



**COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF LONG RANGE PLANNING
MEMORANDUM**

Date: April 6, 2010

To: Board of Supervisors

From: Glenn Russell, Ph.D., Director

Cc: Derek Johnson, Director Long Range Planning
Dianne Black, Director Development Services

Subject: *2010—2011 Annual Work Program & Mid-Year Report for Land Use Planning Projects and Policy Initiatives*

The purpose of this memo is to provide the Board of Supervisors with additional information for consideration when taking action on the Long Range Planning Division's 2010-2011 Work Program. Since docketing, the Work Program has been heard by both the Montecito Planning Commission and the Agricultural Advisory Committee. Furthermore, the Board directed the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) bring back a balanced budget. Subsequent to this direction, the CEO's office requested additional Planning and Development general fund reductions and program restorations resulting in total additional budget reductions of \$831,557. This memo provides information resulting from those three actions.

Based on the revised budget targets and recommendations made by the Montecito Planning Commission and Agricultural Advisory Committee, staff recommends the following:

- A. Receive and file the *2010-2011 Annual Work Program and Mid-Year Report for Land Use Planning Projects and Policy Initiatives*;
- B. Consider recommendations from the County and Montecito Planning Commissions, as well as the Agricultural Advisory Committee;
- C. Direct staff to continue work on current projects, required services, and operations management;
- D. Direct staff to continue efforts and develop appropriate Land Use Development Code amendments to regulate medical marijuana dispensaries and distribution as specified in the work-program;
- E. Direct Energy Division staff to return to the Board with their review of the following projects for eligibility for a General Allocation award from CREF to cover the 2010-2011 costs (\$637,101) for the following projects as specified in the Work Program.

1. Gaviota Coastal Plan
2. Summerland Community Plan Update and Design Guidelines
3. Santa Claus Lane

Additional Budget Reductions

The Work Program was developed under the budget principles adopted by the Board in fall 2009. Those principles included an overall reduction in Departmental budgets of seven percent (7%) and additional funds to cover employee costs (i.e. retirement contributions and healthcare). The staffing levels set forth in the 2010-2011 Work Program met these reduction principles. Following Board budget deliberations in March, the Chief Executive Office requested further revisions to the Planning and Development Department budget which resulted in additional reductions totaling \$831,557. Details of the budget revision request are shown in Table 1. Planning and Development recommends continuing current projects and adding two additional work-program projects through the allocation of Coastal Resources Enhancement Fund (CREF), unallocated designations and mitigation fund interest accounts. While CREF could provide for ongoing funding, the unallocated designations and interest are one time funding sources.

Table 1

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT ADDITIONAL BUDGET REDUCTIONS	
GFC Reduction Request	\$ 680,212
Restore Building and Zoning Enforcement	\$ 151,345
Net Additional GFC Reduction	\$ 831,557

Budget Submittal Background.

In order to achieve the additional General Fund reduction requested by the CEO and to fund the zoning enforcement south and building code enforcement programs requested by the Board of Supervisors, the Department submitted a revised budget to use all of the potentially available General Allocation CREF funds for this year as well as the use of current unallocated designations and interest from a number of mitigation funds, including Torch Natural Resource Damage Assessment fund (with a remaining principle of \$244,511, which staff recommends be retained for coastal acquisitions and mitigation projects), the Hyatt hostel mitigation interest, and interest from a number of other mitigation funds. The sources and interest accruals of funds are outlined in Table 2. The total designation and interest balance available (\$956,774) exceeds the GFC reduction request (\$831,557) by \$125,217.

Table 2

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FUNDING SOURCES	
CREF General Allocation	\$637,101
Torch Interest	\$75,441
Mitigation Funds Interest	\$85,000
Hyatt Youth Hostel Interest	\$37,420
Unallocated Designation	\$121,812
Total Designation & Interest Balance	\$ 956,774

The Board of Supervisors will be considering a separate Board item on April 6, *Options for Allocating Coastal Resource Enhancement Fund (CREF) Grant in the 2010 Cycle*. In order to achieve the General Fund reductions in the Long Range Planning Work Program and fund the program as recommended in the revised recommendations, the Board of Supervisors would need to take the following actions relative to the CREF agenda item:

- A. Conduct a targeted solicitation of Planning and Development Long Range Planning projects for CREF funding in 2010; and,
- B. Allocate no funds from the 2010 CREF fees to acquisitions;
- C. Direct staff to evaluate the LRP projects for eligibility and return to the Board of Supervisors for consideration of CREF awards.

These actions would provide the necessary funds for those Long Range Planning Work Program items that staff believes are projects eligible for CREF funding. These actions would limit funds available for acquisition projects to the current acquisition balance of \$378,076. No additional action is required by the Board of Supervisors prior to the budget hearings related to the use of designations and earned interest.

Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Projects & Programs.

Based on the additional reductions, the Department recommends only two new projects be initiated for next fiscal year; development of an ordinance to regulate Medical Marijuana dispensaries and a master planning effort for Santa Claus Lane. In follow up to the Board's action on February 26, 2010 to adopt an urgency ordinance prohibiting issuance of any new dispensary licenses, this Work Program item will develop the necessary permanent ordinance to regulate medical marijuana facilities. Staff developed budgets for the medical marijuana regulations and the Santa Claus Lane projects which will utilize 0.56 and 0.83 FTE, respectively, for a total staffing allocation of 1.39 FTE for new projects.

Given the severe budget constraints, staff is not recommending any of the other potential projects in the Long Range Planning Work Program or the Telecommunications Ordinance Amendments requested by the Board of Supervisors early in 2010. The emergence of the additional general fund reductions also means that, with the exception of the Medical Marijuana Ordinance, Long Range Planning will not begin work on the projects recommended by the County and Montecito

Planning Commissions, or the Agricultural Advisory Committee. In addition, if the Agricultural Planner position is cut, work on the agricultural buffer policy will be suspended.

CREF Funding.

Staff recommends the utilization of Coastal Resources Enhancement Fund (CREF) monies to fund work efforts for the following projects: 1) Gaviota Coast Plan; 2) Summerland Design Guidelines and Community Plan update; and 3) Santa Claus Lane. Projects eligible to be awarded CREF monies must advance one or more of the following:

1. Coastal land acquisition for public use/preservation;
2. Coastal restoration or habitat protection;
3. Coastal tourism or recreation; and
4. Coastal quality of life.

The Gaviota Coast Plan will develop new policies, tools, and priorities to update coastal policies currently governing the area that are more than 20 years old and do not address current issues and trends. This area of rich biodiversity and unparalleled scenic beauty has experienced increasing pressures to shift from agricultural production to large estate home development. Current policies and standards are not adequate to fairly evaluate and mitigate visual impacts or limits of disturbance.

A number of legal and regulatory hurdles hamper the ability of agricultural operators to practice good stewardship of their lands, to house employees or extended family members on-site, to provide for their heirs to continue agricultural operations in the future, and dissuade property owners from allowing public access to their lands. The Gaviota Coast Plan will develop the tools and programs to assist agriculturalists to improve the economic and environmental health of their operations, develop local tools to assist with estate planning, and determine conditions under which willing property owners would allow uses such as public trails.

CREF monies would also be used to complete the remaining tasks necessary for the Summerland Community Plan Update and Design Guidelines. Those remaining tasks consist of completion of environmental review, adoption hearings, and California Coastal Commission certification. Significant resources have already been spent to complete this project and it is approximately 75% complete. Once adopted, the Community Plan update would establish new policies for roadway encroachments which have resulted in parking nuisances, improve future conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists, and include protections for night sky light pollution. The new design guidelines would give clear guidance to architects, residents, and project proponents and significantly address the visual and aesthetic impacts related to coastal development.

Finally, Santa Claus Lane has been a potential project in the Long Range Planning Work Program since Fiscal Year 2008-2009. The proposed work effort will assist Public Works and Parks Department staff in developing a cohesive plan for three principle components of capital improvements; 1) safe rail crossing for beach access, 2) provision of beach and commercial area parking, and 3) improved safety and streetscape design for the commercial area. The project scope will include development of a phasing plan and a funding analysis which will guide prioritization of capital improvement spending and grant opportunities. The effort will better

position the County to take advantage of real property acquisition opportunities and “shovel ready” grant monies.

Table 3 reflects the estimated costs to fund these projects into Fiscal Year 2010-2011 through Fiscal Year 2013-2014. Gaviota and Summerland are multi-year projects; CREF funding may be required in future years to complete these projects if General Fund monies are not available. The Summerland work effort, however, is expected to be significantly completed by the end of Fiscal Year 2010-2011, with only Coastal Commission certification and implementation to carry over into Fiscal Year 2011-2012. Santa Claus Lane is a multi-year planning, design and construction project; however, the master planning efforts of Long Range Planning are expected to be completed within twelve months.

Table 3

PROJECT	FY 2010-2011 BUDGET	FY 2011-2012 BUDGET	FY 2012-2013 BUDGET	FY 2013-2014 BUDGET	CREF REQUEST
Gaviota Coast Plan	\$ 295,710	\$ 299,200	\$ 189,686	\$ 90,000	\$ 874,596
Summerland Design Guidelines & Community Plan Update	\$ 73,791	\$ 16,632	-0-	-0-	\$ 90,423
Santa Claus Lane	\$ 267,600	-0-	-0-	-0-	\$ 267,600
Totals:	\$ 637,101	\$ 315,832	\$ 189,686	\$ 90,000	\$ 1,232,619

If the Board chooses to adopt staff’s recommendation to continue work on current projects, required services and operations management, and initiate two new projects for with the alternative funding recommendations, the Department will achieve the additional cuts required to address to the County’s budget shortfall and will only require the reduction of 0.5 FTE.

Should the Board not want to commit CREF funds to offset the additional reduction in general fund revenues, further cuts would be necessary. In order to restore the zoning and building code enforcement personnel as requested, unallocated designations and mitigation interest fund proceeds are required to cover these costs. Table 4 is a listing of current Long Range Planning projects which has been ordered from highest to lowest priority with the highest priority projects being those staff believes are most important to retain. The ranking was established based on: 1) whether the project is mandatory or not; 2) the potential to provide economic benefit to the County; 3) the project’s necessity to address urgent issues or conditions; and, 4) the amount of County resources already spent on the effort.

A number of current Long Range Planning projects are required by state law and staff does not recommend that they be eliminated. These include the 2009-2014 Housing Element Implementation Programs, the Seismic Safety and Safety Element, SB 375 Planning as a means to inform the Climate Action Strategy.

Table 4

SIGNIFICANCE RANKING OF CURRENT LONG RANGE PLANNING PROJECTS				
RANKING	PROJECT	% COMPLETE	2010/2011 FTE	2010/2011 BUDGET
1	Housing Element Implementation Programs	0%	1.33	\$172,800
2	Seismic Safety & Safety Element	80%	0.06	\$7,200
3	SB 375/RHNA Pre-Planning	0%	0.75	\$97,200
4	Climate Action Strategy	25%	1.28	\$171,790
5	UCSB LRDP Review	n/a	0.34	\$83,004
6	Isla Vista Master Plan CCC Certification	15%	0.01	\$7,800
7	Los Alamos Community Plan Update	90%	0.09	\$11,736
8	Goleta Community Plan Update	50%	1.05	\$178,846
9	Mission Canyon Community Plan	85%	0.50	\$72,291
10	Mission Canyon Parking Strategy	82%	0.01	\$1,850
11	Summerland Design Guidelines & CP Update	75%	0.42	\$73,791
12	Montecito Growth Management Ordinance	45%	0.19	\$28,368
13	Gaviota Coast Plan	12%	2.07	\$295,710
14	County-wide Annexation Guidelines	30%	0.01	\$1,440
15	Santa Ynez Transportation Improvement Plan	0%	0.36	\$69,545

Should the Board concur with the CEO’s recommendation for further reductions, and decide not to allocate CREF funds, projects 8-15 would need to be suspended. In addition, should the Board decide not to use unallocated designations and mitigation interest fund proceeds to offset additional reductions, projects 5-7 would also need to be suspended. The elimination of these projects would result in the reduction of approximately 5.0 FTE, for a total reduction of 5.5 FTE from Long Range Planning’s budget for 2010-2011 fiscal year.

Commission/Committee Actions

Montecito Planning Commission. The Montecito Planning Commission received a report on the Work Program on February 24, 2010. At that meeting, a representative of the Montecito Association observed that the project scope set for the Montecito Design Guidelines was broader than the work they believe will be necessary. Staff proposed a slightly narrowed scope of effort with a resulting lowered budget. The FTE and budget reflected in the unbound sheets attached hereto reflect the revised numbers. The Montecito Planning Commission then made the following recommendations for new projects:

1. Montecito Design Guidelines (0.58 FTE, *revised*); and,
2. Lighting Standards and Regulations (0.44 FTE)

They wished to also express the need for a Post-Disaster Reconstruction Plan for the Montecito Community Plan area.

The action letter from this hearing is attached hereto as Attachment 1. The project detail sheet reflecting the reduced scope and budget is included as Attachment 2. The reduction in scope affected the total FTE needed for short-term projects, so a revised Table 2 is also included as Attachment 3.

Agricultural Advisory Committee. The Agricultural Advisory Committee received a report on the Work Program on March 2, 2010, discussed potential new projects and requested the following information be communicated to the Board for consideration:

1. Transfer of Development Rights (Mid Term Project #10) is a higher priority than the Visitor-Serving Uses on Agricultural Properties (Short-Term Project #5); and,
2. Visitor-Serving Uses on Agricultural Properties project should be re-defined to, “An Expansion of Visitor-Serving Uses on Agricultural Properties Which Benefit Agriculturally-Zoned Lands”.

The action minutes from this meeting are attached hereto as Attachment 4.

GR/dj/vp

Attachments

1. Montecito Planning Commission Action Letter of February 24, 2010.
2. Work Program Project Detail Sheet – Montecito Design Guidelines & Development Standards (*revised*)
3. Work Program Table 2 Potential New Projects (*revised*)
4. Agricultural Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes of March 2, 2010.

Attachment 1

**Montecito Planning Commission Action Letter
(of February 24, 2010)**



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
CALIFORNIA

MONTECITO PLANNING COMMISSION

COUNTY ENGINEERING BUILDING
123 E. ANAPAMU STREET
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA 93101-2058
PHONE: (805) 568-2000
FAX: (805) 568-2030

TO THE HONORABLE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA

MONTECITO PLANNING COMMISSION
HEARING OF FEBRUARY 24, 2010

RE: 2010-2011 Annual Work Program For Land Use Planning Projects and Policy Initiatives

Hearing on the request of the Office of Long Range Planning to receive and review the *2010-2011 Annual Work Program and Mid-Year Report for Land Use Planning Projects and Policy Initiatives* and direct staff to forward any comments to the Board of Supervisors.

Dear Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors:

At the Montecito Planning Commission hearing of February 24, 2010, Commissioner Phillips moved, seconded by Commissioner Gottsdanker and carried by a vote of 5 to 0 to:

1. Receive and review the *2010-2011 Annual Work Program and Mid-year Report for Land Use Planning Projects and Policy Initiatives*.
2. Direct staff to forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to continue work on current projects, required services and operations management, to assign approximately 1.02 FTE to work on potential new projects #3 and #9 listed in Table 2 of the 2010-2011 Annual Work Program, and to express that there is a need for a Post-Disaster Reconstruction Plan for the Montecito Community Plan area.

Sincerely,

Dianne M. Black
Secretary Planning Commission

cc: Planning Commission File
Dianne M. Black, Director Development Review

Attachment 2

Project Detail Sheet
Montecito Design Guidelines & Development Standards
(revised)



**Potential
Project**

Montecito Design Guidelines & Development Standards

Office of Long Range Planning

*Goal: To develop updates to the Montecito Design Guidelines, along with
MLUDC changes appropriate to implement those guidelines*

Background & Description

¶ The Montecito Architectural Guidelines provide guidance to architects, property owners and the Montecito Board of Architectural Review in the design and review of projects within the Montecito Community Plan Area.

¶ These Guidelines were adopted on May 16, 1995 and are currently almost 15 years old. They rely on definitions and zoning regulations contained in the Montecito Land Use Development Code (MLUDC). Experience with the Guidelines has identified several issues areas in the Guidelines and the zoning ordinance, including the height definition, basement definitions and floor area ratio that require revision in order to meet the intent of Montecito Community Plan policies addressing neighborhood compatibility.

¶ The proposed project would involve updating the format and graphics of the Guidelines and revising the Guidelines and MLUDC rules and definitions with respect to height, basements and floor area ratio. Proposed revisions to the MLUDC would include revisions to the height calculation methodology and basement definitions. Within the Montecito Design Guidelines, the floor area definition would be revised to include the basement definitions for purposes of determining allowable house size. Refinement or reconsideration of particular development standards based on the community's experience with the existing Guidelines would also be included in this project.



Budget

ESTIMATED FY 10-11		ESTIMATED FY 11-12		PROJECTED TOTAL	
Consultant & Dept. Support		Consultant & Dept. Support		Consultant & Dept. Support	
FTE	Total	FTE	Total	FTE	Total
0.58	\$81,225	0.58	\$81,225	0.58	\$81,225

Montecito Architectural Guidelines & Development Standards

Task	Dept.		Start Date	Finish Date	Total Cost	Staff Cost	Consultant		LRP FTE
	Staff Hrs	Hrs					Fees	Support	
Project Administration	100		Jul-10	Aug-10	\$7,200	\$7,200			0.06
Workshops	100		Aug-10	Sep-10	\$7,200	\$7,200			0.06
Draft Preparation	160	35	Sep-10	Nov-10	\$14,745	\$14,520		\$2,625	0.09
Photography/Graphics	100		Nov-10	Dec-10	\$7,200	\$7,200			0.06
Ordinance Amendments	80		Dec-10	Jan-11	\$5,760	\$5,760			0.04
Task Force Meetings	40		Jan-11	Feb-11	\$2,880	\$2,880			0.02
MBAR Meeting	70	8	Feb-11	Mar-11	\$5,640	\$5,040		\$600	0.04
MPC Staff Report/Presentations	85		Mar-11	Apr-11	\$6,120	\$6,120			0.05
MPC Hearing	20	4	Apr-11	Apr-11	\$1,740	\$1,440		\$300	0.01
BOS Staff Report/Presentations	85		Apr-11	Apr-11	\$6,120	\$6,120			0.05
BOS Hearing (1)	30	3	Apr-11	May-11	\$2,385	\$2,160		\$225	0.02
Coastal Commission	125		May-11	Jun-11	\$9,000	\$9,000			0.07
Printing	25		Jun-11	Jun-11	\$1,800	\$1,800			0.01
Dev Rev Planner Training	30	25	Jun-11	Jun-11	\$4,035	\$2,160		\$1,875	0.02
Total:	1,050	75	Jul-10	Jun-11	\$81,225	\$75,600	\$0	\$5,625	0.58

Attachment 3

**Work Program Table 2 – Potential New Projects
(revised)**

TABLE 2
LONG RANGE PLANNING
POTENTIAL NEW PROJECTS
SHORT TERM (1 - 2 YEARS)
FISCAL YEAR 2010 - 2011 COSTS

POTENTIAL NEW PROJECTS -- FY 2010 - 2011 COSTS		FTE	Staff Cost	Consultant Cost	Other Dept. Costs	Total Cost
Short Term (1-2 Years)						
1	Santa Ynez Valley Townships Design Guidelines	0.80	\$103,680	\$15,000	\$7,275	\$125,955
2	Santa Ynez/Los Olivos Parking Studies	0.34	\$43,920	\$0	\$7,770	\$51,690
3	Montecito Design Guidelines	0.58	\$75,600	\$0	\$5,625	\$81,225
4	Santa Claus Lane	0.83	\$107,280	\$75,000	\$85,320	\$267,600
5	Visitor-Serving Uses on Ag Properties	1.63	\$211,680	\$0	\$34,470	\$246,150
6	Vacation Rental LUDC Amendments	0.47	\$61,200	\$0	\$9,525	\$70,725
7	Alcohol-Related Use Regulations	0.63	\$81,360	\$0	\$8,925	\$90,285
8	Medical Marijuana Ordinance	0.56	\$72,720	\$0	\$10,200	\$82,920
9	Lighting Standards & Regulations	0.44	\$56,880	\$0	\$5,325	\$62,205
TOTAL		6.28	\$814,320	\$90,000	\$174,435	\$1,078,755



Attachment 4

**Agricultural Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
(of March 2, 2010)**



COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Unapproved Meeting Minutes for March 2, 2010

These minutes reflect the actions and general discussion of the Committee.

The Agricultural Advisory Committee was called to order at 2:00 pm by Kari Campbell-Bohard, Vice-Chair, at the Santa Barbara County Farm Bureau Office located at 180 Industrial Way in Buellton.

Members Present: # 8

<u>Member</u>
Bradley Miles
Jose Baer
Dorothy Laine
LeRoy Scolari
Kari Campbell-Bohard, Vice-Chair
Richard Quandt
Paul Van Leer
Wilja Happe

<u>Representing</u>
1 st District Supervisor, Salud Carbajal
3 rd District Supervisor, Doreen Farr
4 th District Supervisor, Joni Gray
5 th District Supervisor, Joe Centeno
California Women for Agriculture
Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association
Santa Barbara County Farm Bureau
Santa Barbara Flower & Nursery Growers' Association

Members Absent: # 4

<u>Member</u>
Brian Caird
Grant Cremers, Chair
Willy Chamberlin
Greg France

<u>Representing</u>
2 nd District Supervisor, Janet Wolf
Central Coast Wine Growers Assn
Santa Barbara County Cattlemen's Assn.
California Strawberry Commission

Staff Present: Vicki Parker and David Lackie, P&D - Office of Long Range Planning

Number of Interested Persons: 4

I. Pledge of Allegiance

II. Public Comment

Re: Bill Giorgi – County may be eliminating Ag Land Use Planner position due to budget constraints.

III. Minutes from February 3, 2010

The minutes from the February 3, 2010 were approved as amended by a unanimous vote. Kari Campbell-Bohard and Paul Van Leer abstained.

IV. Report from Agricultural Planning - Ag Planning staff were unable to attend, no report was given.

V. Ag Permit Streamlining Project - Paul Van Leer

Paul updated the Committee about the Planning Commission's comments from the February 17, 2010 that he and Grant Cremers attended. The Ag Permit Streamlining Project will be going to the PC for a second time on March 3rd. The Staff report and Summary of Recommended Changes to Ag Permits and Processes were provided to the AAC ahead of time. The Committee had concerns their recommendations from the prior meetings were not in the proposal. The AAC recommended to following changes to the Summary of Recommended Changes:

- **Agricultural Accessory Structures:** Change building size from 3,000 sq.ft. to 5,000 sq.ft., as this is more adequate sizing for a hay barn to accommodate the typical cattle operations in the County. Strike D from the considerations.
- **Entrance gate posts and cross members:** Under a. – Change to “Cross Member does not exceed two feet in width or height (two feet around); Strike B and C.
- **Housing for up to 4 farm employees and their families:** Should it not be stated, four dwellings for up to 4 employees?
- **Detached Residential Second Units (RSUs):** The AAC would like to see this apply to AG-II-100 parcels as well.
- **Development Plan Threshold:** The AAC would like to see Attachment 3 (Possible Visual and Biological Resources Development Standards), as submitted in the staff report taken out of this proposal. This would defeat the intended purpose to streamline the permit process for agriculture. The AAC would like to exempt all three sided (or less) structures, from the square footage count toward the threshold. Strike B from the consideration list as this pertains to a non-agricultural structure. This is an ag streamlining proposal so we should consider only items that are ag related.

Motion: Richard Quandt moved, seconded by Leroy Scolari and carried by a unanimous vote to authorize Kari Campbell-Bohard and Paul Van Leer to represent the AAC at the Planning Commission meeting on March 3rd and relay the changes that were discussed during the March 2nd AAC meeting.

VI. 2010/2011 Workplan – Vicki Parker and David Lackie, Long Range Planning

Vicki Parker gave an overview of the County's 2010-2011 Workplan and Mid-year Report as described in the memo provided to the AAC in the pre-meeting packet. Discussion focused on Visitor Serving Uses on Ag Properties project. The AAC had questions about the LAFCO Annexation Review (Table 1, #2), Rural Regional Plans, and how the Visitor Serving Uses Project will benefit ag. If proposed changes to the annexation policy involve ag zoned parcels, the AAC would like to review the changes.

Motion: The AAC recommends: 1.)The Transfer of Development Rights project (Mid-Term Project #10) be a higher priority than the Visitor Serving Uses on Agricultural Properties Project (Short Term Project 5) and 2.)The Visitor Serving Uses on Agricultural Properties Project be redefined to include Visitor Serving Uses on Agricultural Properties *Which Benefit Agriculturally Zoned Land*. The motion was made by Richard Quandt, seconded by Jose Baer, and carried by a unanimous vote.

VII. Reports from Committee Members –RWQCB proposed ag requirements

VIII. Meeting Adjourned at 4:55 pm.