – Agricultural Lands: Williamson Act – In Assembly Ag but first hearing canceled by the author.

XII. CORRESPONDENCE

- None

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Bill Draper gave an update on Assembly Bill 1066 – Forest practices; Timber Harvesting Plan. The bill was heard on July 6, 2009 in the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water and was substantially amended.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

- The meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

APPROVED: Greg Boeger, Chair

Date: August 12, 2009