



# AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

311 Fair Lane  
Placerville, CA 95667  
(530) 621-5520  
(530) 626-4756 FAX  
[eldcag@edcgov.us](mailto:eldcag@edcgov.us)

*Greg Boeger, Chair – Agricultural Processing Industry*  
*Lloyd Walker, Vice-chair – Other Agricultural Interests*  
*Chuck Bacchi – Livestock Industry*  
*Bill Draper – Forestry Related Industries*  
*Ron Mansfield – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry*  
*Tim Neilsen, Livestock Industry*  
*John Smith – Fruit and Nut Farming Industry*

## MINUTES

August 13, 2014  
6:30 P.M.

Board of Supervisors Meeting Room  
330 Fair Lane – Building A, Placerville

**Members Present:** Bacchi, Boeger, Smith, Walker, Mansfield, Draper, Neilsen

**Members Absent:** None

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Charlene Carveth, Agricultural Commissioner

**Media Members Present:** None

**Staff Members Present:** LeeAnne Mila Deputy Agricultural Commissioner  
Roger Trout, Planning Director  
David Defanti, Community Development Director  
Shawna Purvines, Principal Planner  
Tom Purciel, Long Range Planning  
Anne Novotny, Long Range Planning  
Chris Flores, Senior Agricultural Biologist  
Myrna Tow, Clerk to the Agricultural Commission

**Others Present:** Cedric Twight, Maryann Argyres, Bonnie & Bob Reitz, Noah Briel, Kathye Russell, Kimberly Star Petre, Bill Bacchi, David Zelinsky, Sue Taylor, Lori Parlin, Valerie Zentner and Dave Pratt

### I. CALL TO ORDER

- Chair, Greg Boeger, called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m.

### II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

***Chair Boeger called for a voice vote for approval to approve the Agenda of August 13, 2014 as submitted with Staff changes on recommendation for item V.***

**AYES:** Bacchi, Smith, Walker, Boeger, Mansfield, Draper, Neilsen  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSENT:** None

### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes of June 9, 2014

***It was moved by Mr. Smith, and seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve the Minutes of June 9, 2014 as submitted.***

- Chair, Greg Boeger, called for a voice vote for approval of the Minutes of July 9, 2014

**AYES:** Bacchi, Smith, Walker, Boeger, Mansfield, Draper

**NOES:** None

**ABSTAIN:** Neilsen

### IV. PUBLIC FORUM- No comments were received

- V. S 14-0005 - D'Artagnan Micro Winery (Robert & Bonnie Reitz):** A special use permit to allow a micro-winery at D'Artagnan Vineyards. 4 acres of grapes planted. Requests to produce and store wine on site, up to 1,000 cases. No new construction. There is a 1,800 sq. ft. existing AG bldg. No tasting room, retail sales, or special events. All sales are accomplished online or at the D'Artagnan Vineyards tasting room located at 815 Sutter Street in Old Folsom. The property, identified by Assessor's Parcel Number 126-130-65, consists of 5 acres, and is located on the east side of Rocky Springs Court 1 mile south of the intersection with Green Valley Road, in the El Dorado Hills area, District I.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tentative APPROVAL of S 14-0005, the request for a Special Use Permit for a micro-winery on APN 126-130-65, as the lot size, vineyard size and vineyard standards have been met. Per El Dorado County's Winery Ordinance, Title 17, Section 17.14.200.D.10.f, the production capacity shall not exceed 250 cases per acre of wine grapes grown on the lot (acreage to be verified by the Agriculture Department). All other micro-winery provisions shall need to be verified through other departments.

Staff also recommends approval of the setback, reduced to no less than 40 feet, for the existing, proposed winery building, as the subject parcel is 5 acres or less, the non-compatible structure was lawfully placed, and a ravine creates a natural buffer between the building and the residential parcel to the north.

**It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Neilsen to recommend tentative APPROVAL of S 14-0005 - D'Artagnan Micro Winery (Robert & Bonnie Reitz) for a Special Use Permit for a micro-winery on APN 126-130-65, as the lot size, vineyard size and vineyard standards have been met. Per El Dorado County's Winery Ordinance, Title 17, Section 17.14.200.D.10.f, the production capacity shall not exceed 250 cases per acre of wine grapes**

**grown on the lot (acreage to be verified by the Agriculture Department). All other micro-winery provisions shall need to be verified through other departments. Setback shall be reduced to no less than 40 feet, for the existing, proposed winery building.**

***Motion passed***

**AYES: Smith, Walker, Draper, Mansfield, Bacchi, Boeger, Neilsen**

**NOES: None**

**ABSENT: None**

VI. Planning Commission and Agricultural Commission presentation of a series of ongoing meetings to receive public comment on the TGPA-ZOU Project, and to prepare a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

- ***Project Components Related to Agriculture and Rural Lands:*** Learn about proposed changes to agricultural and rural lands including Agricultural District expansion, rural commercial policies, agricultural support services, ranch marketing allowances for commercial grazing operations and more. Share your comments with the Agricultural Commission.

During the Agricultural Commission's regularly scheduled meeting held on August 13, 2014 the following discussion and motions occurred following a presentation on the TGPA and ZOU Project specifically addressing the associated Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), and impacts noted by the DEIR regarding agricultural, rural and natural resource lands from Long Range Planning. The DEIR found that certain components of the project may cause significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetic resources, agricultural and forestry resources, biological resources and general land use resources. Ranch Marketing activities, such as music festivals, concerts and special events; Agricultural and Timber Resource Lodging; Intensive Public Utility Service Facilities; Health Resort and Retreat Centers; Ski Resorts; Off-Highway or Off-Road Vehicle Areas; and General Industrial uses were identified in the DEIR as possible sources of impact. The DEIR identifies the following mitigation measures to lessen the impacts to less-than-significant:

**Shawna Purvines gave a brief overview of the TGPA and the ZOU. Available on line [http://eldorado.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view\\_id=2&clip\\_id=480](http://eldorado.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=480)**

**Chris Flores addressed the Agricultural and Natural Resources Land items to be addressed by the Agricultural Commission.**

**Public Comment was received by Kathye Russell, Noah Briel, Valerie Zentner, Cedric Twight, Bill Bacchi and Sue Taylor.**

**The following excerpts were taken from the Staff Report, provided to the Agricultural Commission members, regarding the Draft EIR for the TGPA-ZOU Project.**

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Targeted General Plan Amendment (TGPA) and Zoning Ordinance Update (ZOU) project consists of targeted amendments to the El Dorado County General Plan, a comprehensive ZOU, and design standards and guidelines for mixed use development (MUD). The project applies to those areas that are under County jurisdiction and does not include the incorporated areas of the cities of South Lake Tahoe and Placerville.

### **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND PROCESS OVERVIEW**

The El Dorado County General Plan was adopted in 2004. On April 4, 2011 the Board received the first Five-Year review on the General Plan as required by General Plan Goal 2.9. The General Plan recognizes that development patterns in the County will change, new laws affecting land use will be passed, events will occur that will require changes, and imperfections will be discovered as the County implements the General Plan.

Per General Plan Goal 2.9, the 5-year review discussed a more comprehensive review and assessment of how effective the implementation has been since adoption. The report included:

1. State and local requirements for a General Plan review.
2. New information received since the adoption of the Plan, including:
  - a. Recent Changes in State Law;
  - b. Recent Economic Development Studies;
  - c. Economic and Planning Systems Housing Development Feasibility Study;
  - d. Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) Regulatory Reform General Plan Review;
  - e. 2010 Census Population Results; and
  - f. Current Economy Assessment.
3. A General Plan 5-Year review as delineated by General Plan Objective 2.9.1 including:
  - a. A Land Inventory;
  - b. Rate of Development;
  - c. Community Region/Rural Center Changes options;
  - d. General Plan Mitigation Monitoring Program Review; and
  - e. A Summary of Findings from the Review.

The review concluded that the basic General Plan goals and assumptions were still valid. The review also revealed areas within the General Plan that could be improved to better address the development of moderate income housing, the creation of jobs, the loss of sales tax revenues and the promotion and protection of the agriculture and natural resource industries in the County. The Board adopted a Resolution of Intention (ROI 051-2011) for a TGPA to: reduce constraints to the development of moderately-priced housing, support job creation, capture more sales tax revenues, and protect and

promote agriculture and natural resources. The Board also recognized the project should include any revisions necessary to address recent changes in State law.

The Board directed staff to work with the Community and Economic Development Advisory Committee (formally EDAC but now CEDAC) and its Regulatory Reform Sub Committee to address issues in regards to meeting the County's adopted goals and objectives through implementation of General Plan policies, the Zoning Ordinance and the Land Development Manual.

Following an almost year long process of review, on November 14, 2011, the Board adopted a Resolution of Intention (ROI 182-2011) for a TGPA that specified the policies that are being considered for amendment or analysis only. This ROI superseded any previous General Plan Amendment ROIs including ROI 051-2011 – TGPA, ROI 013-2011 – Agricultural District Expansion, ROI 182-2011 – Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region to Rural Center and ROI 274-2008 - 30% Open Space Policies Amendment.

The ROI identified a limited set of General Plan policies considered for amendment to achieve the Board's project objectives. The proposed policy changes are said to be "targeted" because they are limited to addressing only the areas of the General Plan thought to be inhibiting achievement of these goals and objectives. The specific General Plan policy changes relating to the promotion and protection of agricultural lands can be found in the Project Checklist (v.5.0) – Agricultural Promotion (see attachment).

#### **ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE**

The Zoning Ordinance is the primary tool for implementing the General Plan. In 2008, the Board directed staff to prepare a comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance to bring the Ordinance into conformance with the General Plan. This consistency is required by State law (Government Code §65860). Sections of the County's current Zoning Ordinance have been amended throughout the past 30 years, but the Ordinance has never been comprehensively updated. Piecemeal updates and amendments have resulted in a patchwork of provisions and dated regulations.

The comprehensive draft Zoning Ordinance Update (ZOU) was first presented to the Board at a public hearing on October 18, 2010. After the Board's review, the County released a 2010 Public Review Draft (PRD) Zoning Ordinance on the County's Planning Services website. On November 14, 2011, following an almost yearlong review of the PRD, the Board adopted two ROIs (183-2011 and 184-2011), superseding the previous ZOU ROIs. The new ROIs outlined a project description for completing the update, including the development of design standards and guidelines for mixed-use development and traditional neighborhood design, and additional items the Board desired to address in the draft related to the TGPA project.

#### **Agricultural and Resource Zones**

Through the Zoning Ordinance Update, obsolete zones are proposed to be removed, duplicate zones are proposed to change in name only, and new zones are proposed to

be added.

The Select Agricultural (SA-10) Zone, mostly found in the Camino area, is proposed to be changed to the Planned Agricultural (PA) Zone. Both zone districts were found to have the same allowed uses and were duplicate zones.

The Agricultural (A) zone and the Residential Agricultural (RA) zone are proposed to be deleted and changed to either the new Rural Lands (RL) zone, the new Limited Agricultural (LA) zone, or the new Forest Resource (FR) zone. All parcels with the A or RA zone were given the opportunity, through two separate mailings, to maintain their agricultural zoning, in order to keep their Right to Farm and buffering protections. This process was called the Agricultural Opt-In process. Over 3,000 property owners were notified (see attached Farm Bureau letter) and over 700 property owners "opted-in" to maintain their agricultural zoning. (Note: parcels with Residential Estate zoning in Agricultural Districts were also given the opportunity to request an agricultural zone, if other criteria were met).

The new Forest Resource (FR) zone is intended to identify land that is suitable for timber production. It is proposed for lands without a Timber Production Zone (TPZ), generally above 3,000 feet elevation, and/or National Forest lands.

The proposed new Agricultural Grazing (AG) zone is proposed for those parcels currently in a Williamson Act Contract for a low-intensive agricultural operation such as grazing.

The Exclusive Agricultural (AE) zone and the Agricultural Preserve (AP) zone are proposed to be deleted. Parcels currently in a Williamson Act Contract for a high-intensive agricultural operation are proposed to change to the PA and LA zones, respectively. Parcels, not currently in a Williamson Act Contract were given the opportunity, through the Agricultural Opt-In program to retain their agricultural zoning. Property owners who did not opt-in will have their parcels assigned a zone that is consistent with their underlying General Plan Land Use Designation.

### **Rural Commerce and Recreation**

In addition to the proposed General Plan amendment, the Zoning Ordinance Update (ZOU) also included the expansion of uses allowed in the Agricultural and Resource zones in the Rural Region to provide more opportunities for commercial development that would support the creation of jobs and increase sales tax capture in the County. One of the primary expanded uses would include Ranch Marketing on agricultural grazing land. Ranch Marketing would be allowed by right or upon approval of a CUP, administrative permit, temporary use permit, and minor use permit, depending on the particular use and the lot size.

### ***Ranch Marketing and Agricultural and Timber Resource Lodging:***

The DEIR has determined that certain Ranch Marketing activities and Agricultural and Resource Timber Lodging, because of their inherent location in rural areas, would have

the potential to adversely impact daytime or nighttime views due to lighting.

Implementation of *Mitigation Measure AES-4* would reduce the impact of Ranch Marketing and Agricultural and Timber Resource Lodging to daytime or nighttime views to a less-than-significant (LTS) level by revising the outdoor lighting standards for these uses.

The DEIR has determined that music festivals, concerts and special events, allowed through Ranch Marketing, could have an impact on special-status species habitat by causing fragmentation or conversion of the habitat. Impacts related to wildlife movement, as a result of noise, traffic, and lighting, associated with special events, music festivals and concerts would be significant and unavoidable (SU).

Implementation of *Mitigation Measure BIO-1c* would restrict certain Ranch Marketing events to areas without special-status species habitat. Implementation of this measure would reduce impacts related to Ranch Marketing uses to a less-than-significant (LTS) level. Mitigation Measure BIO-1c would add the following footnote to the Ranch Marketing Use Type matrix in the ZOU for the LA, PA, and AG zones, "Allowed only where the project site has no value as habitat for special-status animal and plant species identified on the most recent California Natural Diversity Database list for El Dorado County, and is consistent with General Plan Policy 7.4.1.6 regarding avoidance of important habitats."

*Mitigation Measure BIO-2* is recommended for implementation, to further protect special-status species habitat. This mitigation measure adds the following underlined language to Section 17.040.260.F.1.e(3): "Special events shall be limited in time duration to 48 hours, and the event site shall be returned to its pre-event condition after each use." The implementation of these measures would reduce impacts related to Ranch Marketing uses to a less-than-significant (LTS) level.

Mitigation Measures BIO-1c and BIO-2 would reduce the impacts from the above mentioned Ranch Marketing activities to a less-than-significant (LTS) level, but impacts to wildlife movement would remain significant and unavoidable (SU).

Although there are no specific uses being proposed on any site at this time and the purpose of the Ranch Marketing provisions is to provide farmers and ranchers a broader range of agriculture-related income-generating activities, these types of uses have the potential to substantially alter the character of the area in which they're located by introducing a new source of noise, traffic, and aesthetic impacts. This would be particularly true where the use would not be subject to a minor use permit, conditional use permit or temporary permit, and the County's ability to impose conditions to minimize impacts would therefore be limited.

To help ensure that Ranch Marketing uses are compatible with surrounding land uses, the DEIR recommends the implementation of *Mitigation Measure LU-4b*. The measure would add the following underlined language to Section 17.40.260.A.3 of the ZOU, to

reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant (LTS) level, "Ranch Marketing activities proposed within Agricultural Districts, as identified on the General Plan land use maps, or adjacent to land zoned Planned Agricultural (PA), Limited Agricultural (LA), Agricultural Grazing (AG), Forest Resource (FR), or Timber Production Zone (TPZ) must be reviewed by the Agricultural Commissioner for compatibility with surrounding agricultural land uses or on agriculturally zoned lands prior to action by the review authority."

***Health Resort and Retreat Centers:***

Also under the ZOU, Health Resort and Retreat Center uses are proposed to be allowed in the PA, AG, RL, FR, and TPZ zones upon approval of a CUP. Under the proposed code, lots adjacent to or within Agricultural zones must be reviewed by the County Agricultural Commission for compatibility with surrounding agricultural uses prior to consideration of the CUP. Nonetheless, the lack of a size limitation in the proposed ZOU raises the possibility of conflicts arising with agricultural operations over traffic and activity levels from this land use or conversion of a substantial amount of farmland to a nonagricultural use. Therefore, under the ZOU, impacts related to direct conversion of farmland or resource land would likely be significant and unavoidable.

***General Industrial Uses and Ski Resorts:***

The ZOU allows general industrial use in Forest Resource (FR) and Timber Production Zones (TPZ). The ZOU Glossary defines these uses as, "manufacturing, processing, assembling, or fabricating from raw materials to include any use involving an incinerator, blast furnace, or similar industrial process and any industrial process conducted wholly or partially indoors." Examples listed in the ZOU include lumber mills, batch plants, truss manufacturing, co-generation plants, food and byproduct processing plants, and fabric mills. The DEIR states that these types of uses are not compatible with the requirement that land within a TPZ be "enforceably restricted" to forestry in order to qualify under the Forest Taxation Reform Act of 1976. The DEIR recommends the implementation of *Mitigation Measure AG-4*, which would revise the Use Matrix in the ZOU to not allow Industrial, General uses in the TPZ zone, therefore reducing this impact to a less-than-significant (LTS) level.

Ski Areas are listed in the ZOU as an allowed use in FR and TPZ zones with a conditional use permit. As mentioned in the DEIR, typical Ski Area base facilities could include a day lodge, restaurants, maintenance facilities, retail shops and an extensive parking area. These uses are not considered "compatible uses" under the TPZ requirements and would necessitate a substantial portion of the ski area site to be removed from the TPZ zone. The DEIR states that allowing ski areas in a TPZ zone would have a significant impact. Implementation of *Mitigation Measure AG-4* would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant (LTS) level.

***Public Utility Service Facilities:***

The ZOU would allow Public Utility Services Facilities, both "intensive" and "minor", in PA, AG, RL, FR and TPZ Zones. "Intensive" service facilities would be defined as "facilities necessary to provide the community with power, water, sewage disposal,



telecommunications, and similar services.” The Glossary states that Intensive Service Facilities, “may have the potential to cause impacts from noise, lights, odors, or the use of hazardous materials, such as electrical receiving facilities or substations, sewage treatment facilities and power generating facilities”. “Minor” facilities would be defined as “service facilities such as water, sewer, gas pipelines, pump stations, telephone and electrical distribution lines 12 kilovolts (kV) or less, and drainage facilities”. Although this project component would result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of agricultural and biological resources, as well as to land use, major impacts to the agricultural resources could be reduced to a less-than-significant (LTS) level by implementing *Mitigation Measure AG-1b* (Amending the ZOU to limit Public Utility Service Facilities to minor facilities [only], in the PA, AG and RL Zones), and *Mitigation Measure AG-4* (removing the CUP allowance for Public Utility Service Facilities, Intensive, from the TPZ zone).

Mitigation Measures relating to Ranch Marketing and Agricultural and Timber Resource Lodging:

1. Mitigation Measure AES-4: Revise proposed ZOU Chapter 17.34 and Section 17.40.170 (light shielding). It was discussed that for safety reasons, lighting needs to be determined for each situation.

**It was moved by Mr. Bacchi and seconded by Mr. Neilsen to recommend revising the mitigation measure to not include a blanket component as written. Adopt the project, as proposed, without Mitigation Measure AES-4.**

***Motion passed***

**AYES: Smith, Walker, Draper, Mansfield, Bacchi, Boeger, Neilsen**  
**NOES: None**  
**ABSTAIN: None**

2. Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Limit music festivals and concerts. Discussed that the CUP would look at whether special-status animal is known in area.

**It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Draper to recommend revising the mitigation language by removing the blanket restriction in the measure. Adopt the project, as proposed, without Mitigation Measure BIO-1c.**

***Motion passed***

**AYES: Smith, Walker, Draper, Mansfield, Bacchi, Boeger, Neilsen**  
**NOES: None**  
**ABSTAIN: None**

3. Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Return event site to pre-event condition. Discussion about what the definition of pre-event condition is.

**It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Bacchi to recommend revising the mitigation measure as it is unnecessary and restrictive as written. Adopt the project, as proposed, without Mitigation Measure BIO-2.**

***Motion passed***

**AYES: Smith, Walker, Draper, Mansfield, Bacchi, Boeger, Neilsen**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: None**

4. Mitigation Measure LU-4b: Revise ZOU Section 17.40.260 to include compatibility review of Ranch Marketing uses by the Agricultural Commissioner.

Roger Trout provided clarification to the Agricultural Commission

**It was moved by Chair Boeger and seconded by Mr. Smith to recommend the wording be redrafted to clarify the project and mitigation language to clarify intent of measure with regards to Ag Commissioner review of ranch marketing activities. *Shawna Purvines mentioned that Long Range Planning will bring this back to the Agricultural Commissions next regularly scheduled meeting.***

***Motion passed***

**AYES: Smith, Walker, Draper, Mansfield, Bacchi, Boeger, Neilsen**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: None**

Mitigation Measure Relating to Health Resort and Retreat Centers:

5. Implementation of *Mitigation Measure AG-1a* would reduce the impact of Health Resort and Retreat Centers on agricultural and forestry resources to a less-than-significant level. The measure would place reasonable size limits on centers consistent with the requirements for Bed And Breakfast Inns.

**It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Neilsen to recommend the mitigation measure be re-written with size limitations and brought back to the Agricultural Commission. *Shawna Purvines mentioned that Long Range Planning will bring this back to the Agricultural Commissions next regularly scheduled meeting.***

***Motion passed***

**AYES: Smith, Walker, Draper, Mansfield, Boeger, Neilsen**

**NOES:** Bacchi  
**ABSTAIN:** None

**Staff notes:** Revise Mitigation Measure AG-1a to 1) strike out the reference to Bed and Breakfast Inns and 2) add new standards to the ZOU to meet the intent of limiting the size of Health Resort and Retreat Centers, specifically located on PA, AG, RL, FR and TPZ zones.

Mitigation Measure Relating to the Protection of Timber Production Zones:

6. Mitigation Measure AG-4: Amend Table 17.21.020 in the ZOU to remove the CUP allowance for Industrial, General; Off-highway or off-road vehicle recreation area; Ski Area; and Public Utility Service Facilities, Intensive.

**It was moved by Mr. Bacchi and seconded by Mr. Neilsen to adopt the project, as proposed, without Mitigation Measure AG-4.**

**Motion passed**

**AYES:** Walker, Mansfield, Bacchi, Neilsen  
**NOES:** Smith, Draper, Boeger  
**ABSTAIN:** None

**(Specifically referring to the removal of General Industrial, ORV Areas and Ski Area uses from the TPZ zone)**

Mitigation Measures relating to Public Utility Service Facilities, Intensive:

7. Mitigation Measure AG-1b: Amend the ZOU to limit Public Utility Service Facilities to minor facilities in the PA, AG, and RL zones.
8. Mitigation Measure AG-4: Amend proposed Table 17.21.020 of the ZOU, to restrict incompatible uses from being located in the TPZ zone

**It was moved by Mr. Bacchi and seconded by Mr. Smith to adopt the project as proposed, with Mitigation Measure AG-1b and a portion of Mitigation Measure AG-4 (see Staff notes).**

**Motion passed**

**AYES:** Walker, Mansfield, Bacchi, Neilsen, Smith, Boeger, Draper  
**NOES:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None

**Staff notes:** Adopt the project, as proposed, with Mitigation Measure AG-1b; amending the ZOU to limit Public Utility Service Facilities to Minor facilities in

***the PA, AG and RL zones and adopt the project, as proposed, with a portion of Mitigation Measure AG-4; amending the ZOU to remove Intensive Public Utility Service Facilities from the TPZ zone.***

### **Zone Mapping Criteria and Consistency with the General Plan**

Changes to the zoning map through the Zoning Ordinance Update have been limited to revising the County's zone district maps to ensure consistency with General Plan Land Use Designations and/or policies. The addition of new zoning types and the elimination of obsolete zones has been proposed to be consistent with the General Plan. As such, zone district remapping is not anticipated to create any new impacts not already reviewed as part of the 2004 General Plan EIR.

**It was moved by Mr. Draper and seconded by Mr. Smith to adopt the mapping measures as proposed.**

***Motion passed***

**AYES: Walker, Mansfield, Bacchi, Neilsen, Smith Boeger, Draper**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: None**

***Staff notes: Adopt the project, as proposed, regarding mapping and zone changes for consistency with the General Plan, State and federal law.***

### **Community Region/Rural Center Boundary Amendments**

A fundamental characteristic of the General Plan is the identification of three (3) distinct planning concept areas. These planning concept areas include:

1. Multiple Community Regions;
2. Rural Centers, and
3. A single Rural Region which consists of all lands not included in either a Community Region or Rural Center. The intent of the General Plan, through the application of these planning concept areas, is to provide for a more manageable land use pattern.

The General Plan defines a Community Region as urban limit areas...where the urban and suburban land uses will be developed (Objective 2.1.1). Community Regions are ...those areas which are appropriate for the highest intensity of self-sustaining compact urban-type development or suburban type development within the County based on the municipal spheres of influence, availability of infrastructure, public services, major transportation corridors and travel patterns, the location of major topographic patterns and features, and the ability to provide and maintain appropriate transitions at Community Region boundaries (Policy 2.1.1.2).

Existing Community Regions identified on the General Plan Land Use map are: Cameron Park, Camino/Pollock Pines, Diamond Springs, El Dorado, El Dorado Hills, Shingle Springs, and the City of Placerville and immediate surroundings (Policy 2.1.1.1).

Rural Center boundaries establish areas of higher intensity development throughout the rural areas of the County based on the availability of infrastructure, public services, existing uses, parcelization, impact on natural resources, etc. (Policy 2.1.2.2).

Existing Rural Centers identified on the General Plan Land Use map are: Chrome Ridge, Coloma, Cool, Fairplay, Garden Valley, Georgetown, Greenwood, Grey's Corner, Grizzly Flat, Kelsey, Kyburz, Latrobe, Little Norway, Lotus, Mosquito, Mount Aukum, Mount Ralston, Nashville, Oak Hill, Phillips, Pilot Hill, Pleasant Valley, Quintette, Rescue, Somerset, and Strawberry (Policy 2.1.2.1).

The Targeted General Plan Amendment does not include changes to the outer boundaries of the Community Regions or Rural Centers identified on the General Plan land use map. The Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region Boundary Amendment (Resolution 110-2009) considered dividing the Community Region of Camino/Pollock Pines into three separate Rural Centers -- Pollock Pines, Cedar Grove, and Camino. The Board of Supervisors included this task in the project review with the adoption of the Resolution of Intention for the Targeted General Plan Amendment. Both Community Region and Rural Center boundaries are shown on the General Plan land use map.

**It was moved by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Neilsen to adopt the proposed measure with specified boundaries between the Camino, Cedar Grove, and Pollock Pines Community Region Boundaries, but with the recommendation of the external boundary of the Pollock Pines Community Region to be re-examined**

***Motion passed***

**AYES: Walker, Mansfield, Neilsen, Smith Boeger, Draper**

**NOES: None**

**ABSTAIN: Bacchi**

**This item will be on our next agenda for clarification purposes as the terminology was Community Region in motion, but should be Rural Centers. We will correct this at the next meeting when Long Range Planning brings the other two items back for your review.**

***Staff notes: Adopt the project proposal to change the Camino/Pollock Pines Community Region to 3 Rural Centers (Camino, Cedar Grove, and Pollock Pines), maintaining the exterior existing Community Region boundary line at this time, but with the recommendation that the exterior boundary line be re-examined in the future.***

### **Agricultural District Boundary Expansion**

The project proposes to amend the boundaries of the County's Agricultural Districts by the inclusion of 479 parcels and the removal of 96 parcels around the Garden Valley-Georgetown, Coloma-Lotus, Camino-Fruitridge, Gold Hill, Oak Hill, Pleasant Valley, and Fair Play-Somerset Agricultural Districts, to fulfill General Plan Implementation Measure AF-J. Although the project would result in significant net expansion of these Agricultural Districts (17,241 acres) the project also proposes a "clean up" removal of several parcels (137 acres) that are now within Agricultural Districts, but which do not actually meet the standards for inclusion, based on the criteria listed in General Plan Policy 8.1.1.2.

The County Agricultural Commission made recommendations on all parcels identified for inclusion and/or removal through a public process that included 9 public hearings and the notification of all affected landowners. Out of 479 proposed parcel additions, only 8 landowners contested the idea. All contested parcels were addressed during the May 2010 Agricultural Commission meeting.

On January 25, 2011, the Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution of Intention (ROI 013-2011) authorizing the Development Services Department to proceed with the recommendations of the Agricultural Commission and prepare a draft revision to the Agricultural District boundaries.

**It was moved by Mr. Bacchi and seconded by Mr. Walker to adopt the project, as proposed, regarding the Agricultural District Boundary Expansion.**

***Motion passed***

**AYES:** Walker, Mansfield, Bacchi, Neilsen, Smith Boeger, Draper

**NOES:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

*Note: The adoption of this proposal would fulfill Implementation Measure AF-J of the General Plan. All parcels proposed for inclusion into an Agricultural District underwent a suitability review consistent with General Plan Policies 8.1.1.1, 8.1.1.2, 8.1.1.3, and 8.1.1.4. The inclusion of suitable lands into an Agricultural District would not have a negative impact on agricultural or forestry resources by converting important farmland, grazing land, or land currently in agricultural production to some other non-agricultural use. The inclusion would also not cause a land use conflict resulting in the cancellation or roll-out of a Williamson Act Contract.*

**VII. LEGISLATION AND REGULATORY ISSUES – Charlene Carveth**

**VIII. CORRESPONDENCE and PLANNING REQUESTS – Charlene Carveth**

**IX. OTHER BUSINESS – None**

**X. ADJOURNMENT 9:47pm**

**APPROVED:** \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE: 9/10/14**  
**Greg Boeger, Chair**