



Plan Alternatives Comparison Chart

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				4.5.3 Goals		
A	B	C		AG-G1. Agricultural Production. Economically viable agricultural operations contributing to the growth and stability of the economy and a strong market demand for agricultural lands dedicated to agricultural production.	SUPPORT	R
				COMMENTS:		
	B			AG-G2. Conservation of Agricultural Lands. To conserve agricultural land for continued agricultural use and maintain the maximum amount of land in parcel sizes that will sustain economically feasible agricultural operations.		D
				COMMENTS:		
A				AG-G2. Preservation of Agricultural Lands. Agricultural land preserved to the maximum extent possible for continued agricultural use in parcel sizes that support economically feasible agricultural operations.	SUPPORT as Modified	M
				COMMENTS: The Farm Bureau supports continuation of policies that seek to keep Agriculturally Zoned lands in the LARGEST existing or voluntary merged parcel sizes within the current Framework Plan.		

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)



With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative			Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
		C	AG-G2. Conservation of Agricultural Lands. Agricultural land conserved for continued agricultural use unless conversion to residential uses is found in the public interest.		D
			COMMENTS:		
		D	2522 The optimum amount of agricultural land shall be conserved for and maintained in agricultural use to promote and increase Humboldt County's agricultural production.		D
			4.5.3 Policies		
A	B		AG-P1. Planned Rural Development. The County shall provide a Planned Rural Development (PRD) Program for lands designated Agricultural Grazing (AG) and Ranchland (AGR) that allows the property owner to voluntary cluster the home sites at a density above what would otherwise be allowed when lands most suitable for agricultural production are retained for permanent continued production. To qualify, identified home site parcels must be clustered to avoid increasing use conflicts and not be in conflict with any applicable conservation plan. Right-to-Farm agreements shall be secured on lands proposed for conversion to residential uses. The remaining lands most suitable for continued agricultural production shall be retained solely for permanent production.	QJ, Leg, Prog AG-S4, AG-IM1   SUPPORT only as MODIFIED See Comments	M
			COMMENTS: We support the voluntary clustering in agricultural lands however; we DO NOT support the proposed density bonuses. Farm Bureau and the Cattlemen believe that plan designations and zoning of agricultural and other resource lands should be based upon the location, soil characteristics and productivity of those lands but should NOT be based on ownership. Therefore we do not support the AGR and TI land use designations and ask they be dropped from the GPU discussion. MS 12-10-09 – The Commission discussed the removal of the language referencing the density bonus for cluster development. It was requested that this language be re-reviewed after the Commission deliberates on AG-S1. The commission wanted to hear from the Farm Bureau on the reasoning for the deletion of the Ranchlands designation and		

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and strikeout (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)


With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p>why no additional density bonuses for clustering.</p> <p>Regarding the deletion of the Ranchland designation, Farm Bureau and the Cattlemen believe that plan designations and zoning of agricultural and other resource lands should be based upon the location, soil characteristics and productivity of those lands but should NOT be based on ownership. Therefore we do not support the AGR and TI land use designations and ask they be dropped from the GPU discussion.</p>		
A	B			<p>AG-P2. Support Voluntary Purchase of Development Rights. The County shall support the voluntary purchase of development rights to provide income to farm operations and limit the intrusion of residential development into agricultural lands.</p>	<p>Recommend re-wording for clarity. Iss, Prog AG-IM2  Support See Comments</p>	M
				<p>COMMENTS: The County should support the continuation and extension of the Williamson Act Program. We do not support the establishment of an explicit county funded program that promotes the establishment of conservation easements and transfer/purchase of development rights which would be paid for by tax dollars.</p>		
A	B	C		<p>AG-P3. Support the Williamson Act Property Tax Incentive Program. The County shall support the continuation, enhancement and growth of the County Williamson Act program.</p>	<p>Iss, Prog AG-IM6  SUPPORT</p>	R
				<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B	C		<p>AG-P4. Supplemental Farm Income. The County shall support activities compatible with agriculture that enhance the viability of agricultural operations such as cottage industries, farm homestays, sale of farm products and visitor services and accommodations.</p>	<p>Leg, QJ, Prog AG-IM3 SUPPORT</p>	R

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				COMMENTS:		
	B			<p>AG-P5. Conservation of Agricultural Lands. Agricultural lands shall be conserved and conflicts minimized between agricultural and non-agricultural uses through all of the following:</p> <p>A. By establishing stable zoning boundaries and buffer areas that separate urban and rural areas to minimize land use conflicts.</p> <p>B. By promoting in-filling to achieve a more logical urban/agricultural boundary.</p> <p>C. By developing available lands not suited for agriculture, or those located within Urban Development Areas, prior to the conversion of agricultural lands outside of these areas.</p> <p>D. By assuring that public service facility expansions and non-agricultural development do not inhibit agricultural viability, either through increased assessment costs or degraded air or water quality.</p> <p>E. By increasing the effectiveness of the Williamson Act Program.</p> <p>F. By not allowing residential subdivision of lands planned Agricultural Exclusive (AE).</p> <p>G. By allowing lot line adjustments for agriculturally designated lands only where planned densities are met and there is no resulting increases in the number of building sites.</p>	<p>Leg, QJ, Prog AG-IM6, AG-S5, AG-S6</p>  <p>Recommend re-wording "A" to include stable "plan" boundaries for clarity.</p>	D
				COMMENTS:		
	A			<p>AG-P5. Conservation of Agricultural Lands. Agricultural lands shall be conserved and conflicts minimized between agricultural and non-agricultural uses through all of the following:</p>	<p>SUPPORT AS MODIFIED</p>	M

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and strikeout (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative	Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>A. By establishing stable zoning boundaries and buffer areas <u>on the properties proposed for development provided by the developing party</u> that separate urban and rural areas to minimize land use conflicts.</p> <p>B. By establishing stable Urban Development, Urban Expansion and Community Planning Areas and promoting residential in-filling of Urban Development Areas with phased urban expansion within Community Planning Areas.</p> <p>C. By developing lands within Urban Development Areas, prior to the conversion of agricultural resource production lands (AE, AG, AGR) within Urban Expansion Areas.</p> <p>D. By not allowing the conversion of agricultural resource production lands (AE, AG, AGR) to other land use designations outside of Urban Expansion Areas.</p> <p>E. By assuring that public service facility expansions and non-agricultural development do not inhibit agricultural viability, either through increased assessment costs, degradation of the environment, land fragmentation or conflicts in use.</p> <p>F. By increasing the effectiveness of the Williamson Act Program.</p> <p>G. By only allowing subdivision of lands planned Ranchlands (AGR) and Agricultural Exclusive (AE) to preserve historical structures and/or protect sensitive habitats.</p> <p>H. By allowing lot-line adjustments for agriculturally designated lands only where planned densities are met and there is no resulting increase in the number of building sites. <u>(Not withstanding clustering concepts endorsed in other policies).</u></p>		
	<p>COMMENTS: PC wants to know why the Farm Bureau wanted section G deleted from this policy.</p>		

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and strikeout (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)


With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p>Staff recommended that G be retained because standards AG-S5 and S6 are based on it. Staff suggests that G be changed to:</p> <p>By allowing historical structures and/or sensitive habitats be split off from agricultural lands where it acts to conserve working lands and structure.</p> <p>Group recommends the following for the wording of G: By allowing registered or designated historical structures be split off from agricultural lands where it acts to conserve historical structures while maintaining the balance in working lands.</p>		
		C	D	<p>2523.1 Agricultural lands shall be conserved and conflicts minimized between agricultural and non-agricultural uses through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. By formulation of logical boundaries separating urban and rural areas and when necessary, buffer areas to minimize land use conflicts. B. By focusing future conversions in areas where land use conflicts would not threaten the viability of existing agriculture. C. By promoting in-filling to achieve a more logical urban/agricultural boundary. D. By allowing development of uneconomical or marginally viable agricultural lands, or agricultural lands already severely limited by conflicts with urban uses to limit the market pressures for conversion of more productive lands. E. By assuring that public service facility expansions and non-agricultural development do not inhibit agricultural viability through degraded water supplies, access systems, air quality, and other relevant considerations, such as increased assessment costs. F. By broadening the utility of agricultural preserves and the Williamson Act Program to accommodate and encourage intensively managed farms. 		D
		C	D	<p>2723.5 Lot line adjustments of AG lands may be approved without regard to the</p>	Standards 3 and 4	D

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)


With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				standards of 3 and 4 of this section in order to consolidate by merger logical management units. Such adjustments shall be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Plan and shall not result in a net reduction of the area of land available for agricultural management.	are Density Ranges and Subdivision Findings in FRMWK Plan Section 2723	
A	B			AG-P6. No Net Loss of Prime Agricultural Lands. The permanent conversion of prime agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses shall be accompanied by mitigation to less than significant effects with mitigated to less than significant effects offsetting protections of agricultural land so there is no net loss of agricultural land.	Wording modified to achieve consistency with <i>Friends of the Kangaroo Rat v. California Department of Corrections.</i> Leg, QJ, AG-IM4 SUPPORT as Modified 	R
				COMMENTS: This policy should be for all Agricultural Lands not just PRIME, and 100% Replacement of the loss should be sought and not just an easement on a remainder portion of the property. Historically, the number one conversion of Ag Lands has been Public or Private Non-Profit Agencies and they should be required to replace the agricultural lands lost. MS – 01-14-10 – The Commission requested additional revisions to the proposed wording for AG-P6. There was concern over the meaning of “permanent” conversion of ag land and “high value” ag land. These terms were requested to be removed as they can have multiple interpretations. The Commission also recommended that the proposed offsetting mitigation language described in subsection B, not be limited to only “residential” zoning district, but more inclusive to other, non agricultural zoning districts. Finally, there was discussion that because this policy is titled “no net loss”, there should be some language		

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p>within the policy that would require this.</p> <p>Note to Planning Commissioners: No net loss only applies outside of the Urban Development Areas.</p>		
		C		<p>AG-P6. Conversion of Agricultural Lands. The conversion of agricultural land to residential uses should only be considered where continued agricultural production is not economically feasible and proposed development is consistent with rural subdivision standards.</p>		D
				<p>COMMENTS:</p>		D
			D	<p>2523.10 The conversion of agricultural land should only be considered where continued agricultural production is not economically feasible and proposed development is consistent with Remote Rural Development Section 2550.</p>		D
			D	<p>2523.2 The conversion of economically viable agricultural lands shall be monitored and reported annually. (Our Comments are in the Standards)</p>		D
			D	<p>2523.3 In-filling shall be encouraged for all development.</p>		D
A	B			<p>AG-P7. Agricultural Production in Conservation Areas. The County shall support continued agricultural production on lands placed into conservation easements or acquired by public agencies for conservation purposes. Enforceable provisions contained in terms of sale, deeds and conservation easements shall which require continued management for agricultural production. can be considered mitigation of agricultural land conversion impacts.</p>	<p>Iss, QJ, Leg</p>  <p>SUPPORT as MODIFIED</p>	M
				<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A	B	C		<p>AG-P8. Right to Farm or Harvest. The County shall utilize the "Right-to-Farm or Harvest"</p>	QJ, Min	R

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)


With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				Ordinance to provide constructive notice about the nature of agricultural activities to residents living adjacent to farm operations.	SUPPORT as Modified	
				COMMENTS:		
	B	C		AG-P9. Predator Control. Support predator control programs that comply with federal, state and local laws in order to reduce livestock depredation. and other agricultural production losses	Iss SUPPORT as MODIFIED	M
				COMMENTS:		
			D	2523.5 The County shall support predator control programs to reduce livestock depredation.		D
	B	C		AG-P10. Support Land Trusts. Support private non-profit land trusts that provide agricultural conservation programs in Humboldt County.	Prog, AG-IM2 SUPPORT	R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		AG-P11. Support Vegetative Management Programs. Support vegetation management programs (controlled burning, etc.) when it is found that they improve the availability and quality of rangeland for livestock and wildlife, reduce the hazard of disastrous wildfires, and increase water quality and quantity.	Iss SUPPORT	R
				COMMENTS:		
			D	2523.6 Vegetation management programs (controlled burning, etc.) shall be supported where they improve the availability and quality of rangeland for livestock and wildlife,		D

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)


With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative		Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
		reduce the hazard of disastrous wildfires and increase water quality and quantity.		
A	B	AG-P12. Advice from Organizations in the Agricultural Community. Seek advice from the various agricultural organizations in the community for any future evaluation of land areas needed for urban development or for any consideration of requests by Humboldt's Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) to change spheres of influence or urban service boundaries next to or near agricultural lands.	Iss, Leg, Prog SUPPORT as Modified	R
		COMMENTS:		
		D 2523.8 The County Planning Department and Board of Supervisors will request the Local Agency Formation Commission to utilize the County's General Plan in advising the County on the appropriate level of services to be provided in the County's unincorporated areas.		R
		D 2523.7 Areas with General Plan designations of Agriculture Exclusive should not be annexed to cities or service districts providing sewer service unless it is in the public interest.		R
A	B	AG-P13. Agricultural Zoning and Parcel Size. Utilize Agricultural Exclusive (AE), and Agricultural Grazing (AG), and Ranchland (AGR) land use classifications to ensure appropriate parcel sizes and land use for continuing availability of the necessary agricultural land base. Note: This title should be "Designations" not "Zoning"	Recommend re-wording for clarity. Leg, QJ  SUPPORT w/M	M
		COMMENTS Farm Bureau and the Cattlemen believe that plan designations and zoning of agricultural and other resource lands should be based upon the location, soil characteristics and productivity of those lands but should NOT be based on ownership. Therefore we do not support the AGR and TI land use designations and ask they be dropped from the GPU discussion. PC wants clarification from the Farm Bureau on the recommendation for deletion of the Ranchland (AGR) designation. MS Regarding the deletion of the Ranchland designation, the group believes that land use	SIDE NOTE: There is a need to clarify development of land with Split Zoning.	

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p>designations should be based on the use not the ownership. The Ranchland designation is based solely on ownership – not land use.</p> <p>Side note: There is a need for a policy regarding parcels that have mixed designations.</p>		
			D	<p>2523.4 Prime agricultural land should be retained in parcel sizes large enough to provide for an economic management base.</p>		D
		C	D	<p>2523.9 Agricultural production requiring smaller parcels and more intensive management, including aquaculture shall be encouraged wherever feasible consistent with the Remote Rural Development Section 2550 and other policies of this section.</p>		D
A	B	C		<p>AG-P14. Residential Uses on Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) Lands within Agricultural Preserves. Residential uses on TPZ lands within agricultural preserves shall be consistent with the requirements of the Williamson Act and local Williamson Act Guidelines.</p>	<p>Min, QJ  SUPPORT</p>	R
				<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
A				<p>AG-Px. Compliance with Regulations. The County shall prevent agricultural land conversion, loss of agricultural productivity and conflicts from un-permitted development.</p>	<p>Prog, AG-IM8</p>	D
				<p>COMMENTS: PC wants to know why the Farm Bureau wanted this policy deleted.</p> <p>MS – 1-14-10: The Commission requested that this policy be modified and to be included in the proposed plan alternative. The proposed revision is as follows:</p> <p>AG-Px. Compliance with Regulations. The County shall prevent agricultural land conversion, loss of agricultural productivity and establish a comprehensive compliance program to address <u>prioritize enforcement of</u> conflicts from un-permitted development that conflicts with agriculture.</p> <p>Since the first two items are already covered in other areas this seems redundant. However, the group recommends changes shown in red underline. Rather than a</p>		

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				complaint driven program, a more comprehensive program is needed.		
A				<p>AG-Pxx. Protect Productive Agricultural Soils. Development on lands planned for agriculture (AE, AG, AGR) shall avoid the placement of buildings, impermeable surfaces or non-agricultural uses on soils classified by the NRCS as Prime Farmland soils or Farmland soils of Statewide Importance to the maximum extent feasible.</p> <p>The group recommends the following wording for this policy if retained: Development on lands planned for agriculture (AE and AG) shall avoid to the maximum extent feasible, the placement of buildings, impermeable surfaces or non-agricultural land as defined in section 51201(c) 1-5 of the California Public Resources Code.</p>		D
				<p>COMMENTS: PC wants to know why the Farm Bureau wanted this policy deleted.</p> <p>The group had originally recommended that this section be deleted because there are no soil designations of these types in the County. If retained, change as shown above.</p>		
A				<p>AG-Pxxx. Substandard Legal Parcels. Parcels not originally created for residential purposes will not be recognized for residential development on lands planned for agricultural.</p>	SUPPORT	R
				<p>COMMENTS: For example, a spring which has a separate parcel is not recognized for development into a larger parcel size for development. This explanation needs to be expanded to clarify.</p> <p>There is a significant need to expand this section to address legal parcels that are less than minimum parcels size established by the zone.</p>		
		C		<p>AG-Pxxxx. Second Dwellings. Two single-family dwelling units and normal accessory uses and structures for owner and caretaker on agricultural lands may be permitted regardless of density standards. The second dwelling unit shall require a use permit and shall be conditioned so as to not constitute a subdivision of the parcel. Minor conversion of resource lands for residential use is limited to an area 5% of the total parcel, or a maximum</p>		D

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				area of one acre for a homesite and appurtenant uses.		
				2523.11 Affirm and support the public services provided by County Government which are necessary in maintaining a viable agricultural products industry.		D
				4.5.4 Standards		
	B	C		<p>AG-S1. Subdivision of Planned Agricultural Exclusive (AE) Lands. No further subdivision of lands planned AE except as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">STANDARDS TO THE EXCEPTIONS TO THE SUBDIVISION PROHIBITION</p> <p>1. Within areas designated AE, no agricultural land division will be approved whereby any parcel thusly created will be less than 60 acres, However, divisions except a division of these lands to a minimum size of 20 acres may be approved if the Planning Commission finds that the division is necessary for a specific agricultural purpose (e.g. to provide for a family member) (e.g., to provide for a separate starter farm for a family member), and the division will not adversely affect the area's agricultural economy or environmental resources. The rezoning and parcel map may be approved only upon satisfaction of all of the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Conveyance of a permanent agricultural easement to the County of Humboldt or other public entity or private non-profit corporation having as its chief goal the preservation of agricultural or open space lands. B. Conveyance of development rights beyond those necessary for agricultural purposes. C. Recorded acknowledgement that, although the new parcel is of a size below that considered a viable economic agricultural unit, its creation was approved for a specific agricultural purpose, and no further division or other conversion from agricultural use, except to other open space or habitat restoration use, will be allowed in the future even if agricultural use of such separate parcel does not provide adequate economic return. <p>2. The subdivision is necessary for the protection of historic structures or cultural resources or to mitigate impacts from acquisitions by public agencies.</p>	SUPPORT AS MODIFIED	M

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative	Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>COMMENTS: PC wants comments from Farm Bureau.</p> <p>MS 1-20-10: There was confusion with both the Commission and staff regarding how this standard would be implemented. Does the conveyance of a conservation easement in subsection A apply only to the remainder? What are development rights being conveyed in subsection B (all residential rights or only those beyond what would be allowed for the subdivision)? And how many times can a family subdivide using this standard? The commission requested clarifying language for this standard to answer these questions.</p> <p>As background information, this standard was designed after a policy found in the Coastal Plans for division of lands planned AE. The coastal policy included the provisions for a “starter” farm to 20 acres when there was an execution of an agricultural preserve contract and a similar acknowledgement that is found in subsection C above. Staff determined that entry into the Williamson Act was not an effective agricultural protection measure because often the family members just wanted the subdivision with no intention of farming and then the County had an enforcement problem with the Williamson Act contract provisions. The design of this standard was a “takeoff” of the coastal policy that allowed for smaller family farms but provided a little more regulatory “teeth”. Proposed wording revisions could include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Clarification on how many times you can utilize this standard (one time for one family member only?) 2) Clarification on what the CE is for – remainder only – entire farm, open space okay or only agriculture? 3) Clarify conveyance of development rights – one house per legal parcel or no additional houses on the remainder? Convey development rights on second units? 4) As an FYI – the McKinleyville Plan prohibits subdivision of AE lands. 		
A	<p>AG-S1. Subdivision of Ranchlands (AGR) and Agricultural Exclusive (AE) Lands. No further subdivision of lands planned AGR and AE unless the subdivision is necessary for the</p>		D

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				protection of cultural resources or to mitigate impacts of public acquisition.		
				COMMENTS:		
	B		D	<p>2722.3 Minimum Parcel Size: BUILDING SITES Sixty (60) acres minimum parcel size, except that divisions to 20 acres may be permitted where the parcel is subject to an agricultural preserve contract or agreement. Sixty (60) acres minimum parcel size, except that divisions to 20 acres may be permitted where the parcel is subject to an agricultural preserve contract or agreement. The total number of building sites shall not exceed a density of one dwelling unit per 20 acres. A use permit or special permit shall be required where a density of more than one dwelling unit per parcel is sought, except that 40 acres or larger agriculture parcels zoned Agriculture Exclusive (AE) will be allowed two single family farm dwellings as a principal use. Total homesite coverage shall not exceed two acres for both dwellings and accessory structures. (Res. 89-106, 6- 27-89).</p>	SUPPORT RETENTION WITH A DIFFERENT NAME	M
	B	C	D	<p>AG-S2. Agricultural Grazing (AG) Land. Parcels designated AG will may be zoned to maintain practical and useful units for Cattle grazing and other commercial agricultural uses. as small as 40 acres in size, where the In the AG areas, we recommend a minimum parcel size of 160 acres. The protection of agricultural operations will be ensured, maintained or enhanced based upon the ability to make all of the following findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The parcel size shall not inhibit the use of the property for commercial agricultural operations; and B. The parcel size shall not inhibit economically viable agricultural and timber production on adjoining lands; and C. Uses and parcel sizes in the adjoining area are compatible; and D. The parcel size is consistent with a comprehensive view of all relevant plan policies; and E. Each parcel has frontage on an existing publicly maintained road; and F. All such zoning is within 1/4 mile of an existing maintained public road. G. In the AG areas, we recommend a minimum parcel size of 160 acres. 	SUPPORT AS MODIFIED	M
				COMMENTS:		
A	B			AG-S3 Subdivision of Planned Agricultural Grazing Lands. Subdivision to the minimum	Recommend	M

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative	Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>parcel size allowed in the zone may be permitted based on the findings that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The subdivision does not reduce the property to parcels less than 160 acres and will result in significant production improvements through intensive management for the commercial growing of crops and animals; and B. The subdivision shall not inhibit the use of the property for agricultural operations. In making this determination the County shall use the County's Williamson Resolution entry requirements as a guide in conjunction with advice from the agricultural community; and C. The subdivision shall not inhibit economically viable agricultural agriculture and timber production on adjoining lands; and D. Adequate access, water and geologic stability can be demonstrated for the proposed use and the land division meets all other regulatory requirements; and E. On each parcel the residential site is located, to the fullest practical extent, in areas of lowest productivity; and Building Sites shall be clustered adjacent to existing development areas or on portions of land least suited for agricultural use with the least adverse effects on the environment. F. Access to the remainder is consistent with the uses of the remaining property; and G. All applicable subdivision policies of the Rural Lands can be met. 	<p>re-wording for clarity.</p> <p>SUPPORT AS MODIFIED</p>	
	<p>COMMENTS:</p>		
<p>C</p>	<p>AG-S3. Subdivision of Planned Agricultural Grazing (AG) Lands. Subdivision to the minimum parcel size allowed in the zone may be permitted based on the findings that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The subdivision shall not inhibit the use of the property for agricultural operations; and B. The subdivision shall not inhibit economically viable agricultural and timber production on adjoining lands; and C. Adequate access, water, and geologic stability can be demonstrated for the proposed use and the land division meets all other regulatory requirements; and 	<p>Eliminates requirement for "significant production improvement."</p>	<p>D</p>

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				D. On each parcel, the residential site is located, to the fullest practical extent, in areas of the lowest productivity; and E. Access to the remainder is consistent with the uses of the remaining property. F. All applicable subdivision policies of the Rural Lands can be met.		
				COMMENTS:		
			D	2723.4 Subdivision to the minimum parcel size allowed in the zone may be permitted based on the findings that: A. The subdivision will result in significant production improvements through intensive management for the growing of crops and animals; and B. An agricultural economic feasibility plan is approved on the significant production improvements; and C. Adequate access, water and geologic stability can be demonstrated for the proposed use and the land division meets all other regulatory requirements; and D. On each parcel, the residential site is located, to the fullest practical extent, in areas of the lowest productivity; and E. Access to the remainder is consistent with the uses of the remaining property.		D
A	B			AG-S4. Planned Rural Development Program Clustering Incentive Options: Tier 1 Clustering <u>Density Bonus</u> program: <i>Density credit:</i> 2 times 1.1 existing entitlements when at least 95% 90% of subject lands are protected <i>Protection instrument:</i> B7 zoning, Conservation easement or equivalent protection on remainder <i>Rezone homesite parcels:</i> County to conduct re-zone. <u>Building Sites shall be clustered adjacent to existing development areas or on portions of land least suited for agricultural use with the least adverse effects on the environment.</u> Tier 2 clustering program:	Only accept as modified	M

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p>Density credit: 3 times existing entitlements when 95% of subject lands are protected</p> <p>Protection instrument: Permanent conservation easement on remainder</p> <p>Rezone homesite parcels: County to conduct re-zone.</p>		
				<p>COMMENTS: We would like the county to provide a clear definition of the existing entitlements. We support voluntary clustering but NOT the proposed density credits.</p>		
A	B	C		<p>AG-S5. Historical Preservation. An exception to the minimum parcel size for planned agricultural land may be made for the purposes of historic preservation where the following findings are made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. The site or structure qualifies and is included on a local, state or federal historic registry; and, B. The viability of continued agricultural operations is not inhibited, and; C. No additional density beyond what would be permitted as part of the existing agricultural operations is created. 	<p>CURRENTLY IN COASTAL PLAN</p>	R
	B	C		<p>AG-S6. Resource Protection Acquisition Program. The division of planned agricultural lands to create parcels of less than the minimum size may be approved to facilitate the maintenance or replacement of residences, agriculture-related structures, or to protect water supplies and water rights lost in public acquisition only when the County finds that such a division will not adversely affect the area's agricultural economy.</p>	<p>CURRENTLY IN COASTAL PLAN Recommend re-wording for clarity.</p>	R
				<p>COMMENTS:</p>		

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
A				<p>AG-S6. Resource Protection Acquisition Program. Allow land divisions associated with public land acquisitions of lands planned agriculture to less than the minimum size when the division would serve to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) maintain land in agricultural production; or 2) protect existing residences and ag related structures; or, 3) protect existing water rights and existing water supply systems. 	COMBINE AB&C	R
				COMMENTS:		
				4.5.5 Implementation Measures		
A	B			<p>AG-IM1. Develop Planned Rural Development Program. Update the zoning regulations to include provisions for Planned Rural Development (PRD) and implement a program to assist landowners with PRD applications.</p>		D
				COMMENTS:		
	B			<p>AG-IM2. Manage an Agricultural Conservation Program. Seek public and/or grant funding to provide staff support for an on-going agricultural conservation program to support pursue activities associated with the Williamson Act, land conservation efforts of local land trusts and conservation easements. and mitigation of agricultural land conversion.</p>	SUPPORT WITH MODIFICATIONS	M
				COMMENTS: We do not support the establishment of a new county staff position to provide this service – rather another organization could provide this technical assistance.		
A				<p>AG-IM2. Manage an Agricultural Conservation Program. Seek funding and provide staff for an on-going agricultural conservation program to support activities associated with the Williamson Act, land conservation efforts of local land trusts, conservation easements and mitigation of agricultural land conversion. Research and report to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors on the potential for a Transfer of Development</p>	Adds TDR and Carbon Sequestration program research to the	D

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				Rights program and a Carbon Sequestration Agricultural Conservation program to enhance farm income.	agricultural conservation program.	
				COMMENTS:		
A	B	C		AG-IM3. Supplemental Farm Income. Update the zoning regulations to provide for greater flexibility and allowances for cottage industries, farm homestays, sale of farm products and visitor services and accommodations within agricultural lands.	SUPPORT	R
				COMMENTS:		
A	B			AG-IM4. No Net Loss of Prime Agricultural Lands. Provisions for offsetting mitigation offsets prime agricultural land conversion shall be adopted by ordinance. Conversion of Prime Agricultural lands shall be prohibited. (except as noted in AG-S1)	Wording modified to achieve consistency with <i>Friends of the Kangaroo Rat v. California Department of Corrections.</i>	M
				COMMENTS:		
A	B			AG-IM5. Monitor Conversion of Agricultural Lands. Annually monitor the conversion of agricultural land to other uses. If conversions have accelerated over previous historic rates, report to the Board of Supervisors with corrective policy recommendations.	SUPPORT	R
				COMMENTS:		

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative			Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	B	C	AG-IM6. Williamson Act Contracts. Support, promote, and broaden the application of Williamson Act contracts and agricultural preserves.	SUPPORT	R
			COMMENTS:		
A			AG-IM6. Williamson Act Contracts. Support, promote, and broaden the application of Williamson Act contracts and agricultural preserves. Provide monitoring and enforcement to protect agricultural and taxpayer benefits and ensure compliance with state law and local guidelines.	SUPPORT	R
			COMMENTS:		
A	B	C	AG-IM7. Economic Development Assistance. Develop programs within the County's Economic Development Division that assists local producers to promote strong local product identity and enhance economic viability of agricultural operations.	SUPPORT	R
			COMMENTS:		
A			AG-IMx. Compliance with Regulations. The County shall maintain an agricultural protection compliance program to enforce land use and building regulations on lands planned for agriculture (AE, AG, AGR).	SUPPORT w/M	M
			COMMENTS:		
		D	5-2520.1 Annually monitor the conversion of agricultural land to other uses. Prepare a report to be considered as part of an annual General Plan review report. This is in the current General Plan and not followed – a higher priority should be placed on documenting this information in the future.	SUPPORT	R
		D	5-2520.2 The County Planning Department will work in close cooperation with LAFCo to assure that conversions of agricultural lands around the periphery of urban areas will be	SUPPORT	R

With comments from the Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in blue and ~~strikeout~~ (June 2009)

With questions from Planning Commission meetings in green with some clarification from Martha Spencer (MS) (January 2010)

With follow up comments from Farm Bureau and Cattlemen in red (February 2010)

Plan Alternative				Section 4.5 Agricultural Resources	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				consistent with the County General Plan.		
			D	5-2520.3 Support, promote, and broaden the application of Williamson Act contracts and agricultural preserves.	SUPPORT	R
			D	5-2520.4 Utilize the application of zone districts to identify the areas where development is appropriate under Sections 2723.3A.	SUPPORT	R
			D	5-2520.5 Continue the County's participation in predator control programs, including the education of the public.	SUPPORT	R
			D	5-2520.6 Continue to support the U.C. Cooperative Extension Service and the County Agricultural Commissioner.	SUPPORT	R
			D	5-2520.7 Broaden the public input base by maintaining a continuing dialogue with public interest groups, expanding and updating the basic data which guides formulation of policy and implementation	SUPPORT	R
			D	5-2520.8 Establish an agricultural review committee to evaluate and report on the implementation of agriculture policies during the first year after adoption of a revised General Plan. The report shall be included as part of the yearly report on progress to the Board of Supervisors.		D
			D	5-2520.9 The County should adopt a Right to Farm Ordinance in cooperation with the Farm Bureau, Board of Realtors and Forestry Review Committee.	Already Completed	D