SUTTER COUNTY
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

FARMLAND PRESERVATION STRATEGIES

DECEMBER 11, 2008

Prepared for:

Sutter County Food and Agriculture Focus Group

Sutter County Community Services

Prepared by:

Applied Development Economics

In association with:

PBS&J

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

This document was prepared for the Sutter County Food and Agriculture Focus Group with the purpose of describing agriculture preservation strategies and techniques adopted by other jurisdictions in California that may be applicable to Sutter County. The categories of agriculture preservation strategies described in this paper include:

- parcel sizing;
- homesite clustering;
- buffers;
- right to farm;
- transfer of development rights; and,
- agricultural land mitigation.

Each strategy is discussed in its own section. Each section begins with a brief description of the policy approach and its usefulness in preserving agriculture. In addition to Sutter County, existing policies, ordinances, and programs have been described for various jurisdictions to illustrate how these agricultural preservation strategies are being implemented in other parts of the State.

The Food and Agricultural Focus Group has been established to represent the interests of Sutter County's agricultural community in the General Plan update process. The input of the Focus Group will have a significant influence in determining how the General Plan addresses the preservation of the County's agricultural resources and the ability to maintain a viable long-term agricultural industry in Sutter County.

At the December 11, 2008 meeting, the General Plan Team will lead a discussion of each policy approach and ask the Food and Agricultural Focus Group for input. Specifically, we will be seeking a consensus of what policy approaches you would like to see applied in Sutter County and what components from existing County policy or policies from other counties should be included in those approaches. Based upon the input of the Focus Group, the General Plan Team will then prepare the appropriate policies and land use regulations to be brought forward for review at a future meeting.

2. AGRICULTURE ZONING (MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE)

Mandating minimum parcel sizes based on the quality of the land and other locational factors, is a common way to protect farmland. Minimum lot sizes in agricultural areas can help to ensure that land is retained in parcel sizes that are viable for profitable agriculture and undesirable for urbanization or ranchette development.

Some of the potential advantages of regulating minimum parcel sizes on agricultural lands include:

- It helps communities preserve their most productive soils for agriculture
- It stabilizes the agricultural land base by keeping large tracks of land relatively free of non-farm development
- It helps to reduce conflicts between farmers and their non-farming neighbors
- It helps to maintain a critical mass of agricultural land to keep farms from becoming isolated and thereby helping to retain agricultural infrastructure and support services
- It can help to limit land speculation keeping lands affordable for farming
- It can help to promote orderly growth by preventing sprawl into rural areas
- It is relatively inexpensive to implement and easy for the community to understand

At the same time, limiting minimum lot sizes can impact land values and the farmers' equity in the land. In addition, it does not protect agricultural lands from potential annexation by cities (American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Fact Sheet on Agricultural Protection Zoning).

The viable size of agricultural parcels varies with the nature of the farm (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 25). The American Farmland Trust, as one example, suggests that lot sizes should be no smaller than 20 acres to support agricultural use, however, even parcel sizes as large as 20 acres can be attractive for ranchettes instead of viable agriculture. (Yolo County Agricultural Preservation Techniques Report, p. 19). As a result, appropriate minimum agricultural parcel sizes should consider local conditions, crop production requirements and economics, growth patterns and pressures, and support of the agricultural community.

The minimum parcel sizes and key consideration in determining those parcel sizes for Sutter County and the other counties studied is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Minimum Agricultural Parcel Sizes

County	Minimum Parcel Size	Key Considerations
Sutter	20-80 acres	Based on soil type. In general, those agricultural lands containing orchard compatible soils have a 20 acre minimum parcel size. Those agricultural lands containing soils used primarily for row crops, field crops, and range land have an 80 acre minimum parcel size.
Butte	20-40 acres	Based on type of agriculture. In general, agricultural lands supporting orchards and field crops have minimum parcel sizes of 20 acres. Agricultural lands supporting livestock grazing and related uses have a minimum parcel size of 40 acres. Note that the Zoning Code also has minimum parcel sizes of 5 to 160 acres.
San Joaquin	5-160 acres	Based on intensity of agricultural use. The County recognizes that minimum parcel sizes for most operations, especially commercial farming, must be at least 80 to 160 acres to assure economic viability. If water is available for irrigation, parcels as small as 20 to 40 acres may be considered viable. Minimum parcel sizes of 5 to 10 acres are generally used for small-scale agricultural operations and "hobby" farming.
San Luis Obispo	10-320 acres	Based on soil type/topography and whether the land contains irrigation. In general, farmland on high quality soils with flat topography has smaller minimum parcel sizes, while farmland with poorer soils on higher topography tends to have larger minimum parcel sizes. Most minimum parcel sizes are 40 acres for all soil types and areas with existing irrigation. For areas that do not contain irrigation and on soils that are not considered to be prime farmland, minimum parcel sizes are either 160 acres or 320 acres. Generally speaking, row crops have 10-acre minimum parcel sizes, while specialty crops have 20-acre parcel sizes. Mixed croplands have 40-acre minimum parcel sizes, dry croplands have 80-acre parcel sizes, and grazing land has 100-acre parcel sizes.
Solano	20-160 acres	The County is divided into ten agricultural regions that are characterized by the commodities grown, soil conditions, cultivation practices, and availability of infrastructure. There are different minimum parcel sizes for each region. In general, minimum parcel sizes for orchards and field crops are 40-80 acres, while minimum parcel sizes for grazing activities are 80- 160 acres. There are areas with 20-acre minimum parcel sizes that are used for small orchards (grapes), and agri-tourism opportunities. Minimum parcel sizes of 40-acres are used for small-scale farming and niche agriculture.
Yolo	20-320 acres	Based on the thought that agricultural parcels are large enough to sustain agriculture while minimizing compatibility between adjacent land uses. Minimum parcel sizes of 80 acres for cultivable and irrigated lands, 160 acres of cultivable and non-irrigated lands, and 320 acres for not cultivable lands are most widely used. A minimum parcel size of one acre is used but is applied in a few parts of the County.

3. FARM FAMILY HOMESITE CREATION (HOMESITE CLUSTERING)

Homesite clustering allows for the protection of farmland for agricultural use while accommodating residential family homesite development. Homes are generally grouped close together and developed in one area of a parcel to allow the remainder of the area to be used for agriculture (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 28). The clustering technique is most practical and successful in areas where the cluster of homes is less likely to affect the farming operations such as in and near rural residential development and around coastal and mountainous areas. Well-designed siting and clustering of homesites typically retains much of the rural "country feel" and maximizes the opportunity and preservation of the adjacent agricultural operations. Homesite clustering also supports efficiencies in infrastructure, through reducing the cost of servicing the development because of the demand for fewer roadways, sewer lines, and water lines than the same number of homes spread over a larger area (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 30).

Some jurisdictions have chosen to provide an incentive by increasing the total number of units allowed to be built in a cluster (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 29). For example, if a landowner seeks to build on a 240-acre parcel in an agricultural zone designated AG-20 (generally maximum density of one house per 20 acres), present zoning permits up to 12 homes spread over the 240-acre property. However, with incentivized homesite clustering, the landowner would be able to build more homes, if the homes are clustered in one part of the property. For example, assume that a cluster incentive allowed the landowner to double the number of homes that could be built. In this case, 24 homes on three-acre plots could be built on 72 acres, preserving over 165 acres for agriculture (Figure 1).

Figure 1: How Clustering Works (H = Homesite)

H	H	H	H
H	H	H	H

Traditional Zoning

	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H
	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	H

Incentivized Clustering

Sutter, San Luis Obispo, and Yolo counties have existing general plan policies and zoning ordinances that address homesite clustering, as described in more detail below.

SUTTER COUNTY EXISTING POLICY

The 1996 General Plan allows for the creation of homesite parcels in agricultural zones, typically up to 2 acres in size, for a property owner or his sons or daughters "as long as it is clearly documented that the family member is involved in the family farming operation." There are currently no regulations or standards in place to prevent the homesite parcel property owner from turning around and selling the newly created homesite parcel to anyone, including non-family members. The Agriculture Preserve (AP) land use designation also allows the clustering of permitted residential density onto small parcels in lieu of subdividing large agricultural parcels into 20 or 80 acre minimums in order to preserve large agricultural parcels.

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

The San Luis Obispo County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance allow for clustering of homes on lands designated for agricultural use when a conventional land division is being considered. There are two types of homesite clustering: major agricultural cluster projects and minor agricultural cluster projects.

Major agricultural cluster projects are allowed on properties that are partly or entirely within five miles of urban areas, as defined in the County's Land Use Ordinance, and minor agricultural cluster projects are allowed throughout the County. For major agricultural cluster projects, the number of residential units allowed is to be no more than the maximum number of parcels within the area under consideration to be subdivided. Minor agricultural cluster projects would receive a 25% density bonus or at least one more lot that could be achieved with a standard land division. Under both types of agricultural cluster projects, the resulting agricultural parcel has to meet the minimum parcel sizes established it the general plan and must be covered by a permanent agricultural open space easement. Additionally, the agricultural parcel under the major agricultural cluster project has to be placed under a Williamson Act contract. For the parcels containing the residential uses, purchasers of those lots are notified that the County supports its "Right-to-Farm" ordinance for protection of agricultural operations. Applications for cluster projects are also given priority processing as a further incentive to applicants.

YOLO COUNTY

Yolo County's General Plan contains a policy that also allows and encourages homesite clustering. Specifically, all dwellings in agriculturally zoned areas are encouraged to be located on portions of the parcel unsuitable for agricultural use and in clustered configurations. Proposed homes that comply with the criteria would be issued building permits, while those that are not consistent with the criteria would require prior approval of a use permit. Areas outside of the homesites are required to be placed in a permanent agricultural conservation easement, deed restriction, or something similar. There is also a requirement of a use permit for homesites on less than 20 acres. A recordation of a deed notice acknowledging the potential for nuisances to occur and the County's right-to-farm

ordinance is required.

4. BUFFERS

Because of the nature of farming, farmers regularly receive complaints due to such things like agricultural operations noise and use of pesticides, among others. To prevent constant irritation on both the part of the residents of nearby subdivisions and the farmers who are often targets of complaints and stolen goods, the two adjacent uses are typically mandated to be separated by a buffer. Often it is the responsibility of the non-farm developer to ensure the land is set aside, or less common a physical barrier is established, as a buffer between the conflicting uses.

Buffers can be used to minimize or avoid urban/agricultural land use conflicts. They can help reduce actual or perceived impacts on neighboring residents (e.g., noise, odor, spray) and on agricultural operations (e.g., thefts, trespass). They also provide environmental benefits such as improved water quality, reduced phosphorus and nitrogen runoff, habitat creation, and increased biodiversity, as well as social benefits such as improved aesthetic quality of the landscape and increased recreational opportunities (Yolo County Agricultural Preservation Techniques Report, December 2006).

For buffers to be effective in limiting off-site impacts, they need to be relatively wide, suggesting that they work best on large tracts of land. There are several types of tools jurisdictions can implement as physical buffers that act as barriers between residential development and adjacent agricultural areas (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 120), including:

- Fences, Walls, and Vegetation Barriers – particularly beneficial when homes are built immediately adjacent to farmland.
- Physical Dedications of Land – typically applied when large developments are approved and jurisdictions require that a strip of land be dedicated or maintained as a buffer as a condition of approval of the new development.
- Topographic Buffers – very effective when existing land uses and topography form natural physical barriers such as rivers, flood plains, hillsides or man-made barriers such as roads, railroad tracks, irrigation canals, parking lots, or power line rights-of-way.
- Setback Requirements – generally setback restrictions, implemented through a jurisdictions' zoning ordinance, limit building within a certain number of feet from the property line that abuts the farming operation, typically ranging from 100 to 1,500 feet, but are more commonly set between 150 and 300 feet (Table 2).

Buffers generally require a management entity to maintain them, and these entities are usually ineffective in dealing with issues of trespass, vandalism, litter, theft, or dogs. If not properly maintained and operated, buffers can sometimes appear as "unused" land, since they are generally not recommended to be developed for public access, as the presence of human activity may restrict a farmer's ability to, for example, apply pesticides.

It must also be recognized that buffers do result in the conversion of farmland as an indirect result of adjacent edge development (Yolo County Agricultural Preservation Techniques Report).

Table 2: Urban/Agricultural Buffers

Jurisdiction	Setback Requirements	Key Considerations
Sutter County	100-300 feet	A 300-foot buffer is required where no residential uses are allowed to be built within the buffer. A 100-foot buffer is allowed as long as it contains a 25-foot vegetative planting area. The County's Agricultural Department is consulted with to determine the exact buffer distance for each development application adjacent to existing agricultural use.
City of Davis	150 feet: 100 feet used for agricultural buffer and 50 feet used for agricultural transition zone.	Maintained by developer, titled to City, public use only within 50-foot transition zone.
Butte County	300 feet from property line in agricultural zones.	Require development to provide land use transitions, setbacks, and buffers between urban development and agricultural interface to reduce interference and conflict.
Monterey County	For developments adjacent to agricultural zoning districts, the easement is required to be a width of 200 feet, or wider where necessary to mitigate adverse impacts between agricultural and adjacent land uses.	The buffer land area comes from the proposed new non-agricultural use or development project site; the buffer is maintained by the County, non-profit agricultural or open space entity, or by any other appropriate local agency, district or property owner association in perpetuity; buffers may be used for passive public purposes (e.g., bike or walking trails), but not for public intensive uses.
San Luis Obispo	The County recommends a distance range for the use of agriculture buffers: • Vineyard 400-800 feet • Irrigated orchards 300-800 feet • Irrigated vegetables/berries 200-500 feet • Field crops 100-400 feet • Dry farm almonds 100-200 feet • Rangeland/pasture 50-200 feet • Wholesale nurseries 100-500 feet	Agricultural buffer policies are discretionary in nature and determined on a case-by-case basis. Generally, buffers are intended to limit human-occupied structures. Size of buffer depends on type of crop, site topography, and wind direction. Size also varies depending on whether irrigated or not.
Solano	Typically 300-500 feet	Located within city municipal service area. Cost to maintain these buffers is typically borne by the proposed development project rather than the agricultural landowner/farmer, and managed or maintained by the adjacent city, a homeowners association, or special district.
Yolo	300 feet	Includes new urban (non-agricultural) development and sensitive areas that are used as public gathering places (e.g. schools, churches, parks and detention basins).

5. RIGHT-TO-FARM

Farmers in more urbanized areas often times face the perceived "nuisance" of farming practices by residents in nearby developments. Right-to-farm laws were developed to offset this problem and discourage neighboring residents from suing farmers (American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Factsheet on Right-to-Farm Laws). These ordinances are typically designed to accomplish the following:

- Provide dispute resolution mechanisms for neighbors as an alternative to filing private nuisance lawsuits against farming operations.
- Strengthen the legal position of farmers, when neighbors sue for private nuisance.
- Protect farmers from anti-nuisance ordinances and unreasonable controls on farming operations.
- Document the importance of farming to the state or locality.
- Provide disclosure notification statements to prospective residents and purchasers about the realities of living adjacent to agricultural areas (Table 3).

Table 3: Right-to-Farm Ordinance/Policy

Jurisdiction	Disclosure Statements	
	Provided at Issuance of Building Permit/ Original Sale	Provided at Time of Property Transfer
Sutter County	Yes	Yes
Butte County	Yes	No
Monterey County	Yes	Yes
San Luis Obispo County	Yes	Yes
Solano County	Yes	Yes
Yolo County*	No	No
City of Davis	No	Yes

* Yolo County has a right-to-farm ordinance but currently has no disclosure requirements.

Most local right-to-farm ordinances include elements that create a degree of certainty for farmers, which provide farm families with a psychological sense of security that farming is a valued and accepted activity in their community (American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Fact Sheet on Right-to-Farm Laws). These elements generally come in the form of policy statements, clear definitions of agricultural operations and farming-related activities, warning and agricultural use notice to disclose adjacency to farming operations, grievance procedures for dispute mediation, and vandalism fines. "An effective ordinance is one that fully informs affected parties and the community at large about the importance of maintaining productive agriculture in the face of urban growth" (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 118).

Right-to-farm ordinances do not eliminate all conflicts, but with clear expectations new residents are less likely to complain about all of the externalities associated with the industry of their farmer neighbor including "sprays, dust, odors, noise and other aspects of

agricultural activities" (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 25).

SUTTER COUNTY EXISTING POLICY

Sutter County does not have a true right-to-farm ordinance but does have agricultural operations disclosure requirements. Under the Sutter County's Agricultural Operation Disclosure policy (County Ordinance Chapter 1330, Sec. 010-040; February 1997), agricultural land and operations within the County are protected exclusively for agricultural use. Agricultural land is defined by the policy as those land areas of the county specifically classed and zoned as Upland Agricultural Districts (U-A), Exclusive Agricultural Districts (A-2), general Agricultural District (AG), Restrictive Agricultural Districts (A-3), and food Processing, Agricultural and Recreation Combining Districts (FPARC).

The policy protects agricultural land and agricultural uses from the impacts and restrictions that often occur when adjacent to residential development. The County requires full disclosure to residents residing adjacent to areas designated for agricultural use. The disclosure warns prospective residents and purchasers of agricultural operations that may cause issues inducing excess sounds, odors, dust, smoke, fertilizers and pesticides that may accompany agricultural operations. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the owner(s) of the property must sign a statement of acknowledgement, which states their property is adjacent to land or included within an area zoned for agricultural purposes. When transfers of the property occur, the seller is required to ensure the disclosure statement is included in the purchasing agreement. However, the acknowledgement is not required to be recorded and there is no existing mechanism to monitor that the disclosure is actually sent to the buyer. In addition, this ordinance only applies to building permits issued after the ordinance was adopted in 1987. Thus, if a property owner was selling a property where permits were issued before 1987, then the disclosure statement is not required to be sent to a new buyer of property.

6. TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

Transfers of development rights (TDR) programs are voluntary, incentive-based, market-driven programs that allow landowners to transfer the right to develop one parcel of land to another, and are generally established by local zoning ordinances (Yolo County Agriculture Preservation Techniques Report). In the context of farmland preservation, TDRs are used to shift development credits from agricultural areas to designated urban growth zones, which are closer to municipal services, or to rural areas that are inappropriate for agriculture and allow for clustering of development. Targeted preservation lands are established (through zoning overlays) as "sending areas" from which land owners sell the development rights of their property to private developers for use in designated "receiving areas" (infill areas designated for development or density increases). TDR programs can (American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Fact Sheet on Transfer of Development Rights):

- Prevent non-agricultural development of farmland permanently, while keeping it in private ownership.
- Reduce the market value of protected farms.
- Provide farmland owners with liquid capital that can be used to enhance farm viability.

The policy of allowing development credits to be sold and purchased independent of the land they are attached to allows for a free market approach to industry protection. The development rights purchased generally allows the owner to build at a higher density than ordinarily permitted by the base zoning and likely allows the developer to "forgo paying the mitigation fee" (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 51).

TDR programs are best suited to areas where large blocks of land remain in farm use. They have been most effective at preserving farmland in areas where there has been a public entity actively purchasing rights or where TDR "receiving areas" have strong real estate pressures that create a natural market for development rights. Ideally, a TDR program is designed such that purchasing the development credits is the most profitable way to develop property in the receiving zone. Drawbacks of TDRs include (American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Fact Sheet on Transfer of Development Rights):

- Technically complicated and requires a significant investment of time and staff resources to implement.
- Unfamiliar concept, and as a result, a lengthy and extensive public outreach process is generally required to educate residents.
- The pace of transactions depends on the private market for development rights; if the real estate market is depressed, few rights will be sold and little land will be protected.

Butte, Monterey, and Solano counties have existing general plan policies that propose a TDR program be established. It is unknown at this time whether these jurisdictions have established a program. San Luis Obispo County, Marin County, San Mateo County, and the

City of Livermore are among the jurisdictions that have enacted ordinances that allowed for TDRs, as described in Table 4.

Table 4: Transfer of Development Rights

Jurisdiction	Existing General Plan Policy/Zoning Code Ordinance	Has the Policy Been Applied
Sutter County	Policy to conduct a study to determine the feasibility and appropriateness of implementing permanent preservation program(s) to protect agricultural lands.	No TDR program has been established. TDR's have been used in limited instances.
San Luis Obispo County	Provides a procedure to allow the voluntary transfer of development credits from one parcel of land to another. Consistent with applicable Land Use Element goals, policies and programs, the objective is to relocate development from environmentally sensitive land, land with agricultural capability or antiquated subdivisions, to more suitable areas. This program is voluntary, incentive-based, and market-driven between willing sellers and buyers. Landowners are not obligated to use this technique to request an amendment to the general plan or subdivide property.	Unknown
Marin County	Participation in the TDR program is on a voluntary basis. A higher density of development is allowed to be built on the receiving property. Restricted development or conservation of the sending property is required to have conservation easements or restrictions recorded against it.	Unknown
San Mateo County	TDR program is set up to make it difficult to subdivide prime farmlands. Allows development rights that are not developable under the Local Coastal Program to be transferred to another area of the County. Sending area is restricted permanently to agricultural use by an easement granted to the County or other governmental agency; in addition to agricultural use, non-residential development considered accessory to agriculture and farm labor housing is allowed; after 3 years, the preserved area can be converted to other uses consistent with open space. A maximum of four density credits may be transferred to any receiving parcel or otherwise determined by Planning Commission.	Yes
City of Livermore	The TDR program is designed to protect agricultural land and open space. Development credits are given for protecting a certain amount of land or forgoing the right to building a dwelling unit; credits are then used in the receiving area. Development credits can be sold, purchased, transferred or received.	Unknown

7. AGRICULTURE FARMLAND MITIGATION

To discourage the use of agriculturally rich land by non-farming uses, a mitigation fee is often established. In effect, the non-farming developer is asked to mitigate the loss of farmable land, by protecting farmable land, generally, but in no way exclusively, on an acre for acre basis. Mitigation fee ordinances typically ask developers to protect one acre of farmland of equal or greater quality for each acre of farmland that is converted to non-farm uses. In 2002, the mitigation fee rates across California generally ranged from $2,500 to $10,000 per acre, but varied widely depending on local land and crop values (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 48, mitigation fee rate assessment calculated based on an economic analysis of easements).

The following information provides perspective on some of the elements associated with agricultural farmland mitigation processing and fees (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 49):

- Acquisition — Development fee use by local agency to purchase conservation easements.
- Intermediaries — Local agency can act on its own or work with a land trust to negotiate and hold easements.
- Public Education — Some education is necessary, particularly for developers.
- Thresholds — Setting a minimum parcel size is recommended. Generally better suited with bigger parcels, except where land values are exceptionally high.
- Setting the Fee — Must be high enough to pay for the conservation easement, transaction costs, and staff time to administer the process. Amount charged to developers is set by formula and is usually updated annually.

In addition, the issue as to whether a nexus, or direct relationship, is required between the impact of the development and the purpose of the mitigation fee is commonly debated (Farmland Protection Action Guide, p. 50). Some jurisdictions elect to develop a nexus study to identify the linkage between new development and the loss of agricultural land, while others suggest that such a study is not necessary. Nexus studies can, however, be useful to a jurisdiction when developing the formula for the mitigation fee and supporting findings, if an ordinance is adopted. Only a few agencies in the state have adopted mitigation programs to offset the conversion of farmland. Table 5 provides information on agricultural farmland mitigation programs in Sutter County and other jurisdictions examined in this report.

Table 5: Agriculture Farmland Mitigation

Jurisdiction	Existing General Plan Policy / Ordinance	Mitigation Ratio
Sutter County	Policy to encourage feasibility study; no required farmland mitigation	None established
Monterey County	Policy requires agricultural land mitigation or payment of in-lieu fees	1:1 mitigation requirement; for every acre of agricultural land converted to non-agricultural use, one acre is required to be protected
Solano County	Policy to implement farmland mitigation program; the program cannot result in regulatory barriers to agritourism, agricultural services, and agricultural processing where these uses are permitted; the program should establish mitigation within the same agricultural region as the proposed development project or within a Agricultural Reserve Overlay district	Minimum ratio of 1:1.5; when program is established, for every acre of agricultural land that is converted to non-agricultural use, 1.5 acres is required to be protected
Yolo County	Zoning ordinance requires mitigation for loss of agricultural land. The mitigation land must: ▪ Be of comparable or better soil quality than the converted land; ▪ Have comparable water rights (sufficient to support ongoing agricultural use) that cannot be separated from the land; ▪ Be within at least two miles of the converted land, or, if no suitable land is available within two mile radius, must be of equal or greater conservation easement market value; and ▪ Not be encumbered by an agricultural conservation easement, though it "may overlap partially with existing habitat easement areas."	1:1 mitigation requirement or payment of in-lieu fee; for every acre of agricultural land converted to non-agricultural zoning, one acre of equal or better quality land must be protected permanently by conservation easement or other mechanism
City of Davis	Zoning Ordinance requires that the protected farmland is required to be adjacent to that being developed to create a permanent community edge.	1:2 mitigation requirement or payment of in-lieu fee; for every acre of agricultural land converted to non-agricultural use, two acres are required to be protected

SOURCES

American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Fact Sheet on Agricultural Protection Zoning, September 1998.

American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Factsheet on Right-to-Farm Laws, September 1998.

American Farmland Trust, Farmland Information Center, Fact Sheet on Transfer of Development Rights, January 2001.

Farmland Protection Action Guide: 24 Strategies for California, Institute for Local Self Government, 2002.

Yolo County Agricultural Preservation Techniques Report, December 2006.

BUTTE COUNTY

Butte County General Plan, May 9, 1995.

http://www.buttegeneralplan.net/background/gp/Agriculture_Element.pdf.

MONTEREY COUNTY

2006 Monterey County General Plan Draft.

2007 Monterey County General Plan Draft.
http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/gpu/Reports/0403/gpu0403_landuse.pdf

http://www.co.monterey.ca.us/gpu/Reports/0403/gpu0403_agriculture.pdf

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

1992 San Joaquin County General Plan.

http://www.sjgov.org/commdev/cgi-bin/cdyn.exe/handouts-planning_GP-V1-TOC?grp=handouts-planning&obj=GP-V1-TOC

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

2002 San Luis Obispo County Land Use Ordinance, Title 22 of the County Code, November 5, 2002.

2007 San Luis Obispo County Agriculture and Open Space Element, Revised January 2007.

http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/agcomm/Land_Use/Agriculture_and_Open_Space_Element.htm

SOLANO COUNTY

2008 Solano County General Plan.
http://www.solanocountygeneralplan.net/GP%20Documents/9-3-08/03%20-%20Agriculture.pdf

Solano County Subdivision Ordinance.

http://www.co.solano.ca.us/resources/ResourceManagement/subord.pdf

Sutter County

Sutter County General Plan, November 25, 1996.

Sutter County's Agricultural Operation Disclosure Policy, County Ordinance 1013, Sec. 1; August, 1987.

Yolo County

County of Yolo Planning Commission Staff Report, 5/10/2007.
http://www.yolocounty.org/archives/planning/Agendas/a051007-72.pdf

Yolo County Codes.

http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=432#Title%207

Yolo County Draft 2030 Countywide General Plan, Agriculture and Economic Development Element.

http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=1528

Yolo County General Plan, July 1983.

City of Davis

http://cityofdavis.org/cmo/citycode/