

# ***Bay Area Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations Study***



**Santa Clara County  
Open Space Authority**

**July 7, 2008**

Cover photos

Top three photos: Sources unknown.

Bottom three photos: By permission of Sustainable Agricultural Education (SAGE), Sibella Kraus, President. Berkeley, California. [www.sagecenter.org](http://www.sagecenter.org)

SAGE's mission is to engage regional diverse populations with the sustainable agriculture movement and to develop urban edge agriculture as a vital urban-rural interface. SAGE is a non-profit corporation, tax-exempt under IRC section 501(c)3.

# ***Bay Area Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations Study***



## **Santa Clara County Open Space Authority**

6980 Santa Teresa Blvd., Suite 100

San Jose, CA 95119

408-224-7476

fax 408-224-7548

[www.openspaceauthority.org](http://www.openspaceauthority.org)

**July 7, 2008**

**This report was researched, written and prepared by the members of the  
Santa Clara County Open Space Authority Citizens Advisory Committee.**

# **SANTA CLARA COUNTY OPEN SPACE AUTHORITY**

## **Board of Directors**

Alex Kennett  
District One

Jim Foran -Chairperson  
District Two

Sequoia Hall - Vice-Chairperson  
District Three

Garnetta Annable  
District Four

Virginia Holtz  
District Five

Mike Potter  
District Six

Kalvin Gill  
District Seven

## **General Manager**

Patrick Congdon

## **Citizens Advisory Committee**

Chris Kangas

Daniel J. Kenney

David Poeschel  
Vice Chairperson

Dorsey Moore  
Chairperson

Eric Carruthers

Gloria Dirkmaat

Jan Hintermeister

Kitty Monahan

Son Cheong Kuan

Susan McKuhen

Yacanex Posadas

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</b> .....	<i>iii</i>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>SECTION ONE: Background</b> .....	2
<b>SECTION TWO: The Organizations and Their Holdings</b> .....	4
<b>SECTION THREE: Organizational Operations Relating to Agricultural Land Conservation</b>	9
A. Introduction .....	9
B. Summary .....	9
C. Detailed Responses to Operations Interview .....	10
<b>SECTION FOUR: Individual Organization Information</b> .....	16
A. 35 Organizational Profiles .....	17
B. Organizational Summary Tables .....	55
C. Organizational Summaries.....	57
D. Organizational Program Summaries .....	72
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
Appendix A: Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations Included in Study .....	87
Appendix B: Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations Interviewed .....	88
Appendix C: Interview Questionnaire .....	88
Appendix D: The Study Method .....	89
Appendix E: Definitions Used in This Report .....	91

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The Santa Clara County Open Space Authority (OSA) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) wishes to express its appreciation to all of the land conservation organizations and their staffs that provided us with their time, counsel and detailed information to make this report possible. The Committee also appreciates both the support of Patrick Congdon, the OSA General Manager, who contributed to the study concept, and the support of the OSA staff who formatted the questionnaire for email use. We also wish to express our appreciation to Bettina Ring and the staff of the Bay Area Open Space Council who gave us the initial list of potential participating organizations.

The Committee thanks the OSA Board for the assignment to prepare this report. Due to jobs, school, and a steep learning curve the project took the volunteer Committee longer to complete than expected. We hope the Board will find this report a useful resource as it considers future directions for the Open Space Authority.

All the CAC members contributed to this report from its inception, starting with developing the concept and work plan, preparing the questionnaire, reviewing the findings and finalizing the report. Special recognition is due to those members who conducted the interviews, verified the data, and drafted and formatted the report. These include Kitty Monahan, Susan McKuhen, Karna Carlson, Son Cheong Kuan, David Poeschel, Jan Hintermeister, Chris Kangas, Eric Carruthers, and Dorsey Moore.

In this kind of report there are many opportunities for errors. Any errors regarding the participating organizations are the responsibility of the report preparers and not the organization staffs.

## **DISCLAIMER**

This study was prepared as the result of work by the members of the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority Citizens Advisory Committee. It does not necessarily represent the views of the Open Space Authority, its employees, or its Board of Directors. The Open Space Authority, its employees, contractors and subcontractors make no warrant, express or implied, and assume no legal liability for the information in this study; nor does any party represent that the uses of this information will not infringe upon privately owned rights. This study has not been approved or disapproved by the Open Space Authority nor has the Open Space Authority passed upon the accuracy or adequacy of the information in this study.

## INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared at the direction of the Board of the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority (OSA) by its Citizens Advisory Committee. Protection of agriculture, along with other conservation goals, is cited in the legislation creating the Authority, in the Authority's mission and its Five-Year Plan. The Board reviews its agricultural land program periodically. This report was done to give the Board information about the state of agricultural land conservation in the region around Santa Clara County. The report is informational only and does not include recommendations. It identifies 35 organizations and agencies active in conserving cultivated agricultural land. They are active in Santa Clara County, the eight other Bay Area Counties, and nine additional counties around Santa Clara County and the Bay Area. The report presents basic information about their programs and their management practices.

The report is focused on the conservation of cultivated agricultural lands, usually found on valley floors. It addresses only those organizations whose programs actively conserve valley floor agricultural land. Therefore, it does not include the many organizations that conserve only natural areas, scenic lands, or habitat. Grazing, which is part of agriculture in the larger sense, is omitted since it is typically conducted on hill sides and is often combined in the management of natural areas. Many of the organizations included in the report also have programs that conserve natural areas, scenic lands, habitat, or grazing. While these programs are immensely important, they are not included. The report uses "agricultural land" and "farmland" interchangeably. In both cases they mean agriculture in the sense of this report that is cultivated agriculture as usually found on the valley floor.

Following **Section One Background**, **Section Two** compiles information about the organizations, their programs and land holdings.

**Section Three** presents information about their program management, with findings from the eleven organizations that were interviewed.

**Section Four** presents profiles for each of the 35 organizations included in the study. Three types of organizations are included:

### **Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations**

Includes organizations that conserve farm lands by holding conservation easements or lands in fee simple, (16 are private non-profit organizations, like land trusts; three are publicly funded districts or authorities),

### **Local Governments with Agricultural Land Mitigation Programs**

Includes 10 local governments that cause farm lands to be conserved by requiring mitigation of agricultural lands when they are converted to urban use,

### **Regional, State, and National Conservation Organizations**

Includes six regional, state and national organizations that conserve farm lands themselves or aid local organizations in conservation efforts.

In this report, we use the term "organization" to mean private organizations (such as non-profit land trusts). We use the term "agency" to mean publicly funded governmental agencies (such as districts, authorities, cities, counties, etc.). We also use the term "organizations" to mean "organizations and agencies" together collectively in the generic sense.

## **SECTION ONE: Background**

The local organizations described in this report are working to preserve farm lands within the context of larger trends, which are described below. Their basic strategy is to pay the farmer an acceptable price for the land's urban development rights, by buying a conservation easement or, sometimes, buying the land in fee simple. This gives the farmer working capital now and ensures that the land will be available in the future for farming at a cost based on its value for agricultural production, rather than urban speculation.

Agriculture in California has been under pressure from urbanization since World War II, with the rapid expansion of automobile-based low density development. Because the value of land for development at the urban edge far exceeds its value for agricultural production, owners of urban edge farmland are usually eager to sell their land for urban development if land regulations permit it, or in the anticipation of regulation change. This has resulted in an on-going process of invasion-and-conversion. The Santa Clara Valley, once one of the nation's highest producing agricultural counties, is now known as the home of Silicon Valley. Growers who farmed in the Mountain View-Sunnyvale area and sold in the 50's and 60's to move to the South County have been selling to move to the Central Valley.

Agriculture and good farm land, however, are still part of the Santa Clara County picture. There are presently about 25,000 acres of agricultural land under cultivation in Santa Clara County, 90 % of which is in irrigated crops and the remainder in hay and grains.

There is growing state-wide concern about protecting farm land at the urban edge. To restrain urban sprawl into farm lands, counties have increased minimum lot sizes in their agricultural zoning and required urban development to take place in cities. Some counties and cities have adopted urban limit lines and other long term restrictions on urban expansion. Cities are beginning to require urban development at higher densities rather than continue the extreme low density development of the post World War II era. The State Legislature created Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCO's) to regulate urban sprawl. LAFCOs and cities now often require that urban development mitigate the loss of agricultural land by the purchasing of conservation easements on nearby agricultural land.

Communities are creating organizations to acquire conservation easements and lands in fee simple to preserve land for farming. Some of these are privately funded organizations, like land trusts, such as the Marin Agricultural Trust created in 1980. Others are publicly funded agencies such as districts or authorities, like the Santa Clara County Open Space District founded in 1994. For many of these organizations, farm lands are part of a broader mission of environmental protection that may embrace natural and scenic areas, habitat, and greenbelts between cities. The Santa Clara County Open Space Authority is a publicly funded agency which includes the protection of agricultural land and greenbelts as part of its larger mission. Some, like the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District are adding farm land protection as their mission and geographical scope evolve.

Environmental trends can affect the context for farm land conservation. The mandated preparation of Habitat Conservation Plans and other protection initiatives are producing some convergence of farm land and habitat protection, such as in the Pajaro River corridor or in Yolo County where the endangered Swainson's Hawk forages in cultivated crop land. In a larger context, it is possible that mounting efforts to address global warming will promote higher density, more compact urban development and the use of public transit to reduce use of the private auto and greenhouse gas emissions. It is possible this change in urban pattern may moderate the demand to develop urban edge farm land. In which case, farming may remain the best use of this land.

At the same time, there are trends which support the continued economic feasibility of farming at the urban edge, an area where land conservation efforts are being concentrated. It is as if there are two forms of agriculture. One is large parcel farming, with parcels of many acres planted to one crop (sometimes referred to as monoculture). The harvest, which may have been contracted for sale before it was planted, is distributed by volume wholesalers to large commercial chain retail outlets throughout the country or overseas. Sometimes it is called industrial agriculture, and it is common in the Central Valley. This type of agriculture is experiencing increasing consolidation, and it is responding to the demand for organic produce, supplying it to the major market chains on a national scale. The other form of agriculture is varied crop farming on small to medium sized parcels, with as many as three harvests per

season, and specializing in greens, vegetables, fruits and specialty crops, generally for sale in the local metropolitan region. This local marketing is often by direct sale to consumers, restaurants or institutions desiring such produce. Consumer demand for fresh greens, vegetables, and fruits is growing as their health benefits are being recognized. These crops can be successfully farmed on the small-medium scale parcels often found at the urban edge. This trend, coupled with increasing consumer interest in the "food-farm connection", supports increased sales of such produce in local commercial markets and farmers' markets. In addition, large institutions, such as hospital networks, commercial food service companies, and school districts are presenting locally produced fresh greens, vegetables and fruits to their clients. This movement is increasingly supported by new produce distribution systems that link the institutions with small to medium scale growers, as an alternative to the large-scale distribution systems that rely on industrial-scale growers.

## SECTION TWO: The Organizations and Their Holdings

The findings presented in this section are based on the detailed information in Section Four, pages 16-86.

### 1. There is a wide range in the size of conservation organizations

The smallest organization in the study has a volunteer board that works without staff on an annual budget of about \$14,000. Their single farm land holding is 65 acres of row crops as part of one of their three easements. At the other end of the scale is a 35 year old agency with an annual budget of \$19 million and a staff of 90. Primarily a natural, scenic and habitat conserving agency, it is beginning to include farm lands in their new acquisitions as part of their working landscapes program along the coast.

Two organizations work with budgets of \$20,000 or under. Six organizations have budgets ranging from \$100,000 to a little over \$500,000, with 1 to 3 full time employees, sometimes helped by a part time employee or consultant. Seven organizations have budgets ranging from \$1 million to a little over \$5 million employing staffs ranging from a low of 6 to a high of 20, with most of them having staffs of about 13. The two largest organizations have budgets of \$15 million and \$19 million and staffs of 24 and 90 respectively.

It should be noted that the budget data may not be rigorously comparable, since it may sometimes be difficult to separate operating budget information completely from capital expenditures for land acquisition or improvements.

### 2. The types of crops generally reflect Northern California agriculture

The types of agriculture protected by the conservation organizations represent much of northern California's agriculture, including row crops, orchards, vineyards and wineries, Christmas tree farms, hay and dairies. The study provides no information regarding how many acres are dedicated to each type of crop.

### 3. The holdings of conservation organizations vary

Nineteen organizations profiled in the study report a total of 462 parcels which include agriculture, totaling 150,470 acres. The number of holdings generally reflects the organizations' budgets.

Regarding size of parcels, the organizations were asked to report the number of their holdings and their total acreage, but not the number of acres by parcel size. While we cannot report the exact number of parcels by parcel size, some conclusions are possible from the various organizations' reports. The reported parcels range in size from 7 acres to 1000 acres. The average parcel size is about 300 acres. About 20% of the identifiable parcels are smaller than 50 acres. Additional small size parcels may be included in other organizations' holdings. The largest identifiable parcel is 1000 acres, 2/3 of which is in grazing and forest. It is likely that other conservation lands are included in our report along with cultivated agriculture, especially on the larger parcels. Therefore the total of 150,470 protected acres is not all cultivated farmland.

Conservation easements are the most common method of protecting agricultural land. Nineteen organizations hold 428 conservation easements, totaling 135,860 acres. The number of easements held by a single organization ranges from 1 to 114. Four organizations have only one easement.

Seven of the organizations hold lands in fee simple. In addition, one city has a 7 acre agricultural park held in fee simple. In all, 34 parcels are held in fee simple, totaling 14,150 acres. One organization holds 7 parcels in fee simple, totaling 1,103 acres. The organizations holding lands in fee simple use them to provide a variety of programs. For information about such programs, see Finding 5 on the next page.

(See Section Three C.10 of the report for views regarding the various merits of these two approaches: easements and ownership in fee simple.)

4. Conserved farm lands must be monitored and/or managed

Monitoring is the periodic inspection and review of a property under a conservation easement to ensure that the terms of the easement are being complied with. The easement terms vary from property to property and typically cover use and maintenance of the buildings and the land. Management generally refers to lands held in fee title, where the organization has full responsibility for how the land, and any buildings, are used to achieve the conservation goals of the organization. Generally, the organizations in the study monitor and manage their holdings themselves. Organizations with adequate funding do this with their own staffs. Small organizations may use volunteers for monitoring functions. A few agencies contract out some part of the monitoring or may contract the complete function. Standards for monitoring are being raised substantially, and the funding of monitoring (and management) is becoming a very serious issue. Organizations are now requiring that easements be accompanied by funds to cover the costs of monitoring, often in the form of an endowment.

Sixteen of the organizations holding easements or lands in fee simple report that they monitor and manage their holding themselves. Some organizations use volunteers in their monitoring program; others have full time land management staff. Three organizations supplement their in-house program with contract personnel, in some cases for a specific property, in one case a winery. The level of monitoring and management varies among the organizations.

5. The organizations' programs vary widely, depending on their size and budget

Fundraising is an essential part of private organizations' programs, while public agencies do not need this. The most basic program is monitoring the easements and managing the lands held by the organization, although the level and degree of monitoring seems to vary. (See Finding 4: Conserved farm lands must be monitored and/or managed above). The small organizations generally limit their program to this basic level, seeking additional easements as they may. The larger organizations often have robust programs with a variety of components.

All the organizations maintain a web site, and many publish a news letter. They all have some type of public outreach program. Some emphasize outreach to landowners regarding prospective easements. Others have public information programs of greater scope. Many, even some smaller ones, maintain volunteer programs which may contribute to easement monitoring, land management activities, and public guidance and interpretation at properties that are open to the public. Somewhat over half of the organizations have formal plans to guide the organization's program and activities and/or specific guidelines and criteria to guide their land acquisitions. Many of the organizations report working in partnership with governmental agencies and other private foundations and organizations to implement their conservation programs. Several of the larger organizations have permanent facilities on lands held in fee simple where they provide educational experiences regard agriculture and nature to adults and youth, sometimes in cooperation with schools. Several host hikes and other types of outings on their lands. Some support farmers' markets in their service area and stage or support seasonal food fairs featuring crops from the area. Two public agencies provide open-space grants to local governments or conservation organizations in their areas. Two organizations provide small farm leases to farmers in the area to facilitate access to land. Two organizations, at least, provide financial assistance to landowners under their easements to improve conditions of the land, such as stream improvement. One, at least, has developed marketing plans for the farmers in the area as well as promoting zoning regulations and "right to farm" ordinances to support the economic viability of farmers in the area. Several report that they are active in local policy making on issues affecting farming and conservation.

6. The private organizations and public agencies have similarities and differences

Sixteen of the conservation organizations are private non-profit organizations (501.c.3). They are funded by private contributions, membership dues, foundation grants, and governmental agency grants for capital projects. There are three public conservation agencies that are funded by a local property tax, sales tax, property assessment, or by permit fees and member governments' contributions.

The most basic difference is their funding. The privately funded organizations must dedicate a significant part of their program to securing a steady stream of private contributions, membership dues, foundation

grants, and governmental agency grants for capital projects. The public agencies have a steady funding stream. However, the amount of their funding is generally fixed unless they return to their voters for an increase, which they have done in some cases. In one case, the agency's funding is set through 2031, when they will have to return to the voters for continued funding. Two public agencies have budgets of about \$4.5 million, while one's budget is about \$19 million. The fourth budget is not reported. The private organization budgets range from \$14,000 to \$19 million. While the average budget is \$1,580,000, half the private organizations have budgets of \$200,000 or less. Both private and public organizations are beginning to require that monitoring funds be provided when easements are acquired.

Both the private and public organizations depend on partnerships with other public agencies and private foundations to fund specific acquisition and improvement projects that are consistent with those funders' programs. Both private and public organizations have received occasional grants for planning and organizational development.

The private organizations are governed by boards that are generally self-selected, while the public agencies are governed by publicly elected boards or by a board with members appointed by other elected local governmental officials.

The missions of the private organizations vary. Some have the primary mission of conserving agricultural land, while others have a broad conservation mission that includes agricultural land protection. The public agencies' missions include agricultural land conservation within a broad resource conservation mission.

It is difficult to compare and contrast the programs of private organizations with those of public agencies, since the range of program scope varies so widely among the private organizations, and there are only 4 public agencies reporting, also with varied programs. In general, however, private and public organizations with similar funding levels have many similarities in program. The private organizations are more likely to rely exclusively on conservation easements as their preservation method, as this is part of the culture of the land trust movement.

#### 7. Local governments and conservation organizations are partnering in agricultural land mitigation

Local governments that grant land development permits have begun to require agricultural land mitigation, usually through the securing of easements on nearby agricultural land or the payment of in-lieu fees, which they then convey to land conservation organizations with programs in the area.

The report profiles six cities, one county and two local agency formation commissions that require the mitigation of agricultural land converted to urban use. This is in response to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that requires that the environmental impacts of governmental actions be evaluated and mitigated (or reduced) to less than significant level. Regarding agricultural land, the accepted mitigation is to preserve, by an easement, an amount of agricultural land proportional to the amount of agricultural land being developed. The usual method is to have the developer present a conservation easement to the city (or other permitting agency) as part of the permit process. Many agencies allow the developer to pay an in-lieu-fee in place of presenting an all-ready purchased easement. The fee is generally based on an estimate of the cost of an acre of agricultural land. Most programs provide for periodic review of the fee to reflect land value appreciation. In effect, the fee may be lower than the actual purchase price of an acre of farm land. The fee based programs sometimes have difficulty in implementing their purchase goals for lack of willing easement sellers at the offered price. (See the Profiles section of this report for information about local governments that have agricultural land mitigation programs.)

The cities and the other land development permitting agencies are not generally holders or managers of rural, agricultural lands. They usually transfer the easement or fee to an organization that has the mission and capability of holding, monitoring, and managing rural, agricultural lands. This could be a land trust or public open space agency. With the cases in this study, the holders are land trusts. As yet, there has been little agricultural land mitigation within the jurisdictions of the public conservation agencies. One city is holding fee simple lands for specific conservation purposes. In cases where the jurisdiction implementing the mitigation transfers the easement, it retains an interest in the easement that is then held

jointly by both the city, let us say, and the land trust. This ensures the city that the purpose of the mitigation will be guaranteed.

Most of the mitigation programs have guidelines or criteria for what lands will require mitigation if they are developed. The guidelines often address the conditions of the agricultural land and its location, e.g., in a designated area or its relative closeness to the city. They specify the required ratio of mitigation, with Davis, for example, requiring two acres of mitigation for each acre developed, while most others require one-for-one mitigation. The programs often have guidelines for type and/or location of land that will be accepted for mitigation.

It is difficult to determine how many acres of farm land have been protected by the mitigation programs or how much mitigation funding has been accumulated for easement acquisitions, since the data are scattered among the records of the jurisdictions requiring the mitigation and the organizations that are the holders of the lands or fees. The City of Brentwood reports \$10 million in the acquisition fund ready to buy easements.

Other governmental agencies that build projects that may require environmental mitigation, such as highways or flood control improvements, sometimes partner in the acquisition of agricultural lands for mitigation purposes.

#### 8. Regional, State and national organizations are important players in agricultural land conservation

Almost all of the organizations in this study report the importance of governmental and foundation grants to their programs. They cite an array of regional, State and national organizations that contribute to local conservation organizations' efforts to preserve farmland. This is generally through grants to supplement local funds for acquisitions. Such projects often involve several organizations working in partnership. In addition, some of these funding organizations provide information, consulting services, and organizational development assistance. Some also participate in projects to restore and enhance environmental conditions on farmland. In general, the partner organizations provide matching funds and require the local conservation organization to provide the base funding.

Our study includes several regional, state and national organizations that are important to conservation of farm land. At the regional level, the Bay Area Open Space Council is a private non-profit organization that provides critical information and coordination programs supporting farmland conservation. Two state agencies fund farmland protection and provide other support. The California State Department of Conservation-Division of Land Resource Protection administers two important farmland related programs: the California Farmland Conservancy Program and the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The California Coastal Conservancy: S.F. Bay Area Conservancy funds farmland protection among its conservation programs. The report also includes three organizations of national scope: the American Farmland Trust, The Nature Conservancy, and the Trust for Public Lands. (See Section 4 of this report for Profiles on these regional, state, and national organizations.)

There are many significant organizations that are not included in this report. One is the Packard Foundation. This important organization has funded planning and organizational development programs for conservation organizations as well as contributed substantial funding to purchases of conservation lands. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has a program, Focusing Our Vision, which is a multi-agency, regional planning initiative, one purpose of which is to identify consensus regarding which agricultural areas of the 9 county region should receive highest priority for preservation efforts. This program is intended to guide the direction of urban development away from priority agricultural lands. It may also guide the availability of agricultural land preservation funding in the future.

In addition to funding farmland protection, some state and federal agencies and programs support the improvement and management practices of farmlands. Some state and federal agencies and programs support the management and improvement of farmlands rather than or in addition to land acquisition. A group of local organizations that work with these programs are the Resource Conservation Districts. They can provide access to the state and federal programs and thus may be sources of funding for farmland management and resource enhancement. The RCD's are organized locally to work with the Federal Resources Conservation Service regional offices. They partner with other local, state and federal

agencies in resource restoration and enhancement. Each RCD is governed by a local board appointed by the County Board of Supervisors or the voters within the district. For some, their basic funding is a local property tax on property within the district. Their project funds come from state and federal grants. Their programs are determined by their local board and vary widely from district to district.

9. All the most effective organizations work to maintain a strong community connection

All of the organizations, private and public, work to develop and maintain a strong connection with their stakeholders and the community in general. They find it critical to their success. This work takes many forms: cultivating relationships with owners of lands considered important to conserve, maintaining working relationships with owners of lands now under easement and owners of neighboring lands, relationships with donors and potential supporters, working relationships with potential partner agency staffs, community leaders, activities to promote the visibility of the organization's goals and program in the community at large. Public information and education programs are considered an important part of this effort. Public agencies must maintain their support among the electorate for the times when they go to the voters for approval.

## **SECTION THREE: Organizational Operations Relating to Agricultural Land Conservation**

### **A. Introduction**

The study undertook to address elements of operations relating to a successful agricultural land conservation program. Eleven of the organizations identified in the study were selected for a phone interview. It asked the organization staff what aspects of operation are considered basic to success, what are their acquisition processes, what do they consider to be the advantages of holding conservation easements or lands in fee title, how do they fund the monitoring or management of their easements or fee lands, and what were some of the issues they had encountered in managing their easements. The agencies interviewed were all private non-profit land trusts, which comprise the vast majority of agricultural land conservation organizations in the study area. Some were new; some were small; while others had years of experience, large scale programs, and substantial resources. The interview questions and the agencies are listed in the Appendixes.

### **B. Summary**

This summary is a very basic summary of findings from the interviews.

#### **Elements of Success: Funding and other basics**

Funding is a major issue for all the land trusts interviewed, since they are generally dependent on contributions and grants. In retrospect it could have been beneficial to include a publicly funded agency, since having a guaranteed income stream might have afforded a different perspective regarding that issue. The other issues relating to agency success are basic, including able leadership by the board and manager, and competent staff focused on building relationships with land owners and other stakeholders, including local government officials, state and federal agencies, private foundations and conservation organizations and the general public. Another important component is having a goal-based plan as the framework for the agency's programs and activities.

#### **Acquisition Practices**

The processes for easement or land acquisition for all the agencies are based on having built relationships with landowners and the community in general. Once acquisition is initiated, usually by the land owner, the processes vary somewhat. The older, more established organizations have a more organized evaluation process based on criteria relating to the organization's goals. It can be expected that the newer, smaller organizations will develop similar processes as they mature. While generally relying on the land owner to initiate an acquisition, some agencies seek lands in order to accomplish their program goals. Legal and appraisal consultant services are sometimes used sometimes to augment agency staff resources.

#### **Easements and Holdings in Fee Simple: Advantages and Disadvantages**

Regarding the advantages of holding conservation easements compared to holding lands in fee title, the majority of land trusts favor easements and cite their advantages. This is part of the culture of the land trust movement. The larger and better funded organizations note advantages of holding some lands in fee where the agency has specific goals or programs that benefit from control of the land. Agencies reported little difference regarding the ease or difficulty of acquiring an easement or fee title. Opinion was mixed regarding the relative costs, while some said fee title is more expensive, others said it varies depending on specific conditions. Agencies in operation for a longer time reported modifying their easement practices in response to their experience.

## Funding the Monitoring Program

Regarding the funding of easement/land monitoring and management, the more experienced agencies reported the securing of endowments connected to the easement acquisition to fund its ongoing monitoring or management.

## Other Issues

Other issues are addressed in the detailed responses presented below.

## C. Detailed Responses to the Operations Interview

This report compiles the responses to the questionnaire. Eleven organizations participated in the interviews, although a few did not answer all questions. Since some respondents mentioned more than one issue in their response, the number of comments for each question is often different from the number of agencies responding to the question.

### 1. What do you consider the major successes or accomplishments of your agency? (11 agencies responded)

The protection of the land. Most agencies cited the number of acres and/or the number of farms, from just a few farms to "38,000 acres in conservation easements on 58 farms" or "50,000 acres in San Mateo and Santa Clara County", (mostly non-agricultural land in the latter case). Some agencies also named specific key properties. 8 comments

Other specific achievements include:

"Just getting started was a major accomplishment"

"The completion of each easement project"

"Creating a regional marketing plan for local farmers to improve their economic success"

"The effort to become an accredited land trust under a program to establish standards for land trusts and conservancies"

"Turning the agency around...creating a strategic plan and reviewing it twice a year. The board is now working in sync with the staff. "

"Acquiring conservation easements through donation and not purchase"

"Acquiring important lands in fee title for conservation and public access; acquiring conservation easements to preserve farm and rangeland and to create greenbelts between cities; and managing our properties to maintain and improve the quality of habitat and to provide educational and recreation experiences to the public"

"Diverse easements...acquired through donations and not purchase"

"The Environmental Studies Academy program for students"

### 2. Regarding an agency starting up a new agricultural land conservation program, what do you think are the most important factors in ensuring the program's success? (10 agencies responded)

Funding: Adequate start-up funds and financial support and starting a solid funding stream. In the case of an agency working with a local agricultural mitigation program, clarify the funding relationships to ensure they work for the conservation agency.  
(5 comments)

Staff: Hiring the right executive director and a dedicated and competent staff. Building your administrative capability so as to satisfy landowners and finalize their deals quickly when they decided to participate in the program. (4 comments)

Stakeholders and the community: Gain respect of the agricultural community. Get to know the farmers. Explain your goals and how they mesh with the farmers' interests. Involve the other stakeholders. Develop connections to the community...they provide donations, tech expertise and time. (4 comments)

Board of directors: Build and maintain a dedicated board of directors. (2 comments)

Strategic plan: Create a conservation program plan, or strategic plan, that sets priorities and a process for developing and implementing projects. (2 comments)

Community analysis: Consider the local demographics: is there a market to support small farm operations. Clarify your definition of agricultural land: is there a market to support your program. Is there infrastructure for support: farm supply, labor, affordable housing. (1 comment)

**3. What are the major challenges or difficulties to address or avoid regarding a start up?**  
(10 agencies responded)

Make sure there is adequate funding, resources, and fundraising program. (5 comments)

Adequate staff, and/or consultants, that know the issues and are skilled in the land transaction process to successfully develop projects. (3 comments)

Craft the organization carefully to ensure that internal actions are coordinated and relationships with other organizations are effective. A strategic plan helps. In the case of an agency working with a local jurisdiction which has an agricultural land mitigation program, the relationships should be clear and designed to be effective, mutual goals should be clear. (2 comments)

The agency should work to gain credibility with all stakeholders, such as land owners, government agencies, funding sources, etc. It should work to prevent or counter misinformation. (2 comments)

The cost of land is a major challenge, since its value for real estate development exceeds its value for agriculture. (1 comment)

Finding willing sellers is a major challenge (at prices the agency is willing to pay). (1 comment)

One agency noted its consideration of buying land at market value and selling it to farmers below market value so they can continue farming, with the challenge of identifying who would be the buyers and crafting the selling process. (1 comment)

**4. Regarding operating a long-term program, what are the most important factors in promoting its continuing success?**  
(11 agency responded)

Build and maintain relationships with landowners, both those with and without easements, and other stakeholders, including local officials, state and federal agencies, and the general public. Agency assistance to land owners regarding their land management problems is one way to build relationships. Agency support for community agricultural programs is another. Community public information activities can build support among the stakeholders and general public. (9 comments)

Adequate, long-term funding, including endowed funding for easement monitoring and land management, and funding for legal defense of easements. Organizations that fund the capital

expense of acquisition do not usually fund the staff costs of putting the deal together or the on-going cost of monitoring and management. (8 comments)

Do a good job. Recruit and retain good staff to develop acquisitions and steward easements and manage lands, so that others look to this agency to do more deals. Maintain a good reputation. (7 comments)

5. What are the major challenges or difficulties regarding its continuing success?  
(10 agencies responded)

Securing adequate funding from the various potential sources to support operations and land management, long term easement compliance, and legal defense of easements. Stewardship and monitoring of properties. (6 comments)

Maintaining competent staff. (2 comments)

Building good relationships with State and federal agencies for response re projects and funding. (2 comments)

Determining how to structure the governing board, and maintaining a competent board. (2 comments)

6. What is your agency's process for considering proposed acquisitions?  
(10 agencies responded)

Most agencies rely on land owners to initiate the acquisition process, typically through community connections or agency contacts. Others are more proactive in generating land owner interest. Most agencies have information programs regarding their programs. In most cases, the acquisition being considered is an easement. The interested land owner contacts the staff, who talk with the landowner regarding the agency's process, its acquisition goals or criteria, and the potential outcomes. The staff may visit the site. The land owner, often with staff consultation, fills out an application form, which may be rather general or may be quite detailed. The staff may include information relating to the agency's acquisition goals or criteria. The criteria for considering proposed acquisitions may range from general goals/guidelines to specific and detailed criteria which can be used for numerical scoring. Some agencies embody their criteria in formally adopted policies. Staff analyzes the application relative to the agency's goals and criteria. In addition to staff review, the application may be reviewed by an advisory committee. The resulting recommendation is considered and acted upon by the agency board. The easement is recorded as part of the deed. There is usually a procedure for considering subsequent modifications to the easement.

7. Do you use acquisition criteria?  
(11 agencies responded)

Yes, agencies use acquisition criteria. (8 comments)

No, but agency has informal questions : "Does it fit our mission? Is there adequate funding? Can we work with other agencies?" (1 comment)

No, agencies do not use acquisition criteria. Acquisitions are considered on a case by case basis; "whoever walks in the door". (2 comments)

8. Do you ever actively seek a property or easement because it is key to your program?  
(11 agencies responded)

Yes, agencies seek a property or easement, negotiating with willing sellers, because it is key to the program. (6 comments)

No, agencies wait for land owners to approach them. (3 comments)

Sometimes. While the agencies usually wait for land owners to approach them, they sometimes seek an individual property or do outreach in a target area. (2 comments)

**9. Regarding the acquisition process, do you do your own acquisitions or contract them out?**  
(10 agencies responded)

Agencies do their own acquisitions. (4 comments)

Agencies use a combination of in-house staff and consulting services, as well as volunteers, e.g. legal and title services. (3 comments)

Agencies sometimes do their own and sometimes contract out, e.g. if timing is short, or staff lacks expertise on a certain subject. (2 comments)

Agencies contract out their acquisitions. (1 comment)

**10. Which type of acquisitions are more challenging, fee title or easements? Which are more: problematic? time consuming? expensive?**  
(11 agencies responded)

There is little difference in ease of acquisition between fee title and easements, depending on the specifics of the deal. Sometimes a fee title acquisition is easy and an easement difficult; sometimes the opposite. Sometimes an easement is more difficult. During the course of negotiations, the owner may become concerned about the restrictions, or family issues may emerge during negotiations. Potential participants may walk away because of family issues or may just change their mind. This doesn't occur in fee title negotiations because a willing seller has already expressed willingness to give up control and may be ready to leave the land. On the other hand, an easement may be easier because the easement can be an option that allows the owner to stay in agriculture. (7 comments)

Easements are easier, but agency will do fee title if it is valuable to our strategy. (1 comment)

Fee title will be more expensive. However, cost differences are highly variable depending on factors affecting valuation. The degree to which a project is time consuming or problematic depends on factors specific to the deal. A generalization cannot be made. (1 comment)

A fee title purchase causes the agency to raise funds from government or foundations. (1 comment)

Agency doesn't do fee title acquisitions. (3 comments)

**11. What are the advantages and disadvantages in holding lands in fee title (or "fee simple")?**  
(8 agencies responded)

Advantages:

Fee ownership provides more control over the land, e.g. ensuring the land will be used for farming, allowing better land management (including livestock management), allowing public access, and the potential for income to the agency. One agency notes that properties transferred to other agencies have not been managed as well as the trust would have done itself. (8 comments)

It avoids the problems and costs of easement compliance. (1 comment)

There is little difference. (1 comment)

Disadvantages:

The agency is responsible for managing the land. (3 comments)

The agency bears liability for the land. (3 comments)

Acquisition is more expensive. (2 comments)

The agency has expenses, such as property taxes. (1 comment)

**12. What are the advantages and disadvantages of holding lands in easements?**

(9 agencies responded)

Advantages:

Acquisition of easements is less expensive. (8 comments)

No responsibility for managing the land, although it must be monitored. (4 comments)

The owner gets to hold and operate the land (1 comment); land owners may be more receptive to granting/selling easements than selling in fee (1 comment) and there may be more community acceptance of an easement based program, rather than taking land from private ownership and putting it in land trust or government ownership (1 comment).

No liability for the agency since it does not own the land. (1 comment)

Easements are easier to acquire. (1 comment)

Disadvantages:

There can be problems regarding enforcement of easements, as with new owners, and enforcement can involve considerable legal cost. (5 comments)

The agency cannot directly manage the land. The agency can suggest improvements but cannot require compliance unless easement terms so provide. Conservation goals are often compromised. (4 comments)

Easements generally provide no public access unless there are special provisions. (2 comments)

Easements generally provide no guarantee the land will be farmed. (1 comment)

Easements generally provide no opportunity for income to the agency. (1 comment)

**13. What issues have you had with easements? Examples?**

(9 agencies responded)

Few if any issues. 1 of these noted the challenge of maintaining good communication with land owners. (6 comments)

Difficulties with owners regarding the terms of the easement or with succeeding owners (e.g. heirs or purchasers) not liking the easement terms. (3 comments)

Problems with the owners not using their land for farming but rather keeping their land as undeveloped open space and getting tax relief. (2 comments)

Other issues include neighbors' complaints regarding landowner activities. On the other hand, one agency polls the neighbors of its easements and reports no problems. (2 comments)

14. Have you changed your handling of easements or the terms of your easement due to past experience? In what ways?  
(11 agencies responded)

5 agencies reported changing their easement handling and terms as an ongoing process in response to their experience.

Process changes for two agencies include increased documentation of "everything" for better follow through from negotiation to easement terms to implementation and management. Also reported were increased contacts with landowners in general and with future buyers of easement-encumbered properties regarding the easement terms.

Easement term changes include restrictions more focused on the agency's goals and what can be effectively monitored. Specifically, the inclusion of land management plans for slopes or creek conservation areas. Two agencies are working on provisions to limit house sizes and to ensure the lands don't become just rural estates.

Five agencies report no change in their easement handling or terms. (Some of these are new and may have limited experience.)

15. How do you fund your monitoring/management of your fee title lands and/or your easements? Is monitoring funded as part of your operating budget. Assessments? Donated or required endowments, e.g. as part of easements? Other?  
(11 agencies responded)

Three agencies reported funding their monitoring/management program by a combination of their operating budget and endowments set up as part of their acquisition process.

Three agencies rely primarily on endowments established as part of the acquisition process. At least one of these seeks funds from its supporters to provide additional funding for the monitoring program.

Two agencies use volunteers for their monitoring programs. One relies on volunteers entirely. The other uses volunteers to supplement its monitoring program.

One agency reported relying on its large endowment fund augmented by annual contributions. It noted that public agencies and foundations that support acquisition do not want to fund monitoring.

One agency asks the easement donor to contribute to two funds. The first funds the baseline aspect of monitoring. The second funds the ongoing cost of monitoring as well as contributing to an easement legal defense fund. This fund also receives large donations.

### **Agricultural Conservation Organizations Participating in the Interviews**

The Agricultural Land Trust (Monterey County)  
Bodega Land Trust  
Brentwood Land Trust  
Central Valley Farmland Trust (CVFT)  
Agricultural-Natural Resources Land Trust of Contra Costa County  
Marin Agricultural Land Trust (MALT)  
Land Trust of Napa County  
Peninsula Open Space Trust  
Silicon Valley Land Conservancy  
Solano Land Trust  
Sonoma Land Trust

## SECTION FOUR: Individual Organization Information

This section includes the following information on the 35 organizations included in the study.

- A. Organizational Profiles (pages 17 – 54)
- B. Organizational Summary Tables (pages 55 - 56)
- C. Organizational Summaries (pages 57 – 71)
- D. Organizational Program Summaries (pages 72 – 86)

The following are the organizations included in the study:

	Organizational Profile Page #	Organizational Summary Page #	Program Summary Page #
<b><u>Local Organizations Conserving Agricultural Land</u></b>	17		
Bodega Land Trust	18	57	72
Brentwood Land Trust	19	57	72
Central Valley Farmland Trust (CVFT)	20	58	73
Coastside Land Trust	21	58	73
Agricultural – Natural Resources Trust of Contra Costa County	22	59	74
Marin Agricultural Land Trust (MALT)	23	59	74
The Agricultural Land Trust (Monterey County)	24	60	75
Land Trust of Napa County	25	60	75
Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST)	26	61	76
San Benito Agricultural Land Trust	27	61	76
Land Trust of Santa Cruz County	28	62	77
Silicon Valley Land Conservancy	29	62	77
Solano Land Trust	30	63	78
Sonoma Land Trust	31	63	78
Tri-Valley Conservancy	32	64	79
Yolo Land Trust	33	64	79
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	34	65	80
Santa Clara County Open Space Authority	35	65	80
Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation & Open Space District	36	66	81
<b><u>Local Governments with Agricultural Land Mitigation Programs</u></b>	37		
City of Brentwood	38	66	81
City of Davis	39	67	82
City of Gilroy	40	67	82
City of Livermore	41	68	83
Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	42	68	83
City of Winters	43	69	84
City of Woodland	44	69	84
Yolo County	45	70	85
Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency	46	70	85
Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	47	71	86
<b><u>Regional, State and National Organizations</u></b>	48		
The American Farmland Trust	49	NA	NA
California State Department of Conservation – Division of Land Resource Protection	50	NA	NA
The Nature Conservancy	51	NA	NA
The Trust for Public Lands	52	NA	NA
The Bay Area Open Space Council	53	NA	NA
California State Coastal Conservancy – San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program	54	NA	NA

LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS CONSERVING AGRICULTURAL LAND  
PROFILES

**BODEGA LAND TRUST**

Contact Information 17175 Bodega Highway #4  
 PO Box 254  
 Bodega CA 94922  
 707-876-3093  
 www.bodeganet.com/landtrust/about.html email: landtrust@bodeganet.com

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1992

Funding Sources Donations. Some government and foundation grants for projects.

Operating Budget \$20,000

Governance 5 member self-appointed board.

Agency Mgr Abigail Myers, Executive Assistant Total staff 1 part time

Activity area West Sonoma County, inc Salmon Creek watershed

Program Highlights Mission includes protection of agricultural land, agriculture, community, and natural habitat. Program focused on conservation easements. Program includes environmental restoration projects. Now completing acceptance of first easement with agricultural land. Education program.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: 20 acres cropland, 300 acres grazing, rest in forest.

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
1	1000	0	0	Self-monitored, volunteers

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	no	no	no	no	0

**BRENTWOOD AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (BALT)**

Contact Information 1120 2nd Street, Suite 108  
 (P.O.Box 2046)  
 Brentwood CA 94556  
 925-634-6738, cell: 925-818-1511 FAX 925-634-6748  
 www.brentwoodaglandtrust.org email: brentwoodagtrust@sbcglobal.net

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 2002, initiated by City of Brentwood to partner with City in its agricultural land mitigation program.

Funding Sources Private donations, annual fund raiser. City of Brentwood contributed between \$75,000 and \$180,000/year for first 4 years. As of July 2007, the City no longer provides BALT with administrative funding, but does contract with BALT on a transaction by transaction basis for conservation easement work. Foundation and USDA grants. City funds are from city ag land mitigation program. (See City of Brentwood)

Operating Budget \$100,000

Governance 7 member self-elected board of directors.

Agency Mgr Kathryn Lyddan, Executive Director Total staff 1, contracts for some services

Activity area Eastern Contra Costa County

Program Highlights Preserves local farmland through purchase and acceptance of conservation easements. Organization initiated by City of Brentwood to implement its agricultural land mitigation program. City funds acquisition of agricultural land easements. Trust adopted Strategic Plan in 2007. Transfer of "agricultural credits" program with City of Brentwood, by which housing credits on some agricultural land can be transferred/sold for development in the city (2 housing credits/acre of ag land). Monthly meetings of farmers, local governmental representatives, and community members to promote local agriculture, including the Agricultural Enterprise Committee. Promotion of agricultural viability, e.g. creation of regional marketing program, including "Buy Fresh, Buy Local", and sponsoring start of Farmers Market. Advocacy to ease local restrictions on agricultural economic activities. (See City of Brentwood)

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: 90-100% of holdings in agriculture, incl: orchard, cropland, vineyard

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
3	53	0	0	Self-monitored

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

**Agricultural Land Mitigation**

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	53

**CENTRAL VALLEY FARMLAND TRUST (CVFT)**

Contact Information 8788 Elk Grove Boulevard, Bldg 1, Suite 1  
Elk Grove CA 95624

916-687-3178 FAX 916-685-1041  
www.valleyfarmland.org email: info@valleyfarmland.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 2004. Three local land trusts consolidated, after meetings convened by the Great Valley Center.

Funding Sources Membership contributions. Private donations, government and foundation grants.

Operating Budget \$284,467

Governance 11 member self-selected board of directors.

Agency Mgr William (Bill) Martin, Executive Director Total staff 2

Activity area Sacramento, San Joaquin, Merced, and Stanislaus Counties

Program Highlights The Trust protects agricultural land through the securing of agricultural easements and the donation or purchase of lands in fee simple. Fee simple lands are sometimes sold to farmers, with a permanent easement. The Trust monitors its easements. The Trust works with other private and governmental conservation organizations. The trust has criteria for acquisitions. CVFT leverages state, local and private funds to purchase easements on quality farmland with good water. They also accept easements from property owners for mitigation of development on other properties or for tax planning purposes.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: 90-100% holdings in agriculture, incl: orchards, croplands, vineyards, dairy, also some ranchlands

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
17	10,564	0	0	Self-monitored

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land,etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	0

**COASTSIDE LAND TRUST**

Contact Information (P.O.Box 3205)  
 Half Moon Bay CA 94019  
 650-284-5056 FAX 650-284-5056  
 www.coastsidelandtrust.org email: info@coastsidelandtrust.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1997, as the Half Moon Bay Open Space Trust. Changed name in 2007.

Funding Sources Donations, grants.

Operating Budget \$200,000

Governance 14 member self-appointed board.

Agency Mgr Exec. Dir Total staff 1

Activity area Northern San Mateo County coast

Program Highlights The Trust protects primarily urban lands along the coast from Half Moon Bay through Montara. The Trust will work with agricultural land owners in the area to develop conservation strategies for their properties which could include conservation easements or donation of land.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: na

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
0	0	0	0	na

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	maybe	no	no	maybe	0

**AGRICULTURAL - NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST of CONTRA COSTA COUNTY**

Contact Information 2366 A Stanwell Circle  
 P.O.Box 6224  
 Concord CA 94524  
 925-588-5351 FAX: 925-891-9212  
 www.anrtccc.org email: info@anrtccc.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1997, formed by the Board of Supervisors to maintain agricultural viability of the County. Formed as Agricultural Trust of Contra Costa County. Re-named and focus since expanded to include most natural resources conservation activities.

Funding Sources Tax deductible donations, gifts, private and governmental grants, and mitigation funding from development.

Operating Budget \$120,000

Governance 7 member self-appointed board.

Agency Mgr Joe Ciolek, Executive Director Total staff 1,with occasional contract

Activity area Contra Costa County

Program Highlights The Trust permanently protects and encourages conservation and stewardship of agricultural lands, watersheds, habitat, and related natural resources in Contra Costa County. The Trust's powers include: 1. acquire real property or interests therein, including conservation easements; 2. monitor or manage directly property or easements acquired for agriculture, habitat or mitigation purposes; 3. create and operate a mitigation or conservation bank; 4. other powers necessary to its mission. The Trust has conserved about 2,000 acres, mostly grazing and habitat, through various conservation tools and efforts, collaborating with willing sellers.

Agriculture Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: Orchard. 2 pending easements w/vineyards. Other holdings are grazing, open space, etc

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
1	14	0	0	Self-monitored

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land,etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	115 pending

**MARIN AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (MALT)**

Contact Information 145 "A" Street  
 (P.O.Box 809)  
 Point Reyes Station CA 94956  
 415-663-1158 FAX: 415-663-1099  
 www.malt.org email: farmland@malt.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1980. First land trust in US to focus on farmland preservation.

Funding Sources 6000 membership (provides 80% of operating budget), private donations, foundation and governmental grants, state bond funds.

Operating Budget \$1,080,000

Governance 17 member self-elected board of directors.

Agency Mgr Robert Berner, Executive Director Total staff 12

Activity area Marin County

Program Highlights The Trust preserves farmland and related habitat areas through purchase and acceptance of conservation easements. Program includes the following: advocacy regarding public policy; a very active community education program; volunteer program; hikes, tours, info booths at community events; the annual Taste of Marin event in partnership with Marin Organix and Marin County Farmers Market Assn.; school programs; a regular newsletter. The Stewardship Assistance Program provides assistance to land owners under MALT easements. 40,000 acres are protected on 61 family farms and ranches. The Trust has adopted policies.

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: 90-100% of holdings in ag., incl: mostly dairy, beef cattle, also orchard, cropland, vineyard, grazing

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
61	40,000	0	0	Self-monitored

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

**Agricultural Land Mitigation**

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	no	no	no	no	0

**THE AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (MONTEREY COUNTY)**

Contact Information 66 Monterey-Salinas Highway  
 Salinas CA  
 P.O.Box 1731, Salinas CA 93902-1731  
 831-422-5868 FAX 831-758-0460  
 www.aglandconservancy.org email: brian@rianda

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1985, as Monterey County Agricultural and Historical Land Conservancy  
 Name changed 2007.

Funding Sources Private donations. Foundation and governmental grants : Packard Foundation, CA Dept of Conservation Farmland Conservancy Program, Federal farmland funds. State bond funds.

Operating Budget About \$140,000

Governance 7 member self-elected board of directors.

Agency Mgr Brian Rianda, Managing Director Total staff 2

Activity area Monterey County

Program Highlights Agricultural land is highest priority. The Trust preserves land by acquiring conservation easements. Some are donated. Some are purchased with grants from State bond funds or foundations. The Trust also owns several farms in fee. The 1985 plan cites acquisition factors: quality of agriculture, natural/historical resources, degree of threat, location, and probability of funding. Parcels are not ranked quantitatively. Major target areas are the most prime farmlands near cities. Attention is given to establishing and maintaining rapport with land owners.

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: 80% crop land, 20% grazing

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
66	21,882	3	396	Self-managed

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	NA

**LAND TRUST OF NAPA COUNTY**

Contact Information 1700 Soscol Avenue, #20  
Napa CA 94559

707-252-3270 FAX 707-252-1071  
www.napalandtrust.org

email: info@napalandtrust.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1976

Funding Sources 1,500 membership. Private donations. Governmental and foundation grants.

Operating Budget \$1,500,000

Governance 13 member self-elected board of trustees. Advisory council.

Agency Mgr John Hoffnagle, Executive Director Total staff 14

Activity area Napa County

Program Highlights Trust preserves farmland and other lands through securing conservation easements, accepting donations of lands in fee simple, facilitating property transfers, and working with local, state, and federal agencies to acquire open space, parks and wildlife refuges, which may be transferred to other conservation organizations. It monitors its protected lands. The program is guided by the strategic plan. It offers hikes and field trips. The educational program is based at Connolly Ranch, an educational center for sustainable agriculture and environmental science, with school and recreational programs, and annual Feast of Eden benefit. The volunteer program includes about 300. There is a regular newsletter. Accepts mitigation lands but no ag mitigation land to date.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: Vineyards and croplands

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
20	6666	0	0	Self-monitored

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	0

**PENINSULA OPEN SPACE TRUST (POST)**

Contact Information 222 High Street  
Palo Alto CA 94301

650-854-7696 FAX 650-854-7703  
www.openspacetrust.org email: post@openspacetrust.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1977

Funding Sources Private donations, public agency support, foundation grants.

Operating Budget \$10,000,000

Governance 14 member self-elected board. 30 member Advisory Council.

Agency Mgr Audrey C. Rust, President Total staff 24

Activity area Mostly the Peninsula and Coast

Program Highlights POST buys properties with its capital fund and then usually sells them to public agencies or private organizations, which hold the property for long-term management. The Trust often buys lands and easements and sells them to Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD), the State Parks system, or the National Park Service. POST does not usually hold lands for long-term management. The Trust has a close working relationship with MROSD. POST has protected 60,000 acres of land. POST has recently emphasized acquisition along the San Mateo County coast, including farmlands. POST has worked closely with other agencies, especially MROSD. The organization expenses are \$10,200,000. Its revenue is \$20,300,000 (See Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District)

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: mostly row crops or dry farming

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
6	1,236	6	620	Self-managed, w/exceptions

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
no	yes	yes	no	no	no	0

**SAN BENITO AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST**

Contact Information P.O.Box 549  
Tres Pinos CA 95075

831-628-0838  
www.sanbenitoaglandtrust.org email: info@sanbenitoaglandtrust.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1993

Funding Sources Membership contributions, donations, grants.

Operating Budget \$14,000 + -

Governance 7 member self-appointed board.

Agency Mgr none Total staff 0

Activity area San Benito County and adjacent areas

Program Highlights The Trust provides financial options to landowners in order to protect the agricultural heritage of San Benito County. The Trust accepts donations of conservation easements. The Trust has 4 easements one of which is in row crops. The others are ranchlands.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: row crops, grazing.

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
1	65	0	0	Self-managed

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
maybe	maybe	no	no	no	yes	65

**LAND TRUST OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY**

Contact Information 617 Water Street  
Santa Cruz CA

831-429-6116 FAX 831-429-1166  
www.landtrustsantacruz.org

email: info@landtrustsantacruz.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1978

Funding Sources Member contributions, private donations, governmental and foundation grants.

Operating Budget \$1,000,000

Governance 11 member self-appointed board of directors.

Agency Mgr Terri Corwin, Executive Director

Total staff 6

Activity area Santa Cruz County

Program Highlights The Trust has protected 1,500 acres and worked with other organizations to protect another 9,000 acres. The Trust owns and manages several natural area and habitat properties in fee simple. In 2006 the Trust adopted a plan that includes protection of prime farmland. The Trust has been selected to receive \$ 4.5 million in state and federal conservation funds to protect over 560 acres of prime Pajaro Valley farmland through conservation easements. Completion expected in 2008.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: none at this time, 560 acres pending

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management Self-manage or contract out? Self-monitored
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	
0	0	0	0	

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	depends	0

**SILICON VALLEY LAND CONSERVANCY**

Contact Information 1884 The Alameda  
San Jose CA 95126

408-260-3044 FAX 408-260-9606  
www.siliconvalleylc.org email: cedgerton@siliconvalleylc.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1993 as Land Trust for Santa Clara County. 2000, reorganized and renamed Silicon Valley Land Conservancy.

Funding Sources Donations, government and foundation grants.

Operating Budget \$150,000

Governance 9 member self-appointed board.

Agency Mgr Craige Edgerton, Executive Director Total staff 1 +1 part time

Activity area Santa Clara County and all adjacent counties

Program Highlights The Conservancy protects agricultural land as well as habitat. Target areas include: the Bolsa area along the Pajaro River, habitat for endangered species, hillsides and oak woodlands, and the Coyote Valley Greenbelt. The agricultural easements, which are managed by the Conservancy, have been acquired through cooperative funding by several agencies: the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, the California Dept of Conservation, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, The American Farmland Trust, and The Nature Conservancy. One agricultural easement was donated by the owner.  
(See Santa Clara County Open Space Authority)

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: 75-90% of holdings in agriculture, mostly row crops

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
4	1210	0	0	Self-monitored & contracted

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land,etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	1,150

**SOLANO LAND TRUST**

Contact Information 1001 Texas Street Suite C  
Fairfield CA 94533

707-432-0150 FAX 707-432-0151  
www.solanolandtrust.org email: admin@solanolandtrust.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1986, as the Solano County Farmlands and Open Space Foundation, as result of litigation between open space advocates, developers, and city government. 2004, name changed to Solano Land Trust.

Funding Sources Private donations, business donations, government and foundation grants.

Operating Budget \$2,000,000

Governance 11 member self-appointed board.

Agency Mgr Marilyn Farley, Executive Director Total staff 12

Activity area Solano County

Program Highlights The Trust protects a variety of habitat and open space lands, however agricultural land has been a priority since preparation of the Agricultural Conservation Easement Plan in 2002 with a grant from the Packard Foundation. The Plan identifies high priority areas in the County. The goal is to preserve 20,000 acres in 20 years. In 2004 the Trust adopted an agricultural land mitigation program to be used with agencies that require mitigation when approving projects which result in a loss of agricultural land. The Trust holds 289 acres of ag mitigation lands in easement, farmed by the landowner. Easements are held jointly with City of Davis, the source of the mitigation requirement. The Trust has policies for agricultural land mitigation.  
(See City of Davis)

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: Easement lands are mostly a mix of orchard, cropland, vineyard.

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
19	7215	na	na	Self-managed

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land,etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	289

**SONOMA LAND TRUST**

Contact Information 966 Sonoma Avenue  
Santa Rosa CA 95404

707-526-6930 FAX 707-252-1071  
www.sonomalandtrust.org email: slt@sonic.net

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1976

Funding Sources Membership dues, private donations, in-kind contributions, project revenue and fees.  
also government and foundation grants.

Operating Budget \$3,000,000

Governance 12 member self-elected board of directors.

Agency Mgr Ralph Benson, Executive Director Total staff 14

Activity area Sonoma County, with some program in Mendocino County.

Program Highlights The Trust owns and manages lands, holds and monitors conservation easements, works with other conservation agencies and organizations to protect and restore lands through coordinating joint projects, assisting in transfer of lands to public agencies. Trust conserves scenic, natural, agricultural land, and open land. Program also includes activities (e.g. hikes) and newsletter. The Trust works closely with the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space Dist., which has funded some of the Trust's acquisitions.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: 25-50% of total holdings in agriculture, incl: orchard, cropland, vineyard, hay, grazing

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
9	1800	7	1011	Self-managed

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
no	yes	yes	no	yes	possibly	0

**TRI-VALLEY CONSERVANCY**

Contact Information 1736 Holmes Street  
Livermore CA 94550-6012

925-449-8706 FAX 925-449-8709  
www.trivalleyconservancy.org email: info@trivalleyconservancy.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1994, as the South Livermore Valley Agricultural Trust. In 2003, renamed and area expanded to include the cities of Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon, and the Sunol Area.

Funding Sources Mitigation fees from cities of Livermore and Pleasanton are main funding source. Also member contributions, private donations, foundation and government grants, and fundraising events.

Operating Budget \$523,220

Governance 9 member board of directors: 5 appointed by local governments and vineyard advocacy groups, 4 add'l members elected by the 5 appointed members.

Agency Mgr Sharon Burnham, Executive Director Total staff 3 + 1 part time

Activity area Cities of Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon, and the Sunol Area and adjacent County lands

Program Highlights Preserves agricultural lands and natural open spaces. Acquires easements. Conducts programs to promote agriculture, primarily vineyards and olive orchards.  
The South Livermore Valley Area Plan directs development to appropriate locations.  
It has three methods of encouraging agricultural expansion:  
1. Bonus Density program permits the County to allow a reduction in minimum parcel size from 100 acres/home to 2 acres/home, if the developer plants remainder in cultivated agriculture and places permanent agricultural easement preventing further development.  
2. The Ruby Hill development (850 high value homes) must contribute minimum of \$10,000/home to the Conservancy and place easements on 460 acres of new vineyards. 3. Development will be allowed in 5 subareas, where, for each acre developed and each house built, one acre of cultivated agriculture must be protected. (See City of Livermore)

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: vineyards, orchards, cropland

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
114	4159	0	0	Self-monitored

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	no	no	yes	yes	3734

**YOLO LAND TRUST**

Contact Information P.O.Box 1196  
Woodland CA 95776  
530-795-3110  
www.yololandtrust.org email: info@yololandtrust.org

Legal Status Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3

Org/program Started 1988

Funding Sources Membership. Donations. Governmental grants, e.g. City of Davis ag land mitigation program, Calif. Farmland Conservancy Program. Foundation grants.

Operating Budget \$150,000

Governance 12 member self-appointed board.

Agency Mgr Deborah North, Conservation Director Total staff 2

Activity area Yolo County

Program Highlights Focus on protecting farm, open space, and habitat lands. Over 6,650 acres protected by conservation easements. The Trust encourages public policies that support and enhance long-term agriculture, promotes public awareness of the need to preserve it. Publishes a newsletter. Some easements are produced by the agricultural land mitigation programs of the City of Davis and Yolo County; also from the habitat mitigation program of the Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency. Some easements from the City of Davis program are held jointly with the City. (See City of Davis, Yolo County, Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency)

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: row and field crops, orchards

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
36	6650	0	0	Self-monitored

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

**Agricultural Land Mitigation**

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
no	yes	no	no	yes	yes	900 +

**MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

Contact Information 330 Distel Circle  
Los Altos CA 94022-1404

650-691-1200  
www.openspace.org email: info@openspace.org

Legal Status Public agency: special district

Org/program Started 1972, created by a voter initiative in northwestern Santa Clara Co. Additions: 1975-southern San Mateo Co; 1992, a small part of Santa Cruz Co; 2004, the coast from Pacifica to the Santa Cruz County line.

Funding Sources Funded by property tax collected in the District, about 1.7 cents per \$100 assessed property value, about \$19M/yr. Donations, government grants, interest/rental income, and note issues.

Operating Budget \$19,000,000

Governance 7 member board, elected by Wards, for 4 year terms.

Agency Mgr Craig Britton, General Manager Total staff 90

Activity area San Mateo County and northwest Santa Clara County, and the cities therein.

Program Highlights The District purchases, permanently protects and restores lands to form a regional open space greenbelt, preserve wilderness, habitat, watershed, viewshed, ecosystems, and provide opportunities for low-intensity recreation and environmental education. The District has 25 preserves with 55,000 acres preserved. While agricultural conservation was not the primary goal, it is included in the context of their larger purpose. Several of their properties include agriculture. The Service Plan for their new focus area, the San Mateo Coast, includes agricultural preservation, with a number of policies for its implementation. As yet, no agricultural coastal properties have been acquired, but are expected as part of future acquisitions.  
Mid-Pen works closely with Peninsula Open Space Trust. (See Peninsula Open Space Trust)

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: winery, Christmas tree farm, chestnuts

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
1	77	1	308	Self-managed exc. winery

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	yes	no policy	no	possibly	0

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY OPEN SPACE AUTHORITY**

Contact Information 6980 Santa Teresa Blvd, #100  
San Jose CA 95119

408-224-7476 FAX 408-224-7548  
www.openspaceauthority.org email: pcongdon@openspaceauthority.org

Legal Status Public agency: assessment district

Org/program Started 1994, by local election confirming 1992 state legislation.

Funding Sources Funded by annual property assessment. 20% of the net proceeds of the Authority's capital funds are distributed to the local jurisdictions within the Authority's boundaries. Annual property assessment of \$12/ residential parcel and sliding scale business rate. In 2004 voters approved second assessment of \$20/residential parcel and sliding scale business rate. First assessment survived court challenge. Second assessment under challenge in court. Also government and foundation grants and project partnerships.

Operating Budget \$4,360,470

Governance 7 member board, elected by district for 4 year terms. 17 member Citizens Advisory Committee.

Agency Mgr Patrick Congdon, General Manager Total staff 13

Activity area Santa Clara County, excl: area of Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, and City of Gilroy

Program Highlights The Authority's program is guided by the Five-Year Plan, as further defined by 10 Study Areas. Agricultural preservation is part of the Authority's mission. In addition to the agricultural land easement it purchased and holds, the Authority contributed \$1M to the purchase of conservation easements on 792 acres of farmland, now held and administered by the Silicon Valley Land Conservancy. Other contributors were the Calif. Dept of Conservation, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, The American Farmland Trust, and The Nature Conservancy. The Authority is reviewing its policy regarding potential agricultural land mitigation programs and agricultural land conservation in general. (The Authority is prepared to act as the holder of Habitat Mitigation funds until their disbursement.) (See Silicon Valley Land Conservancy)

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: na

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
1	301	0	0	Self-monitored

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc yes?	Receives funds yes	Transfers land, etc no	Transfers funds yes	Has Mitigation Policy pending	Accepts Ag Mitigation pending	Mitigation Ag Acres 0

**SONOMA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

Contact Information 747 Mendocino Avenue, #100  
Santa Rosa CA 95401

707-565-7360 FAX 707-565-7359  
www.sonomaopenspace.org email: openspace@sonoma-county.org

Legal Status Public agency: special district

Org/program Started 1990. Created by voters, the first special district with purpose to protect agricultural land.

Funding Sources 1/4 cent sales tax authorized through 2031 generates \$18 to 20 million per year. Also public agency and foundation grants. Partnership projects.

Operating Budget \$4,625,764

Governance The District board is the County Bd. of Supervisors, elected by district. Independent 5 member Open Space Authority monitors all sales tax expenditures. Citizens Adv. Com. advises on policy and proposed land protection efforts.

Agency Mgr Andrea Mackenzie, General Manager Total staff 20

Activity area Sonoma County

Program Highlights Permanently protects diverse agricultural, natural resource, and scenic open space lands. Program includes acquisition of easements and purchase/ownership of lands in fee simple. Program guided by 2006 plan: "Connecting Communities and the Land: A Long Range Acquisition Plan. Plan has four focus areas: Farms & Ranches, Greenbelts & Scenic Hillside, Water, Wildlife & Natural Areas, and Recreation & Education. Programs include: Competitive matching grants (to cities and organizations), Small farms (leases land at affordable rate to farmers for vegetables, flowers, etc), Stewardship, Education (incl schools), Volunteers, and Outings.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: 25-50% of holdings in agriculture, incl: orchard, cropland, vineyard, dairy, grazing

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
64	33,220	2	30	Self-managed

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	yes	yes	pending	yes	100

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WITH AGRICULTURAL LAND MITIGATION  
PROGRAMS PROFILES

**CITY OF BRENTWOOD**

Contact Information: City of Brentwood, Economic Development Division  
 708 Third Street  
 Brentwood CA 94513  
 925-516-5139 FAX: 925-516-5407  
 www.ci.brentwood.ca.us/department email:

Legal Status: Local government: city

Org/program Started: 2001, Council adopted Agricultural Enterprise Program, after 4 year study. Program included: Farmland Mitigation Program, Transferable Agricultural Credits, Agricultural Enterprise Programs.

Funding Sources: Agricultural land mitigation fees paid by land developers. Primarily for easement and land acquisitions. Program manager's salary paid by city general fund.

Operating Budget: Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Governance: 5 member City Council, elected at large, adopts policies and regulations and approves land/easement acquisitions. Council advised by Agricultural Enterprise Committee composed of 2 council members.

Agency Mgr: Linda Maurer, Economic Development Manager Total staff 1

Activity area: Brentwood and nearby unincorporated area in eastern Contra Costa County

Program Highlights: 2001 mitigation program requires 1 acre be protected by easement for each acre developed. Developer may acquire and offer the easement or may pay in lieu fee. The mitigation fund is now about \$10 M. 20% of collected fees put into administrative fund for legal and consultant fees, etc. The Transferrable Agricultural Credits (TAC) program allows developers to acquire conservation easements from farmland owners in target ag areas of the the County and get credit for dwelling units in the City as a density bonus up to the maximum allowed by the Genral Plan. Currently, the TAC is not used much, because of market conditions. The Agricultural Enterprise Programs are to improve viability of local agriculture, e.g.: marketing programs for the Brentwood area; negotiation with the County to relax restrictions on value- added activities (processing to create products from locally grown agricultural produce). The City's Agriculture Enterprise Program is now under consultant study to consider possible improvements. In 2002 City initiated the Brentwood Land Trust (BALT) to partner in mitigation program by buying and holding easements, using allocation from City's mitigation fund. In 2007 City discontinued its agreement with BALT and decided to operate the program directly by acquiring easements itself and partnering with other land trusts in the County, including BALT and the Contra Costa County Agricultural and Natural Resources Land Trust. Easements held by the land trusts name the City as the beneficiary.  
 \* for number of easements and acreage from mitigation program, see Brentwood Land Trust

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: None yet.

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
0	0	1	7	na

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land,etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
no	no	yes	yes	Requires mitigation	goes to trusts	7

**CITY OF DAVIS**

Contact Information City of Davis Parks and Community Services Department  
 23 Russell Boulevard  
 Davis CA 95616  
 530-757-5626 FAX: 530-758-0204  
 www.city.davis.ca.us/pcs email: msears@cityofdavis.org

Legal Status Local government: city

Org/program Started 1988

Funding Sources  
 1. Program operations funded 50% by general fund and 50% by parcel tax approved by voters in 2000. Parcel tax yields about \$600K/year, 20% allotted to operations.  
 2. Acquisition program augmented by City agricultural land mitigation requirement, adopted 1995  
 3. Acquisition funds supplemented by state and federal grants

Operating Budget Mitigation function not budgeted separately. \$125,000 estimate.

Governance 5 member City Council, elected at large, adopts policies and regulations and approves land/easement acquisitions. 8 member Open Space and Habitat Commission advises Council on agricultural land conservation and land acquisitions.

Agency Mgr Mitch Sears, Open Space Planner Total staff 3 plus 2 part time

Activity area City of Davis and nearby unincorporated area in Solano and Yolo Counties

Program Highlights Program guided by General Plan policies and by the Acquisition and Management Plan. GP policies are fairly general. Land developments that take agricultural land must protect 2 acres of land for each 1 acre of agricultural land developed, with the mitigation land located adjacent to the farm edge of the new project\*. Acquisition plan includes qualitative criteria for acquisitions. Most holdings are in easements, most of which are co-held with local land trust (Solano Land Trust or the Yolo Land Trust). The City holds some lands in fee which have special concerns, e.g. restoration. City holds some easements that may not meet Trusts program goals. City assists Trusts, e.g. legal help if easement is challenged. Some mitigation lands acquired with supplemental state or federal grants. \* Adjacency requirement for mitigation easements added in late 2007. (See Solano Land Trust and Yolo Land Trust)

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: 75 % of holdings in agriculture: row and field crops

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
9	2012	6	1675	Self-managed & contracted

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

**Agricultural Land Mitigation**

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
no	yes	yes	no	Requires mitigation	yes	1000

**CITY OF GILROY**

Contact Information 7351 Rosanna Street  
Gilroy CA 95020

408-846-0440 FAX: 408-846-0500  
www.ci.gilroy.ca.us

email: Bfaus@ci.gilroy.ca.us

Legal Status Local government: city

Org/program Started 2004, in response to a law suit regarding mitigation.

Funding Sources Administration of program funded by applicant fees and general fund.

Operating Budget Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Governance City Council. 7 members.

Agency Mgr Bill Faus, Planning Division Manager Total staff

Activity area Lands within and adjacent to the City

Program Highlights Gilroy has an agricultural land mitigation program that applies to agricultural lands that are developed within the City. It also applies to adjacent agricultural lands which may request inclusion in the City's urban service area. The policy includes criteria for determining if the land qualifies for mitigation, based on the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA Model). Criteria determining how much mitigation will be required are included. The general requirement is one acre mitigated for each acre developed, with some exceptions and variations. Mitigation may be satisfied by purchase of a conservation easement or the payment of an in-lieu fee, with the easement or fee conveyed to the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority or other City-approved agency. As yet no projects have met the criteria requiring mitigation. The City will not hold agricultural easements or lands, as they are to be vested in a city-approved conservation agency.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: na

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
na	na	na	na	na

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na

**CITY OF LIVERMORE**

Contact Information 1052 South Livermore Avenue  
Livermore CA 94555

925-960-4468

email: Planning @ci.livermore.ca.us

Legal Status Local government: city

Org/program Started 1997. Adoption of the South Livermore Valley Specific Plan. The Specific Plan is the regulatory document.

Funding Sources Applicant fees and general fund.

Operating Budget Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Governance City Council. 5 members.

Agency Mgr Eric Brown, Planning Mgr; Steve Stewart, Sr Planner Total staff

Activity area Area in city limits and adjacent unincorporated lands

Program Highlights The South Livermore Valley Specific Plan has the legal function of an ordinance. It requires that the conversion of agricultural land in the Specific Plan area be mitigated. The requirement is that 1 acre of agricultural land be preserved for each 1 acre of land converted plus 1 acre for each dwelling unit built in the project. Preservation is accomplished by a conservation easement. The builder/developer is required to acquire the easement. No in-lieu fee is accepted. The easement is conveyed directly to the Tri-Valley Land Trust. The City holds no easements or lands. The City also has a Transfer of Development Credit program for the North Livermore Valley area. This program is to preserve habitat areas and agricultural land in the unincorporated area adjacent to the City. It allows developers to buy conservation easements from farmland and habitat land owners in the County and get credit for dwelling units in the City as a density bonus.

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types:

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
na	na	na	na	na

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	goes to trusts	na

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO)**

Contact Information	70 West Hedding Street San Jose CA 95112	
	408-299-5127 www.santaclaralafco.ca.gov	email:
Legal Status	Local Government agency (each California county has a LAFCO)	
Org/program Started	LAFCO was created in 1963, and LAFCO's Agricultural Mitigation Policy was adopted April 2007.	
Funding Sources	1/3 County, 1/3 City of San Jose, 1/3 other cities, based on city's total revenue, as reported in the most recent edition of the Cities Annual Report published by the Controller, as a percentage of the combined city revenues within a County.	
Operating Budget	Mitigation function not budgeted separately.	
Governance	5 members. 2 County Supervisors named by the Board of Supervisors, 1 San Jose City Council Member, 1 other City Council Member, and 1 Public Member named by the other 4 members. 4 alternate members.	
Agency Mgr	Neelima Palacherla, Executive officer	Total staff 3
Activity area	All of Santa Clara County	
Program Highlights	<p>Santa Clara County LAFCO policy encourages the cities to mitigate the conversion of agricultural land to urban use as a result of expansion of city's urban service area and subsequent city annexation of the land. The LAFCO policy recommends that mitigation be at a 1:1 ratio along with payment of funds to cover costs of land management and maintenance of agriculture on the lands, etc. The policy further recommends that the easement or lands be transferred to an agricultural conservation entity for permanent protection. The policy includes guidelines for the lands to be preserved. It includes policies addressing the interface between preserved lands and adjacent land uses. The policy addresses methods to assure the mitigations are implemented. It calls for the cities to present a mitigation plan to LAFCO when it files an application with LAFCO. It includes the expected components of the mitigation plan.</p> <p>3 cities have extensive agricultural lands in their spheres of influence: Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and San Jose. Gilroy has adopted an agricultural land mitigation policy. Morgan Hill is in the process of developing one. San Jose is beginning its policy development, relative to the Coyote Valley. As yet, no proposals involving agricultural land mitigation have been presented to LAFCO</p>	

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: na						
Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management		
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?		
na	na	na	na	na		
Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations				Agricultural Land Mitigation		
Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations				Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land,etc	Transfers funds	Requires mitigation	na	na
na	na	na	na			

**CITY OF WINTERS**

Contact Information 318 First Street  
Winters CA 56994

530-795-4910, x 113  
www.cityofwinters.org email: kate.kelly@cityofwinters.org

Legal Status Local government: city

Org/program Started 2006, resulting from community concerns re several high impact projects.

Funding Sources Development fees and mitigation fees fund the program.

Operating Budget Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Governance City Council.

Agency Mgr Kate Kelly, Planning Manager Total staff na

Activity area Land within the city limits

Program Highlights The City requires mitigation of habitat loss, much of which is agricultural land, as well as agricultural land which is not habitat. Mitigation is generally 1 acre of land protected for each acre developed. Developer acquires and submits the easement, as well as paying costs of project administration and funding its long-term stewardship, monitoring and management. The City has guidelines for what land must be mitigated and what land is acceptable as mitigation. The easement, with stewardship funds, is conveyed directly to a qualified land trust, usually the Yolo Land Trust which has a long successful track record.

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: na

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
na	na	na	na	na

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

**Agricultural Land Mitigation**

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land,etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na

**CITY OF WOODLAND**

Contact Information 520 Court Street  
 (Mailing address: 300 First Street)  
 Woodland CA 95695  
 530-661-5820  
 www.cityofwoodland.org email: robert.macnicholl@cityofwoodland.org

Legal Status Local government: city

Org/program Started About 2002

Funding Sources Applicant fees

Operating Budget Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Governance City Council, 5 members.

Agency Mgr Bob MacNicholl, Planning Manager Total staff

Activity area Land within the city limits, lands being annexed

Program Highlights The City requires agricultural land mitigation on a case by case basis in response to comments on the proposed development project's Draft Environmental Impact Report. The City's practice is based on its General Plan policies for the protection of agriculture. The City's General Plan complements the County's General Plan, which calls for urban development to be done in the cities. The mitigation of agricultural land is often combined with habitat mitigation because the Swainson's hawk, a protected specie, forages in agricultural areas. An independent agricultural land/habitat consultant determines what the mitigation requirement will be: how much, what kind, and where. The City also requires mitigation relative to LAFCO's mitigation requirement for LAFCO permits. The City also participates in the Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency. Mitigation is accepted in the form of an easement, fee title, or payment of an in-lieu fee. The easement, land, or fee is conveyed to the Solano Land Trust. The City does not hold easements or land in fee, but may be a joint holder with the Land Trust. The Land Trust is responsible for monitoring/managing the easements or lands. The developer pays into an endowment fund to cover the costs of monitoring and management. (See Yolo Land Trust, Yolo County LAFCO)

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: na

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
na	na	na	na	na

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
no	no	no	no	Requires mitigation	goes to trust	0

**YOLO COUNTY**

Contact Information	Planning Division 292 West Beamer Street Woodland CA 95696  530-666-8043 www.yolocounty.org	email: eparfrey@yolocounty.org
Legal Status	Local Government: county	
Org/program Started	2000, ordinance adopted in response to Yolo County LAFCO. 2008 ordinance revised after several years study. Now in hearings.	
Funding Sources	Applicant fees and general fund	
Operating Budget	Mitigation function not budgeted separately.	
Governance	Board of Supervisors, 5 members elected by district.	
Agency Mgr	Eric Parfrey, Principal Planner	Total staff na
Activity area	Unincorporated area of Yolo County	
Program Highlights	2000 ordinance required mitigation of agricultural land when it was rezoned to other lot size or use. The required mitigation is one acre preserved for each acre rezoned. The preserved land is to be within 2 miles of the converted land. If no suitable land is available, the land can be located within 4 miles. The fee option has not been used much. Most easements have gone to the Yolo Land Trust. The new ordinance now in hearings adds the mitigation requirement to lands being converted from agriculture where no rezoning is required for the conversion, with some exemptions. It provides for the payment of the in-lieu fee for land conversions of less than 40 acres. It sets the in-lieu fee at \$10,100/acre. It provides for the mitigation lands/easements to go to a qualified land trust, with criteria regarding their qualification.	

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types:

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
na	na	na	na	na

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	no	na

**YOLO COUNTY HABITAT JOINT POWERS AGENCY (JPA)**

Contact Information 120 West Main Street, Suite C  
Woodland CA 95695

530-406-4885 FAX 530-668-1801  
www.yoloconservationplan.org email: Maria.Wong@yolocounty.org

Legal Status Local government. Joint Powers Agency (JPA), incl. Yolo Co. and 5 cities  
Org/program Started 1993: mitigation program for agricultural land habitat of the Swainson's hawk. 2002: Yolo County Joint Powers Agency created as lead agency for the county-wide Natural Communities Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP).  
Funding Sources Hold-over funds from 1992 Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) program, \$450 administrative fee on each easement, Wildlife Mitigation Fund loan.

Operating Budget Mitigation function not budgeted separately.  
Governance Governing Bd: Yolo County (2 members); 1 each Cities of Davis, Woodland, West Sacramento, Winters; UC Davis (ex officio, non-voting member). Steering Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Independent Science Advisors.  
Agency Mgr Maria Wong, Executive Director Total staff  
Activity area Most of Yolo County  
Program Highlights JPA manages two programs: (1) Swainson's Hawk Interim Mitigation Fee Program, (2) Yolo Natural Heritage Program. The Swainson's Hawk mitigation program generates fees to fund easement purchases as well as proffers of direct mitigations by developers of projects over 40 acres, mainly of ag lands in the bird's foraging range. The mitigation is based on one acre to be protected for each acre developed. Developments with less than 40 acres mitigation obligation can pay the fee or participate in a concurrent easement that has excess acreage. Developments with more than 40 acres of obligation must mitigate directly with an easement that meets the JPA approval. They must also pay transaction costs and endowments. The JPA created a Trust Fund to hold mitigation funds until spent on an approved acquisitions. It also holds funds received for long term management and enhancement of the habitat lands. The Yolo Natural Heritage program is preparing the NCCP/HCP. In addition to provisions for target species in five dominant habitats/natural communities, the Plan will also continue Yolo County's ag heritage as part of its conservation objectives. The JPA works closely with the Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game. The JPA member governments are amending their General Plans to integrate elements of the JPA program.

Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:

Agriculture types: Pending easements from the program total about 2500 acres.

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	Self-manage or contract out?
2	318	0	0	Self-managed

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

Agricultural Land Mitigation

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	318

**YOLO COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO)**

Contact Information 625 Court Street, #107  
Woodland CA 95695

530-666-8048

www.yolocounty.org/lafco

email: elizabeth.kemper@yolocounty.org

Legal Status Local Government agency (each California county has a LAFCO)

Org/program Started Mid 1990's, in response to development impact mitigation issues. The policy has evolved from quite general to more specific based on experience and response to emerging issues.

Funding Sources Program funded by County, cities, and fees.

Operating Budget Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Governance 5 member commission. County appoints 2 members, cities appoint 2 members, 1 public member appointed by the other 4 members.

Agency Mgr Elizabeth Kemper, Executive Officer Total staff

Activity area All of Yolo County

Program Highlights Yolo County LAFCO policy requires the cities to mitigate the conversion of prime agricultural land to urban use as a result of annexations by the cities or municipal special districts. The impacts relate to loss to development of both agricultural land and habitat. The 4 cities (Davis, Winters, Woodland, West Sacramento) and Yolo County can formulate their own policy specifics. The LAFCO policy is a basic minimum, applicable in the absence of a city or County policy. It has criteria for land to be mitigated. It requires protection of one acre of ag land for each acre of prime ag land developed. It provides for the developer to acquire the mitigation land/easement or pay an lieu fee. The in lieu fee is most applicable to small acreages, to allow fund accumulation for larger acquisitions. The mitigation is usually in the form of easements. The easements/lands are usually held by a land trust, most often the Yolo Land Trust. The LAFCO policy applies also to the County as a recommendation.

**Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:**

Agriculture types: na

Agricultural land easements		Agricultural lands in fee simple		Monitoring/ Management Self-manage or contract out?
No. parcels	No. Acres	No. parcels	No. Acres	
na	na	na	na	na

Receives land or easements or funds from other organizations

Transfers land or easements or funds to other organizations

**Agricultural Land Mitigation**

Receives land, etc	Receives funds	Transfers land, etc	Transfers funds	Has Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na

REGIONAL, STATE AND NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL  
PROFILES

**THE AMERICAN FARMLAND TRUST (AFT)**

It is a national non-profit organization organized in state chapters. It has an active program in California and the Bay Area.

National Headquarters	1200 18th Street, # 800 Washington DC 20036 202-331-7300 www.farmland.org
Founded:	1980
Governance:	Self-appointed board of directors: 19 members John (Jay) Winthrop, Chairman of the Board
Staff:	Ralph Grossi, President,
Budget	Its multimillion dollar budget is funded by donations and grants from foundations, corporations, public agencies and individuals.
California Office	PO Box 92 Sutter CA 95982 530-755-1162 calweb@tnc.org
California State Dir.	Edward Thompson, Jr. ethompson@farmland.org

The American Farmland Trust has four key strategies to protect the nation's strategic agricultural resources: (1) transform U.S. farm policy to strengthen the future of American agriculture, (2) protect the best land by supporting effective state and local farmland protection initiatives, (3) plan for agriculture to keep farming viable and help communities balance growth while protecting the land, and (4) keep the land healthy and productive by encouraging stewardship practices that safeguard our nation's natural resources.

In addition to its national and state research and policy work, AFT provides services to communities seeking to protect agricultural land and farming. These include technical and community organizing assistance in planning for agriculture. AFT provides training and outreach to support landowner and community goals. AFT publications cover a wide array of topics, through its Farmland Information Center, the Center for Agriculture in the Environment, and the Agriculture Conservation Innovation Center, as well as the State office. The AFT often partners with state and local agencies and organizations.

In California AFT's primary focus is protecting agriculture in the Central Valley, the nation's most productive and threatened agricultural region. The Central Valley is the state's major agricultural area, and it is under increasing pressure from urbanization. The AFT participated with the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, the Santa Clara County Water District, The Nature Conservancy, and the Silicon Valley Land Conservancy in acquiring an easement on agricultural and riparian land east of Gilroy along the Pajaro River.

**CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION  
DIVISION OF LAND RESOURCE PROTECTION**

Dept. of Conservation	DOC Headquarters 801 K Street MS 24-01 Sacramento CA 95814 916-322-1080
Div. of Land Resource Protection	801 K Street MS 13-71 Sacramento CA 95814 916-327-9721 dlrp@consvr.ca.gov
Calif. Farmland Conservancy Program	916-322-9721 cfcp@consvr.ca.gov
Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program	916-324-0859 fmmp@consvr.ca.gov

The California State Department of Conservation-Division of Land Resource Protection administers two state programs which are important to local agencies conserving agricultural land. They are the California Farmland Conservancy Program and the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. A third program is the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment model.

**The California Farmland Conservancy Program (CFCP)**

The California Farmland Conservancy Program encourages the long-term, private stewardship of agricultural lands through the voluntary use of agricultural conservation easements. The CFCP provides grant funding for projects which use and support agricultural conservation easements for protection of agricultural lands. Technical information and assistance are provided to support participation in the program. The CFPP may partner with a variety of public and non-profit organizations in the acquisition of land conservancy easements.

**Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP)**

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program produces maps and data for analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources. Agricultural land is rated according to soil qualities and irrigation status; the best quality land is called Prime Farmland. The maps are updated every two years, using aerial photographs, a computer mapping system, public review, and field reconnaissance. The maps are often used to evaluate what lands are appropriate for protection. They may also be used in the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model.

**The Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (LESA)**

This is a point-based method for rating the relative importance of agricultural land resources based on specific measurable features. It was adapted from a federal model to provide lead agencies in California with an optional methodology to ensure that potentially significant effects on the environment of agricultural land conversions are quantitatively and consistently considered in the environmental review process. It can be used to evaluate agricultural land, based on measures of soil resource quality, a given project size, water resource availability, surrounding agricultural lands, and surrounding protected resource lands. For a given project, the factors are rated, weighted, and combined, resulting in a single numeric score. The project score becomes the basis for making a determination of a project's potential significance. It may be used to determine if mitigation for the loss of agricultural land should be required. Local governments can adjust the various factor weightings to reflect local policies for consistent application to local projects.

**THE NATURE CONSERVANCY (TNC)**

It is a national non-profit organization with a conservation program of international scope. In the U.S. its program is organized in state chapters. It has an active program in California and the Bay Area.

National Headquarters	4245 North Fairfax Drive, #100 Arlington VA 22203 703-841-5300 www.Nature.org
President & CEO	Steanie K. Meeks, (acting)
Founded:	1951
Governance:	Self-appointed board of directors: 20 members John P. Morgridge, Chairman of the Board
Budget	Its multimillion dollar budget is funded by donations and grants from foundations, corporations, public agencies and individuals. It also has a contributing base of almost 1 million members and supporters.
California Field Office	201 Mission Street, 4th floor San Francisco CA 94105 415-777-0487 calweb@tnc.org
California Director	(Open. Current contact: Mike Sweeney)
San Francisco Bay Area	Lloyd Wagstaff 415-281-0447
Mt. Hamilton Project	Daniel Olstein 415-281-0422

The Nature Conservancy generally focuses on large landscape scale ecological habitat protection projects. In general, its activities include conservation easements, land acquisitions, restoration programs, policy work, and compatible economic development. It usually works in partnership with public agencies and private non-profit organizations. It may include the conservation of agricultural land as part of a larger habitat protection project.

In California, The Nature Conservancy has partnered with over a hundred federal, state, and local and private agencies and organizations on a wide variety of habitat conservation projects.

In Santa Clara County, The Nature Conservancy has two large scale projects: the Pajaro River Flood Plain Project and the Mt. Hamilton Range Project. The Mt. Hamilton Project seeks to protect 500,000 critical acres in the 1,875 square mile mountain range. Among its various habitats, it includes grazing lands but not cultivated agriculture. The Pajaro River Project includes (1) preserving the upper Pajaro River and adjacent lands to protect the wildlife corridor, (2) creating a buffer zone around the upper Pajaro River by preserving agricultural use of surrounding land, (3) maintaining the current flood plain, so as to preserve the area for migratory birds, bobcat, deer and other animals, as well as preventing the worsening of downstream flooding. The Pajaro River Project is a sub-set of the Mt. Hamilton Project, as is the Santa Cruz Mountain Range. The Mt. Hamilton Project also covers parts of Stanislaus, San Benito, San Joaquin, Alameda and Merced Counties.

As part of the Pajaro River Project, The Nature Conservancy has participated substantially in the purchase of conservation easements on several hundred acres of cultivated agricultural land, south-east of Gilroy, as part of the buffer zone around the Pajaro River. Partners in this project included The Silicon Valley Land Trust, the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, the Santa Clara Valley Water District, the San Benito Agricultural Land Trust, and the American Farmland Trust.

**THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND (TPL)**

It is a national non-profit organization organized in regional divisions. It has an active program in California and the Bay Area.

National Headquarters	116 New Montgomery Street, 4th floor San Francisco CA 94105 415-495-4103 www.tpl.org
President & CEO	Will Rogers
Founded:	1972
Governance:	Self-appointed board of directors: 23 members George P. Denny, Chairman of the Board
Budget	Its multimillion dollar budget is funded by donations and grants from foundations, corporations, public agencies and individuals.
Western Reg'l Office	116 New Montgomery Street, 3rd floor San Francisco CA 94105 415-495-0541
Western Executive Dir.	Reed Holderman 415-495-5660
Bay Area Program Mgr.	Tim Wirth 415-495-5660 ext. 346 tim.wirth@tpl.org

As part of its national program, the Trust for Public Lands supports a wide array of conservation programs in California and the Bay Area, including conservation of cultivated agricultural land, although grazing lands are a larger part of the TPL program. It is estimated that 3-5% of the TPL program is directed to cultivated agricultural land in California. These cultivated agricultural lands are generally associated with other conservation values. TPL projects in the Central Coast area have included farmland.

TPL actively advocates for national, state, and local policies to support conservation and community connection with the land. It provides organizations with technical assistance. It does studies regarding conservation issues and publishes reports.

TPL usually works in partnership with other national, state, and local non-profit organizations, public agencies and land-owners.

It usually does not fund major programs itself, but assists organizations and land owners/farms to find funders for land conservation programs and acquisitions. It does not acquire land or easements to hold and manage. It assists in land/easement acquisitions which are ultimately held by other organizations/agencies for long-term management. It provides leads regarding potential land conservation efforts. It participates and supports land acquisition negotiations. It assists in completing the purchase. It assists in finding organizations/agencies to ultimately hold and manage the land. It assists organizations and communities to mount successful fund raising programs. TPL requires strong community support and involvement in local projects/programs that it selects to participate in.

**THE BAY AREA OPEN SPACE COUNCIL (BAOSC)**

Address Bay Area Open Space Council  
c/o Greenbelt Alliance  
631 Howard Street, # 510  
San Francisco CA 94105

415-460-1540 Fax: 415-460-1540

[www.openspacecouncil.org](http://www.openspacecouncil.org)

Founded: 1991

Governance: 18-member Executive Committee

Staff: Bettina Ring, Executive Director. Total staff: 4  
[bettina@openspacecouncil.org](mailto:bettina@openspacecouncil.org)

Funding; Membership dues, State Coastal Conservancy and private foundation grants

Budget: \$500,000

The Bay Area Open Space Council is a collaboration of public and nonprofit land management agencies and organizations with a mission to permanently preserve and manage important parks, trails, agricultural lands and natural habitats of the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area through public and nonprofit efforts. Initiated in 1991 with about a dozen participants, the Council has grown to include 55 members on the Council's Steering Committee. Members of the Council have already protected 1 million acres of open space and will continue to work to protect significant open space in the region and steward already protected lands. Bay Area Open Space Council supports a number of programs and projects to support and expand land conservation in the Bay Area, including bi-annual updates of the protected lands database; conservation planning, information sharing, capacity building, offering an annual conference and workshops that address emerging issues and securing additional funding for the region. See their web site for more program information.

**SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA CONSERVANCY PROGRAM**

Address: 1330 Broadway, 13th floor  
Oakland CA 94612  
510-286-1015 fax: 510-286-0470  
[www.scc.cs.gov/Bay%20Program/faqs.htm](http://www.scc.cs.gov/Bay%20Program/faqs.htm)

Founded: Established by the Legislature in 1997, first funded in 1999

Governance: The Coastal Conservancy, which oversees the Bay Conservancy, is governed by 7 member board of directors, appointed by the Governor and the State Legislature. 6 members of the Legislature, 3 from each house, provide legislative oversight and participate in Conservancy activities.

Staff: Amy Hutzel, Program Manager Total staff: 12  
510-286-4180  
[ahutzel@scc.ca.gov](mailto:ahutzel@scc.ca.gov)

Budget State bond funds and general fund. Grants are made on a matching basis. Annual funding has ranged generally from \$10 million to \$20 million.

The San Francisco Bay Conservancy is a regional program of the Coastal Conservancy. It is staffed, managed, and governed by the Coastal Conservancy, and is sometimes referred to as the Bay Program.

The Conservancy provides a state and regional perspective and coordinated funding for a range of projects addressing environmental protection, restoration, recreation and education, and including farmland protection. The Conservancy provides grants to public agencies and nonprofit organizations. All acquisitions have been with willing sellers and have involved both the purchase of fee title ownership and conservation easements. The projects are regionally significant. Each achieves multiple goals. All are cooperative ventures bringing together many different agencies, organizations and interests. The Conservancy closes institutional gaps and brings coherence and comprehensiveness to individual efforts. The Bay Program projects are directed to the 9 Bay Area counties.

**Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations**

**Summary Table - Part I**

Organizations	Agricultural Holdings and Land Monitoring/Management:				
	Ag land easements		Ag lands in fee simple		Monitoring/Management (self-manage, contract out)
	# of Parcels	# of Acres	# of Parcels	# of Acres	
Bodega Land Trust	1	1,000	0	0	Self-monitored, volunteers
City of Brentwood	0	0	1	7	na
Brentwood Land Trust	3	53	0	0	Self-monitored
Central Valley Farmland Trust (CVFT)	17	10,564	0	0	Self-monitored
Coastside Land Trust	0	0	0	0	na
Agricultural-Natural Resources Trust of Contra Costa County	1	14	0	0	Self-monitored
City of Davis	9	2,012	6	1,675	Self-managed and contracted
City of Gilroy	na	na	na	na	na
City of Livermore	na	na	na	na	na
Marin Agricultural Land Trust	61	40,000	0	0	Self-monitored
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	1	77	1	308	Self-managed exc. Winery
The Agricultural Land Trust (Monterey County)	59	19,327	3	396	Self-managed
Land Trust of Napa County	20	6,666	0	0	Self-monitored
Peninsula Open Space Trust	6	1,236	6	620	Self-managed
San Benito Agricultural Land Trust	1	65	0	0	Self-managed
Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	na	na	na	na	na
Santa Clara County Open Space Authority	1	301	0	0	Self-monitored
Land Trust of Santa Cruz County	0	0	0	0	Self-monitored
Silicon Valley Land Conservancy	4	1,210	0	0	Self-monitored and contracted
Solano Land Trust	19	7,215	0	0	Self-managed
Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	64	33,220	2	30	Self-managed
Sonoma Land Trust	9	1,800	7	1,011	Self-managed
Tri-Valley Conservancy	114	4,132	0	0	Self-monitored
City of Winters	na	na	na	na	na
City of Woodland	na	na	na	na	na
Yolo County	na	na	na	na	na
Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency	2	318	0	0	Self-managed
Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	na	na	na	na	na
Yolo Land Trust	36	6,650	0	0	Self-monitored

**Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations**

**Summary Table - Part II**

Organizations	Receives/Transfers land or easements or funds from/to other organizations:				Mitigation Policy	Accepts Ag Mitigation	Mitigation Ag Acres
	Receives Land	Receives Funds	Transfers Land	Transfers Funds			
Bodega Land Trust	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	0
City of Brentwood	No	No	Yes	Yes	Requires mitigation	goes to trusts	7
Brentwood Land Trust	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	53
Central Valley Farmland Trust (CVFT)	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	0
Coastside Land Trust	Yes	yes	Maybe	No	No	Maybe	0
Agricultural-Natural Resources Trust of Contra Costa County	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	115 pending
City of Davis	No	Yes	Yes	No	Requires mitigation	Yes	1,000
City of Gilroy	na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na
City of Livermore	na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	goes to trusts	na
Marin Agricultural Land Trust	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	0
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District	Yes	Yes	Yes	No policy	No	Possibly	0
The Agricultural Land Trust (Monterey County)	Yes	yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	na
Land Trust of Napa County	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	yes	0
Peninsula Open Space Trust	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	0
San Benito Agricultural Land Trust	Maybe	Maybe	No	No	No	Yes	65
Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na
Santa Clara County Open Space Authority	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Pending	Pending	0
Land Trust of Santa Cruz County	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Depends	0
Silicon Valley Land Conservancy	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	1,150
Solano Land Trust	yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	289
Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Pending	Yes	100
Sonoma Land Trust	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Possibly	0
Tri-Valley Conservancy	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	3,632
City of Winters	na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na
City of Woodland	No	No	No	No	Requires mitigation	goes to trusts	0
Yolo County	na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	No	na
Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	318
Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na
Yolo Land Trust	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	900+

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

**BODEGA LAND TRUST**

<u>Activity area</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Legal status</u>	<u>Governance</u>	<u>Founded</u>
West Sonoma County, inc Salmon Creek watershed	\$20,000	Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	5 member self-appointed board.	1992

Funding source  
Donations. Some government and foundation grants for projects.

**BRENTWOOD AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (BALT)**

<u>Activity area</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Legal status</u>	<u>Governance</u>	<u>Founded</u>
Eastern Contra Costa County	\$100,000	Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	7 member self-elected board of directors.	2002, initiated by City of Brentwood to partner with City in its agricultural land mitigation program.

Funding source  
Private donations, annual fund raiser. City of Brentwood contributed between \$75,000 and \$180,000/year for first 4 years. As of July 2007, the City no longer provides BALT with administrative funding, but does contract with BALT on a transaction by transaction basis for conservation easement work. Foundation and USDA grants. City funds are from city ag land mitigation program. (See City of Brentwood)

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

---

**CENTRAL VALLEY FARMLAND TRUST (CVFT)**

<u>Activity area</u> Sacramento, San Joaquin, Merced, and Stanislaus Counties	<u>Budget</u> \$284,467	<u>Legal status</u> Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	<u>Governance</u> 11 member self-selected board of directors.	<u>Founded</u> 2004. Three local land trusts consolidated, after meetings convened by the Great Valley Center.
<u>Funding source</u> Membership contributions. Private donations, government and foundation grants.				

---

**COASTSIDE LAND TRUST**

<u>Activity area</u> Northern San Mateo County coast	<u>Budget</u> \$200,000	<u>Legal status</u> Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	<u>Governance</u> 14 member self-appointed board.	<u>Founded</u> 1997, as the Half Moon Bay Open Space Trust. Changed name in 2007.
<u>Funding source</u> Donations, grants.				

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

**AGRICULTURAL - NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST of CONTRA COSTA COUNTY**

<u>Activity area</u> Contra Costa County	<u>Budget</u> \$120,000	<u>Legal status</u> Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	<u>Governance</u> 7 member self-appointed board.	<u>Founded</u> 1997, formed by the Board of Supervisors to maintain agricultural viability of the County. Formed as Agricultural Trust of Contra Costa County. Re-named and focus since expanded to include most natural resources conservation activities.
<u>Funding source</u> Tax deductible donations, gifts, private and governmental grants, and mitigation funding from development.				

**MARIN AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (MALT)**

<u>Activity area</u> Marin County	<u>Budget</u> \$1,080,000	<u>Legal status</u> Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	<u>Governance</u> 17 member self-elected board of directors.	<u>Founded</u> 1980. First land trust in US to focus on farmland preservation.
<u>Funding source</u> 6000 membership (provides 80% of operating budget), private donations, foundation and governmental grants, state bond funds.				

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

---

**THE AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (MONTEREY COUNTY)**

<u>Activity area</u> Monterey County	<u>Budget</u> About \$140,000	<u>Legal status</u> Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	<u>Governance</u> 7 member self-elected board of directors.	<u>Founded</u> 1985, as Monterey County Agricultural and Historical Land Conservancy Name changed 2007.
 <u>Funding source</u> Private donations. Foundation and governmental grants : Packard Foundation, CA Dept of Conservation Farmland Conservancy Program, Federal farmland funds. State bond funds.				

---

**LAND TRUST OF NAPA COUNTY**

<u>Activity area</u> Napa County	<u>Budget</u> \$1,500,000	<u>Legal status</u> Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	<u>Governance</u> 13 member self-elected board of trustees. Advisory council.	<u>Founded</u> 1976
 <u>Funding source</u> 1,500 membership. Private donations. Governmental and foundation grants.				

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

---

**PENINSULA OPEN SPACE TRUST (POST)**

<u>Activity area</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Legal status</u>	<u>Governance</u>	<u>Founded</u>
Mostly the Peninsula and Coast	\$10,000,000	Private non-profit organization 501(c)3	14 member self-elected board. 30 member Advisory Council.	1977

Funding source  
Private donations, public agency support, foundation grants.

---

**SAN BENITO AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST**

<u>Activity area</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Legal status</u>	<u>Governance</u>	<u>Founded</u>
San Benito County and adjacent areas	\$14,000 + -	Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	7 member self-appointed board.	1993

Funding source  
Membership contributions, donations, grants.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

---

**LAND TRUST OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY**

<u>Activity area</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Legal status</u>	<u>Governance</u>	<u>Founded</u>
Santa Cruz County	\$1,000,000	Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	11 member self-appointed board of directors.	1978

Funding source  
Member contributions, private donations, governmental and foundation grants.

---

**SILICON VALLEY LAND CONSERVANCY**

<u>Activity area</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Legal status</u>	<u>Governance</u>	<u>Founded</u>
Santa Clara County and all adjacent counties	\$150,000	Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	9 member self-appointed board.	1993 as Land Trust for Santa Clara County. 2000, reorganized and renamed Silicon Valley Land Conservancy.

Funding source  
Donations, government and foundation grants.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

---

**SOLANO LAND TRUST**

<u>Activity area</u> Solano County	<u>Budget</u> \$2,000,000	<u>Legal status</u> Private non-profit organization 501(c)3	<u>Governance</u> 11 member self-appointed board.	<u>Founded</u> 1986, as the Solano County Farmlands and Open Space Foundation, as result of litigation between open space advocates, developers, and city government. 2004, name changed to Solano Land Trust.
	<u>Funding source</u> Private donations, business donations, government and foundation grants.			

---

**SONOMA LAND TRUST**

<u>Activity area</u> Sonoma County, with some program in Mendocino County.	<u>Budget</u> \$3,000,000	<u>Legal status</u> Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3	<u>Governance</u> 12 member self-elected board of directors.	<u>Founded</u> 1976
	<u>Funding source</u> Membership dues, private donations, in-kind contributions, project revenue and fees. also government and foundation grants.			

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

**TRI-VALLEY CONSERVANCY**

<p><u>Activity area</u>                  Cities of Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon, and the Sunol Area and adjacent County lands</p>	<p><u>Budget</u>                  \$523,220</p>	<p><u>Legal status</u>                  Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3</p>	<p><u>Governance</u>                  9 member board of directors: 5 appointed by local governments and vineyard advocacy groups, 4 add'l members elected by the 5 appointed members.</p>	<p><u>Founded</u>                  1994, as the South Livermore Valley Agricultural Trust. In 2003, renamed and area expanded to include the cities of Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon, and the Sunol Area.</p>
<p><u>Funding source</u>                  Mitigation fees from cities of Livermore and Pleasanton are main funding source. Also member contributions, private donations, foundation and government grants, and fundraising events.</p>				

**YOLO LAND TRUST**

<p><u>Activity area</u>                  Yolo County</p>	<p><u>Budget</u>                  \$150,000</p>	<p><u>Legal status</u>                  Private non-profit organization, 501(c)3</p>	<p><u>Governance</u>                  12 member self-appointed board.</p>	<p><u>Founded</u>                  1988</p>
<p><u>Funding source</u>                  Membership. Donations. Governmental grants, e.g. City of Davis agricultural mitigation program, Calif. Farmland Conservancy Program. Foundation grants.</p>				

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

**MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

<p><u>Activity area</u> San Mateo County and northwest Santa Clara County, and the cities therein.</p>	<p><u>Budget</u> \$19,000,000</p>	<p><u>Legal status</u> Public agency: special district</p>	<p><u>Governance</u> 7 member board, elected by Wards, for 4 year terms.</p>	<p><u>Founded</u> 1972, created by a voter initiative in northwestern Santa Clara Co. Additions: 1975-southern San Mateo Co; 1992, a small part of Santa Cruz Co; 2004, the coast from Pacifica to the Santa Cruz County line.</p>
<p><u>Funding source</u> Funded by property tax collected in the District, about 1.7 cents per \$100 assessed property value, about \$19M/yr. Donations, government grants, interest/rental income, and note issues.</p>				

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY OPEN SPACE AUTHORITY**

<p><u>Activity area</u> Santa Clara County, excl: area of Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, and City of Gilroy</p>	<p><u>Budget</u> \$4,360,470</p>	<p><u>Legal status</u> Public agency: assessment district</p>	<p><u>Governance</u> 7 member board, elected by district for 4 year terms. 17 member Citizens Advisory Committee.</p>	<p><u>Founded</u> 1994, by local election confirming 1992 state legislation.</p>
<p><u>Funding source</u> Funded by annual property assessment. 20% of the net proceeds of the Authority's capital funds are distributed to the local jurisdictions within the Authority's boundaries. Annual property assessment of \$12/residential parcel and sliding scale business rate. In 2004 voters approved second assessment of \$20/residential parcel and sliding scale business rate. First assessment survived court challenge. Second assessment under challenge in court. Also government and foundation grants and project partnerships.</p>				

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

**SONOMA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

<u>Activity area</u> Sonoma County	<u>Budget</u> \$4,625,764	<u>Legal status</u> Public agency: special district	<u>Governance</u> The District board is the County Bd. of Supervisors, elected by district. Independent 5 member Open Space Authority monitors all sales tax expenditures. Citizens Adv. Com. advises on policy and proposed land protection efforts.	<u>Founded</u> 1990. Created by voters, the first special district with purpose to protect agricultural land.
	<u>Funding source</u> 1/4 cent sales tax authorized through 2031 generates \$18 to 20 million per year. Also public agency and foundation grants. Partnership projects.			

**CITY OF BRENTWOOD**

<u>Activity area</u> Brentwood and nearby unincorporated area in eastern Contra Costa County	<u>Budget</u> Mitigation function not budgeted separately.	<u>Legal status</u> Local government: city	<u>Governance</u> 5 member City Council, elected at large, adopts policies and regulations and approves land/easement acquisitions. Council advised by Agricultural Enterprise Committee composed of 2 council members.	<u>Founded</u> 2001, Council adopted Agricultural Enterprise Program, after 4 year study. Program included: Farmland Mitigation Program, Transferable Agricultural Credits, Agricultural Enterprise Programs.
	<u>Funding source</u> Agricultural land mitigation fees paid by land developers. Primarily for easement and land acquisitions. Program manager's salary paid by city general fund.			

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

**CITY OF DAVIS**

<u>Activity area</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Legal status</u>	<u>Governance</u>	<u>Founded</u>
City of Davis and nearby unincorporated area in Solano and Yolo Counties	Mitigation function not budgeted separately. \$125,000 estimate.	Local government: city	5 member City Council, elected at large, adopts policies and regulations and approves land/easement acquisitions. 8 member Open Space and Habitat Commission advises Council on agricultural land conservation and land acquisitions.	1988
	<u>Funding source</u> 1. Program operations funded 50% by general fund and 50% by parcel tax approved by voters in 2000. Parcel tax yields about \$600K/year, 20% allotted to operations. 2. Acquisition program augmented by City agricultural land mitigation requirement, adopted 1995 3. Acquisition funds supplemented by state and federal grants			

**CITY OF GILROY**

<u>Activity area</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Legal status</u>	<u>Governance</u>	<u>Founded</u>
Lands within and adjacent to the City	Mitigation function not budgeted separately.	Local government: city	City Council. 7 members.	2004, in response to a law suit regarding mitigation.
	<u>Funding source</u> Administration of program funded by applicant fees and general fund.			

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

---

**CITY OF LIVERMORE**

<p><u>Activity area</u> Area in city limits and adjacent unincorporated lands</p>	<p><u>Budget</u> Mitigation function not budgeted separately.</p>	<p><u>Legal status</u> Local government: city</p>	<p><u>Governance</u> City Council. 5 members.</p>	<p><u>Founded</u> 1997. Adoption of the South Livermore Valley Specific Plan. The Specific Plan is the regulatory document.</p>
	<p><u>Funding source</u> Applicant fees and general fund.</p>			

---

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO)**

<p><u>Activity area</u> All of Santa Clara County</p>	<p><u>Budget</u> Mitigation function not budgeted separately.</p>	<p><u>Legal status</u> Local Government agency (each California county has a LAFCO)</p>	<p><u>Governance</u> 5 members. 2 County Supervisors named by the Board of Supervisors, 1 San Jose City Council Member, 1 other City Council Member, and 1 Public Member named by the other 4 members. 4 alternate members.</p>	<p><u>Founded</u> LAFCO was created in 1963, and LAFCO's Agricultural Mitigation Policy was adopted April 2007.</p>
	<p><u>Funding source</u> 1/3 County, 1/3 City of San Jose, 1/3 other cities, based on city's total revenue, as reported in the most recent edition of the Cities Annual Report published by the Controller, as a percentage of the combined city revenues within a County.</p>			

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

---

**CITY OF WINTERS**

Activity area

Land within the city limits

Budget

Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Legal status

Local government: city

Governance

City Council.

Founded

2006, resulting from community concerns re several high impact projects.

Funding source

Development fees and mitigation fees fund the program.

---

**CITY OF WOODLAND**

Activity area

Land within the city limits, lands being annexed

Budget

Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Legal status

Local government: city

Governance

City Council, 5 members.

Founded

About 2002

Funding source

Applicant fees

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

**YOLO COUNTY**

<p><u>Activity area</u> Unincorporated area of Yolo County</p>	<p><u>Budget</u> Mitigation function not budgeted separately.</p>	<p><u>Legal status</u> Local Government: county</p>	<p><u>Governance</u> Board of Supervisors, 5 members elected by district.</p>	<p><u>Founded</u> 2000, ordinance adopted in response to Yolo County LAFCO. 2008 ordinance revised after several years study. Now in hearings.</p>
	<p><u>Funding source</u> Applicant fees and general fund</p>			

**YOLO COUNTY HABITAT JOINT POWERS AGENCY (JPA)**

<p><u>Activity area</u> Most of Yolo County</p>	<p><u>Budget</u> Mitigation function not budgeted separately.</p>	<p><u>Legal status</u> Local government. Joint Powers Agency (JPA), incl. Yolo Co. and 5 cities</p>	<p><u>Governance</u> Governing Bd: Yolo County (2 members); 1 each Cities of Davis, Woodland, West Sacramento, Winters; UC Davis (ex officio, non-voting member). Steering Advisory Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Independent Science Advisors.</p>	<p><u>Founded</u> 1993: mitigation program for agricultural land habitat of the Swainson's hawk. 2002: Yolo County Joint Powers Agency created as lead agency for the county-wide Natural Communities Conservation Plan/ Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP).</p>
	<p><u>Funding source</u> Hold-over funds from 1992 Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) program, \$450 administrative fee on each easement, Wildlife Mitigation Fund loan.</p>			

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: ORGANIZATIONAL SUMMARY**

---

**YOLO COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO)**

Activity area

All of Yolo County

Budget

Mitigation function not budgeted separately.

Funding source

Program funded by County, cities, and fees.

Legal status

Local Government agency (each California county has a LAFCO)

Governance

5 member commission. County appoints 2 members, cities appoint 2 members, 1 public member appointed by the other 4 members.

Founded

Mid 1990's, in response to development impact mitigation issues. The policy has evolved from quite general to more specific based on experience and response to emerging issues.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**BODEGA LAND TRUST**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
1	1000	0	0	Self-monitored, volunteers	\$20,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	no	yes	no	no	no	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

West Sonoma County, inc Salmon Creek watershed

Types of agriculture

20 acres cropland, 300 acres grazing, rest in forest.

Program Highlights

Mission includes protection of agricultural land, agriculture, community, and natural habitat. Program focused on conservation easements. Program includes environmental restoration projects. Now completing acceptance of first easement with agricultural land. Education program.

**BRENTWOOD AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (BALT)**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
3	53	0	0	Self-monitored	\$100,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
no	no	yes	no	yes	yes	53

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

Eastern Contra Costa County

Types of agriculture

90-100% of holdings in agriculture, incl: orchard, cropland, vineyard

Program Highlights

Preserves local farmland through purchase and acceptance of conservation easements. Organization initiated by City of Brentwood to implement its agricultural land mitigation program. City funds acquisition of agricultural land easements. Trust adopted Strategic Plan in 2007. Transfer of "agricultural credits" program with City of Brentwood, by which housing credits on some agricultural land can be transferred/sold for development in the city (2 housing credits/acre of ag land). Monthly meetings of farmers, local governmental representatives, and community members to promote local agriculture, including the Agricultural Enterprise Committee. Promotion of agricultural viability, e.g. creation of regional marketing program, including "Buy Fresh, Buy Local", and sponsoring start of Farmers Market. Advocacy to ease local restrictions on agricultural economic activities. (See City of Brentwood)

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**CENTRAL VALLEY FARMLAND TRUST (CVFT)**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
17	10,564	0	0	Self-monitored	\$284,467	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

Sacramento, San Joaquin, Merced, and Stanislaus Counties

Types of agriculture

90-100% holdings in agriculture, incl: orchards, croplands, vineyards, dairy, also some ranchlands

Program Highlights

The Trust protects agricultural land through the securing of agricultural easements and the donation or purchase of lands in fee simple. Fee simple lands are sometimes sold to farmers, with a permanent easement. The Trust monitors its easements. The Trust works with other private and governmental conservation organizations. The trust has criteria for acquisitions. CVFT leverages state, local and private funds to purchase easements on quality farmland with good water. They also accept easements from property owners for mitigation of development on other properties or for tax planning purposes.

**COASTSIDE LAND TRUST**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
0	0	0	0	na	\$200,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	maybe	yes	no	no	maybe	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

Northern San Mateo County coast

Types of agriculture

na

Program Highlights

The Trust protects primarily urban lands along the coast from Half Moon Bay through Montara. The Trust will work with agricultural land owners in the area to develop conservation strategies for their properties which could include conservation easements or donation of land.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**AGRICULTURAL - NATURAL RESOURCES TRUST of CONTRA COSTA COUNTY**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
1	14	0	0	Self-monitored	\$120,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	115 pending

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Contra Costa County

Types of agriculture  
Orchard. 2 pending easements w/vineyards. Other holdings are grazing, open space, etc

Program Highlights

The Trust permanently protects and encourages conservation and stewardship of agricultural lands, watersheds, habitat, and related natural resources in Contra Costa County. The Trust's powers include: 1. acquire real property or interests therein, including conservation easements; 2. monitor or manage directly property or easements acquired for agriculture, habitat or mitigation purposes; 3. create and operate a mitigation or conservation bank; 4. other powers necessary to its mission. The Trust has conserved about 2,000 acres, mostly grazing and habitat, through various conservation tools and efforts, collaborating with willing sellers.

**MARIN AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (MALT)**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
61	40,000	0	0	Self-monitored	\$1,080,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	no	yes	no	no	no	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Marin County

Types of agriculture  
90-100% of holdings in ag., incl: mostly dairy, beef cattle, also orchard, cropland, vineyard, grazing

Program Highlights

The Trust preserves farmland and related habitat areas through purchase and acceptance of conservation easements. Program includes the following: advocacy regarding public policy; a very active community education program; volunteer program; hikes, tours, info booths at community events; the annual Taste of Marin event in partnership with Marin Organix and Marin County Farmers Market Assn.; school programs; a regular newsletter. The Stewardship Assistance Program provides assistance to land owners under MALT easements. 40,000 acres are protected on 61 family farms and ranches. The Trust has adopted policies.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**THE AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST (MONTEREY COUNTY)**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
66	21,882	3	396	Self-managed	About \$140,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	NA

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Monterey County

Types of agriculture  
80% crop land, 20% grazing

Program Highlights

Agricultural land is highest priority. The Trust preserves land by acquiring conservation easements. Some are donated. Some are purchased with grants from State bond funds or foundations. The Trust also owns several farms in fee. The 1985 plan cites acquisition factors: quality of agriculture, natural/historical resources, degree of threat, location, and probability of funding. Parcels are not ranked quantitatively. Major target areas are the most prime farmlands near cities. Attention is given to establishing and maintaining rapport with land owners.

**LAND TRUST OF NAPA COUNTY**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
20	6666	0	0	Self-monitored	\$1,500,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Napa County

Types of agriculture  
Vineyards and croplands

Program Highlights

Trust preserves farmland and other lands through securing conservation easements, accepting donations of lands in fee simple, facilitating property transfers, and working with local, state, and federal agencies to acquire open space, parks and wildlife refuges, which may be transferred to other conservation organizations. It monitors its protected lands. The program is guided by the strategic plan. It offers hikes and field trips. The educational program is based at Connolly Ranch, an educational center for sustainable agriculture and environmental science, with school and recreational programs, and annual Feast of Eden benefit. The volunteer program includes about 300. There is a regular newsletter. Accepts mitigation lands but no ag mitigation land to date.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**PENINSULA OPEN SPACE TRUST (POST)**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
6	1,236	6	620	Self-managed, w/exceptions	\$10,000,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
no	yes	yes	no	no	no	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Mostly the Peninsula and Coast

Types of agriculture  
mostly row crops or dry farming

Program Highlights

POST buys properties with its capital fund and then usually sells them to public agencies or private organizations, which hold the property for long-term management. The Trust often buys lands and easements and sells them to Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD), the State Parks system, or the National Park Service. POST does not usually hold lands for long-term management. The Trust has a close working relationship with MROSD. POST has protected 60,000 acres of land. POST has recently emphasized acquisition along the San Mateo County coast, including farmlands. POST has worked closely with other agencies, especially MROSD. The organization expenses are \$10,200,000. Its revenue is \$20,300,000 (See Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District)

**SAN BENITO AGRICULTURAL LAND TRUST**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
1	65	0	0	Self-managed	\$14,000 + -	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
maybe	no	maybe	no	no	yes	65

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
San Benito County and adjacent areas

Types of agriculture  
row crops, grazing.

Program Highlights

The Trust provides financial options to landowners in order to protect the agricultural heritage of San Benito County. The Trust accepts donations of conservation easements. The Trust has 4 easements one of which is in row crops. The others are ranchlands.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**LAND TRUST OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
0	0	0	0	Self-monitored	\$1,000,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	depends	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Santa Cruz County

Types of agriculture  
none at this time, 560 acres pending

Program Highlights

The Trust has protected 1,500 acres and worked with other organizations to protect another 9,000 acres. The Trust owns and manages several natural area and habitat properties in fee simple. In 2006 the Trust adopted a plan that includes protection of prime farmland. The Trust has been selected to receive \$ 4.5 million in state and federal conservation funds to protect over 560 acres of prime Pajaro Valley farmland through conservation easements. Completion expected in 2008.

**SILICON VALLEY LAND CONSERVANCY**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
4	1210	0	0	Self-monitored & contracted	\$150,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	no	yes	no	no	yes	1,150

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Santa Clara County and all adjacent counties

Types of agriculture  
75-90% of holdings in agriculture, mostly row crops

Program Highlights

The Conservancy protects agricultural land as well as habitat. Target areas include: the Bolsa area along the Pajaro River, habitat for endangered species, hillsides and oak woodlands, and the Coyote Valley Greenbelt. The agricultural easements, which are managed by the Conservancy, have been acquired through cooperative funding by several agencies: the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, the California Dept of Conservation, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, The American Farmland Trust, and The Nature Conservancy. One agricultural easement was donated by the owner. (See Santa Clara County Open Space Authority)

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**SOLANO LAND TRUST**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
19	7215	na	na	Self-managed	\$2,000,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	289

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Solano County

Types of agriculture  
Easement lands are mostly a mix of orchard, cropland, vineyard.

Program Highlights

The Trust protects a variety of habitat and open space lands, however agricultural land has been a priority since preparation of the Agricultural Conservation Easement Plan in 2002 with a grant from the Packard Foundation. The Plan identifies high priority areas in the County. The goal is to preserve 20,000 acres in 20 years. In 2004 the Trust adopted an agricultural land mitigation program to be used with agencies that require mitigation when approving projects which result in a loss of agricultural land. The Trust holds 289 acres of ag mitigation lands in easement, farmed by the landowner. Easements are held jointly with City of Davis, the source of the mitigation requirement. The Trust has policies for agricultural land mitigation. (See City of Davis)

**SONOMA LAND TRUST**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
9	1800	7	1011	Self-managed	\$3,000,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
no	yes	yes	no	yes	possibly	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Sonoma County, with some program in Mendocino County.

Types of agriculture  
25-50% of total holdings in agriculture, incl: orchard, cropland, vineyard, hay, grazing

Program Highlights

The Trust owns and manages lands, holds and monitors conservation easements, works with other conservation agencies and organizations to protect and restore lands through coordinating joint projects, assisting in transfer of lands to public agencies. Trust conserves scenic, natural, agricultural land, and open land. Program also includes activities (e.g. hikes) and newsletter. The Trust works closely with the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space Dist., which has funded some of the Trust's acquisitions.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**TRI-VALLEY CONSERVANCY**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
114	4159	0	0	Self-monitored	\$523,220	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	no	yes	no	yes	yes	3734

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

Cities of Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, San Ramon, and the Sunol Area and adjacent County lands

Types of agriculture

vineyards, orchards, cropland

Program Highlights

Preserves agricultural lands and natural open spaces. Acquires easements. Conducts programs to promote agriculture, primarily vineyards and olive orchards.

The South Livermore Valley Area Plan directs development to appropriate locations.

It has three methods of encouraging agricultural expansion:

1. Bonus Density program permits the County to allow a reduction in minimum parcel size from 100 acres/home to 2 acres/home, if the developer plants remainder in cultivated agriculture and places permanent agricultural easement preventing further development.
2. The Ruby Hill development (850 high value homes) must contribute minimum of \$10,000/home to the Conservancy and place easements on 460 acres of new vineyards.
3. Development will be allowed in 5 subareas, where, for each acre developed and each house built, one acre of cultivated agriculture must be protected. (See City of Livermore)

**YOLO LAND TRUST**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
36	6650	0	0	Self-monitored	\$150,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
no	no	yes	no	yes	yes	900 +

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

Yolo County

Types of agriculture

row and field crops, orchards

Program Highlights

Focus on protecting farm, open space, and habitat lands. Over 6,650 acres protected by conservation easements. The Trust encourages public policies that support and enhance long-term agriculture, promotes public awareness of the need to preserve it. Publishes a newsletter. Some easements are produced by the agricultural land mitigation programs of the City of Davis and Yolo County; also from the habitat mitigation program of the Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency. Some easements from the City of Davis program are held jointly with the City. (See City of Davis, Yolo County, Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency)

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
1	77	1	308	Self-managed exc. winery	\$19,000,000	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	yes	yes	no	no	possibly	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

San Mateo County and northwest Santa Clara County, and the cities therein.

Types of agriculture

winery, Christmas tree farm, chestnuts

Program Highlights

The District purchases, permanently protects and restores lands to form a regional open space greenbelt, preserve wilderness, habitat, watershed, viewshed, ecosystems, and provide opportunities for low-intensity recreation and environmental education. The District has 25 preserves with 55,000 acres preserved. While agricultural conservation was not the primary goal, it is included in the context of their larger purpose. Several of their properties include agriculture. The Service Plan for their new focus area, the San Mateo Coast, includes agricultural preservation, with a number of policies for its implementation. As yet, no agricultural coastal properties have been acquired, but are expected as part of future acquisitions.

Mid-Pen works closely with Peninsula Open Space Trust. (See Peninsula Open Space Trust)

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY OPEN SPACE AUTHORITY**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
1	301	0	0	Self-monitored	\$4,360,470	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes?	no	yes	yes	pending	pending	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

Santa Clara County, excl: area of Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, and City of Gilroy

Types of agriculture

na

Program Highlights

The Authority's program is guided by the Five-Year Plan, as further defined by 10 Study Areas. Agricultural preservation is part of the Authority's mission. In addition to the agricultural land easement it purchased and holds, the Authority contributed \$1M to the purchase of conservation easements on 792 acres of farmland, now held and administered by the Silicon Valley Land Conservancy. Other contributors were the Calif. Dept of Conservation, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, The American Farmland Trust, and The Nature Conservancy. The Authority is reviewing its policy regarding potential agricultural land mitigation programs and agricultural land conservation in general. (The Authority is prepared to act as the holder of Habitat Mitigation funds until their disbursement.)

(See Silicon Valley Land Conservancy)

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**SONOMA COUNTY AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
64	33,220	2	30	Self-managed	\$4,625,764	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	yes	yes	yes	pending	yes	100

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Sonoma County

Types of agriculture  
25-50% of holdings in agriculture, incl:orchard, cropland, vineyard, dairy, grazing

Program Highlights

Permanently protects diverse agricultural, natural resource, and scenic open space lands. Program includes acquisition of easements and purchase/ownership of lands in fee simple. Program guided by 2006 plan: "Connecting Communities and the Land: A Long Range Acquisition Plan. Plan has four focus areas: Farms & Ranches, Greenbelts & Scenic Hillside, Water, Wildlife & Natural Areas, and Recreation & Education. Programs include: Competitive matching grants (to cities and organizations), Small farms (leases land at affordable rate to farmers for vegetables, flowers, etc), Stewardship, Education (incl schools), Volunteers, and Outings.

**CITY OF BRENTWOOD**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
0	0	1	7	na	Mitigation function not	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
no	yes	no	yes	Requires mitigation	goes to trusts	7

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Brentwood and nearby unincorporated area in eastern Contra Costa County

Types of agriculture  
None yet.

Program Highlights

2001 mitigation program requires 1 acre be protected by easement for each acre developed. Developer may acquire and offer the easement or may pay in lieu fee. The mitigation fund is now about \$10 M. 20% of collected fees put into administrative fund for legal and consultant fees, etc. The Transferrable Agricultural Credits (TAC) program allows developers to acquire conservation easements from farmland owners in target ag areas of the the County and get credit for dwelling units in the City as a density bonus up to the maximum allowed by the Genral Plan. Currently, the TAC is not used much, because of market conditions. The Agricultural Enterprise Programs are to improve viability of local agriculture, e.g.: marketing programs for the Brentwood area; negotiation with the County to relax restrictions on value- added activities (processing to create products from locally grown agricultural produce). The City's Agriculture Enterprise Program is now under consultant study to consider possible improvements. In 2002 City initiated the Brentwood Land Trust (BALT) to partner in mitigation program by buying and holding easements, using allocation from City's mitigation fund. In 2007 City discontinued its agreement with BALT and decided to operate the program directly by acquiring easements itself and partnering with other land trusts in the County, including BALT and the Contra Costa County Agricultural and Natural Resources Land Trust. Easements held by the land trusts name the City as the beneficiary.

\* for number of easements and acreage from mitigation program. see Brentwood Land Trust **81**

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**CITY OF DAVIS**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
9	2012	6	1675	Self-managed & contracted	Mitigation function not	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
no	yes	yes	no	Requires mitigation	yes	1000

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

City of Davis and nearby unincorporated area in Solano and Yolo Counties

Types of agriculture

75 % of holdings in agriculture: row and field crops

Program Highlights

Program guided by General Plan policies and by the Acquisition and Management Plan. GP policies are fairly general. Land developments that take agricultural land must protect 2 acres of land for each 1 acre of agricultural land developed, with the mitigation land located adjacent to the farm edge of the new project\*. Acquisition plan includes qualitative criteria for acquisitions. Most holdings are in easements, most of which are co-held with local land trust (Solano Land Trust or the Yolo Land Trust). The City holds some lands in fee which have special concerns, e.g. restoration. City holds some easements that may not meet Trusts program goals. City assists Trusts, e.g. legal help if easement is challenged. Some mitigation lands acquired with supplemental state or federal grants. \* Adjacency requirement for mitigation easements added in late 2007. (See Solano Land Trust and Yolo Land Trust)

**CITY OF GILROY**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
na	na	na	na	na	Mitigation function not	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity

Lands within and adjacent to the City

Types of agriculture

na

Program Highlights

Gilroy has an agricultural land mitigation program that applies to agricultural lands that are developed within the City. It also applies to adjacent agricultural lands which may request inclusion in the City's urban service area. The policy includes criteria for determining if the land qualifies for mitigation, based on the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA Model). Criteria determining how much mitigation will be required are included. The general requirement is one acre mitigated for each acre developed, with some exceptions and variations. Mitigation may be satisfied by purchase of a conservation easement or the payment of an in-lieu fee, with the easement or fee conveyed to the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority or other City-approved agency. As yet no projects have met the criteria requiring mitigation. The City will not hold agricultural easements or lands, as they are to be vested in a city-approved conservation agency.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**CITY OF LIVERMORE**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>		<u>Budget</u>
na	na	na	na	na	na	Mitigation function not
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	goes to trusts	na

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Area in city limits and adjacent unincorporated lands

Types of agriculture

Program Highlights

The South Livermore Valley Specific Plan has the legal function of an ordinance. It requires that the conversion of agricultural land in the Specific Plan area be mitigated. The requirement is that 1 acre of agricultural land be preserved for each 1 acre of land converted plus 1 acre for each dwelling unit built in the project. Preservation is accomplished by a conservation easement. The builder/developer is required to acquire the easement. No in-lieu fee is accepted. The easement is conveyed directly to the Tri-Valley Land Trust. The City holds no easements or lands. The City also has a Transfer of Development Credit program for the North Livermore Valley area. This program is to preserve habitat areas and agricultural land in the unincorporated area adjacent to the City. It allows developers to buy conservation easements from farmland and habitat land owners in the County and get credit for dwelling units in the City as a density bonus.

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO)**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>		<u>Budget</u>
na	na	na	na	na	na	Mitigation function not
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
All of Santa Clara County

Types of agriculture  
na

Program Highlights

Santa Clara County LAFCO policy encourages the cities to mitigate the conversion of agricultural land to urban use as a result of expansion of city's urban service area and subsequent city annexation of the land. The LAFCO policy recommends that mitigation be at a 1:1 ratio along with payment of funds to cover costs of land management and maintenance of agriculture on the lands, etc. The policy further recommends that the easement or lands be transferred to an agricultural conservation entity for permanent protection. The policy includes guidelines for the lands to be preserved. It includes policies addressing the interface between preserved lands and adjacent land uses. The policy addresses methods to assure the mitigations are implemented. It calls for the cities to present a mitigation plan to LAFCO when it files an application with LAFCO. It includes the expected components of the mitigation plan.

3 cities have extensive agricultural lands in their spheres of influence: Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and San Jose. Gilroy has adopted an agricultural land mitigation policy. Morgan Hill is in the process of developing one. San Jose is beginning its policy development, relative to the Coyote Valley. As yet, no proposals involving agricultural land mitigation have been presented to LAFCO

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**CITY OF WINTERS**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
na	na	na	na	na	Mitigation function not	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na	na

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Land within the city limits

Types of agriculture  
na

Program Highlights

The City requires mitigation of habitat loss, much of which is agricultural land, as well as agricultural land which is not habitat. Mitigation is generally 1 acre of land protected for each acre developed. Developer acquires and submits the easement, as well as paying costs of project administration and funding its long-term stewardship, monitoring and management. The City has guidelines for what land must be mitigated and what land is acceptable as mitigation. The easement, with stewardship funds, is conveyed directly to a qualified land trust, usually the Yolo Land Trust which has a long successful track record.

**CITY OF WOODLAND**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
na	na	na	na	na	Mitigation function not	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
no	no	no	no	Requires mitigation	goes to trust	0

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Land within the city limits, lands being annexed

Types of agriculture  
na

Program Highlights

The City requires agricultural land mitigation on a case by case basis in response to comments on the proposed development project's Draft Environmental Impact Report. The City's practice is based on its General Plan policies for the protection of agriculture. The City's General Plan complements the County's General Plan, which calls for urban development to be done in the cities. The mitigation of agricultural land is often combined with habitat mitigation because the Swainson's hawk, a protected specie, forages in agricultural areas. An independent agricultural land/habitat consultant determines what the mitigation requirement will be: how much, what kind, and where. The City also requires mitigation relative to LAFCO's mitigation requirement for LAFCO permits. The City also participates in the Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency. Mitigation is accepted in the form of an easement, fee title, or payment of an in-lieu fee. The easement, land, or fee is conveyed to the Solano Land Trust. The City does not hold easements or land in fee, but may be a joint holder with the Land Trust. The Land Trust is responsible for monitoring/managing the easements or lands. The developer pays into an endowment fund to cover the costs of monitoring and management. (See Yolo Land Trust, Yolo County LAFCO)

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**YOLO COUNTY**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
na	na	na	na	na	Mitigation function not	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	no	na

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Unincorporated area of Yolo County

Types of agriculture

Program Highlights

2000 ordinance required mitigation of agricultural land when it was rezoned to other lot size or use. The required mitigation is one acre preserved for each acre rezoned. The preserved land is to be within 2 miles of the converted land. If no suitable land is available, the land can be located within 4 miles. The fee option has not been used much. Most easements have gone to the Yolo Land Trust. The new ordinance now in hearings adds the mitigation requirement to lands being converted from agriculture where no rezoning is required for the conversion, with some exemptions. It provides for the payment of the in-lieu fee for land conversions of less than 40 acres. It sets the in-lieu fee at \$10,100/acre. It provides for the mitigation lands/easements to go to a qualified land trust, with criteria regarding their qualification.

**YOLO COUNTY HABITAT JOINT POWERS AGENCY (JPA)**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>	
2	318	0	0	Self-managed	Mitigation function not	
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>	<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	318

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
Most of Yolo County

Types of agriculture  
Pending easements from the program total about 2500 acres.

Program Highlights

JPA manages two programs: (1) Swainson's Hawk Interim Mitigation Fee Program, (2) Yolo Natural Heritage Program. The Swainson's Hawk mitigation program generates fees to fund easement purchases as well as proffers of direct mitigations by developers of projects over 40 acres, mainly of ag lands in the bird's foraging range. The mitigation is based on one acre to be protected for each acre developed. Developments with less than 40 acres mitigation obligation can pay the fee or participate in a concurrent easement that has excess acreage. Developments with more than 40 acres of obligation must mitigate directly with an easement that meets the JPA approval. They must also pay transaction costs and endowments. The JPA created a Trust Fund to hold mitigation funds until spent on an approved acquisitions. It also holds funds received for long term management and enhancement of the habitat lands. The Yolo Natural Heritage program is preparing the NCCP/HCP. In addition to provisions for target species in five dominant habitats/natural communities, the Plan will also continue Yolo County's ag heritage as part of its conservation objectives. The JPA works closely with the Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game. The JPA member governments are amending their General Plans to integrate elements of the JPA program.

**AGRICULTURAL LAND CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS: PROGRAM SUMMARY**

**YOLO COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO)**

<u>Agricultural land easements : Acres</u>		<u>Agricultural lands in fee simple : Acres</u>		<u>Land Management</u>	<u>Budget</u>
na	na	na	na	na	Mitigation function not
<u>Receives easements *</u>	<u>Transfers easements*</u>	<u>Receives funds*</u>	<u>Transfers funds*</u>	<u>Mitigation Policy</u>	<u>Accepts Mitigation Lands</u>
na	na	na	na	Requires mitigation	na
					<u>Mitigation Acres</u>
					na

\* receives from, or transfers to, other organizations or agencies

Area of activity  
All of Yolo County

Types of agriculture  
na

Program Highlights

Yolo County LAFCO policy requires the cities to mitigate the conversion of prime agricultural land to urban use as a result of annexations by the cities or municipal special districts. The impacts relate to loss to development of both agricultural land and habitat. The 4 cities (Davis, Winters, Woodland, West Sacramento) and Yolo County can formulate their own policy specifics. The LAFCO policy is a basic minimum, applicable in the absence of a city or County policy. It has criteria for land to be mitigated. It requires protection of one acre of ag land for each acre of prime ag land developed. It provides for the developer to acquire the mitigation land/easement or pay an lieu fee. The in lieu fee is most applicable to small acreages, to allow fund accumulation for larger acquisitions. The mitigation is usually in the form of easements. The easements/lands are usually held by a land trust, most often the Yolo Land Trust. The LAFCO policy applies also to the County as a recommendation.

## **Appendix A: Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations Included in This Study**

### **Local Organizations Conserving Agricultural Land**

Bodega Land Trust  
Brentwood Land Trust  
Central Valley Farmland Trust (CVFT)  
Coastside Land Trust  
Agricultural – Natural Resources Trust of Contra Costa County  
Marin Agricultural Land Trust (MALT)  
Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District  
The Agricultural Land Trust (Monterey County)  
Land Trust of Napa County  
Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST)  
San Benito Agricultural Land Trust  
Santa Clara County Open Space Authority  
Land Trust of Santa Cruz County  
Silicon Valley Land Conservancy  
Solano Land Trust  
Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District  
Sonoma Land Trust  
Tri-Valley Conservancy  
Yolo Land Trust

### **Local Governments with Agricultural Land Mitigation Programs**

City of Brentwood  
City of David  
City of Gilroy  
City of Livermore  
City of Winters  
City of Woodland  
Yolo County  
Yolo County Habitat Joint Powers Agency  
Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)  
Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)

### **Regional, State and National Organizations**

The Bay Area Open Space Council  
The Trust for Public Lands  
The Nature Conservancy  
The American Farmland Trust  
California State Department of Conservation – Division of Land Resource Protections  
California State Coastal Conservancy – San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program

## **Appendix B: Agricultural Land Conservation Organizations Interviewed**

The Agricultural Land Trust (Monterey County)  
Agricultural-Natural Resources Land Trust of Contra Costa County  
Bodega Land Trust  
Brentwood Land Trust  
Central Valley Farmland Trust (CVFT)  
Land Trust of Napa County  
Marin Agricultural Land Trust (MALT)  
Peninsula Open Space Trust  
Silicon Valley Land Conservancy  
Solano Land Trust  
Sonoma Land Trust

## **Appendix C: Interview Questionnaire**

1. What do you consider the major successes or accomplishments of your agency?
2. Regarding an agency starting up a new agricultural land conservation program, what do you think are the most important factors in ensuring the program's success?
3. What are the major challenges or difficulties to address or avoid regarding a start up?
4. Regarding operating a long-term ongoing program, what are the most important factors in promoting its continuing success?
5. What are the major challenges or difficulties regarding its continuing success?
6. What is your agency's process for considering proposed acquisitions?
7. Do you use acquisition criteria?
8. Do you ever actively seek a property or easement because it is key to your program?
9. Regarding the acquisition process, do you do your own acquisitions or contract them out?
10. Which type of acquisitions are more challenging, fee title or easements? Which are more: Problematic? Time consuming? Expensive?
11. What are the advantages in holding lands in fee title (or "fee simple")? What are the disadvantages?
12. What are the advantages of holding lands in easements? What are the disadvantages?
13. What issues have you had with easements? Examples:
14. Have you changed your handling of easements or the terms of your easements due to past experience? In what ways?
15. How do you fund your monitoring/management of your fee title lands and/or easements? Is monitoring funded as part of operating budget? Assessments? Donated or required endowments? Endowments w/ easements? Other?

## **Appendix D: The Study Method**

The study was undertaken at the direction of the Open Space Authority Board. In response to the general study concept approved by the Board, the Citizens Advisory Committee prepared the study design with input from the OSA staff. The focus was on conservation of flat agricultural land and the farming activities it supports rather than hillside grazing land, since the Board was interested in this aspect of agricultural land conservation. "Agriculture" in the context of this study was generally meant to be the various forms of cultivated farming conducted on flat land, such as row crops, vineyards, orchards, dairy and pasture, floriculture, nursery stock, etc. The participating organizations defined "agriculture" by their responses to the survey. They were asked to report the types of agriculture conducted on their holdings, excluding hillside lands used for grazing or natural, habitat and scenic lands, etc. Their responses are presented in the Organization Profiles in Section Four under "Agriculture types."

The study design included two basic steps. The first was to conduct an inventory and prepare descriptive profiles of organizations in the Bay Area that have agricultural land conservation programs. The second was to conduct interviews of a sample of the organizations to get information about aspects of their management and operations. A third phase was to convene a panel of participating organization representatives to review the study findings and further explore aspects of agriculture conservation management and operations. This third phase was abandoned as beyond the resources and schedule of the project.

The CAC began the inventory phase with a preliminary list of data items to include in the inventory, which it honed to the final items, with staff input. The CAC prepared an email questionnaire, which the staff finalized and formatted for the SurveyMonkey.com online survey. The CAC drew the list of candidate organizations from the data base of the Bay Area Open Space Council and was guided by the very helpful Council staff. The OSA staff distributed the questionnaire by email. The CAC study team compiled the responses and then contacted the responding organizations to clarify, correct and augment the emailed data. Also, the team contacted the few organizations that did not respond to the email questionnaire by phone. In addition, the team researched all the organizations' on-line resources to compile organization information that was not included in the questionnaire.

During the study, more organizations became known and were included. It was decided to include conservation organizations working in the counties which border Santa Clara County, in addition to those in the Bay Area. One such organization, the Central Valley Land Trust serves four counties, two of which lie beyond our County border. A few organizations were deleted when it became apparent that their programs did not include cultivated agriculture. A profile page was drafted for each organization and sent to that organization for review and correction.

Late in the study, the mitigation of agricultural land converted to urban development emerged as an Authority interest. The Santa Clara County Local Agencies Formation Commission made agricultural land mitigation an important issue for cities in Santa Clara County, with possible implications for the Open Space Authority's program. Also, the study team had become aware that some of the organizations were holding easements that had resulted from local governments' policies to require the preservation of land as a mitigation of the loss of agricultural land to urban development...an environmental impact requiring mitigation under California law.

The team found that local governments that require the mitigation as part of the urban development process usually (but not always) transfer the resulting conservation easements to a conservation organization to be the final holder of the mitigation lands. As a result, the team worked to identify the local governments that transfer protected lands to conservation organizations. Profiles of local governments that require agricultural land mitigation are included in the Profile section of the report. Only eight were included in the Profiles because of time and resource constraints.

The study also prepared profiles on several regional, state and federal organizations that promote and often partner with local organizations in agricultural land conservation. These are included in the Profiles section of the report.

The study team members prepared profiles for all the organizations, compiling the information from the various sources. A team member prepared the draft report based on compiled information in the inventory profiles. The CAC reviewed the draft report and, after corrections and amendments, accepted it.

The second part of the study focused on management and operations information. The CAC drafted a list of desired information that it honed to the final items, with staff input. The CAC prepared a final phone questionnaire. The study team selected eleven organizations, as being within the team's available resources and time. In retrospect, it might have been beneficial to include a publicly funded county conservation organization, because of its similarity to the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority. Team members phoned the organization staffs to conduct the interviews. In some cases, follow up phone calls were necessary to clarify responses. The responses were compiled from the interview note sheets. A team member drafted the report based on the compiled responses. The team members reviewed the draft report, and after corrections and amendments, accepted it.

The final draft report, including the profiles, was circulated to the 35 participating organizations. Changes to the profiles were received and corrections made. In addition, the final draft report was distributed to the OSA Board and staff for review and comment. Their comments have been incorporated into the final report.

## Appendix E: Definitions Used in This Report

### Agriculture

For this study, agriculture was defined to include all forms of agriculture conducted on flat land, generally on valley floors. It does not include hill-side or range land cattle grazing. Valley floor agriculture is understood to include all forms of cultivated crops both irrigated and non-irrigated, such as hay and grains. It also includes dairies and pasture. The organizations in the study reported a wide variety agriculture on their conservation holdings, including row crops, orchards, vineyards, Christmas tree farms, and dairies which might include both cows and goats. It might have included floriculture and nursery stock, but none were reported. While no greenhouses, horse farms or mushroom farms were reported, they could also have been included. It generally would not include feed lots, since such activities are not generally allowed in Bay Area counties without special permit.

### Conservation Easement (or "easement")

This is a legal transfer of property rights to create an enforceable land preservation agreement between a land owner and a governmental entity or conservation organization, specified in a legal document locally recorded as such. The term also describes the on-going effective conditions on the land resulting from the easement. A property may be said to have an easement on it. The landowner sells, or may donate, the easement in a transaction that is strictly voluntary.

In this report "conservation easement" and "easement" are used to mean the same thing.

The terms of the conservation easement restrict the use of the land to assure the land will remain available for farming or otherwise in its natural state in perpetuity, generally. The restrictions generally limit any conversion of the land for urban purposes, such as its subdivision, urban land uses and structures.

The easement specifies what can and cannot be done with the land and is binding on all future owners of the land, consistent with the goals of the easement. To some degree, they can be tailored to the specific needs of the landowner. In a few cases, organizations holding conservation easements have found that some landowners are not using the protected land for farming but simply holding the land as open space around their residence. While the land is being preserved for farming, in principle, it is not achieving the goal of continuing working farms.

Occasionally easements, called "affirmative easements", specify conditions or responsibilities the landowner *must* do to meet the conditions of the easement. These might be to conduct active farming for certain periods, maintain farm structures, protect riparian areas from destruction, or such.

The easement has a monetary value which is largely determined by the specific restrictions and their impact, related to land values in the general area where the land is located. The appraisal of easements is something of a special art. The restrictions may provide the landowner with substantial tax benefits, if the specified conditions for tax benefit are met in the terms of the easement and conditions of the land it applies to, as well as the organization that holds the easement. The drafting of conservation easements is complicated and requires the attention of experts.

An important aspect of easements is that they must be monitored by the organization that holds them to assure that the terms of the easement are being met by the landowner. Over the long run this is costly, depending on the level of monitoring and management. Agencies receiving easements are increasingly requiring contributions to an endowment fund when the easement is acquired to pay for monitoring in the future. In addition, easements are sometimes legally challenged by subsequent landowners or others. This requires the organization that holds the easement to undertake and fund a defense of the easement. Conservation organizations are seeking endowments for such legal defense.

## **Agricultural Land Mitigation**

This is the accepted remedy for the loss of agricultural land resulting from the conversion of the land to urban development. The mitigation is required so as to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act.

California courts have held the conversion of agricultural land to urban development to be a potentially significant environmental impact, depending on the attributes of the land proposed for development. When the jurisdiction finds the environmental impact to be significant, mitigation is required. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is the basis for this procedure. CEQA requires that before any public decision, project, or development permit is decided, all potential environmental impacts of the decision must be identified. If an impact is found to be "significant", the impact must be reduced to a less than significant level by "mitigation"...that is, by acts that reduce, or compensate for, the impacts.

The jurisdictions active in agricultural land mitigation are usually cities, counties, and to some extent Local Agency Formation Commissions, which regulate the expansion of cities in their respective counties. Occasionally state agencies, such as the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), may also be involved, if their projects result in the loss of agricultural land.

Agricultural land mitigation is implemented by requiring the land developer to secure the preservation of some amount of agricultural land. This is usually accomplished through the acquisition of a conservation easement on the land to be preserved. It could also be accomplished by acquiring the land in fee simple, although this is not usual. The more usual alternative is payment by the developer of a mitigation fee into a fund which is subsequently used to purchase conservation easements (or land in fee).

Local governments are now adopting policies and procedures for agricultural land mitigation, sometime in response to successful legal suits initiated upon the jurisdiction's having failed to identify the impact and require mitigation. The basic question facing the local government is: does the community want a minimal program to meet the minimum requirements of the law, or does the community want a robust program to preserve agricultural land within the terms of the law and as supported by adopted local policy. The law may support some latitude in this regard.

Some jurisdictions decide that full mitigation requires the re-establishment of agriculture on land previously converted to urban use, resulting in no net loss of land. When the jurisdiction finds this is infeasible and the impact cannot be thus mitigated, the jurisdiction is required by law to adopt a finding of overriding considerations. In this case, CEQA requires the jurisdiction to approve the project by a super majority. Nevertheless, these jurisdictions usually also require the preservation of other agricultural lands as a partial mitigation.

Most jurisdictions implement their agricultural land mitigation by adopting a policy, with procedures, which is applied consistently to all agricultural lands which may be subject to urban development under the control of the jurisdiction, consistent with CEQA.

Each jurisdiction has the opportunity to determine how robust a preservation program it wants by what it specifies for these issues:

What lands are subject to the mitigation requirement?

How much mitigation will be required?

What lands will be accepted as mitigation and where may they be located?

What agency will ultimately hold title (and management responsibility) for the lands that are accepted as mitigation?

What agency will hold and administer any fees that are accepted as mitigation, including the seeking and purchasing of easements or lands in fee?

Some jurisdictions, however, do their mitigation on a case by case basis. Either approach is subject to the test of law.

Regarding what lands will require mitigation, the jurisdiction usually adopts criteria relating to the condition of the land being developed in order to apply a consistent approach to all proposed projects. The criteria may relate to the Important Farmland Maps produced biennially by the State Dept. of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. They may use various indicators of the quality of the soil, availability of irrigation, surrounding land use, the size of the parcel, etc. They may use the state's LESA model which includes some of the criteria mentioned above. Often the criteria are given different weightings. Some jurisdictions designate specific areas where the policy applies. Some jurisdictions exempt certain land areas or urban land uses from the mitigation requirement. While they may be consistently applied, these attempts to be objective are ultimately subjective, since explicitly or implicitly the criteria represent policy decisions. They determine how much land will be protected.

The decision regarding how much mitigation will be required is usually expressed as a ratio of the number of acres of required for mitigation to the number of acres approved for development. The common ratio is one acre of agricultural land to be protected for each acre to be developed. This, too, is a policy decision. One city requires that two acres be protected for each developed. Another city requires one acre be protected for each acre developed and further requires that an additional acre be protected for each housing unit approved in the development. As an alternate way to meet the land mitigation requirement, payment of a mitigation fee is often provided for. The policy may specify how much the fee will be or how the amount will be determined. This is supposed to be based on the cost of acquiring conservation easements in the area. Generally it is based on some procedure for getting appraisals. Here too there is the opportunity for policy variation. Determining the value of easements is an art and depends to some extent on the terms of the easement. Multiple appraisals usually result in a range of value. As a result there is a range from low to high in which the fee can be set. Further, land values, particularly in the Bay Area, have appreciated rapidly and at the same time are subject to changes in the housing markets. Often, the fees have been set too low to support purchase of the amount of acres required by the mitigation policy. As a result, provision is often made for periodically revising the mitigation fee requirement. The amount of fees collected will determine how much land will be protected, since the purchase of easements is based on a policy of willing sellers. The sellers will only sell when they get the price they want when they want it, although there are may be other factors that influence a seller's decision.

The jurisdiction must also decide what lands will be accepted as mitigation and where they may be located. The mitigation policy may include criteria for what kinds of lands will be accepted, in some cases similar to the criteria for lands requiring mitigation. The jurisdiction may also specify the areas where mitigation may be accomplished. Generally it is in the immediate area of the jurisdiction. These decisions are again policy decisions and, hopefully, are set so as to accomplish the goals of the community.

The decision regarding what entity or entities will hold the easements (or fee title) relates to two concerns. What entity is able and willing to manage the holding? And, what entity is able to guarantee and defend the holding in perpetuity thus guaranteeing the land will be permanently available to agriculture and not be developed? Management of easements (or lands in fee) requires at the minimum the monitoring of the land to assure that the terms of the easement are being met. Further, it may require the maintenance of the physical improvements (fencing, agricultural buildings) and condition of the land, drainage, erosion, etc. Most local governments prefer not to do this. They usually transfer the easement or title to a conservation organization, such as a land trust or a public conservation agency, which has experience and expertise in these functions. However, the local government often retains a joint interest in the easement title to participate in the legal defense of the easement if it is challenged and to assure that the conservation organization will not unilaterally divest itself of the easement. Likewise the easement may be held jointly by several organizations which have contributed to the purchase of the easement for similar reasons.

## **California Environmental Act (CEQA)**

Enacted in 1970, this law (California Public Resources Code section 2 1000 et seq.) applies to projects requiring approval by California governmental agencies, such as cities, counties, State agencies and other agencies in the State. (Actions of the Federal government are covered by the National Environmental Policy Act.)

"Each public agency shall mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment of projects that it carries out or approves whenever it is feasible to do so." Sec. 2 1002.1

The types of actions subject to CEQA are specified. Projects are first subject to an Initial Study to determine if there are potential significant impacts. If there are no significant impacts the approving agency may adopt a Negative Declaration. If potential significant impacts are identified, the agency will require preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to identify significant potential impacts. The EIR states how the significant impacts are to be mitigated to a less than significant level. If all the significant impacts can be mitigated to less than significant level, the agency may adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration. If there are significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant level, the agency must acknowledge them and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, stating that although there may be adverse impacts, specific economic, social, or other considerations override the project's unmitigated impacts.

The CEQA process has the effect of informing all stakeholders of a project's potential environmental impacts and considering them in the decision to approve or not. It provides a public process for determining whether the impacts have been identified and satisfactorily mitigated. The process is subject to litigation regarding whether the requirements of the law regarding these issues have been met.

CEQA is relevant to agricultural land conservation. California courts have established that the loss of agricultural land to urban development is a potentially significant environmental impact, and as such requires mitigation. In response, local governments are increasingly adopting agricultural mitigation programs to regularize their response to this requirement. (See definition of Agricultural Land Mitigation.)

## **Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)**

Since the State Legislature enacted the Knox-Nesbit Act in 1963, every California County has had a Local Agencies Formation Commission (LAFCO) which regulates the expansion of the cities and special districts in the county and the formation of new ones. Its membership includes 2 City officials, 2 County supervisors, and one public member selected by the other four. It was created to curb the wasteful duplication of services, chaotic boundaries, and on-going loss of agricultural land to unplanned growth that characterized urban development in California. LAFCO is empowered to regulate the outward expansion of cities and of districts that provide urban services, such as sewers. Thus, it has a potential role in the preservation of agriculture at the urban edge by regulating where and when urban growth will occur. LAFCO performance in this regard has varied from county to county. In the last few years, however, LAFCO's have exercised a new approach that is related to preserving agricultural land. That is through agricultural land mitigation. Based on court decisions requiring mitigation, some LAFCO's are beginning to require their city's to show how they are going to mitigate the loss of agricultural land when they come to LAFCO for approval of their urban expansion.

## **Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)**

The Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), prepared under Federal regulations, and the Natural Community Conservation Plans (NCCP), prepared under State regulations, relate to agricultural land preservation in areas where cultivated agriculture is habitat for a protected specie, as with the Swainson's Hawk in Yolo County. Santa Clara County's HCP/NCCP is currently being prepared. While no protected specie has been associated with cultivated farm land in Santa Clara County, it is anticipated that a limited amount of agricultural land may be acquired for protection in association with riparian areas along the Pajaro River. The primary purpose of preserving this land would be to facilitate reestablishment of riparian vegetation (e.g., wetland marshes, groves of willow trees).

HCPs are prepared pursuant to the Federal Endangered Species Act (1973) and the California Endangered Species Act and other laws that protect species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. In 1982 the Federal Endangered Species Act was amended to provide for the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) as a means to resolve conflicts between land development and protection of endangered species and their habitats and to give landowners incentives to participate in conservation of endangered species on a landscape scale rather than on an individual project scale. Preparation of an HCP acceptable to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service enables land owners to get "incidental take permits" for development in the HCP area. Within the planning area, the HCP identifies the highest priority species to protect and the important habitat areas to support and protect them. It also identifies the areas where development may be allowed without substantially threatening the priority species and what impacts will result. It identifies the steps to mitigate the impacts of development in the permitted areas. It also establishes funding mechanisms to assure that the designated priority habitat areas will be preserved and maintained and that identified restoration or enhancement programs will be implemented. Further, the HCP identifies a local institutional framework for administering the HCP.

Upon approval of the HCP by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, individual development projects may be permitted on the basis that the resulting "incidental taking"...will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of the species in the wild". Approval of the development project usually involves the developer paying a mitigation fee that contributes to the funding of the protection program and incorporating some best management practices and other site measures intended to minimize impacts on species and their habitat. An important benefit to the developer and the local government is that the endangered species process is clearly established with a degree of certainty unavailable without the HCP, and individual EIR and project-specific mitigations are generally not required.

The HCP can be prepared concurrently with a California Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), under the provisions of the California Natural Community Conservation Planning Act (1991) and other State Endangered Species regulations. The Act created a regional planning process focused on protecting biological communities rather than single species. The HCP is focused on mitigation of future project impacts. The NCCP is focused on both mitigation and enhancement of natural communities/habitats and thus requires creation of more extensive conservation measures than the HCP, including the acquisition of more extensive habitat reserves. The NCCP must be approved by the California Department of Fish and Game. Implementation of a NCCP is integrated with implementation of the corresponding HCP.

### **Right to Farm Ordinances**

These are generally local ordinances intended to protect farming operations from nuisance actions. State legislation may also address these problems. When nonagricultural land uses extend into agricultural areas, agricultural operations often become the subject of nuisance complaints and suits. As a result, farmers are sometimes forced to cease operations. Others may be discouraged from making investments in farm improvements. Complaints may cite noise, dust, odors, drift of spraying, low flying aircraft for spraying, activities that are too late or too early, appearance, signs for on-site sale of produce, and so on.

Right to farm ordinances generally limit or restrict the right to bring nuisance action against farm operations that meet specified criteria, such as scale, duration, and type of operation so long as they comply with relevant laws. They may provide that buyers of land near agricultural areas be informed about the on-going agricultural operations and the "right to farm" ordinances.

### **501(c)3**

501(c)3 is the section of the Internal Revenue Code (1983) that governs tax-exempt non-profit organizations. Among other considerations, it defines the conditions that those organizations must meet to maintain their tax-exempt status. This is important to non-profit land trusts and other private conservation organizations.

### **Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA)**

Created in 1935 as the Soil Conservation Service, the Natural Resources Conservation Service is an arm of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The NRCS California office is in Davis, and the agency has area offices located throughout the state. The NRCS operates a number of programs to help landowners, farmers, and land managers conserve their soil, water, and other natural resources. In addition to its many programs that promote resource conservation and support agriculture, the agency's Farmland Protection Program provides matching funds to State, Tribal, or local governments and non-governmental organizations with existing farmland protection programs to purchase conservation easements or other interests in land.

### **Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs)**

Conservation Districts were first created during the 1930's to involve local communities in preventing the soil erosion problems of the Dust Bowl from recurring. Now, throughout the nation, they work closely with the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. They are formed as independent local liaisons between the federal government and local landowners. In California, they are "special districts", under California law, with a locally appointed or elected board of directors made up of landowners in that district. They are funded largely through grants, although a few get limited funds from county property tax revenues. RCDs address a wide variety of conservation issues. Their programs vary widely. A main function may be providing a conduit to programs of the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service and the California Department of Conservation. While they do not contribute funding to the acquisition and preservation of farm land, they may play a role in programs to improve conditions on preserved farm land.

### **California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)**

The California Department of Transportation is required to mitigate the significant environmental impacts of its projects. From time to time, this may include funding to acquire farm land or habitat lands, if such lands are impacted by a Caltrans project.

### **California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Model**

Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) is a method for evaluating the quality of agricultural land based on measurable conditions and qualities. The California version was developed by the state Resources Agency for use regarding CEQA and the need to determine if the conversion of a parcel of agricultural land to urban use is a "significant impact" requiring mitigation. It is based on a model developed by the federal government. Its purpose is to have a model for evaluating projects consistently, rather than arbitrarily on a case-by case basis.

It uses six factors. Two Land Evaluation factors are based on measures of soil resource quality. Four Site Assessment factors use the project's size (area), water availability, surrounding agricultural lands, and surrounding protected lands. The factors are rated, given a weighted score and then combined for a total score. The total score determines the level of "significance".

The weightings, in effect, represent judgments regarding the importance of each factor. The state agency encourages local governments to adjust the model scorings to reflect local policy. In general, the state model seems best suited for large scale agriculture. It may be less suited to assessing the significance of small-scale specialty crop agriculture at the urban edge. Its use by local governments is varied, as indicated in this report in the Profiles of local governments with agricultural land mitigation programs.

(See in the Profiles section of this report: California State Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection. Also the local governments with agricultural land mitigation programs.)

### **Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)**

The Association of Bay Area Governments was formed in 1963 as the first council of governments in California. It includes the nine counties surrounding San Francisco Bay. The nine county governments

and the 101 cities are voluntary members. ABAG is the official comprehensive planning agency for the region. An elected official from each member city and county serves as a delegate to ABAG's General Assembly. The General Assembly determines policy annually, adopts the annual budget and work program, and reviews policy actions of the Executive Board. The 38-member Executive Board, composed of locally elected officials based on regional population, meets bimonthly to make operating decisions, appoint committee members, authorize expenditures and recommend policy. As an advisory organization, ABAG has limited statutory authority.

Some ABAG programs are: the regional population and employment projections, the housing allocations that indicate the number of new housing units expected throughout the region, and the Bay Trail Project. The ABAG Regional Plan is used in transportation planning.

An important current program is **Focusing Our Vision** or "FOCUS". It seeks to meld local and regional objectives into a development strategy for the Bay Area, identifying priority areas for development and conservation and then developing effective incentives to implement them. To the extent the program succeeds, it will influence which urban edge agricultural areas are more likely to be preserved.



**Santa Clara County Open Space Authority**

6980 Santa Teresa Blvd., Suite 100

San Jose, CA 95119

408-224-7476

[www.openspaceauthority.org](http://www.openspaceauthority.org)