



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

May 11, 2006

Meeting Minutes

Submitted by Michael Isensee, May 24, 2006, approved with changes at May 25 mtg

Present:

-Alison Denlinger (alt)	-Debra Garrison	-Jamie Kirk	-Sandra Wallace (alt)
-Angela Thompson	-Doug Filipponi	-Joy Barlogio	-Steve Sinton
-Charlie Whitney	-Duane Waddell	-Kim Pasciuto	-Steven Knudsen (alt)
-Colleen Childers	-Eric Michielssen (alt)	-Mary Bianchi	-Michael Isensee (staff)
-Deanne Gonzales	-Holly Sletteland	-Roy Parsons	-Brenda Ouwerkerk

Absent:

Anne McMahon, Dick Rogers, Elizabeth Rolph, Karen Mansfield (ATF monitor), Kate Loftus (alt), Lora Pankey Eade, MaryAnn Vasconcellos, Karen Nall (staff)

Handouts:

1. Agenda & Draft minutes
2. Processing & Products overview for committee #1 (pink)
3. Second draft lodging—dude ranches, etc (#7) (goldenrod)

Introductions & Announcements (Brenda)

June 2 – Ag Task Force Annual Fundraiser - <http://www.centralcoastgrown.org/sloatfbbauction.jpg>

Minutes Review (Michael)

April 27 minutes changed to reflect that the following under the B&B section a concern included the following: allowing lodging on any ag land means that farmers are not necessarily the ones benefiting from the presence of these lodging opportunities in ag land

Process Check (Brenda)

Please use email as an effective communication tool. Reread and make sure you are stating what you intend to state, focusing on issues and ideas rather than people and positions.

Take info out to groups & organizations you represent or are in contact with

1. Be careful about how you represent info
2. Please do not give a misrepresentation – we are still early in overall process and no products are in a final draft stage with the overall approval of the work group.
3. Encourage two-way communication, so that people can express concerns about the outcome now. They can do this thru you or directly to Brenda

There will be a number of steps where members of the public can provide input (industry mtgs, ag liaison board, community advisory bodies, & planning commission before going to the Board)

The work group can always agree to disagree. Consensus is a goal but may not be realistically achieved due to the timeframe and extent of issues under discussion. The most important task is to ID issues and solutions even if consensus is not reached within the committee.

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

Continued discussion around the question: What is a *working ranch*? Terms such as producing, working, active were all considered. Effort is about sustaining agriculture (production of food, fiber, flowers, & fuel).

There was agreement that if the term is utilized a definition will need to be given to it.

There was disagreement whether the intent of the dude ranch standard was specifically for grazing on large properties or if it includes other uses of larger ag properties that are in other agricultural uses or a variety of uses.

There appeared to be general agreement that a dude ranch should only occur on larger properties and with sizeable setbacks from neighboring properties. There was not agreement about what was a large enough property and whether the committee's exception for abutting public land made sense—the committee was recommending 320 with certain exceptions. There was also disagreement about whether smaller properties with terrain that clearly separated the use from neighbors or with a site specific rationale could be used for a dude ranch.

There were concerns expressed about the definition of units and the allowable number of units based upon property size. It was noted that under the existing standard, a 3,000-acre site could have up to 600 "units" (3,000 people) and develop 60 acres of the site as a dude ranch. Some believed this was not a credible option in that it did not meet policy, the group's definition of AgTourism, or common sense. The committee agreed to revisit these areas of the standard.

Introduction: Products (Committee #1) (Michael)

Overview of the handout with existing definitions and standards for ag processing, food and beverage products, and stores & restaurants in the non-commercial category

Committee was reminded to consider fiber processing & products in its discussion

AG Policy 7 & 8 will be provided to the work group as they each provide a context for the locating facilities that create value-added ag products on ag land.

It was clarified that the existing Ag Processing: Winery standards will not be modified during this process.

Other questions/comments re restaurants: if allowed should be limited to only along significant roads; to the extent events are allowed, food prep kitchens for these events should be allowable; there is a problem with a one size fits all approach

Report on joint meeting between #6 Lodging & #5 Farmstay Committees

There are two approaches- one considers all lodging together and creates a standard that addresses lodging on ag land. The other considers each potential lodging use (farmstay, residential B&B and nonresidential B&B/Inn) separately.

Members of the committees jointly toured five different lodging facilities which provided valuable insight into range of accommodations that are currently permitted and offered in rural settings.

Presentation Third Draft: Temp/Special Events - #3 Events Committee

The fundamental question remains of what defines an event. Options range from considering an event any special activity at a farm where more than 20 people attend to the winery standards which excludes activities where fewer than 50 people attend at an otherwise permitted wineries. At least one thought that up to 100 people should be allowed to attend an event before it would be defined as an event.

The committee agrees that tours of the ag operation should be exempted from any event regulations, as should normal patronage of a permitted sales facility on ag land [it was not discussed if a CSA pickup would classify as a permitted sales facility, but the concern was raised about how CSAs that have member pick-up on the farm would be considered.]

The question of whether only events that are directly related to the agricultural use should be allowed an easy permit was brought up. There was a feeling that events that were educating others about agriculture or were directly related to the agricultural use should be supported.

It was noted that there is a relationship between the # of people in attendance at any event and the total number of events

Presentation Final Draft: Camping/Hunting/Activities - #2 Events Committee

Roy presented final work on the topic area of incidental camping, organizational camping, hunting clubs, apologizing for neglecting to bring copies of the latest draft [copies to be provided]

Outstanding issues addressed by the committee included campfires. Roy provided info from contact with CDF. It was stated that campfires of private lands cannot be banned except by special proclamation.

Property owners must grant permission and can regulate as they desire. It was also noted that campfires are very broadly defined to include campstoves, enclosed stoves and portable BBQ pits/braziers. It was noted that as a land use matter the county can place additional restrictions on camping.