

Agricultural Subcommittee Meeting #5

Agenda for Wednesday March 10, 2010

1. Review/Debrief Ideas Forum
2. Discuss Uses
3. Determine Next Steps for Ag Recos Development

Last Meeting Summary:

Attendees: Christina Tate, Dena and Lonnie Malouff, Denise Bohemier, J. Paul Brown, Jennifer Burbey, Katie Roseberry, George and Mae Morley, Roy Horvath, Michelina Nyberg, Barbara Jefferies, Dick Norton.

Staff: Tracie Hughes, Courtney Krueger,Carolynn Pakeltis, Shawn Nau, Kellie Hotter, Sheryl Rogers, Marjo Curgus

During the last meeting we discussed the following:

1. Engagement in the Ideas Forum and Lessons Learned from Other Community Processes
2. 1999 Comp Plan Strategies compared to current recommendations.

Marjo reported back on the 1999 Comprehensive Plan strategies for agriculture for comparison purposes to where we are in this process prior to idea forum.

1999 Strategies:

1. Promote site planning assistance.
2. Landowner education about conservation tax benefits
3. Use some of ag property tax to fund agricultural preservation strategies.
4. Open space acquisition fund.
5. Inventory of important agricultural lands
6. TDR/PDR.
7. Incentives
8. Improve ag viability
9. Land use process that provides alternatives

2010 Draft Strategies

Marjo presented back the agricultural draft strategies to the subcommittee. Modifications to the strategies were made in order to prepare for the Ideas Forum. The modified version was distributed at the meeting and at the ideas forum.(attachment)

COMMENTS and DISCUSSION

The discussion continued a theme expressed in other subcommittee meetings to date. There is not 100% unity within the agricultural subcommittee as to what degree of incentives ought to be offered. Some feel there ought to be incentives for land use development that help ag producers with land subdivision. Others feel that the incentives ought to be focused on agricultural production and if land is taken out of ag it should face equal, not special, standards for development.

Additionally, while all agree government not ought to be overbearing and private property rights ought to be respected, the degree of regulatory oversight is not agreed upon. Some feel strongly that the market ought to be the determinant and landowners ought to be able to do with their land as they please, some feel some degree of oversight is necessary due to the impacts of neighboring development on agricultural operations.