Working Lands Committee Meeting Minutes May 7, 2008

Members Present:

Roger King, Abby Meyer, Sam Skemp, Delores Rhymes, Bud Deflorian

Sam:

By definition, this lease has to be compatible with PDR's and most be compatible with farm and ranchland preservation.

Bud/Delores:

But where does the money come from, especially in this economy.

Review of Purpose Statement

Discussion

Committee Task #2

Discussion of homework assignment

Had difficulty breaking down criteria, too many had importance.

Delores:

- 1. Land Use policy.
 - a. Ranked soils, natural scenic beauty real problem with removal of Ag. Land
- 2. Stewardship
- 3. Environmental limitations

Bud:

- 1. Land Use/ Working Lands
- 2. Soil Quality
- 3. Stewardship/Wildlife
- 4.
- 5.
- 6. Wetland/Riparian
- 7.
- 8. Environmental limitations

First must consider what land is being used for.

Roger King:

- 1. Soils
- 2. Stewardship
- 3. Opens space & working lands & land use policy
- 4. Infrastructure, urbanization and services
- 5. Irrigation/ Ag. Services
- 6, 7, 8 Scenic Value, Flood Plain, Etc.

Open space/Strategic Value

Doug asked: What would you measure?

Roger: I live in the country, and I want to enjoy the open living areas that are undeveloped.

- Proximity to development

Abby Meyer:

- 1. Stewardship to Land
- 2. Proximity to protected open spaces

3.

- 4. Soils
- 5. Size of Farm
- 6. Compatibility with adjacent land uses

7.

8. Educational ability

Sam Skemp

- 1. Soils quality for growing crops
- 2. Availability of Ag. Infrastructure
- 3. Compatibility with adjacent
- 4. Proximity to protected working lands
- 5. Size of farm
- 6. Stewardship
- 7. Distance to urban boundaries
- 8. Land use policies

Sam Skemp:

NRCS already has land evaluation information in place

Doug:

NRCS actually looks higher at local CEZA models

Roger

Important to look at farm size too, not just soil productivity

Committee members asked to use dots to rank various characteristics

Only one dot per category

Asked to have each other place their 8 dots where they feel represent the most important aspects.

Site Assessment Data

W.	hat	t are im	portant	devel	lopment	pressure c	harac	teris	tics?
----	-----	----------	---------	-------	---------	------------	-------	-------	-------

2	Land Use Policies
1	Percent of surrounding land uses
2	D: 1 1 1 1 1 1

3 Distance to urban/service/boundaries/feeder highways

<u>5</u> Proximity to protected working lands

____ Other

What are imp	ortant public values?
_ 3	Strategic Open Space
	Educational Value
	Historical/Archeological Value
1	Wetland/Riparian areas
	Scenic Values
	Wildlife
	Flood Plain Protection
	Other
What are imp	ortant agriculture productivity characteristics?
_ 4	Size of Farm
5	Shape of Farm
	Compatibility w/ adjacent surrounding land uses
	On-farm Investments
4	Availability of Ag. Infrastructure
4	Stewardship
	Environment Limitations
	Irrigation Availability
3	Type of Farm Operation
	*

Land Use Policies- What are they?

Ag. Exclusive gets highest score

Roger:

• Soil classification 1, 2, 4 – this is why Bud scored it this way. – Bud resided his vote.

Meeting to adjourn @ 6:00p.m.

Doug asked committee comment.

- Bob Skemp thinks most of this work has been done by NRCS
- Delores enjoying the discussion going on.
- Roger King thinks the same way.
- Bud DeFlorian
 - o There are plenty of conservation programs, but they aren't enforced
 - We need a local CEZA program

June meeting to be skipped, next meeting July 2, 2008.