



## County of San Mateo Planning & Building Department Agricultural Advisory Committee

John Vars  
Koren Widdel  
Jess Brown  
Jim Howard

Frank McPherson  
Judith Humburg  
Lauren Silberman  
Louie Figone

William Cook  
Peter Marchi  
Natalie Sare  
Fred Crowder

Ryan Casey  
James Oku  
Jonathan Winslow  
Summer Burlison

County Office Building  
455 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, California 94063  
650/363-1825  
Fax: 650/363-4849

### Regular Meeting \*\*BY VIDEOCONFERENCE ONLY\*\*

**Date:** Monday, July 11, 2022

**Time:** 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

**Place:** Virtual Meeting due to COVID-19 Shelter in Place Order  
<https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/98081766542>

Pursuant to the Shelter in Place Orders issued by the San Mateo County Health Officer and the Governor, the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, and the CDC's social distancing guidelines which discourage large public gatherings, the Half Moon Bay Public Library is no longer open to the public for Agricultural Advisory Committee meetings.

#### **\* PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

##### **Written Comments:**

Members of the public may provide written comments by email to [SBurlison@smcgov.org](mailto:SBurlison@smcgov.org) and should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting, or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda.

The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the 5 minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 300-400 words. To ensure your comment is received and read into the record for the appropriate agenda item, please submit your comments no later than 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting. The County will make every effort to read emails received after that time, but cannot guarantee such emails will be read into the record. Any emails received after the deadline which are not read into the record will be provided to the Committee after the meeting and become part of the administrative record.

Individuals who require special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet, or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting should contact Summer Burlison, the Planning Liaison, by 10:00 a.m. on the Friday before the meeting at [SBurlison@smcgov.org](mailto:SBurlison@smcgov.org). Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting, the materials related to it, and your ability to comment.

## **Virtual Meeting/Spoken Comments**

Spoke public comments will be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. **Please read the following instructions carefully:**

1. The July 11, 2022 Agricultural Advisory meeting may be accessed through Zoom online at <https://smcgov.zoom.us/j/98081766542>. The **meeting ID is 980 8176 6542**; the meeting may also be accessed via telephone by dialing +1 669-900-6833 (Local). Enter the meeting ID: **980 8176 6542** then press #. (To find your local number: <http://smcgov.zoom.us/u/admSDqceDg>).
2. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting using an internet browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up to date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionalities may be disabled in older browsers including internet explorer.
3. You may be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
4. When the Committee calls for the item on which you wish to speak, click on “raise hand” or \*9 if calling in on a phone. The Secretary will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called to speak.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted.

### **MATERIALS PRESENTED FOR THE MEETING:**

Applicants and members of the public are encouraged to submit materials to the Agricultural Advisory Committee. All materials (including but not limited to models and pictures) submitted on any item on the agenda are considered part of the administrative record for that item and must be retained by the Committee Secretary. If you wish to retain the original of an item, a legible copy must be left with the Committee Secretary.

### **AGENDAS AND STAFF REPORTS ONLINE:**

To view the agenda, please visit our website at <https://planning.smcgov.org/agricultural-advisory-committee>. Staff reports will be available on the website one week prior to the meeting. For further information on any item listed below please contact the corresponding Project Planner indicated.

### **CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMITTEE:**

Summer Burlison, Interim Agricultural Advisory Committee Liaison  
455 County Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94062  
Email: [SBurlison@smcgov.org](mailto:SBurlison@smcgov.org)

### **NEXT MEETING:**

The next regularly scheduled Agricultural Advisory Committee meeting is on August 8, 2022.

**AGENDA**  
**7:00 p.m.**

1. **Call to Order**
  2. **Member Roll Call**
  3. **Adopt a Resolution** that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees.
  4. **Oral Communications** to allow the public to address the Committee on any matter not on the agenda. If your subject is not on the agenda, the Chair will recognize you at this time.
  5. **Committee Member Update(s) and/or Questions** to allow Committee Members to share news and/or concerns for items not on the agenda.
  6. **Committee Discussion and Update** on the current COVID-19 pandemic, potential policies needed to protect local agricultural and water from contamination, how the pandemic may affect local food supply, and access to farm labor and resources available to producers and farm workers.
  7. **Committee Discussion and Update** on next action steps for market development for San Mateo County's agricultural production and potential.
  8. **Community Development Director's Report**
- 

**Regular Agenda**

9. **Presentation** on Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District's agricultural policy development process. Presenter: Kirk Lenington, Natural Resources Department Manager, Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District.
10. **Committee Review of (AAC) Subcommittee Meeting Notes on Agritourism Guidelines** from Subcommittee Meeting 1 (January 28, 2021) and Subcommittee Meeting 2 (February 17, 2021).
11. **Adjournment**

---

Agricultural Advisory Committee meetings are accessible to people with disabilities. Individuals who need special assistance or a disability-related modification or accommodation (including auxiliary aids or services) to participate in this meeting; or who have a disability and wish to request an alternative format for the agenda, meeting notice, agenda packet or other writings that may be distributed at the meeting, should contact the County Representative at least five (5) working days before the meeting at (650) 363-1815, or by fax at (650) 363-4849, or e-mail SBurlison@smcgov.org. Notification in advance of the meeting will enable the Committee to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting and the materials related to it.

**ROLL SHEET – July 11, 2022**

Agricultural Advisory Committee Attendance 2021-2022

	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July
<b>VOTING MEMBERS</b>													
Judith Humburg Public Member	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
James Oku Farmer								X	X	X	X	X	
Natalie Sare Farmer	X	X		X	X		X	X	X			X	
Louie Figone Farmer, Vice-Chair		X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Jonathan Winslow Public Member								X	X	X	X	X	
John Vars Farmer, Chair		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
William Cook Farmer		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Peter Marchi Farmer	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ryan Casey Farmer								X	X	X	X	X	
Fred Crowder Conservationist								X	X	X		X	
Lauren Silberman Ag Business	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
<b>Natural Resource Conservation Staff</b>													
Jim Howard													
San Mateo County Agricultural Commissioner Koren Widdel	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Farm Bureau Executive Director Jess Brown	X	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	
San Mateo County Planning Staff Summer Burlison	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
UC Co-Op Extension Representative Frank McPherson													

**X: Present**

**Blank Space: Absent or Excused**

**Grey Color: No Meeting**

**\* Special Meeting**



**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**ITEM**

**3**

**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**DATE:** June 30, 2022

**To:** Agricultural Advisory Committee  
**From:** Summer Burlison, Planning Liaison  
**Subject:** Resolution to make findings allowing continued remote meetings under Brown Act

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a resolution finding that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency, in person meetings of the Agricultural Advisory Committee would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

**DISCUSSION:**

On June 14, 2022, the County of San Mateo Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution finding that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees. The Board's adopted resolution invokes the provisions of recently enacted state legislation (AB 361) to continue teleconferencing for meetings, and strongly encourages other County legislative bodies to make similar findings and continue meeting remotely through teleconferencing.

As encouraged by the Board of Supervisors, and for the reasons set forth in the proposed resolution, we recommend that your Committee similarly avail itself of the provisions of AB 361 allowing continuation of remote meetings by adopting findings to the effect that conducting in-person meetings would present an imminent risk to the health and safety of attendees. A resolution to that effect, and directing staff to return each 30 days with the opportunity to renew such findings, is attached hereto.

If the resolution is not adopted, the Committee must meet in person, effective as of July 11, 2022.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

A. Resolution (No. 10) for Adoption

## RESOLUTION NO. (10)

### RESOLUTION FINDING THAT, AS A RESULT OF THE CONTINUING COVID-19 PANDEMIC STATE OF EMERGENCY, IN PERSON MEETINGS OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO THE HEALTH OR SAFETY OF ATTENDEES

---

**RESOLVED**, by the Agricultural Advisory Committee of the County of San Mateo, State of California, that

**WHEREAS**, on March 4, 2020, pursuant to section 8550, *et seq.*, of the California Government Code, Governor Newsom proclaimed a state of emergency related to the COVID-19 novel coronavirus and, subsequently, the County of San Mateo Board of Supervisors declared a local emergency related to COVID-19, and the proclamation by the Governor and declaration by the Board remain in effect; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 17, 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended certain provisions in the California Open Meeting Law, codified at Government Code section 54950, *et seq.* (the “Brown Act”), related to teleconferencing by local agency legislative bodies, provided that certain requirements were met and followed; and

**WHEREAS**, on June 11, 2021, the Governor issued Executive Order N-08-21, which extended certain provisions of Executive Order N-29-20 that waive otherwise-applicable Brown Act requirements related to remote/teleconference meetings by local agency legislative bodies through September 30, 2021; and

**WHEREAS**, on September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed AB 361, which provides that a local agency legislative body may continue to meet remotely without complying with otherwise-applicable requirements in the Brown Act related to remote/teleconference meetings by local agency legislative bodies, provided that a state of emergency has been declared and the legislative body determines that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and provided that the legislative body makes such finding at least every thirty days during the term of the declared state of emergency; and

**WHEREAS**, on June 14, 2022, the County of San Mateo Board of Supervisors made the finding that, as a result of the continuing COVID-19 pandemic state of emergency, meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees, and therefore adopted a Resolution invoking the provisions of AB 361 to continue teleconferencing for meetings, and strongly encouraging other County legislative bodies to make similar findings and continue meeting remotely through teleconferencing; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Agricultural Advisory Committee concludes that there is a continuing threat of COVID-19 to the community, and that Committee meetings have characteristics that give rise to risks to health and safety of meeting participants (such as the increased mixing associated with bringing together people from across the community, the need to enable those who are immunocompromised or unvaccinated to be able to safely continue to participate fully in public governmental meetings, and the challenges with fully ascertaining and ensuring compliance with vaccination and other safety recommendations at such meetings); and

**WHEREAS**, California Department of Public Health and the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention caution that the Delta variant of COVID-19, currently



the dominant strain of COVID-19 in the country, is more transmissible than prior variants of the virus, that it may cause more severe illness, and that even fully vaccinated individuals can spread the virus to others, resulting in rapid and alarming rates of COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/delta-variant.html>); and

**WHEREAS**, this Agricultural Advisory Committee has an important interest in protecting the health and safety of those who participate in meetings of this Committee; and

**WHEREAS**, this Agricultural Advisory Committee typically meets in-person in a public setting, such that the number of people present at these meetings may impair the safety of the occupants; and

**WHEREAS**, the COVID-19 pandemic has informed County agencies about the unique advantages of online public meetings, which are substantial, as well as the unique challenges, which are frequently surmountable; and

**WHEREAS**, in the interest of public health and safety, as affected by the state of emergency caused by the spread of COVID-19, the San Mateo County Agricultural Advisory Committee finds that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees, and the Committee will therefore invoke the provisions of AB 361 related to teleconferencing for meetings of the Agricultural Advisory Committee, as strongly encouraged by the Board of Supervisors, to make such findings and continue meeting remotely through teleconferencing.

**NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED AND ORDERED** that

1. The recitals set forth above are true and correct.
2. The Agricultural Advisory Committee finds that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of meeting attendees.
3. The Planning staff liaison to the Committee is directed to continue to agendize public meetings of the Agricultural Advisory Committee only as online teleconference meetings, as strongly encouraged by the Board of Supervisors, until the risk of community transmission has further declined.
4. No later than thirty (30) days, or at the beginning of the next regular meeting, after the date of adoption of this resolution the Committee shall again consider whether to make the findings required by AB 361 in order to continue meeting remotely under its provisions.



**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**ITEM**

**8**

**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO  
PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**DATE:** June 30, 2022

**TO:** Agricultural Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Planning Staff  
**SUBJECT:** Community Development Director's Report

**CONTACT INFORMATION:** Summer Burlison, Senior Planner, [SBurlison@smcgov.org](mailto:SBurlison@smcgov.org)

The following is a list of Planned Agricultural District permits and Coastal Development Exemptions for the rural area of the County that have been received by the Planning Department from June 2, 2022 to June 30, 2022.

**PLANNED AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT (PAD) PERMIT OUTCOMES**

The following PAD permit applications were heard or considered by the Board of Supervisors and/or Planning Commission during this time period:

No PAD Permit applications were heard or considered during this time period.

**UPCOMING PLANNED AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT PERMIT PROJECTS**

No PAD permit applications were filed during this time period.

**COASTAL DEVELOPMENT EXEMPTIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL PROJECTS**

Two (2) rural CDX applications were submitted during this time period. Please see the attached status report regarding the applications. The CDX list includes the description of the project and its status. A copy of the CDX is available for public review upon request.

**OTHER PROJECTS**

- a. **Owner/Applicant:** C & K Beffa Trust/Kerry Burke  
**File Number:** PLN2022-00204  
**Location:** 2510 Purisima Creek Road, North San Gregorio  
**Assessor's Parcel No.:** 066-230-040

After-the-fact Coastal Development Permit for an emergency domestic well approved under PLN2021-00211 to replace an existing failed well serving the existing residence.

*This application was submitted on June 30, 2022.*

- b. **Owner/Applicant:** County of San Mateo  
**File Number:** PLN2022-00066  
**Location:** Various, Agriculture lands  
**Assessor's Parcel No.:** Various

Consideration of Amendments to Chapter 5.148 of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code regarding Commercial Cannabis Cultivation in the unincorporated area of San Mateo County. Please direct any questions to Summer Burlison at [SBurlison@smcgov.org](mailto:SBurlison@smcgov.org).

*The Board of Supervisors will consider this project at their July 12, 2022 meeting.*

- c. **Owner/Applicant:** California Dept. of Transportation, State of California  
**File Number:** PLN 2021-00383  
**Location:** State Route 1 at Postmile 1.12 (approx. 2,000 feet south of the entrance to Año Nuevo State Park, Pescadero)  
**Assessor's Parcel No.:** Public Right of Way (adjacent to 089-230-420)

Consideration of a Coastal Development Permit to repair a section of eroding road embankment located at Postmile 1.12 (Cold Dip Creek) located on Highway 1, just north of the Santa Cruz County line, in the unincorporated Pescadero area of San Mateo County. This project is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. Application deemed complete on October 5, 2021. Please direct questions to Michael Schaller at [mschaller@smcgov.org](mailto:mschaller@smcgov.org).

*The Planning Commission approved this project at their June 22, 2022 meeting. The County's local appeal period ends on July 7, 2022.*

- d. **Owner/Applicant:** CA State Department of Parks and Recreation  
**File Number:** PLN2022-00016  
**Location:** Green Oaks Way (Año Nuevo State Park), Pescadero  
**Assessor's Parcel No.:** 089-230-480

Consideration of a Coastal Development Permit to implement the Green Oaks Habitat Restoration Project on undeveloped farmland in a section of Año Nuevo State Park west of Highway 1 (known as Steele Ranch), in the unincorporated Pescadero area of San Mateo County. This project is appealable to the California Coastal Commission. Application deemed complete on April 7, 2022. Please direct questions to Summer Burlison at [SBurlison@smcgov.org](mailto:SBurlison@smcgov.org).

*The Planning Commission approved this project at their June 22, 2022 meeting. The County's local appeal period ends on July 7, 2022.*

## **ADDITIONAL ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. The next regular meeting of the AAC is scheduled for August 8, 2022. Tentative agenda item: Follow-up on the Local Coastal Program Amendment related to the replacement of the Pescadero Fire Station and extension of CSA-11. *This AAC continued this item at their June 13, 2022 meeting to give Planning staff time to research questions raised during the AAC's consideration of the project.*

# COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

Count Distinct (RECORD ID)						
2						
Permit Number	RECORD NAME	DATE OPENED	DESCRIPTION	APN	ADDR FULL LINE1	RECORD STATUS
<a href="#">PLN2022-00187</a>	AG WELL	6/3/2022	CDX for an ag well for a cattle ranch.	086241050	515 STAGE RD, PESCADERO, CA	Submitted
<a href="#">PLN2022-00192</a>	AG WELL	6/13/2022	CDX for an ag well to support agricultural operations on the property (worker breakroom, restrooms).	048320020	37 FRENCHMAN'S CREEK RD, HALF MOON BAY, CA	Approved



**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**ITEM**

**9**

MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT  
AGRICULTURAL POLICY DEVELOPMENT

**Agricultural Producers and Stakeholders Survey**

April 2022

**Background:**

Since 2005, Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (Midpen) has been preserving open space and agricultural land in coastal San Mateo County to protect and restore the natural environment, preserve rural character of the region, promote viable agricultural land use and provide opportunities for ecologically sensitive public enjoyment and education. Midpen has primarily carried out this work through our Conservation Grazing Program by integrating conservation grazing operations into land management activities on Midpen lands to preserve the biodiversity of grassland habitats and reduce fuels loads and fire risk while sustaining the local agricultural heritage of the coastside. Midpen also works collaboratively with many partners to support agricultural preservation in the region. These diverse partnerships include local producers, Peninsula Open Space Trust, the San Mateo Resource Conservation District, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the Agriculture Commissioner's office among many others. The San Mateo Resource Conservation District helps farmers with technical expertise and connects them to funding sources for infrastructure improvements to keep farming viable while protecting the environment. In addition, they host the county Agriculture Ombudsperson to help farmers navigate county permitting. Peninsula Open Space Trust preserves active agriculture operations through the purchase of fee title land or easements through its Farmland Futures Initiative. POST places agriculture conservation easements on intensive agriculture properties, such as row crop farmlands, to keep lands in agriculture and prevent their conversion to other uses. Midpen has largely focused its work in coastal San Mateo County on rangelands (grazing lands) and associated upland habitats or riparian corridors, generally leaving cultivated (row crop) agricultural lands to private ownership and management.

**Midpen is currently reviewing and refining its policies that guide its agricultural role in the region. We seek your input!** Please take a moment to fill out this survey to help us better understand your perspective on our agricultural work on the San Mateo County coast. We will also hold a workshop in mid- April to gather more feedback. We invite you to participate in both this survey and the workshop and appreciate your thoughts. **Please complete this survey by Tuesday May 10, 2022.** If you have other comments, concerns or questions, please contact Lewis Reed at [lreed@openaspace.org](mailto:lreed@openaspace.org) or (650) 772-3634.

---

**JUNE 2022 Update: Surveys may still be completed and submitted to Lewis Reed (email above); or mailed to Midpen Regional Open Space District, Attn: Lewis Reed, 5050 El Camino Real, Los Altos, CA 94022. The Survey can also be found online here:**

**English: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/QN5D5YR>**

**Spanish: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/MGWR7RY>**



**SURVEY:**

- 1) Midpen is interested in promoting more environmentally sensitive agricultural practices in our region given the ongoing effects of climate change and Midpen’s mission to protect the natural environment and encourage viable agriculture use. For example, practices that reduce greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural systems, practices that increase carbon capture or sequestration within agricultural systems, practices that reduce non-target effects of agricultural chemicals such as fertilizers or pesticides, and practices that promote habitat for wildlife. How might Midpen best support these goals in agricultural regions of the San Mateo Coast? Please rank the following options from 1 through 6 with 1 being the most valuable/preferred and 6 being the least valuable/preferred. If you have other ideas, please add them at the end of this question.

- \_\_\_\_\_ Require such practices on Midpen agricultural lands.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Incentivize but do not require such practices on Midpen lands.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Support research to better understand viable methods for meeting these goals in agricultural production systems.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Support education and outreach on scientifically validated, environmentally sensitive practices.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Support partners such as the Resource Conservation District that currently have programs to promote these practices by helping producers overcome financial or technical barriers to implement such practices.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Favor organic pesticides, fertilizers, and other organic practices on Midpen agricultural lands.

Other ideas? Please add them here or attach them as additional pages.

- 2) Midpen does not normally acquire fee title or easements on intensive agricultural lands (i.e., row crops, greenhouses). Are there other ways Midpen might consider supporting more intensive agriculture that align with its mission and role?

- Yes
- No

If you answered YES, please prioritize the following ways Midpen might consider supporting more intensive agriculture:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Offer grants and/or funding contributions to partners who are actively acquiring easements and fee title to preserve intensive agricultural lands
- \_\_\_\_\_ Offer grants to partners who are implementing new infrastructure projects that support environmentally sensitive practices on intensive agricultural lands

\_\_\_\_\_ Expand community education and outreach to help build awareness and appreciation for local intensive agriculture among the general public.

If you have other thoughts or comments, please add them here or attach additional pages.

- 3) Midpen has remained primarily focused on preserving rangelands and maintaining its conservation grazing program as a tool to protect the biodiversity of grasslands, reduce fuels and fire risk, and promote viable agricultural use of land resources. Recognizing this focus, how might Midpen best support the protection of row crop land and other forms of non-rangeland (non-grazing) agriculture on the San Mateo County coast? Please choose one of the following:
- Separate these lands in the acquisition process so that they can be maintained under private ownership and management.
  - Support partner organizations such as the Resource Conservation District or Peninsula Open Space Trust in their efforts to protect and manage these lands.
  - Avoid involvement with these types of agricultural uses.
  - Another preferred idea? Please explain here or attach additional pages.
- 4) When Midpen acquires an agricultural property, and there is an existing agricultural operator on site, our practice has generally been to work with the existing operator and to enter into a long-term lease with them (typically 5 years with one option for a 5-year extension at Midpen's discretion). How and when might Midpen consider providing the opportunity for other ranchers/farm operators to compete for a lease on Midpen lands? Please choose one of the following:
- Once an agricultural production or rangeland management plan is approved for a property.
  - After the end of a long term lease, including any associated eligible lease extensions.
  - Preference should be given to the current operator if they remain in good standing for at least two (2) lease cycles.
  - Preference should be given to the current operator if they remain in good standing for at least three (3) lease cycles.
- 5) Agricultural Leases: Currently, Midpen conservation grazing leases are typically set for a 5-year term with one option for a 5-year extension at Midpen's discretion for a total of 10 years. Please choose one of the following. Do you consider these terms:
- Just right?
  - Too short?
  - Too long?

- Other? Please explain here or attach additional pages as needed.
- 6) Agricultural Housing: Midpen currently provides one (1) discounted agricultural work force house for onsite labor. It also rents housing to agricultural operators (lessees) at two (2) other sites. What are your thoughts about Midpen's role in agricultural work force housing?
- When housing units on Midpen's agricultural lands are available for renting, and Midpen does not require the housing for its operational needs, Midpen should prioritize renting by onsite agricultural operators for their use or for their employee's use.
  - When housing units on Midpen lands are not needed to support either Midpen operational needs or onsite agricultural operations, Midpen should prioritize regional agricultural work force needs when soliciting interested renters.
  - Midpen should explore the feasibility and suitability of working with partners to lease or sell land to non-profit housing organizations for them to build/install new agricultural workforce housing units.
  - If you have other ideas, please describe them here or attach additional pages.
- 7) Water use: Midpen manages water consumption to balance operational/agricultural and environmental/ecological needs. How might Midpen best support agricultural water needs while maintaining this balance? Please choose one of the following:
- Expand financial support to agricultural operations on Midpen lands for actions that facilitate water efficient practices.
  - Fund partners like the Resource Conservation District who have existing programs to support agriculture practices that promote efficient water use.
  - Invest in water storage, new wells, and/or other strategies on Midpen lands to reduce dependency of in-stream water use.
- 8) Marketing and Promotion: Midpen allows agricultural tenants to post signs within the lease areas that identify/promote the agricultural producer and educates visitors about the role of agricultural lands in protecting open space and natural resource values. What might Midpen's role be as a public agency with regards to the marketing and promotion of agricultural uses/operators. Please choose from the following:
- Midpen should continue allowing tenants to post signs within lease areas.
  - Midpen should explore opportunities to promote producers on Midpen lands if they are interested.
  - Midpen should partner in regional efforts that educate the public about the land conservation and environmental benefits of local agriculture.
  - Midpen should prohibit all marketing on its lands.
  - Another idea? Please explain here or attach additional pages as needed.

9) How might Midpen better preserve the rural character and promote viable agricultural use on the San Mateo coast while continuing to protect and restore the natural environment and provide opportunities for public enjoyment and education?

10) Please help us understand your role in local agricultural production by selecting from the following (choose all that apply)

- I am the primary decision maker in terms of day to day and seasonal operations on a farm or ranch in coastal the San Mateo County
- I provide labor and carry out the basic work of operating a farm or ranch in coastal San Mateo County
- I don't work directly at a farm or ranch, but I am interested in supporting our agricultural community in coastal San Mateo County
- I would like to become more involved in the operation and management of a farm or ranch in coastal San Mateo County
- Other? Please briefly explain your role in local agriculture or share your interest in agriculture on the coast here.

11) What type of agricultural operation are you active or interested in:

- Floral and Nursery crops
- Vegetables
- Fruit and Nuts
- Livestock (e.g., cattle, goats, pigs, poultry etc.)
- Livestock Products (Honey, cheese, eggs, wool etc.)
- Field Crops (Beans, grain, oat rye, hay, pasture)

12) If you are an agricultural operator or work for an agricultural operation, please indicate the type of operation you engage in:

- Conventional agricultural operation
- Organic agricultural operation
- Other? Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_

Also, to expand our understanding of current practices, please let us know what practices, if any, your operation uses to reduce operational greenhouse gas emissions, increase carbon

capture and/or sequestration, reduce non-target effects of agricultural chemicals, and/or protect habitat for wildlife.

Thank you for providing your input on this agricultural policy development survey. If you would like to receive future notifications about the policy development, please sign up via email on our coastal interested parties list at [www.openspace.org/opt-in](http://www.openspace.org/opt-in).



**COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**ITEM**

**10**

# January 28, 2021 AAC Subcommittee Meeting Notes

## Definitions/Input from County

- **Agritourism:** The act of visiting a working farm/ranch or agricultural operation for the purpose of enjoyment, education or active involvement in the activities of the farm/ranch or agricultural operation that adds to the economic viability of the agricultural operation
  - *Note: Agritourism uses must be “secondary and supplemental to existing agricultural uses of the land”*
- County processes permits based on the impact of the activity on land/community, and not whether the event is commercial or non-commercial, etc.
- Educational farm tours currently fall under grey area of ag-tourism guidelines: “Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director”

## Input from Ag Ombudsman

- Strongly in favor of revisiting guidelines to better reflect evolution of agritourism activities (that do not require significant impact/development)
- Types of agtourism activities people have expressed interest in (that aren't already covered in the existing guidelines): Educational tours, food trucks serving prepared food grown on farm, farm stays, semi-regular events like student tours/yoga classes, U-picks, CSA membership days, volunteer work days (planting/harvesting), peer-to-peer farmer/rancher demos/workshops, and environmental education events
- Additional Notes: temporary events are limited to 45 days twice per year; farm dinners and other non-agricultural commercial events are limited to 12 per year, with more requiring a full PAD permit (costing roughly \$7000); U-picks don't need permits (but county still needs parking/ops plan); CSA membership days with no extra charge is a primary agricultural activity; and the type of environmental education activity determines the required permit type
- Discussed idea to conduct a short survey (5 questions) about agritourism guidelines to gather qualitative/quantitative data on what ag community wants re: agritourism updates

## References/Resources:

- [SMC Agritourism Guidelines](#) (website/downloadable file)
- [UCANR's California Agritourism](#) (website)
- [Food Tourism Book](#) (downloadable file)
- [Temporary Events](#) (downloadable file)

## Discussion Points

- All suggested changes need to be based in existing wording of Agritourism Guidelines, with consideration for bigger changes that could trigger an LCP amendment - need to keep suggestions narrow, grounded & concise

- Recommendations need to be as SPECIFIC as possible, with clear metrics regarding # of participants, # of events per year/days, traffic load/impact, parking needs, etc.

### Subcommittee Member Suggestions

- General recommendation to consult with those who wrote those regs, Supervisor Don Horsley & Farm Bureau Manager Jess Brown for clarification on current ag-tourism regs
- Interest in adding language to agritourism guidelines about: encouraging/pre-approving non-commercial, education focused events
- Suggestion to specify: "standard farm tours are simply marketing for the agricultural business and/or agricultural product sold, not ag tourism or ancillary ag activities."
- Recommendation that the following event types NOT require special permit, and DO require notification to county of with proposed dates/#'s expected guests/traffic load, perhaps capped at 12 annually: Walkabout tours/farm open house days (where no special construction/development on the land is required); volunteer days to help with harvest, planting, maintenance; educational workshops/presentations or activity circles; farm stands or retail shop sales of on-farm or locally made food products (including Adria's note about food trucks being parked close by featuring produce from farm); pick your own days; and CSA pick up activities
- Recommendation that one-off events using existing buildings not on prime soil and food is catered from off-site sources (limit 12 annually; notify county of # guests/traffic load but no permit): Farm to table dinners; independent group or community meetings; special occasion social events such as weddings, private celebrations; retreats requiring overnight stays and food service
  - If food is catered by the host farm, then some form of permit and inspection of the kitchen facilities should be required for health purposes.
- Recommendation that the following activities be allowed WITHOUT PERMIT whether paid or free: Farm Tours; All ag and food related educational activities, programs, workshops, trainings, gatherings including meals. (up to 200 people?); All environmental, open space and nature related educational activities, programs, workshops, hikes, nature walks, nature studies, tours, gatherings including meals. (up to 200 people?); Farm food and meals using local produce & meat; Year round local produce & meat sales similar to farm stands and farmer's markets; Sales of ag, environmental, ranching, nature supplies, etc. such as how to books, seeds, beekeeping equipment, birdhouses, chicken supplies, feed, planters, mushroom growing kits, native plants, flower growing kits etc.
- Recommendation that the following activities be allowed WITH PERMIT whether paid or free: Ag Tourism that includes non-ag or non-environmental/nature/open space activities such as train rides, bouncy houses, train rides etc; The currently allowed two 45-day permit periods per year may be spread over the entire year such as only on weekends, Tuesday/Thursday, every Sunday, one week per month etc.
  - Questions: Should ag/ranch/open space production be required on the property for any or all of the activities above? Should any of these activities be included in the definition of ag/ranch/open space?



## Agritourism Conversation Notes from 01/11/21 AAC Meeting

- Educational farm tours fall under grey area of ag-tourism guidelines – ‘subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director’
  - No desire to create extra bureaucratic approval process for farm tours from farmers or organizers, especially for a free/educational event like Tour de Fleur
  - Standard farm tours are marketing for core agriculture activities, not ag-tourism
- Interest in adding language to Ag-tourism guidelines about encouraging/pre-approving non-commercial, education focused events
- County processes permits based on the impact of the activity on land/community, and not whether event is commercial or non-commercial
- From Adria, SMC Ag Ombudsman:
  - Narrow list of activities in the ag-tourism guidelines, and gets different answers from county on interpretations – confusion about how education events are misinterpreted in policy
  - Seeking clarity that is more open/allowing for education activities
  - Long history of inviting people onto farms and ranches both for public and for peer education among ag community – critical for our farms that need secondary income
  - Guidelines don’t reflect where ag-tourism guidelines are going in California and what direction local community wants to take it in (ie CSA pickups on farms)
  - Strongly in favor of revisiting guidelines that better reflect what is currently happening and more focused on the opportunities that exist (that don’t require significant impact/development)
- ACC to provide specific recommendations to county about how to improve ag-tourism guidelines, will form subcommittee

**NOTE: Need established thresholds for farm tours/educational tours**

### Notes from Adria Arko, SMC Ag Ombudsman:

Agritourism – The act of visiting a working farm/ranch or agricultural operation for the purpose of **enjoyment, education or active involvement in the activities of the farm/ranch or agricultural operation** that adds to the economic viability of the agricultural operation.  
County: secondary to the agricultural uses of the land.

Types of Ag Tourism that people have expressed interest in:

Farm-to-table dinners

Educational tours

On-off events, like harvest events, fairs, weddings, meetings, retreats  
Food truck parked near farm stand showcasing food grown on farm  
Farm stays (CA has regulations for this type of activity)  
Semi-regular events, like tours/classes for school children, yoga classes  
Café  
Store  
U-pick  
CSA membership day  
Volunteer event helping to plant, harvest, etc.  
Farmer-farmer demo/learning event

#### Comments from County regarding Ag Tourism:

Farm to table events are akin to weddings, so are exempt from AAC but these types of events are limited to 12 per year. After that, they require a full PAD, which is ~\$7000  
Events that don't require permits may require operations plans be submitted to planning.  
There is a difference between commercial and not commercial events and public and private events - makes no difference for ag tourism guidelines  
U Pick don't need permits. Planning doesn't care unless you are building structure. Planning still wants to know about parking, operations plan.  
Depends on the type of environmental education activities that determines whether a permit is required.  
Inviting CSA members with no charge does not need a permit (they are within your network, so its not a public event).  
Events temporary are 45 days to allow for set up, event and take down. Designed around pumpkin festival.

#### Resources:

<https://ucanr.edu/sites/agritourism/>

#### Attachments:

1. Food Tourism Book:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/18d8uEfiIwSsHoZMj0WQrQtWJUPEBh7hG/view?usp=sharing>

2. Temporary Events:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cYGSrUvEufxpjGH9JhzicnBNB7fCvJQm/view?usp=sharing>

## Notes from Natalie Sare, AAC Member:

Thank you Lauren for providing your meeting notes and sharing. In that where it says "*Standard farm tours are marketing for core agriculture activities, not ag-tourism.*" I would like to expand on that. While I

think we are thinking the same thing, I believe it was expressed at the meeting, and I believe it to be, that farm tours are simply marketing the agriculture product that the farmer sells. While the growing of the crop is in a fact the core ag activity, as you wrote, I think we should write it more specifically. Selling and marketing of the agricultural crop/product that one grows is not an agriculture "activity" but instead it is simply the farmer's crop and/or ag business and ALL *activities* are all ancillary to that. While we are on the Right track-In my opinion we have to take it a step further separate "activities" from the agricultural product and business very specifically to avoid confusion.

B.J. stated at the meeting - currently and historically we do not need a permit to run our ag business and grow and sell our crop (other then the typical business licenses, pesticide regs if applicable, zoning laws and other regs we adhere to). Bringing the public in to see our product is simply marketing our ag-business and it is important that we keep it that way.

So I would like to propose we write that "*standard farm tours are simply marketing for the agricultural business and/or agricultural product sold, not ag tourism or ancillary ag activities.*"

To add to this: There are many farms that do not partake in agri-tourism; farms that sell wholesale, farms that live in too rural an area to make it worthwhile to do so, farmers who dont make enough money to invest in agri-tourism, and farms that simply do not want to join the barrage of bouncy houses and other carnival stuff. Yet they need to be able to market their product and having people come into the farm to see it is often the best form of marketing as well as the least expensive and as such needs to be allowed just as other businesses are allowed to bring people in to see their product being made, without restriction or regulation. While I understand the product itself is regulated- this basic form of marketing one's product or ag-business should not be regulated in this way as the AAC committee felt at the last meeting. That would absolutely have an unnecessarily adverse effect on agricultural sales and viability in this county going forward.

Bringing people into one's ag business and showing them crop production is the most accessible form of marketing, agriculture and all businesses, have and restricting that would be detrimental to:

A) Ag- business in this county. As many farmers dont have the means to advertise in the traditional sense, especially those just starting out.

B) Ag education. As we have learned from past meetings, it is extremely important that we continue to show children what agriculture is, especially those that would otherwise not have access. The best way to do this is to help current farmers show their product to others.

C) The chamber of Commerce and others who depend on agri-tourism for their fundraisers as was discussed at the last meeting.

D) To the public. The agri-tourism guidelines call for two 45 day periods. Crop production is a year round endeavor that implements different things at different stages of the growth of the product. As such we need to be able to share with the public as much as we can about agriculture. Only being allowed to show them the crop at a couple 45 day snippets denies the public access to learning about the crop correctly, and completely falsifies what we are showing.

**What we should do:**

\*For any clarification on current ag-tourism regs we should consult with those who wrote those regs. We are fortunate in that Peter Marchi is on our committee and he was one of the people who wrote the current regs we use along with Tiera Pena from the county and former committee members.

\*Listen to our Supervisors, as Don Horsely reportedly stated that he agrees that bringing people into the farms and agri-businesses is a form of marketing the product and/or ag-business and should continue to not be a part of the agri-tourism regulations.

\*Look at what Farm Bureau rep, Jess Brown, stated at the last meeting -that San Mateo County is the most restrictive regarding regs for agriculture.

And use the above in our write up.

## Notes from Judee Humburg, AAC Member:

Following are my ideas/suggestions for the meeting tomorrow evening:

From my own experience organizing farm visits/walkabouts, volunteer days, and various workshops for learning about farming practices (sometimes including a picnic lunch/dinner prepared with local/farm produce), I support both Natalie's and BJ's thoughts about these types of events being primarily (a) educational related to agricultural practices or (b) forms of community outreach/marketing for the farms. In many cases, these events create supplemental income for farmers which is important to sustain ag on the coast. As such, I propose no permit be required for these activities but perhaps a notification to the county about dates and #'s of expected guests/traffic load. My assumption is that these events are supplemental to the primary agricultural business on the property.

One distinction Adria made in our conversation was whether or not the event required any 'special development' on the land that would in any way limit agricultural activity on prime soil. To adhere to the intentions of the agritourism guidelines, permits should be required in these instances. For supplemental income (and as a form of marketing), I know some farms already host off-site group/corporate meetings and special events like weddings that include some food prep with local farm products but the buildings used are already on the farm on non-prime soil land. In these cases, require an annual permit with up to 12 for the year at a reasonable cost. If on-going 'catering' is part of these event offerings where food is being prepared on site routinely, then there likely needs to be an annual inspection to ensure the kitchen is up to health codes.

SUMMARY:

No special permit required but notification to county of with proposed dates/#'s expected guests/traffic load, perhaps capped at 12 annually:

- walkabout tours/farm open house days (where no special construction/development on the land is required)
- volunteer days to help with harvest, planting, maintenance
- educational workshops/presentations or activity circles
- farm stands or retail shop sales of on-farm or locally made food products (including Adria's note about food trucks being parked close by featuring produce from farm)
- pick your own days
- CSA pick up activities

one-off events that use existing buildings not on prime soil and food is catered from off-site sources (limit 12 annually; notify county of # guests/traffic load but no permit)

- farm to table dinners
- independent group or community meetings
- special occasion social events such as weddings, private celebrations
- retreats requiring overnight stays and food service

If food is catered by the host farm, then some form of permit and inspection of the kitchen facilities should be required for health purposes.

Thanks, Lauren, for compiling!! I hope I've gotten everything from my notes. If not, I'm sure the meeting will surface questions. The most uncertainty for me is related to the # of events, people/event and traffic load — at what point to require a more expensive permit maybe with on-site inspection. I don't feel I have the 'technical' experience to really have an answer.

Just remembered...I forgot to add a suggestion that Adria and I came up when we talked on Monday. She indicated that a survey might be a good idea (maybe using her newsletter list and the email/member lists for the Farm Bureau) to get qualitative and quantitative info on what folks are most interested in (or already involved in) and what their concerns might be. I'm happy to draft something for others' editing as that's what I used to do for a living (customer research for tech product design). Depends on if the subcommittee agrees this would be useful. Adria also indicated that she saw this process as taking awhile to go through the various steps and parties' reviews so that we would have time for a very short survey — I'm thinking no more than 5 questions. Thoughts?

**Notes from Bill Cook, AAC Member:**

Here are my initial thoughts:

Activities allowed WITHOUT PERMIT whether paid or free:

- Farm Tours
- All ag and food related educational activities, programs, workshops, trainings, gatherings including meals. (up to 200 people?)
- All environmental, open space and nature related educational activities, programs, workshops, hikes, nature walks, nature studies, tours, gatherings including meals. (up to 200 people?)
- Farm food and meals using local produce & meat.
- Year round local produce & meat sales similar to farm stands and farmer's markets
- Sales of ag, environmental, ranching, nature supplies, etc. such as how to books, seeds, beekeeping equipment, birdhouses, chicken supplies, feed, planters, mushroom growing kits, native plants, flower growing kits etc.

Activities allowed WITH PERMIT whether paid or free:

- Ag Tourism that includes non-ag or non-environmental/nature/open space activities such as train rides, bouncy houses, train rides etc.
- The currently allowed two 45-day permit periods per year may be spread over the entire year such as only on weekends, Tuesday/Thursday, every Sunday, one week per month etc.

All appropriate food safety, parking safety and building permits will be enforced.

Questions:

Should ag/ranch/open space production be required on the property for any or all of the activities above? (I am thinking not but wat to hear your thoughts)

Should any of these activities be included in the definition of ag/ranch/open space?

## Notes from Peter Marchi, AAC Member:

I, Peter Marchi, support the current Agritourism Guidelines as they Stand with nothing less.

I would like one addition and that is a ninety day nonconsecutive days of agritourism to support the farmer that does not have consecutive people traffic. For example weekends and/or CSA pick-ups on farms et cetera.

Solely farm related events should be permit free such as educational farm tours et cetera.

# February 17, 2021 AAC Agritourism Subcommittee Notes

Note: Existing Agritourism Guidelines available [here](#).

- Length/Frequency of Agritourism Uses: 45 consecutive day events twice per year
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**
    - i. Allow temporary agritourism uses and facilities on all agricultural lands, but *limit them in scale, location, and time*. Require staff level review to confirm temporary uses are consistent with these guidelines.
    - ii. Uses that occur for more than 45 consecutive days or more than two (2) times per year require a Planned Agricultural District Permit, or a Resource Management Permit, a Coastal Development Permit, and review by the Agricultural Advisory Committee.
  - **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
    - i. **Event Type:** agritourism events are limited by the length and frequency of the event to 45 consecutive days twice per year
    - ii. **Frequency:** we discussed allowing one 90 consecutive day event per year; non-consecutive day events were also discussed
    - iii. **Attendees:** not discussed, current guidelines do not limit or qualify agritourism events based on number of attendees/participants
  - **Discussion Questions:**
    - i. *Is this secondary to ag on site? Is it limited in scale, location & time?*
    - ii. *Does the amount of people onsite constitute an impact? To traffic, soils, neighbors? Is the impact limited in duration or is there a cumulative impact?*
    - iii. *Would this trigger a PAD or LCP permit?*
    - iv. *If the days are non-consecutive, would this constitute year round use?*
    - v. *Would changing this conflict with existing PAD regulations?*

## Meeting #2 Notes:

- Two 45 consecutive days or 12 non-consecutive events not to exceed 7 days or
  - Something that allows summer weekends?
- What prime agricultural use would require 12 7-day events per year?
  - Harvesting vegetables
  
- Farm Dinners
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**
    - i. *From D. Agritourism Guidelines; 1. Agritourism Uses and Activities that Require a Permit; 5. Commercial Dining Events (pg 5-6):*
    - ii. Commercial food service to groups with issuance of an Environmental Health permit and fire review occurring on an infrequent basis shall be allowed without the need of a PAD permit unless otherwise required.\*

1. \*For purposes of this section, infrequent is defined as no more than twelve (12) meal servings per calendar year.
  - iii. All other commercial food services not meeting the standards above may occur with the issuance of a PAD permit.
  - iv. Commercial dining events cannot occur simultaneously with any temporary or seasonal agritourism event.
- **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
    - i. **Event Type:** Interested in creating a preference for farm dinner events that feature what is produced on the farm hosting the dinner/ locally sourced food
    - ii. **Frequency:** currently capped at 12 per year; we discussed preference for unlimited amount of farm dinners, however Agritourism Guidelines require limits in 'scale, location, and time'
    - iii. **Attendees:** no current cap on attendees in existing guidelines, but Planning Dept does consider number of attendees when reviewing ag-tourism permits; we discussed capping attendees at up to 200 or in alignment with public safety guidelines
  - **Discussion Questions:**
    - i. *How could the Planning Dept verify and check what will be served at farm dinners to ensure this? Could this potentially create additional layers of oversight when the desire is to have no permit/oversight?*
    - ii. *Do we want to add an attendee cap to help guide future ag-tourism activities? Or do we want to leave it undefined? What is the benefit to having a defined or undefined number of attendees in the guidelines?*
    - iii. *As an alternative to unlimited, do we want to recommend something like: up to \_\_\_\_ (24) per year (doubling current amount), not to exceed \_\_\_\_ (4) farm dinner events per month?*

Meeting #2 Notes:

- Want to create situation where farms could host an event every summer weekend
  - Interest in 24-30 per year but no more than 8 per month, one day event
  - Bill's Suggestion: 48 farm dinners per year, which would allow two farm dinners per weekend for 6 months
- Want to create preference/goal to feature produce grown in SMC
  - Note from Farm Stand language: "main part of main course is from SMC" or "majority of dishes served will feature products from SMC" as part of goal to promote local agriculture
  - To enforce, county would take word of farmer unless there is complaint
  - What if a farmer wants to host an event on a neighbor's property (ie one who may have better facilities?)
- Attendees: "what the property can reasonably accommodate;" leave as is in regs
- Agritourism events should take place in existing structures on the property, and not require new buildings/development/construction
  - Re: commercial kitchens - cooking facilities need to be temporary



- Educational Activities
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**
    - i. Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director.
  - **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
    - i. **Event Type:** Interested in adding further definition to what constitutes an 'recreational/educational activity' in existing guidelines, particularly regarding educational activities; we discussed that educational events should be regarding the environment, agriculture, nature, or food
    - ii. **Frequency:** we discussed limiting to 12 annually or having no limit on frequency, and instead limiting amount of participants
    - iii. **Attendees:** we discussed limiting number of attendees instead of limited frequency of events annually
  - **Discussion Questions:**
    - i. *How to define 'educational activity' allowed without an Agritourism Permit? Is this a class, a tour, a workshop, etc? Does it need to be connected to a school or other formal educational group - or just by the curriculum/content of the educational activity?*
      - 1. *Does the educational activity have to be about the farm/ranch that is hosting the event? Does it have to be about the prime agricultural activity taking place at that farm/ranch?*
    - ii. *What thresholds could be recommended for educational activities? Number of attendees and/or frequency of the educational event?*
      - 1. *What thresholds would ensure that educational activities are secondary to the primary agricultural use?*
      - 2. *What is a reasonable threshold that would allow most educational activities without an Agritourism Permit but have limits in place for outliers/unusual events?*

Meeting #2 Notes:

- Educational activities currently under grey area because lack definition
- Is there a distinction between educational activities and farm tours?
- Educational Activities:
  - Seminars, tours, field walks, presentations, classes AND farm tours
  - Open Houses vs Farm Tours
  - About the farm or ranch hosting event, related to ag/ranching activities
  - Alternate approach: about the specific ag/ranch hosting event could be too limiting - about ag/ranching generally
  - Gathering or receiving a benefit from the instruction
  - No age range limitations, open to everybody
- K/Other Recreational/educational activities is currently being used as catch-all by county

- Main purpose of the LCP is to support ag & environment
  - Educational activities allowed on PAD properties on the coast; about agriculture, environment, nature
- Concerns about farms turning into venues in PAD
  - Levels/thresholds for No Permit; Agtourism Permit; PAD Permit
    - i. **No Permit:** about core ag/ranching activity on property; peer-to-peer prof dev workshops, etc; farm tours showcasing that property;
      - 1. No more than 10/20/30/40 people? Per acre? Per what property can reasonably accommodate?
      - 2. When does it become 'intensive use' beyond the core ag activity?
    - ii. **Agtourism Permit:** brings public to property at defined frequency (by single day or consecutive day event)
      - 1. Not more than the property/space can reasonably accommodate
        - a. Amount of people based on what space can handle
        - b. Without making a (negative) impact
      - 2. No more than 40/50 people? Per instructor? Per what property can accommodate?
    - iii. **PAD Permit:** anything beyond agtourism frequency
      - 1. Beyond 50?
    - iv. Alternate Option: no permits required for any educational activity
- Gathering to receive a benefit from instruction about environment, agriculture, nature, or food
  - Relation to PAD activities?
- Threshold Options:
  - What are current thresholds for educational events in the county? Safety guidelines?
    - i. County looks at potential activity; looking at Building Code, Fire Code & planning discretion
    - ii. Does the amount of people onsite constitute an impact? To traffic, soils, neighbors?
  - Limitations on number of attendees?
  - 'Not more than the property can reasonably accommodate'
  - Classes/workshops normally around 30-40
  - What about the existing thresholds in the agritourism guidelines (ie scenic corridor)?
- Farm Tours
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**
    - i. Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director.
  - **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
    - i. **Event Type:** we discussed the difference between farm tours as marketing for agriculture vs. farm tours as educational events

- ii. **Frequency:** not discussed
- iii. **Attendees:** not discussed
- o **Discussion Questions**
  - i. *How do we define farm tours? How is this different from an educational activity as discussed above?*
  - ii. *Do we want to add a further distinction here between educational activities? If so, what would the limits be?*
    - 1. *Are these free events or ticketed/at cost to attendees?*
    - 2. *Is a group of 10 or fewer people a farm tour? Would more than 10 people make it an educational event? Would farm tours be for more than 20 people at a time?*

Meeting #2 Notes:

- List of example educational activities
- Is there a benefit to having separate definitions for educational activity vs farm tour?
  - Tour is about that specific farm/ranch and activities taking place there
  - Educational event is beyond that
  - Not defined by commercial activity (fee/ticket)
  - Not limited by day of the week/weekend
- Tours are hard for farmers because it takes time out of the work day; anyway we can streamline for farmer would be a help
  - Example: Allowing several classes at once would help streamline for farmer
- Peer-to-Peer Educational Activities for Farmers/Ranchers
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**
    - i. Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director.
  - **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
    - i. **Event Type:** we discussed including this activity under the educational activities; alternatively could be defined as professional development
    - ii. **Frequency:** not discussed
    - iii. **Attendees:** not discussed
  - **Discussion Questions**
    - i. *How do we define peer-to-peer educational activities? How is this different from an educational activity as discussed above?*
    - ii. *Do we want to add a further distinction here between educational activities? If so, what would the limits be?*

Meeting #2 Notes:

- Allowed by right without an agritourism permit
- Example: CCTGA event hosted with up to 80 people
- Same note re: streamlining for farmers; figuring out how to allow multiple presentations at one time; potential limit based on instructor/acreage, not attendees

- U-Pick Farm Activities
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**
    - i. Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director.
  - **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
    - i. **Event Type:** we believe this is a core agricultural activity and does not need to be included in the agritourism guidelines
    - ii. **Frequency:** n/a
    - iii. **Attendees:** n/a
  - **Discussion Questions**
    - i. *Do we want to add this to the list of allowed uses without a permit in the Agritourism Guidelines and specify that no ag-tourism permit is required?*

Meeting #2 Notes:

- Allowed by right without an agritourism permit
  
- Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) Member Activities
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**
    - i. Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director.
  - **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
    - i. **Event Type:** we believe that this is a core agricultural activity, but need to further define what constitutes a CSA member activity vs an agritourism activity (ie picking up boxes, volunteer hours, etc.); we discussed limiting to non-ticketed/free events for CSA members
    - ii. **Frequency:** n/a
    - iii. **Attendees:** n/a
  - **Discussion Questions**
    - i. *What is the definition of CSA Member Activities?*
      - 1. *Note: Please see [USDA Community Supported Agriculture](#) resources page for reference.*
    - ii. *Do we want to add this to the list of allowed uses without a permit in the Agritourism Guidelines and specify that no ag-tourism permit is required?*

Meeting #2 Notes:

- Activities covered under CSA membership considered core agriculture; agritourism permit may be required if other types of activities are proposed (ie farm dinners)
  - Perhaps excluding farm dinners?
  
- Volunteer Service Events
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**

- i. Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director.
- **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
  - i. **Event Type:** discussed one-off volunteer day events at farms/ranches, such as planting/harvest days
  - ii. **Frequency:** not discussed
  - iii. **Attendees:** discussed not exceeding public safety guidelines for number of attendees
- **Discussion Questions**
  - i. *How do we define a 'volunteer event' or 'service days' and ensure this activity doesn't bleed into other agritourism activity types?*
  - ii. *What definition would prevent these volunteer events from being abused/stretched to fit other activity types? (ie a volunteer work day rolling into a farm dinner as defined by the existing guidelines)*

Meeting #2 Notes:

- Suggestion that (non-commercial) volunteerism activities generally do not require agritourism permit
  - Examples: barn raising event, work days on open space property, help around a farm/ranch like pulling weeds, etc.
  - Any additional activities associated with volunteering subject to review/approval
- Discussion re: defining 'volunteer service event'
  - Consider impact to the land, could we define volunteer activities as things that improve the property/agricultural operations (don't make negative impact)
  - Discussed commercial vs non-commercial or public vs private
- Food Trucks
  - **Per current Agritourism guidelines:**
    - i. One (1) food vendor, mobile or on-site including mobile prepackaged food/snack bar (Environmental Health permit required) located on all soils.
    - ii. One (1) prepackaged food/snack bar on non-prime soils (may be subject to Environmental Health permit).
  - **Notes on Subcommittee Recommendations:**
    - i. **Event Type:** interested in allowing food trucks that showcase farm product as an allowed activity at agritourism events, specifically discussed food trucks parked near farm stands that feature the food/products grown onsite at that particular farm
    - ii. **Frequency:** was discussed in context of 45 consecutive day events
    - iii. **Attendees:** was discussed in context of 45 consecutive day events
  - **Discussion Questions**

- i. **Note:** San Mateo County has an existing ordinance regulated mobile food, so the Agritourism Guidelines cannot be in conflict with the existing regulations:
  1. SMC Health [Mobile Food Facilities](#)
  2. SMC Code of Ordinances, Title 5 Business Regulations, [Chapter 5.52 Mobile Food Preparation Units](#)
    - a. *Note: limited to thirty (30) minutes in one location during any eight (8) hour period, sales must be located on a County road*
- ii. *What changes to existing guidelines are needed here? Does current wording around one food vendor or one snack bar already meet our needs here?*

Meeting #2 Notes:

- Current wording works as is
- Desire to decouple the food trucks from the agricultural tourism activity - will revisit in context of the farm stand conversation (coming up at future AAC meeting)

# SAN MATEO COUNTY AGRITOURISM GUIDELINES

The San Mateo County Planning and Building Department and the San Mateo County Agricultural Advisory Committee's subcommittee on agritourism have developed the following guidelines for the review and establishment of commercial activities on agricultural land. These guidelines seek to provide guidance regarding the application of existing Local Coastal Program (LCP) policies and zoning regulations in a manner that facilitates the establishment of uses that are **secondary** to the agricultural uses of the land, support the economic viability of farming and ranching, and minimize conflicts with agricultural activities on said lands and/or adjacent lands. These guidelines are not intended to obviate the need for compliance with other State or Federal regulations. (Agritourism review procedures are addressed in Part F of this document.)

## A. DEFINITIONS

1. **Agritourism** – The act of visiting a working farm/ranch or agricultural operation for the purpose of enjoyment, education or active involvement in the activities of the farm/ranch or agricultural operation that adds to the economic viability of the agricultural operation.
2. **Compatible Use(s)** – A use that, as determined by the Community Development Director of San Mateo County, will not diminish or interfere with existing or potential agricultural productivity, and can be accommodated without adverse impact to the agricultural resources of the site or surrounding area.
3. **Non-Prime Agricultural Land** – Land that is not “prime agricultural land” as defined below. This may include, but is not limited to, land used for grazing or dry farming.
4. **Prime Agricultural Land** – Means any of the following:
  - a. All land that qualifies for rating as Class I or Class II in the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Land Use Capability Classifications; or land that qualifies as Class III in the NRCS Land Use Capacity Classifications if producing no less than two hundred dollars (\$200) per acre annual gross income for three of the past five years.
  - b. Land which qualifies for rating 80 through 100 in the Storie Index Rating.
  - c. Land which supports livestock used for the production of food and fiber and which has an annual carrying capacity equivalent to at least one animal unit per acre as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture.

- d. Land planted with fruit- or nut-bearing trees, vines, bushes or crops which have a non-bearing period of less than five years and which will normally return during the commercial bearing period on an annual basis from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant production not less than two hundred dollars (\$200) per acre.
- e. Land which has returned from the production of unprocessed agricultural plant products an annual gross value of not less than two hundred dollars (\$200) per acre annual gross income for three of the past five years.
- f. In all cases, prime land shall have a secure water source adequate to support the agriculture on the premises.

**B. COMPATIBILITY DETERMINATIONS**

Any activity authorized by these guidelines may be made subject to a Use Permit at the discretion of the Community Development Director.

**C. GOALS**

- 1. Confirm that agritourism uses are secondary and supplemental to existing agricultural uses of the land.
- 2. Agritourism uses must be compatible with and beneficial to the agricultural uses on the land.
- 3. Allow temporary agritourism uses and facilities on all agricultural lands, but limit them in scale, location and time. Require staff level review to confirm temporary uses are consistent with these guidelines.
- 4. Limit percentage of lands utilized for agritourism.
- 5. Ensure the “Right to Farm” on all lands per Chapter 2.65 of the San Mateo County Ordinance (Administration/Agricultural Awareness).

**D. AGRITOURISM GUIDELINES**

- 1. **Agritourism Uses and Activities that Require a Permit.** Uses will be reviewed by Planning staff and the Agricultural Advisory Committee to ensure adherence to the guidelines.

Agritourism uses must be found to be compatible with the long-term agricultural uses of the land. Uses that occur for more than 45 consecutive days or more than two (2) times per year require a Planned Agricultural District Permit, or a Resource Management Permit, a Coastal Development Permit, and review by the Agricultural Advisory Committee.



**MAINTAIN COMPATIBILITY WITH AGRICULTURE BY LIMITING ATTRACTIONS AND ACTIVITIES TO NO MORE THAN THE FOLLOWING:**

- a. One (1) farm animal petting zoo on **non-prime soils**.
- b. One (1) pony ride area located on **non-prime soils** (confined animal permit or exemption required).
- c. One (1) food vendor, mobile or on-site (Environmental Health permit if applicable) located on **non-prime soils**.
- d. One (1) prepackaged food/snack bar on **non-prime soils**.
- e. One (1) haunted house/barn on **non-prime soils**.
- f. One (1) hay maze on **non-prime soils**.
- g. One (1) train and tracks located on **non-prime soils**.
- h. One (1) hayride on all soils.
- i. Train rides on rubberized wheels throughout all soils subject to case-by-case review.
- j. Inflatables\* on **non-prime soils** (subject to height limitations set forth in the Planned Agricultural District and Resource Management Regulations) subject to case-by-case review.
- k. Produce stand permitted per Section 6352(5) of the Planned Agricultural District Regulations (Environmental Health permit required).
- l. Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director.
- m. Days and hours of operation per determination of the Community Development Director.

2. **Performance Standards for Agritourism Uses and Activities that Require a Permit.** Agritourism uses shall be consistent with LCP and zoning standards, including but not limited to the following:

- a. Adequate on-site parking to accommodate the uses must be provided on non-prime soils and designated on the site plan for review by Planning staff.

---

\*Inflatables subject to the standards of the Safe Inflatable Operators Training Organization.

- b. Parking subject to standards of Policy 10.22 (*Parking*) of the LCP.
  - c. Signage subject to standards of Policy 8.21 (*Commercial Signs*) of the LCP.
  - d. On parcels forty (40) acres or more in size, all agritourism elements shall be clustered and shall consume no more than two (2) gross acres (excludes hayrides or trains with rubberized wheels). Parking is excluded from acreage calculation.
  - e. On parcels under forty (40) acres in size, all agritourism elements shall be clustered and shall consume no more than one (1) gross acre (excludes hayrides or trains with rubberized wheels). Parking is excluded from acreage calculation.
  - f. Setbacks subject to regulations pertaining to watercourses and riparian vegetation.
3. **Temporary Seasonal Agritourism Uses and Activities that Do Not Require Permits.** Temporary seasonal visitor serving uses and facilities allowed on all agricultural lands limited in scale, elements and time. Uses will be reviewed by Planning staff and the Agricultural Advisory Committee to ensure adherence to the guidelines.
- a. Does not interfere with agricultural production on or adjacent to the lot.
  - b. Allowed for a maximum of 45 consecutive days per use and limited to no more than two (2) per year.
  - c. Days and hours of operation: Sunday through Saturday from 9:00 a.m. to sunset (no lighting shall be allowed).
  - d. Two (2) inflatables\* allowed on all lands (subject to height limits set forth in the Planned Agricultural District and Resource Management Regulations).
  - e. One (1) pony ride area (confined animal permit or exemption required).
  - f. One (1) farm animal petting zoo on all lands.
  - g. One (1) hayride on all lands.
  - h. One (1) train with rubberized wheels on all lands.

---

\*Inflatables subject to the standards of the Safe Inflatable Operators Training Organization.

- i. One (1) food vendor, mobile or on-site including mobile prepackaged food/snack bar (Environmental Health permit required) located on all **soils**.
  - j. One (1) prepackaged food/snack bar on non-prime soils (may be subject to Environmental Health permit).
  - k. Other recreational/educational activities subject to review and approval of the Community Development Director.
4. **Performance Standards for Seasonal Uses and Activities that Do Not Require Permits**
- a. Adequate on-site parking to accommodate the temporary seasonal uses must be provided and designated on the site plan for review by Planning staff.
  - b. Parking subject to standards of Policy 10.22 (*Parking*) of the LCP.
  - c. Signage subject to standards of Policy 8.21 (*Commercial Signs*) of the LCP.
  - d. Meets the current standards for buffers from creeks and/or riparian vegetation.
  - e. On parcels forty (40) acres or more in size, all agritourism elements shall be clustered and shall consume no more than two (2) gross acres (excludes hayrides or trains with rubberized wheels). Parking is excluded from acreage calculation.
  - f. On parcels under forty (40) acres in size, all agritourism elements shall be clustered and shall consume no more than one (1) gross acre (excludes hayrides or trains with rubberized wheels). Parking is excluded from acreage calculation.
  - g. Setbacks subject to regulations pertaining to watercourses and riparian vegetation.
  - h. No land disturbance including import of gravel or fill.
  - i. Produce stand permitted per Section 6352(5) of the Planned Agricultural District Regulations (Environmental Health permit required).
5. **Commercial Dining Events**
- a. Commercial food service to groups with issuance of an Environmental Health permit and fire review occurring on an infrequent basis shall be allowed without the need of a PAD permit unless otherwise required.\*

- b. All other commercial food services not meeting the standards above may occur with the issuance of a PAD permit.
- c. Commercial dining events cannot occur simultaneously with any temporary or seasonal agritourism event.

**E. OTHER NON-AGRICULTURAL COMMERCIAL EVENTS**

Commercial events on PAD lands require review by the Agricultural Advisory Committee to determine whether they constitute an agritourism event.

The following examples are uses when operated as a commercial business that are not considered agritourism and require County permits.

- Weddings.
- Music concerts.
- Paint ball.
- Carnivals.

\*For purposes of this section, infrequent is defined as no more than twelve (12) meal servings per calendar year.

**F. AGRITOURISM REVIEW PROCEDURES**

For seasonal non-permit required event applications, applicants shall submit an application and accompanying materials to the Planning and Building Department two (2) months prior to desired date of event.

For seasonal permit required event applications, applicants shall submit an application and accompanying materials no later than six (6) months prior to desired date of event.

All application submittals are subject to the following:

1. Completion of permit application forms.
2. Submittal of any existing Williamson Contract on said lands.
3. Description of existing agricultural operations and statement of conformance with the goals of the agritourism standards.
4. Site plan showing existing permanent buildings and structures, all agricultural areas, watercourses, riparian areas and wells.
5. Site plan showing all agritourism uses and activities, and existing/proposed parking areas.

6. Statement of operations (days/hours).
7. Number of employees on-site for agritourism purposes.

**G. RECOMMENDED FINDINGS**

When considering proposals to establish agritourism uses, the Agricultural Advisory Committee and relevant decision makers should determine:

1. That the agritourism use is compatible with the long-term agricultural uses of the land.
2. That the agritourism operation will not adversely affect the health or safety of persons in the area and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to agricultural property.
3. That the agritourism operation is in substantial conformance with the goals set forth in the San Mateo County Agritourism Guidelines. Specifically, that the operation is secondary and supplemental to existing agricultural operation on said land.
4. That the proposed use and activities comply with all relevant provisions of the General Plan, Local Coastal Program, Zoning Regulations, and Williamson Act (where applicable).

TGP:fc/pac/jlh – TGPW0230\_WFR.DOCX (9/25/12)