

APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

Monday, February 1, 2010

Guests Present: Jackie Crabb (Farm Bureau), Tavener Holland and Daniella Sapriel (CABO), Susan McDonald (Hearst Ranch), Lisa Bodrogi (Wine Country Alliance)

Staff: Brenda Ouwerkerk, Mike Isensee, Lynda Auchinachie -Agriculture Department;

Absent Members: Charles Pritchard, Tom Ikeda, David Pruitt, Mark Pearce, Mary Bianchi

1. Call to Order: 4:04 PM. Quorum Present.

2. Open Comment

- Eric Michielssen provided a summary of the controversy surrounding SLO Thursday Night Farmers' Market (see attachment A). Eric questioned what ALAB's role might be and if ALAB could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors (BOS). Don Warden indicated that this was not an agenzized item and Brown Act precluded any action.
- Brenda Ouwerkerk explained the Food and Agriculture Code that regulates issuance of Farmers' Market certificates. The code indicates that the landlord has jurisdiction and that the City of San Luis Obispo occupies the field for the downtown location. Therefore, because the city gave jurisdiction for the market area to the Downtown Association, the SLO County Farmers' Market Associations certificate became invalid due to the transfer of jurisdiction. Brenda provided a copy of emails from Bob Lilley detailing the application of the code (see attachment B). ALAB members agreed to place item on next meeting agenda.

3. Agency Reports

- Brenda Ouwerkerk (Agriculture Department)
 - Light Brown Apple Moth (LBAM) eradication outreach for Nipomo and Arroyo Grande area February 8, 2010, 6 – 7.30 (MEETING POSTPONED). Agencies in attendance will include CDFA and Public Health. Los Osos eradication effort has not generated any complaints to date.
 - 2009 crop report surveys sent out January 4, 2010, ALAB members were asked to remind growers to return surveys to Agriculture Department.
 - US Census Bureau has asked to partner with the Agriculture Department in an attempt to survey hard to reach individuals. Carlos Castaneda is assisting.
 - Brenda asked if there was knowledge of major crop damage with recent winter storms. Bill Strubble indicated there had been some avocado drop due to winds.
 - The Agriculture Department is partnering with the Rural Crime Task Force to update crop layer for cattle ownership locations. The update is necessary to enable quick response to

livestock emergencies. Cattlemen will be canvassed. Joy Fitzhugh is working on a form to be associated with GIS map.

- Calendar update: Tuesday, February 9th and 23rd COSE at BOS. Thursday, Feb 11th EIR scoping session at PC on agricultural clusters. Tuesday, March 2nd Grading Ordinance at BOS.
- Mike Isensee (Agriculture Department)
 - The BOS gave tentative approval to the Grading and Stormwater Management Ordinance, with the exception of the Agricultural Grading section. The BOS directed staff to continue to work with the agriculture community on exempt agricultural grading.

Joy Fitzhugh indicated she was in the process of setting up a meeting with staff and interested parties to discuss grading. Joy indicated there were 18 issue areas that the BOS identified for discussion. Joy also stated that Farm Bureau and other organizations were meeting tomorrow to nibble away at the 18 issues.

Jean-Pierre Wolff expressed concern that there are two agricultural positions and that it may be divisive to have organizational positions and ALAB position. ALAB was established as the advisory board that is supposed to provide direction to the BOS and that the organizations are represented on ALAB. Dee Lacey indicated that ALAB members are supposed to bring information from their organizations to these meetings.

Mike Isensee indicated he will participate in the meetings between staff and the agriculture community. Brenda agreed to let ALAB members know date and time of meeting.

4. Previous Minutes

MOTION: Approve minutes: *Motion* – Dee Lacey. 2nd – Jean-Pierre Wolff. **Approved: Unanimous.**
Abstentions: none

5. Review Amendments to Land Use Ordinance Temporary Events (Mike Isensee – Agriculture Department)

- Mike Isensee provided an update of recent Board of Supervisor direction to evaluate a ministerial process for a variety of events (see attachment C). He indicated that ALAB input was requested for the ordinance standards proposed by the Planning Department. Mike provided a handout summarizing the 17 standards (see attachment D). Mike began the group discussion by asking if the proposed standards were adequate to protect agricultural land and operations. Additional discussion points included:
 - if an event site should be required to be fenced to reduce trespassing and liability issues;
 - water use concerns;
 - best methods and standards to protect limited resources;
 - acknowledgement by event participants that they are aware of Right to Farm ordinance;
 - speed limit signs should be posted at events site to reduce dust;
 - frequency of events and number of attendees;
 - use of existing structure;
 - concerns regarding fire potential.
- ALAB members discussed the pros and cons of standards. Daniella Sapriel of CABO provided her

interpretation of AGP 6.

MOTION: ALAB supports the following proposed standards: 1) 200 foot buffer to property line, 2) parking to be free of combustible material, 3) no parking within public right of way, and 4) notification for nearby property owners. ALAB recommends the following revisions: 1) elimination of preclusion of parking on Class 1 soil, 2) frequency of events should be limited to no more than 6 events per year; 3) number of attendees should be reduced to 50 – 200 (excluding staff), and 4) no new permanent structures be allowed for use. Motion – Dick Nock. 2nd – Neil Roberts. Approved: Unanimous. Abstentions: none

6. COSE Update Discussion (Subcommittees, ALAB)

- Bill Strubble indicated that some, but not all, of ALAB's introduction comments were incorporated in the COSE. Bill suggested that the discussion regarding how the COSE applies to agriculture land needs to be included. Members discuss concerns and agree to resubmit Introduction chapter comments to BOS for consideration.
- Richard Quandt, Biological Resources Subcommittee member, indicated that the Planning Commission had revised the language in Policy BR 1.8 on page 3.15. The original language stated that designation and management of Major Ecosystem Networks will "not interfere" with agricultural uses. The Planning Commission revised to "be coordinated." Richard recommended the original language be maintained. Members discussed and agreed that a recommendation to maintain the original language should be forwarded to the BOS.

Richard also suggested that food safety issues be addressed in this policy. He recommended the following language be included at the end of Policy BR 1.8:

"Ecosystems need to be separated and buffered from irrigation agriculture production areas to reduce the risk of microbial contamination due to wildlife intrusion."

MOTION: ALAB recommends: 1) the unincorporated changes to the COSE Introduction chapter be resubmitted, 2) the language "not interfere" be maintained in Policy BR 1.8 and that "be coordinated" be removed, 3) Policy BR 1.8 include additional language regarding microbial contamination. Motion – Dick Nock. 2nd – Dee Lacey. Approved: Unanimous. Abstentions: none

- Jean-Pierre Wolff indicated that the ALAB authored Soil Resources chapter had been approved by the Planning Commission with minor changes including language to ensure consistency with AGP 18. One of the changes included adding the word "certain" to Implementation Strategy SL 3.1.1. The subcommittee is not recommending any changes.
- Don Warden indicated that most of the Visual Resources subcommittee's concerns had been addressed with the exception of recommended changes for Page 9.7. Don recommends resubmittal of Page 9.7 comments.
- Water Resources subcommittee indicated that none of their recommended changes were incorporated into the draft document. The subcommittee recommended that all of the proposed Water Resources chapter comments be resubmitted for the Boards consideration. The committee expressed frustration that there was not a response to their comments from Planning that explained why they had not been recommended for inclusion.
- Lynda Auchinachie provided an overview of the COSE draft/hearing process and the variety of ways in which ALAB could interact in the process. She explained that Planning Department provided detail responses to comments submitted during the hearing process. She indicated that many of ALAB recommendations had been incorporated into the document and that Planning

staff had attended several ALAB meetings to discuss document and process.

MOTION: ALAB recommends: 1) support for the PC Draft Soil Resources chapter, 2) resubmittal of Page 9.7 Visual Resources chapter, and 3) resubmittal of all Water Resources chapter recommended changes and comments. Motion – Dee Lacey. 2nd – Dick Nock. Approved: Unanimous. Abstentions: none

- ALAB members continued to discuss the COSE process and expressed frustration because many of ALAB's recommended changes were not incorporated.
- Jean-Pierre Wolff suggested that the 5 Supervisor District appointees of ALAB discuss frustration with Board of Supervisors. Members discussed participating in the hearing process and suggested that Agriculture Department staff could fulfill this role.
- Brenda Ouwerkerk indicated that Agriculture Department staff represents the department and that ALAB would be best represented by their own membership. Discussion ensues of how better to communicate with Board of Supervisor members about critical issues.

7. Election of ALAB Chair and Vice Chair for 2010 thru 2012 terms (Ad hoc Nominating Committee). Election of ALAB representative and alternate to Ag Preserve Rules Committee (APRC) for 2010 thru 2012 terms

- Nominating committee nominated Dee Lacey Chairperson and Jean-Pierre Wolff Vice Chairperson.

MOTION: ALAB accepts nominating committee's recommendation. Motion – Bill Strubble. 2nd – Dick Nock. Approved: Unanimous. Abstentions: none

MOTION: ALAB votes for Dee Lacey as Chairperson and Jean-Pierre Wolff for Vice Chairperson. Motion – Bill Strubble. 2nd – Dick Nock. Approved: Unanimous. Abstentions: none

- Don Warden and Chuck Pritchard nominated to remain ALAB representative and alternate, respectively, for APRC.

MOTION: ALAB votes for Don Warden as APRC representative and Chuck Pritchard for APRC alternate. Motion – Dick Nock. 2nd – Dee Lacey. Approved: Unanimous. Abstentions: none

8. Use of Tape Recordings

- ALAB members agreed to discuss this item at the next meeting.

9. Time Change for Future Meetings

- ALAB members agreed to discuss this item at the next meeting.

10. Upcoming Meeting: February 22, 2010 @ 6:00pm (Formerly scheduled for March 1, 2010)

- The March meeting date will be changed to February 22, 2010, to allow adequate time to submit comments regarding proposed Grading Ordinance changes. Additional agenda items will include SLO Farmers' Market, meeting recordings, and consideration of a time change for future meetings.

Meeting adjourned: 7:00 PM. Respectfully submitted by Lynda Auchinachie, County Agriculture Department.

Action: Agenda Item #6:

Motions for revisions to Planning Commission Recommended Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) provided to County Board of Supervisors – see February 5, 2010 ALAB letter.

DATE: February 1, 2010
TO: ALAB
CC: Kami Griffin and Karen Nall, County Planning and Building Department
FROM: Michael Isensee, County Agriculture Department
RE: ITEM 5: Events Ordinance update

This item is to provide ALAB with an opportunity to provide input regarding proposed changes to the County Temporary Events ordinance. At the January 12, 2010 Board of Supervisors hearing, Board members directed Planning and Building Department staff to return to the Board with a new authorization to amend the County's Land Use Ordinance regarding Temporary Events and the Temporary Commercial Outdoor Entertainment license procedures

EVENT ORDINANCE PROCESS

At numerous meetings in 2007 and early 2008, ALAB provided staff direction regarding preferred implementation of a revised ordinance which would create a ministerial permit process for a limited number of agriculture-related events as well as a process to ensure that County Agriculture Policy 6: *Visitor Serving and Retail Commercial Use and Facilities* (AGP6), was implemented. ALAB recommended that the county Agriculture Department review visitor use proposals including proposed event site in the *Agriculture* land use category in order to verify the site had an adequate primary agricultural use and that the visitor use(s) would be incidental in area to the area devoted to agricultural production.

Since that time the Planning Commission (PC) discussed the resulting proposed ordinance. Ultimately, numerous issues, including implementation of AGP6, were left unresolved and the PC requested that the Board provide input and guidance prior to further PC discussion.

MINISTERIAL EVENT PERMIT

On January 12, 2010, the Board also directed that a ministerial permit process be evaluated for a range of events which:

- are scaled appropriately in terms of frequency, number of attendees and location
- meet standards to ensure public health and safety, protection of natural resources, that avoid neighborhood conflicts, and avoid any impacts to agricultural resources (including agricultural conflicts)
- not include any new construction or site grading

PRIMARY AG USE and INCIDENTAL VISITOR USE

The Board did not determine if a primary agricultural use should be necessary in order to obtain a permit for events in agricultural areas. The Board also did not decide if or how to determine an event use was incidental to a site's agricultural use.

For *discretionary* projects (requests requiring either a Minor Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit), the decision-making body would be able to consider the existing and potential agricultural use of the site, the scope and scale of the proposed event use, and potential site-specific factors which could impact agricultural resources or operations.

For *ministerial* projects (over the counter event permit), staff is now recommending that the process not require a primary agricultural use as long as the site meets all standards.

MINISTERIAL EVENT STANDARDS

The specific standards to apply to ministerial event permits need to be determined. Standards are needed in order to ensure that event sites approved with a *ministerial* permit do not adversely impact agriculture and to ensure the County's agricultural operations are not adversely impacted by adjoining event uses. Specific standards are necessary because events approved with a *ministerial* permit receive no staff review or public/neighbor input. Such projects are only required to meet existing written ordinance standards (and other legal requirements such as health code and CalFire).

Agriculture Department staff is seeking input from ALAB regarding the types of standards necessary to ensure that events adjoining a farm or ranch operation and approved with a ministerial permit would have no potential of causing adverse impacts to the neighboring agricultural operation.

As an example, a standard could require that event sites including all parking be located a minimum of ___ feet from a neighboring property. Such a setback would prevent a neighbor from setting up and hosting weddings too close to an agricultural operation where the potential conflict could include pesticide application/application restrictions, noise from pumps, tractor or harvest operations; odors; apiaries; or dust from farm roads or field work.

Staff is seeking input on any other standards that ALAB believes would help to ensure the compatibility between an event operation and adjoining agricultural operations. These standards could range from the number of attendees and the frequency of events to addressing issues such as food safety, spread of animal/crop pests/disease, increased fire risk, or the use of limited groundwater resources for landscaping rather than production agriculture.

FURTHER EVENTS BACKGROUND

For further information and background regarding events, visit the Agriculture Department website:

http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/agcomm/Agricultural_Tourism_Direct_Marketing/Events.htm

STAFF PROPOSAL – MINISTERIAL EVENTS PERMIT STANDARDS

1. Fire
 - a. Require fire safety plan approved by CalFire
2. Water
 - a. Water supply must meet Env. Health Standards
3. Wastewater
 - a. Sanitation facilities must meet Env. Health Standards
4. Food Preparation
 - a. Food facility must meet Env. Health Standards
5. Buffers
 - a. 200 feet to property line
 - b. 400 feet to neighboring residence
6. Two access roads
 - a. 20 feet in width
 - b. Primary access road located within 1 mile of arterial or collector
7. Parking
 - a. Open area with 10% slope or less
 - b. Free of combustible material
 - c. 1 space per 2.5 attendees
 - d. Located off soils defined Class 1 by NRCS
 - e. No parking within public right of way
 - f. No off -site parking
8. Hours of operation
 - a. Guests allowed 10am – 10:30pm
 - b. Operations: setup/cleanup between 8am - 11pm
9. Amplified sound
 - a. 10am – 5pm
 - b. Subject to county standards
10. Lighting
 - a. Must meet county standards
11. Frequency (# per year)
 - a. 2 - 12 (NOT DETERMINED)
12. Number of attendees
 - a. 50 – 300 (NOT DETERMINED)
 - b. May be the number of attendees per event, or the number allowed at any one time on event site.
13. Duration
 - a. 1 to 3 days each
14. Structures
 - a. No use of structures allowed
15. Dust
 - a. Unpaved roads or parking areas must use an APCD approved method to prevent airborne dust.
16. Notification
 - a. Property owners within 1000 feet are to be notified one of two ways:
 - i. By a website
 - ii. Be letter a minimum of 30 days in advance of each.
17. Violations – Enforcement
 - a. 3 substantiated complaints within 6 months could result in revocation

County of San Luis Obispo Agricultural Liaison Advisory Board



**Agricultural Liaison
Advisory Board (ALAB)**

2156 Sierra Way, Suite A
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 (805) 781-5914

Positions/Members/Terms

CHAIR: Dee Lacey

District One: Mecham Appt.
Dee Lacey, (1/13)

District Two: Gibson Appt.
Lisen Bonnier (1/11)

District Three: Hill Appt.
Tom Ikeda (1/13)

District Four: Achadjian Appt.
Bill Struble (1/11)

District Five: Patterson Appt.
Noah Small (1/13)

Agriculture Finance Rep.
Mark Pearce (8/10)

Cattlemen Rep.
Dick Nock

Coastal San Luis RCD Rep.
Jean-Pierre Wolff (8/11)

Direct Marketing/Organic Rep.
Eric Michielssen (4/12)

Environmental Rep.
Debra Garrison (1/11)

Farm Bureau Rep.
R. Don Warden

Nursery Rep.
David Pruitt (4/12)

Upper Salinas-Las Tablas RCD Rep.
Charles Pritchard (1/10)

Vegetable Rep.
Richard Quandt (4/12)

Wine Grape Rep.
Neil Roberts (4/12)

County Agricultural Commissioner
Bob Lilley, *Ex-Officio*

U.C. Coop. Extension / Farm Advisor
Mary Bianchi, *Ex-Officio*

DATE: February 5, 2010

TO: San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT: ALAB Recommended revisions to the Planning Commission Recommended Conservation and Open Space Element (December 29, 2009)

Members of the Agricultural Liaison Advisory Board (ALAB) met on February 2, 2010, to discuss the Planning Commission recommended Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE).

While the Planning Commission adopted several of ALAB's recommended changes, members unanimously agreed to request that several of their original comments be resubmitted as well as a few additional revisions. Please consider incorporating the attached revisions to the Planning Commission recommended version of the COSE.

Sincerely,

Dee Lacey, Chair
Agricultural Liaison Advisory Board

att: Introduction Recommended Revisions
Biological Resources Recommended Revisions
Water Resources Recommended Revisions

cc: Mike Wulkan, Planning Department

**CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED DRAFT
ALAB Comments – February 1, 2010**

INTRODUCTION

General comment: throughout element, substitute *conserve* for “protect” and “preserve”. Conserve reinforces the goal of the Element, and links all policies, etc to the “Conservation and Open Space Element”. Additionally, all existing and recommended references to Agriculture Element policies should be included in the final document and the COSE glossary should direct readers to Appendix J: Production Agriculture Determination for a definition of Production Agriculture.

Page 1.17 or 18 General comment: stronger reference is needed to inform and link reader to all other Elements also apply. Add a section to expand the “How to Read the Element” section to further inform the reader how this element applies and how the reader would know what other Elements also apply to their property. An example is page 1-19 of the current Agriculture and Open Space Element.

Add:

HOW THIS ELEMENT APPLIES TO PROPERTY

In order to find out how this plan applies to a particular property or area of the county, follow these steps:

(adds steps, similar to page 1-19 of the current Agriculture and Open Space Element, reference to other land use designations would need to be added.)

Page 1.15 OPEN SPACE RESOURCES:

General comment: This section seems to blend the concepts of open space and agriculture. Stronger reference is needed to inform and link reader to all other Elements also apply. In this case, reference to AGP 26 – AGP 35 is needed. A more inclusive differentiation of Elements can be found in the paragraph below D-4 of page 3-25 of the current Agriculture and Open Space Element.

Add: *Open space lands described in this Element are resources or features of the landscape with unique or sensitive habitat for plants and animals; recreational opportunities; distinctive scenic values; hazards that threaten public health and safety; or archeological or historical sites. Because open space resources do not observe man-made boundaries, they occur on both public and private lands. Therefore, the following goals and policies in this Element refer to the treatment of open space resources on public lands and on private non-agricultural lands. Agricultural Element policies AGP 26-Agp 35 deal with the treatment of open space resources on agricultural lands.*

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Page 3.15 The Planning Commission recommended the language in Policy BR 1.8 be revised to read:

Policy BR 1.8 Effects of Major Ecosystems on Agricultural Uses

Designation and management of a Major Ecosystem Network will ~~not interfere~~ be coordinated with agricultural uses on private lands that are either within or adjacent to the network, as stated in the Agriculture Element. ~~(AGP 28). (OSP 13 and 14 revised)~~

ALAB requests that the original language of “not interfere” be maintained and not replaced with “be coordinated.”

Additionally, ALAB requests that language be added as follows:

...as stated in the Agriculture Element. Ecosystems need to be separated and buffered from irrigation agriculture production areas to reduce the risk of microbial contamination due to wildlife intrusion.

CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED DRAFT
ALAB Comments – February 1, 2010

WATER RESOURCES

Page 10.2 Relationship to Other Elements, Plans and Programs

Third paragraph, last sentence ADD: For lands used in production agriculture, refer to AGP 10 and AGP 11 of the AG Element for groundwater matters involving water supply, demand, quality, and basin/resource capacity.

Page 10.3 Water Supply

4th Bullet – ADD: There is a need to secure water supplies to protect environmental resources while at the same time protect groundwater supplies for agriculture. (AGP 11).

Page 10.4 2nd bullet – ADD: Water management programs (e.g., ground water management plans) may be needed in or around non-agricultural land ~~are needed~~ to adequately manage water resources, but they require additional funding.

Page 10.4 Goal WR 4

ADD: Per capita potable water use for human consumption in the county will decline by 20 percent by 2020.

Page 10.4 Goal WR 6

ADD: Damage to life, structures, agricultural and natural resources from floods will be avoided.

Page 10.5 WR 1.1

ADD: reference to APG 10-11 to first paragraph.

WR 1.1.1 c.

Establish a water demand monitoring program in coordination with the Co Planning Depts Resource Management System to monitor municipal, industrial, ~~agricultural~~, recreational, and environmental demand

Page 10.6 WR 1.3.3

Identify potential partners for advanced tertiary treatment projects (i.e., ~~agriculture~~, park fields, etc). (IRWM)

WR 1.3.4 missing?

WR 1.3.5

ADD: Explore opportunities for groundwater recharge with reclaimed water. Opportunities include but are not limited to recharge through use of reclaimed water for landscape irrigation, dust control, and fire suppression. (IRWM)

Page 10.6

ADD: WR 1.3.6

Explore opportunities for agricultural use of recycled water that meets water recycling criteria adopted by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH, §60303-60303, 2009)

Page 10.8

WR 1.7

ADD: Surface water will only be used to serve development within urban and village reserve lines and will not be used to serve development in rural areas, with the exception of surface water collected for agricultural use. (AGP II).

Page 10.9

WR 1.11

ADD: Accurately assess and mitigate the impacts of new non-ag development on water supply.

Page 10.9

WR 1.13

~~Place limitations on further land divisions in these areas until plans are in place and funded to ensure that the safe yield will not be exceeded.~~
(Division of ag land does not always lead to increased water consumption. For example grazing land divided that remains in grazing).

Page 10.10

General comment:

Including agriculture in the Groundwater Monitoring Management Goal 2 and its related policies in this Element may not be acceptable to the vast majority of the agricultural community. Securing right of access to ag wells, the resulting government system mapping of ag well water locations, and the resulting public knowledge of these sites and access create serious trespass and food safety concerns. AGP11 addresses agricultural water supply issues in the new Ag Element. Therefore, add the following accordingly:

WR 2.1.1

Insert non-agricultural after “funding for”

WR 2.1.2

Insert non-agricultural after “govern”

WR 2.1.3

Insert non-agricultural after “overlying”

WR 2.2.2

Insert non-agricultural before “well permit”

Page 10.10 WR 2.2.3

Revise as follows: Secure right of access to all new key wells together with retaining voluntary access to existing wells having useful histories to ensure that the County’s investment in these records is protected. The county ~~should~~ shall obtain ~~unlimited~~ permission from each of the well owners for only county use with identification of the landowner protected from public or other uses and all ~~releasing or publishing~~ groundwater data shall remain confidential.

Define key wells.

If not inserting “non-agricultural” after “key”, delete: ~~The County should obtain unlimited permission from each of the well owners for releasing or publishing groundwater data.~~

Page 10.11 WR 2.3.1

ADD: Revise non-agricultural well permit procedures to address adopted groundwater management plan objectives.

WR 2.5

ADD: Investigate the ramifications of ~~Encourage~~ ground water-banking programs.

Page 10.12 Figure WR-2

Hydrologic Units – what is purpose of map and is this map geological units instead of hydrological units?

Page 10.13 WR 3.2

ADD: Protect watersheds, groundwater and aquifer recharge areas and natural drainage systems from potential adverse impacts of non-agricultural development projects. (GM1, AGP 10 and 11)

Page 10.15 WR 3.5

ADD: Continue support of and partnerships with *Resource Conservation Districts* to encourage education and technical assistance regarding erosion and sediment control in ~~agricultural~~ land management practices. (AGP 9-10)

WR 3.6

ADD: AGP10 at end of sentence

WR 3.6.1

Delete this strategy. It is already implemented by the RWQCB so this is a duplication of effort and funding.

WR 3.7

Capitalize Resource Conservation Districts

GOAL 4

ADD: at end of sentence: For ag lands, see AGP 10.

Page 10.18 WR 4.8

Capitalize Resource Conservation Districts

Page 10.18 WR 5.1.1

ADD: Support development and implementation of watershed *wide* management plans for all key watersheds in the county in collaboration with Resource Conservation Districts, water purveyors, cities, agricultural operations and landowners.

Page 10.25 ADD: WR 6.6.1

Stream channelization and alteration practices should be referred to the Resource Conservation Districts and other appropriate agencies for technical assistance and compliance with laws and regulations.