

Public Comment - COLAB #2

Daly, Julia Rutherford

From: Andy Caldwell <andy@colabsbc.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 03, 2017 10:45 AM
To: Williams, Das; Adam, Peter; Lavagnino, Steve; Wolf, Janet; Hartmann, Joan
Cc: Miyasato, Mona; sbcob; Russell, Glenn
Subject: wrong subject indication! This is regarding Hoop Houses

Dear Chair Hartmann and Honorable Supervisors,

Please consider these comments in your deliberations concerning Hoop Houses.

We support Option 1 which serves to interpret hoop structures as farm equipment. This option renders hoop structures as exempt from zoning permits. In our opinion, this is consistent with the fact that hoop structures are neither buildings or structures that should require a permit. They are simply a tool, typically used on an intermittent basis, that serves to protect the crops.

Please consider the fact that hoop structures are extremely important to agriculture and in wide use throughout the county and state. The county has received very little in the way of complaints about their use because the impacts arising from the same are extremely minimal. In other words, the wherewithal to use hoop houses is not broke, so please don't try to fix it by way of environmental review!

There are many other pressing issues that deserve the attention of the Planning and Development department and the use of the county's limited financial resources. We would rather the Board direct staff to move on to these other issues, including those requested by the County's Ag Advisory Committee.

The North County has an appreciation and live and let live relationship with agriculture. The community recognizes the need for flexibility, innovation, and freedom to adopt to market conditions, weather, and competition sans permitting requirements! We also believe in truth in zoning. For those lands designated for agricultural use, farmers should be able to plant and cultivate without additional permits and regulatory oversight in those cases where they are using the land in a manner that is recognized as an industry standard. These facts and this logic certainly applies to the use of hoop houses.

With all due respect, we are opposed to the staff recommendation (option 4) for the express purpose that staff has suggested! That is, "the development of operational standards to address adverse impacts related to visual resources and/or storm water runoff and drainage". In our estimation, this option would serve to encumber agriculture creating inefficiencies and uncertainty while increasing the costs of hoop structures.

Our area farmers are already under a tremendous burden having to compete with other states and nations, not to mention the impending costs of SGMA, the \$15 minimum wage, the strictest overtime regulations in the nation, labor shortages and water shortages, just to mention a few concerns.

Because our area farmers, like others throughout the state, have been using hoop houses for years without issue or complaint, we believe there is no compelling reason to begin regulating the utilization of these shade devices.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Andy Caldwell
COLAB