



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO Department of Agriculture/Measurement Standards

2156 SIERRA WAY, SUITE A, SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA 93401-4556
ROBERT F. LILLEY (805) 781-5910
AGRICULTURAL COMMISSIONER/SEALER FAX: (805) 781-1035

AgCommSLO@co.slo.ca.us

Ag Tourism & Direct Marketing Work Group

April 27, 2006

Meeting Minutes

Submitted by Michael Isensee, May 9, 2006

Present:

-Mary Bianchi	-Colleen Childers	-Joy Barlogio	-Brenda Ouwerkerk
Alison Denlinger (alt)	-Deanne Gonzales	-Kim Pasciuto	-Jackie Crabb (alt)
-Angela Thompson	-Doug Filippini	-Lora Pankey Eade	-John Schram (visitor)
-Anne McMahan	-Duane Waddell	-Roy Parsons	
-Charlie Whitney	-Elizabeth Rolph	-Michael Isensee	

Absent:

Debra Garrison, Dick Rogers, Eric Michielssen (alt), Holly Sletteland, Jamie Kirk, Karen Mansfield (ATF monitor), Kate Loftus (alt), MaryAnn Vasconcellos, Sandra Wallace (alt), Steve Sinton, Steven Knudsen (alt)

Handouts:

1. Agenda & Draft minutes
2. Third Draft sales (#4)
3. First draft lodging – B&B/Inn (#6)
4. First draft lodging—dude ranches, etc (#7)
5. Second draft activities/events (#2) – recreation/camping & hunting clubs
6. Second draft events (#3) – temporary/special events

Introductions & Announcements(Brenda)

Jackie Crabb from Farm Bureau, John Schram from Templeton

Brenda reported on the Work Group's efforts to date at the April 24 Ag Liaison Board

Minutes Review (Michael)

Approved

Presentation Third Draft: Sales – (#4 Sales Committee)

Committee, led by Kim, presented questions to the work group for direction. The committee would continue to work on created a document that had support from all within the sales committee.

Questions for the work group included:

1. Where should items aside from the 50% of product produced on site come from?
 - There was a variety of opinion, including the question of how such a matter would be regulated. ---
 - There was agreement that not everything needed to be grown on site or on neighboring properties, and that a reasonable middle ground would allow anything from within the county plus from other farms owned or leased by the farmstand/farmstore operator. For cases of crop failure or when there is no county produce available, product from the rest of California could be offered, but that the purpose of the farmstore/produce stand was primarily to sell locally (county) grown produce
2. Should gift items be allowed in produce stands?
 - It was clarified that Env Health rules do not preclude produce stands from selling nonfood items. Thus, allowing a certain amount of non-food gift items (cookbooks, picnic supplies, etc) could be appropriate in a produce stand.

- It was also clarified that there might be some flexibility within the Env Health code to allow for a Mobile Food Facility (equivalent to a coffee cart or a hotdog stand) to sell processed food products.
- 3. How should gift items be defined, as ag-related or as anything?
 - There was concern that defining ag-related was too subjective
 - Conversely, allowing the sale of any items could also be problematic in a larger facility, since there would be nothing to preclude it from selling appliances, electronics, etc

Presentation First Draft: B&B/Inn – (#6 Lodging Committee)

- Committee presented a brief reminder of the three “B&B” options that currently exist.
- A fundamental question and disagreement at the committee level has been with regard to the distinction between farmstay and B&B. The question is whether the farmstay standard as drafted is the appropriate form of lodging on agricultural land and if not, why not? There was not agreement on this item, but the members of the farmstay committee present agreed to meet jointly with the B&B/Inn committee to discuss the potential for a common unifying approach to lodging.
- There is a concern that the draft farmstay standards “takes away” a use that is currently allowed for all owners of land zoned for agricultural use (up to a 3-room residential B&B). Since there are limited apparent problems with the existing ordinance, especially as it relates to the small residential B&B, why change it? The opposing concern is that allowing lodging on any ag land does not meet the policy of being secondary and incidental to an agricultural use, means that farmers are not necessarily the ones benefiting from the presence of these lodging opportunities in ag land (as they are available to any owner of land zoned for agriculture, not necessarily only for farmers or ranchers), and the long-term cumulative impact of allowing lodging on any ag lands will adversely impact resources.

Presentation First Draft: Dude Ranch – (#7 Lodging Committee)

The committee brought forth one suggested revisions (an increase in parcel size from 160 to 320), and asked for input. Other portions of the existing ordinance that might also be evaluated were emphasized. A handout compiled by Michael regarding the standard for “guest ranches” in Santa Barbara County was provided.

A discussion ensued about several fundamentals regarding the standard.

- What is a *working ranch*? The term is used in the standard but is not defined. There was not agreement on the term, with opinions ranging from any property zoned AG, to any ag operation (a orange ranch, a row crop ranch, etc), to only large cattle operations.
- What is an appropriate size for a dude ranch where guests will participate in any number of recreation opportunities? 160, 320, and 640 acres were all suggested minimums.
- What differentiates a dude ranch from other types of guest accommodation on ag land? Is it an extension of a farmstay (a larger lodging opportunity on a larger site)? Is a dude ranch accommodation along with a guest-only restaurant and also with recreational events, activities, and infrastructure?

One point of agreement was that there should not be RV hookups at a Dude Ranch

There was a discussion of whether smaller sites might somehow fit into the dude ranch standard

Presentation Second Draft: Camping/Hunting/Activities - (#2 Events Committee)

Latest proposal continues to try to balance competing views on committee. Committee felt prepared to hand off effort to staff to craft language as standard moves forward through process.

Primary outstanding issues include:

- Should organizational camping be allowed on ag land?
- Should site size be increased or the allowed numbers of campsites be decreased beyond current committee’s proposal?
- Should there be an exception from site size requirements for sites that abut public land?
- Who should be the review body that conducts the case-by-case review of camping or other recreational uses?

Concerns raised by the work group included:

- Does camping need to be secondary to an ag operation, or is it allowed on any ag-zoned property that otherwise meets the standard?

- What is the definition of a cabin for organizational camps? Should this relate to other accommodations if allowed on ag land?
- How is the issue of fire and fire danger addressed?

Presentation Second Draft: Temp/Special Events - (#3 Events Committee)

The committee sought input from the work group on several questions.

- Should special events be limited to sites with active agriculture in order to meet policy? Work group agreement was that events on AG-zoned land needed to be located on an active farm or ranch.
- Should all events be treated similarly? General work group agreement was that all events should be evaluated the same, whether for profit or not-for profit.
- Should tours of up to a certain amount (per day) be allowed with an easy permit? Work group felt this was appropriate.
- Should the theme or topic of the event matter? The work group felt that it was not important, but that all events should be evaluated the same (same as question #1)

It was confirmed that music/noise and parking were significant issues to address from the perspective of neighbors.

It was also generally agreed that a process to address sites with neighbor complaints is needed if a certain amount of events can occur without discretionary review.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 PM

Next Meeting: May 11, 6:30-9 PM at Templeton Sheriff Substation