



MARIN COUNTY FARM BUREAU

P.O. Box 219, Pt. Reyes, CA 94956

March 12, 2013

President Judy Arnold and the Marin County Board of Supervisors
Via e-mail c/o Kristin Drumm: kdrumm@marincounty.org

Re: **Clarification on Remaining Issues;**
Corrected Link to California Farm Bureau Federation's 3/4/10 Letter

Dear President Arnold and Honorable Supervisors,

Thank you for being so receptive to the agriculture community's concerns at your February 26, 2013 hearing. We particularly appreciate your board's inclination to revise permit requirements for veterinary clinics and cottage industries and, with County Counsel's and Staff's input, to modify the Potential Takings Economic Evaluation in acknowledgment of the Constitutional right to privacy.

There remain just a few issues where some clarification might help everyone, and which we hope you will consider in advance of the April 16 hearing.

Categorical Exclusion Orders

We are very grateful that you understand the potentially devastating impacts to agriculture of disallowing "Agricultural Exclusions" on all lands directly adjacent to the coast, recognizing that the disparity is discriminatory and makes no sense. You offered to do what you can to broaden the Categorical Exclusion Areas for Agriculturally Related Development to include all the farms and ranches in the Coastal Zone, by bringing up the matter during the Coastal Commission's May Agricultural Workshop and to bring it to the attention of the California State Association of Counties, in addition to looking into legislative remedies involving amending the Coastal Act itself.

We believe we may have discovered language in the Coastal Act that will allow you to legally and simply correct this inequity yourselves, through the LCP amendment process:

Please see Coastal Act Section 30610.5, where you can find the geographical description pertaining to conditions for exclusions from permit provisions,

"Tide and submerged land, beaches, and lots immediately adjacent to the inland extent of any beach, or of the mean high tide line of the sea where there is no beach, and all lands and

waters subject to the public trust shall not be excluded under either subdivision (a) of this section or subdivision (e) of Section 30610."

Note that this geographical description applies to "Urban" land areas. We don't find anything in this or any other Coastal Act section that applies these geographical parameters to deny exclusions on rural or agricultural lands.

Because the Coastal Act limits the area in which development can be Categorically Excluded in Urban land areas, there is nothing we can see that precludes you from expanding the Excludable Areas for Agricultural Exclusions to encompass *all* of Marin's rural, agriculturally-zoned parcels in the Coastal Zone.

Given the Coastal Act's mechanisms for requesting Categorical Exclusions and for amending local LCPs, we think you could right this disparity now, through this process, and remain compliant with the entirety of Section 30610 of the Coastal Act dealing with coastal resource protection.

The "Constitutionality (or similar) Clause" and References to it

We appreciate the intent of the new proposed section, Interpretation of the Land Use Plan (INT), and the proposed policy **C-INT-1 Consistency with Other Law**. However, we believe that at the last hearing there was some confusion and a misunderstanding regarding the part of our request, and that of our attorney, Doug Ferguson, to reference such a clause in all relevant policies and codes. We are not arguing for redundancy and repetition of a constitutionality or consistency clause in every relevant policy or code, but rather a simple reference to it, i.e. "Consistent with Policy C-INT-1..." in all the applicable codes and policies where there may be a potential takings implications. Some of these are listed in Attachment #1 of our February 19, 2013 letter [2/19/2013](#).

By incorporating this brief reference, you would also provide internal consistency in the LCP language. Please see the difference between the language in C-AG-7.B.3: "*Consistent with state and federal laws*, a permanent agricultural conservation easement... shall be required..." and C-PA-2: "*Where a nexus exists between impacts of proposed development and provision of [an easement]...*" as one example.

In any case, with respect to the actual language of the clause, we continue to believe that without specific incorporation of the nexus and proportionality requirements, the LCP will not provide the clarity and transparency necessary for creating a fair and legal permitting process, and will result in undue legal costs for both applicants and the County. Mr. Ferguson has offered his pro bono assistance to work with County Counsel to come up with compromise language, as would PLF's Paul Beard. Unless the Board and Staff can provide a sound and valid reason why this should not be done, then it should be included.

Internally Inconsistent Language in C-AG-7.A Development Standards for the Agricultural Production Zone (C-APZ) Lands

Regarding the development standards for Non-Agricultural Uses, we understand that our proposal dealing with specifying a portion of the property is not feasible. Rather, we suggest that you follow the recommendation made near the end of the last hearing referring you to Coastal Act Section 30242 regarding conversion, which uses the word "or" rather than the word "and." If the LCP similarly uses the word "or" when listing the required findings, this will resolve the policy's inconsistency and address the intent of the Coastal Act.

Bed and breakfast inns, Table 5-1-d

As we have maintained in our earlier letters during this process, even though we did not include it as an unresolved issue in our last letter, we concur with our membership that bed and breakfast inns, three or fewer guest rooms, should be changed back to a Principally Permitted Use, as it currently is allowed in Development Code Section 22.57.030i., and was designated as such in the original LCPA public review draft. Any allowance for additional income for farmers and ranchers will help them to be economically viable and enable them to continue in agriculture production.

Support for California Cattlemen's Association's Positions

In its February 26, 2013 letter [2/26/2013](#), CCA's Margo Parks, Director of Government Relations, made compelling arguments to recommend changes in the LCPA that would be vital to agriculture's viability. Marin County Farm Bureau strongly supports these positions, including:

- adding brush clearing and vegetation management as a Principally Permitted Use,
- requiring scientific determination and open public comment to determine ESHA,
- determining buffer zones through specific site review and not on a one-size-fits-all basis.


Please incorporate these considerations in your adopted amendments.

Corrected Link

A letter from California Farm Bureau Federation was incorrectly linked as a reference in our February 19, 2013 "Outstanding Issues" letter. The correct letter containing CFBF's relevant positions was submitted to the County on March 4, 2010 and can be found at this link [3/4/2010](#). We apologize for the error.

Thank you for your consideration, and thanks once again for recognizing that the Coastal Act gives you the authority over, and the autonomy from, the Coastal Commission, when determining the precise content of our LCP. Thank you for continuing to support this in the future as the LCPA goes through the Coastal Commission certification process.

Respectfully submitted,



Dominic Grossi
President
Marin County Farm Bureau

Cc:

Marin County Board of Supervisors BOS@co.marin.ca.us
Steven Woodside, Interim Marin County Counsel SWoodside@marincounty.org
David L. Zaltsman , Deputy County Counsel Dzaltsman@marincounty.org
Stacy Carlsen, Marin Agriculture Commissioner SCarlsen@co.marin.ca.us
Jack Rice, California Farm Bureau Federation JRice@cfbf.com
Chris Scheuring, California Farm Bureau Federation CScheuring@cfbf.com
Doug Ferguson doug.ferguson@sbcglobal.net
Paul Beard, Pacific Legal Foundation pjb@pacificlegal.org
David Lewis, UCCE djllewis@ucdavis.edu
Jamison Watts, MALT jwatts@malt.org
Tito Sasaki, Sonoma County Farm Bureau tito@att.net
Margo Parks, California Cattlemen's Association Margo@calcattlemen.org