

MINUTES OF THE SOLANO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting of July 21, 2011

The regular meeting of the Solano County Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, Fairfield, California.

PRESENT: Commissioners Rhoads-Poston, Cayler, and Chairman Mahoney

EXCUSED/ABSENT: Commissioners Boschee & Karah

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Yankovich, Planning Program Manager; Jim Leland, Principal Planner; Karen Avery & Nedzlene Ferrario, Senior Planners; Jim Laughlin, Deputy County Counsel; Victor Chan, Civil Engineer, and Kristine Letterman, Planning Commission Clerk

Items from the floor - none

The Minutes of the regular meeting of June 16, 2011 were approved as prepared. The minutes of July 7, 2011 were continued to the next regular meeting to allow for a quorum of the members who were in attendance at the July 7th meeting.

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** to consider Variance Permit Application No. V-11-01 and Use Permit Application No. U-11-01 of **William & Elisabeth May** to permit less than the required front and rear yard setback for a proposed residential accessory structure. The property is located at 37 Willotta Drive, Fairfield, in an "RE-1/3" Residential Estate Zoning District, APN: 0027-332-010. This project is determined to be categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (Project Planner: Karen Avery) **Staff Recommendation:** Approval

Karen Avery gave a brief presentation of staff's written report. She stated that the applicant is requesting a use permit to build an accessory structure larger than 600 square feet and a variance to build an accessory structure within the front yard setback and within the front 50% of the parcel. Per the project narrative, the applicant is proposing to build a 952 sq. ft garage/shop within the front portion of the parcel. The applicant is proposing this location due to the location of the existing primary and secondary leachfields in the rear portion of the parcel.

Since there were no questions or comments Chairman Mahoney opened the public hearing. There were no speakers either for or against this matter therefore the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Commissioner Rhoads-Poston and seconded by Commissioner Cayler to adopt the resolution approving Variance Permit Application No. V-11-01 and Use Permit Application

No. U-11-11 subject to the recommended conditions of approval. The motion passed unanimously. (Resolution No. 4555)

2. **PUBLIC HEARING** to consider Minor Revision No. 5 to Use Permit No. U-91-28 of **G2 Energy (Hay Road)** to add a landfill gas to energy facility to an existing landfill. The proposal includes a power generator, 800 square foot office building and associated facilities. The project is located at 6426 Hay Road 5 miles southeast of the City of Vacaville in an "A-80" Exclusive Agricultural Zoning District, APN's: 0042-020-280 and 060. The Planning Commission will also be considering adoption of a Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact as recommended by the Solano County Department of Resource Management. (Project Planner: Nedzlene Ferrario) **Staff Recommendation:** Approval

Nedzlene Ferrario gave a brief presentation of the written staff report. She stated that approval of the project will allow the opportunity to establish a renewable energy facility for Recology Hay Road. She said the facility will utilize an Internal Combustion Engine to convert methane gas, an odorless landfill by product, to electrical power, to be sold via purchase and power agreement to PG&E. The project will reduce methane emissions by encouraging the recovery and beneficial use of landfill gas (LFG) as an energy resource that will be captured and used to provide power to homes, and more. The facility will be operated by G2 Energy and housed in a container, located along Hay Road.

Chairman Mahoney opened the public hearing. Since there were no speakers either for or against this matter, the public hearing was closed.

Chairman Mahoney stated that he is excited about this project and commented that he believed this is the way in moving forward by utilizing the waste that is coming into the county. He hoped that the project would be up and running quickly.

A motion was made by Commissioner Cayler and seconded by Commissioner Rhoads-Poston to adopt the negative declaration and approve the minor revision to Use Permit No. U-91-28 subject to the recommended conditions of approval. The motion passed unanimously. (Resolution No. 4556)

3. **STUDY SESSION** on proposed changes to the **Exclusive Agricultural (A) District**, including revisions to definitions, permitted uses and permitting requirements, development standards for various permitted uses and changes in formatting and organization of the zoning regulations.

Jim Leland briefly reviewed the staff report. He stated that the changes proposed by staff have three intended objectives: 1) additional uses added to the district; 2) reduced permitting requirements; and 3) improved usability. He noted that staff has also received input from the Solano County Farm Bureau and the Agricultural Advisory Committee. Mr. Leland provided a summary of the proposed changes.

Mr. Leland noted that there have been several meetings held between the Ag Advisory Committee and the Solano County Farm Bureau with regards to these proposed changes. He stated that the two groups had some differences of opinion on what should be done, and he believed that many of those issues have been resolved. Mr. Leland stated that staff is looking for some direction from the commission as to whether staff is on the right track or whether another direction should be followed. He stated that the purpose of this study session is to receive direction from interested parties and the commission so that staff can put together a more complete document to bring back for the

commission's consideration. He noted that this is part of a series of changes in the zoning regulations. He noted that tonight's study session will cover agriculture while the next study session will review changes to residential, suburban, and urban residential districts pursuant to the General Plan Implementation program. Mr. Leland stated that later in the summer staff will be back before the commission with some changes to zoning as it pertains to the Suisun Marsh.

Commissioner Cayler inquired if the commission will be provided a list of the changes that have been agreed upon and not agreed upon between the two ag committees before the commission is asked to vote on the changes.

Mr. Leland noted that both committees seem to have resolved much of the issues at hand. He stated that both committees have not as yet had the opportunity to take the matter to their respective boards for consideration, but believed that they will have done so prior to this item being brought back before the commission. Mr. Leland also noted that staff will have a list prepared to show where the two committees agree or disagree.

Commissioner Roads-Poston inquired about meteorological towers. She wanted to know if the objectives could be amended to add that safety markings be required for a tower higher than 150 feet, and keep the use as an administrative permit.

Mr. Leland stated that it could be approached that way however there may also be other instances on a property-by-property basis where there is a desire for additional setbacks from property lines beyond some minimum standard. For instance if a meteorological tower is located in an area where it is known that there is active aerial spraying there may be a desire for a larger than minimum setback. He said that staff preferred a minor use permit to address other unusual conditions on a specific property, but stated that the marking standards could be put into the code and the use could be left as an administrative permit.

Commissioner Roads-Poston stated that on top of the cost of building the tower, the permit fees seemed to be exorbitant over what the benefit of the tower may provide. Mr. Leland stated that these met towers are associated with wind farms which are multi-million dollar propositions and he did not believe the companies are particularly sensitive to the permitting costs of the towers.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston commented that she was under the impression that this was for the smaller towers that are erected on private properties. Mr. Leland stated that the permit for meteorological towers is basically for wind farm towers and associated with large scale wind projects.

Chairman Mahoney commented that the reason this has come about is due to the incident where a pilot hit a met tower. Mr. Mahoney commented that he was involved in the ag industry for 10 years and has observed aerial sprayers when they sprayed and noted that many times the pilot will have someone on the ground, on either end of the field, or they will mark the field. He stated that the pilot is going to see the tower. He said that some of the spraying planes hit the high tension lines and other things, and he did not want to say that this was acceptable, but for the pilot not to know what is in the field before he sprays is the fault of the spraying company. He commented that these planes will also fly inward of the property lines because they are worried about drift.

Chairman Mahoney stated that he is trying to understand why changing this permit would help when these spraying companies have to do their part and do their job which is to know what is in the field. Mr. Mahoney voiced his concern with the cost of the permit, as with all of these permits. He said that the county needs to remain economically competitive with surrounding counties and that this is his overriding concern to make sure that the county is economically competitive. Mr. Mahoney stated that the administrative permit still gives the county some kind of control in knowing where the uses are going to be and the ability to impose some specifications.

Commissioner Cayler commented that her husband is a former pilot and he has said time and time again that when an accident happens where a light plane or helicopter has run into high tension wires it because those wire cannot be seen. She said that when a pilot is up in the air and looking at the sky those wires become invisible. She said that is why a lot of the time high tension wires over water will have large balls attached so the pilots can see the wires. Ms. Cayler stated that she agreed the pilots should know what is in a field, but the pilots are out there spraying numerous fields and farms and ranches and sometimes are unfamiliar with that particular piece of property.

Mr. Leland pointed out that before this use was moved to an administrative permit it was a full use permit. He said that when the accident occurred, staff realized that there is no ability to condition these towers because the safety marking standards were not in the code. Mr. Leland stated that it is the commission's choice whether to add the standards in the code and leave it as an administrative permit or raise it to minor use permit.

Chairman Mahoney stated that in his experience over the years he has observed Alexander's Flying Service many times. He stated that they made sure that they knew what everything was in the field. He noted that he has been out of farming and of being around aerial spraying since the windmills were erected so he could not speak from experience with regard to those windmills. He stated that he was familiar with the high power lines that run through Dow Chemical by Collinsville, and the PG&E property, and has observed those pilots flying in and around that area and they had spotters on the ground. Mr. Mahoney did comment that he has also seen pilots do some crazy things. He suggested conditioning the administrative permit that if a met tower is over 150 feet it have safety markings.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston referred to roadside stands and asked for clarification on the definition of a roadside stand. She commented that years ago in driving through Brentwood and Antioch the stands were small and temporary and again she was concerned about the permit cost.

Mr. Leland explained that roadside stands are typically temporary structures that do not necessarily have a covered roof. He said the county only requires a minor use permit for stands above 2,500 square feet. He said that when the stand gets into that size range and greater they tend to morph into buildings. He said that the county has processed roadside stands that have air conditioned space, almost like a store, such as the one on Abernathy Road and Suisun Valley Road. He noted that these stands start to generate a lot of traffic off of county roads. Mr. Leland stated that staff has had people come in and inquire about 10,000 square foot roadside stands in air conditioned buildings. He said that roadside stands that are 1,000 square feet or less are allowed by right.

Chairman Mahoney asked staff if the permit costs of neighboring counties are looked at in determining permit fees. Mr. Leland stated that staff did not look at neighboring counties. He explained that staff presents the Board of Supervisors with what it cost to process an application in

terms of staff cost, and the Board's view is that the permittee should not bear the full cost because then the fees would be much higher. He said the Board makes a judgment call as to what is a reasonable fee for the kind of permit that is being sought. He said that the county does from time to time compare their fees to other counties and he said they are significantly less than some counties, in line with some, and greater than some. He said it is a mixed bag all around the state.

Chairman Mahoney gave an example of a use such as an agricultural research facility and the area around Dixon available for such a use and wondered how much Yolo County was charging because if it is going to be cheaper for the applicant to jump county lines, that is what they are going to do. He said if the county really wants to promote agriculture within Solano County then they need to pay attention to what Yolo County is doing.

Mr. Leland stated that he did not know off hand what Yolo County charges for that kind of permit. He said he was aware that this was a concern from the ag community and that is why staff created a small and a large version so the small ones could have a lesser permit fee. With respect to the area up in Dixon, Mr. Leland stated that that is going to become an ag industrial park and a different zoning will be created to implement that and he suspected those uses would be allowed by right in that district.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston asked about auctions and how they would be policed. Mr. Leland explained that currently there are firms who conduct auctions periodically up and down the state. He said it is not an individual property owner or a collection of property owners who want to sell or auction off something, it is a firm that specializes in bringing implements from a variety of farms and sources region-wide and putting on a major auction which could last 5 or 6 days. He said presently these companies are not allowed to hold auctions on ag properties even though they do, and so the county wants to acknowledge the use and impose some requirements. Mr. Leland stated that it does not affect the individual property owner who is selling equipment because they are retiring or going out of business, this is only for the commercial operation.

Chairman Mahoney inquired as to why this is not allowed under an administrative permit. Mr. Leland stated that an administrative permit can be crafted, but it would need to be thought through what the standards are that they are to be held to because the permit cannot be conditioned. Mr. Leland stated that unlike a smaller auction or sale at a private property in a private setting, these commercial operations generate a lot of traffic and so the county would want to be able to see that the connection to county roads is proper. He said that such an operation frequently requires dust control measures for parking areas. He stated that staff could write standards for that and make it an administrative permit, if that is the direction the commission would like to go.

Chairman Mahoney again commented about permitting costs and the impact on a farmer who is going out of business. Mr. Leland stated that this does not apply to the farmer going out of business. He is free to sell off whatever he wants and can hire an auctioneer to come in and conduct a sale for him on his own property of his own equipment. Mr. Leland explained that this is for someone who has obtained farm equipment from a variety of sources and picks a location in Solano County and brings the equipment here. He said the county would like some controls over that operation because it is far larger than what the private individual would be selling. He noted that the auctions can take place up to 3 times per year.

Chairman Mahoney asked if the county can put specifications on the administrative permit. Mr. Leland answered in the affirmative. He said that when a minor use permit is required is because there are not a lot of standards because there was not time to study that use. Mr. Leland stated that if the commission would like staff to downscale the permitting from a minor use permit to an administrative permit, staff could come back with proposed rules for the use under an administrative permit.

Chairman Mahoney again commented on cost. He stated that if it is cheaper to hold the auction in Yolo County, the applicant will go to Yolo County. Mr. Mahoney stated that these businesses bring in people who are going to patronize area restaurants and hotels so why would the county turn away that business. He said the county is in competition with neighboring counties. Mr. Mahoney said that he would like to see the permit be reduced to an administrative permit and impose standards to regulate the use.

Commissioner Rhoads-Poston wanted to know if it was possible to first find out what the two closest counties charge before reducing it to an administrative permit. Mr. Leland stated that staff could come back with a report on how Solano County is priced competitively with other counties. Ms. Rhoads-Poston stated that she would specifically like to see in the report Yolo, Napa, Santa Rosa, and San Joaquin counties.

Jim Laughlin commented on the permit fees. He explained that by law the fees the county charges cannot exceed the cost of providing the service. He said that the cost is the number the Board of Supervisors started with and then decided to ratchet those numbers down a bit to make it easier on the applicant. He said the true cost is what it costs the county to process the permit and to regulate that activity. He said the county has allocated some General Fund monies to help subsidize some of these permits and that means it is money that the county cannot spend on other services in order to help the applicant out and give them a lower price. Mr. Laughlin stated that the commission is not making the county's total cost any cheaper by lowering the price, it is just a decision of whether the applicant pay or the taxpayers at large pay for the county's cost in providing these services.

Chairman Mahoney stated that the best way to go is to charge less so the operator conducts their business in the county which generates more money for the county vs. if the county charges more and the operator goes to another county. Mr. Laughlin stated that this is part of the Board's calculus; the county as a whole is better off by encouraging these businesses to come here, and the taxpayers to the extent they receive some benefit by having the business here, they should chip in to pay the cost as well.

Mr. Laughlin stated that while staff has given a discussion about three different levels of permitting, the commission should keep in mind that there is actually a fourth level of regulation which is allowing some of these uses by right. He said the administrative permit is essentially identifying a use that the county wants to allow by right within the district as long as it meets certain conditions; it is imposing some level of regulation, but is saying that the county is comfortable allowing it by right anywhere within the district as long as it meets those conditions. He said if the commission wants to be a little more selective in choosing where within the zoning district it is appropriate, since there may be some locations within the zoning district that are decided not appropriate, then the use would need to go to the use permit stage. He said if the commission is happy with the use anywhere, for some of these uses the commission may want to consider allowing them by right as well which would reduce the cost considerably.

In response to Commissioner Cayler, Mr. Laughlin stated that an administrative permit is a much lower cost for the county to process and conduct its regulatory activity than a major use permit

Mr. Leland stated that it is important the commission bear in mind that one of the values of a minor use permit over an administrative permit is that there is some discretion over what location the use can occur in. He said if the commission feels that an auction that runs for 7 days and into the evening, with patrons coming and going, and the firing up of heavy equipment can occur on any ag zoned parcel anywhere in the county regardless of what the neighboring conditions are, then the administrative permit or making it allowed by right would make sense. Mr. Leland explained that staff's experience is that sometimes people get sensitive to abnormal uses arriving on the neighboring parcels and so that should be a consideration. He noted that some of the concerns can be mitigated with the regulations that are written for an administrative permit, but every conceivable locational difference that might crop up in the county when considering a particular use cannot be anticipated, and so it would be more advantageous to require a use permit of one variety or another.

Chairman Mahoney stated that he could picture a problem occurring if someone were to bring this activity to an area such as to the outskirts of Rio Vista, but conducting it on a 160 acre parcel where the neighbors are further away are probably not going to complain much.

Mr. Leland stated that staff can use tools such as minimum setbacks for the use to distance it from neighbors and the like.

Since there were no further questions, Chairman Mahoney opened the public hearing.

Larry Clement, Fairfield, consultant to the Solano County Farm Bureau stated that he served on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the General Plan update and is proud of the fact that he pushed hard to get an Agricultural Chapter which is something the county has never had before. He commented that he, along with several others, wrote the chapter. He stated that this is the first bit of rules that is going to add substance to the plan. He commented that the general plan has an unwritten theme about economic viability for agriculture. Mr. Clement thanked staff for their hard work and stated that everyone involved has done a great job. He said staff has taken seriously what the farmers think and the importance of the ag industry and the tax revenue it provides. He said that with a little incentive it can provide a lot more.

Russ Lester, Winters, stated that he has been farming in the county for the past 30+ years. He stated that he is the Chairman of the Ag Advisory Committee and also chairman of the committee that met for many hours with planning staff to try and work through some of the proposed regulations. He thanked staff for their time. Mr. Lester stated that this process started right after the adoption of the General Plan. He stated that the committee adopted what is before the commission last week by unanimous vote.

Mr. Lester stated that most of the details have been worked through as far as differences between the Farm Bureau and the Ag Advisory Committee recommendations. He briefly spoke to several items at hand. He stated that the permit fees are important because they give the county revenue to offset some of the expenses that are involved with these permits, and as stated earlier, it is already subsidized. He stated that although an applicant is going to, or already have paid the fees, it is important to realize that it is not a full cost that is being beared for those permits. He stated that the county is subsidizing the cost from the taxpayers which goes to someone's individual business plan.

He noted that the fees are a one-time fee and there are no annual costs. Mr. Lester stated that he believed one thing that needs to be balanced is the fact that the county does need to be competitive and not be onerous, but at the same time the county should want quality applicants that are going to conduct quality business. He said that we do not want to make the fees so low that the county attracts fly by night outfits doing something that folks do not want to see happen next to their property.

Mr. Lester stated that one impact that has been brought forward is the impact of bicycles on the agricultural area. He said the same is true with these kinds of actions out in the country. He stated that it took a long time trying to balance the two between the ability to control and allow the staff to control what happens, and at the same time the ability of the existing landowners to do what they do. He said that if there is too much traffic in the area then the farmer cannot farm. He said it becomes uneconomic. He said the same thing is true if there becomes too much activity and the police cannot control it, then the farmer cannot farm and he loses money. Mr. Lester commented that last year he had \$70,000 worth of equipment stolen off of his property. He stated that it was a huge cost to him as a business and he had to come up with \$40,000 to buy back the items that were destroyed.

Mr. Lester stated that another thing that is important to note is that the administrative permit does not require public notification and so neighbors are not alerted to what is being permitted next to their property, and as a consequence do not have the opportunity to comment. He said it is a different, lower threshold for an administrative permit vs. a minor use permit. Mr. Lester said that they have spent a lot of time balancing these issues and he believes that they have come up with a pretty good plan. He stated that between themselves and the farm bureau they would ask the commission for support. Mr. Lester commented that he also farms in Yolo County and the permit fees seem to be comparable to Solano County.

Joe Martinez appeared before the commission. He stated that he farms in Northern Solano County and has since 1965. He stated that prior to that he farmed in Yolo County and now farms in both counties. He also complimented staff for their hard work. He stated that he believes that they have a good process and a good way of airing out differences and coming up ultimately with some good guidelines and zoning. Mr. Martinez noted that he is President of the Solano County Farm Bureau. He stated that they have some differences in opinion with some of the recommendations made by staff as well as differences with the Ag Advisory Committee. He stated that one of the areas that they still differ in is under agricultural processing facilities for aquaculture. He stated that he believes that would be a processing plant for fish or other products grown under aquaculture and would suggest that the commission look at a tiered system of small, medium and large where a small fish processor would require an administrative permit, a medium an minor use permit and a large a major use permit. He believed that it makes it difficult for a small time processor to have to pay those kinds of permit fees since they are also going to have to get permits from the Building Department, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Fish and Game, Fish & Wildlife, plus others.

Mr. Martinez stated that another area of concern is they would like to see added in the definition retirement sales, charity fundraiser, auctions, and for example, a community round up sale. He explained that a professional auctioneer would be brought in but the proceeds would go to a charity such as a community based group like the 4H club, Saturday Club or Garden Club. Mr. Martinez stated that the definition should be expanded in case the current staff or planning commission is not around in 5 or 10 years and some of these things might be left to interpretation. He said their concern would be that either another category or an exemption be written and included.

Mr. Martinez spoke with regard to slaughterhouses. Again, he urged the commission to include categories or brackets for small, medium, and large. He talked about Yolo County where they have just permitted a resale and processing plant for meat products which is going to be a great boom to farmers in that county. He stated livestock producers in Solano County, under USDA standards, have to ship their beef out of county to get it slaughtered then bring the beef back to a facility like the one in Yolo County. He stated that he certainly does not have a problem with a facility such as Superior Meats which is slaughtering 300 to 400 animals a day, but it should be taken into consideration for a small slaughterhouse who might only slaughter 1,000 animals in an entire year. With regard to cottage industries, he said this needs to be looked at especially in looking at a Type I use and what their requirements would be. He stated that the needs of everyone might be better served with having this as an administrative permit and the Type II use as a minor or major use permit.

Mr. Martinez spoke with regard to agricultural research facilities. He said that there are numerous seed companies and they are all located in Yolo County. He stated that this is something that needs to be addressed because if Solano County is going to have a viable agricultural industry we need agricultural support facilities and these types of research facilities. Mr. Martinez stated that he is proud of Solano County and is tired of losing business to Yolo County.

Mr. Martinez referred to temporary ag tourism. He stated that the Farm Bureau would propose that farmers markets and seasonal sales lots be under an administrative permit. He commented that certified farmers markets by law are regulated by the Agricultural Commissioner who is in charge of certifying the farmers and issuing the certificates, as well as regulations that are imposed by the Department of Food and Agriculture.

Mr. Martinez stated that another area of concern deals with agricultural services. With regard to trucking services and facilities, Mr. Martinez stated that the farm bureau would propose that rather than basing the trucking on acreage it should be based on number of trucks. For example 1 to 5 trucks be an administrative permit; 6 to 10 a minor use permit; and 11 trucks or more a major use permit. He commented that if a person knows how to drive a truck and how to park it, a lot of trucks can be parked on 1 acre. Mr. Martinez spoke to custom farm services and believed that the definition needs to be clarified. He said that it would be a business which provides support services other than trucking to agricultural facilities. He said custom farm services do not include ordinary agricultural operations such as field leveling, discing, irrigation installation, harvesting, cultivation, etc. He said it needs to be looked at what is usual, customary, and reasonable.

Mr. Martinez stated that he and his family have been farming in this county since 1965. He stated that to keep farming operations in this county economically viable so that the farmer can make a profit, pay his property taxes, and do all the other good things that need to be done there needs to be zoning and plan. He said that he has heard people in Solano County say that they love farmers and want to keep them in business, and his comment is then don't make it impossible for them to farm and produce food and fiber in this county. He stated that he wants to encourage these agricultural supply and service people to come into the county. He said that he would like to see research facilities come in and fertilizer companies relocate here. He stated that he would also like to see the expansion of the Campbell's Soup Company.

Mr. Martinez commented on a situation where one of the fire departments was requiring fire sprinklers in hay buildings. He stated that Yolo County does not have that requirement. He noted

that sprinklers could cost anywhere from \$20 to \$50,000 depending on the size of the building. Mr. Martinez stated that this requirement has just been lifted and now he understands that one of the major hay growers in this county is coming back with 11 new hay barns. He stated that these are the kinds of businesses and activities that this county needs.

Mr. Martinez stated that the farm bureau will work with county staff, the ag advisory committee and the planning commission in accomplishing these goals.

Chairman Mahoney asked Mr. Martinez his views on ag tourism. Mr. Martinez gave a personal example. He stated that their ranch hosted the Chinese Trade Mission and the Chinese Ambassador from San Francisco. He said that he did not believe that any kind of a permit should be necessary for something like that. He said that if he wanted to bring out groups of people to tour his farm on a regular basis or at harvest time he believed that those uses, if anything should be done under an administrative permit. Mr. Martinez commented on the Center For Land Based Learning on Putah Creek Road. He stated that the county needs to encourage more facilities like this, and by requiring a major use permit and having someone pay nearly \$6,000 in fees for zoning above and beyond all the other fees that they are going to have to pay, could tend to discourage that.

Since there were no further speakers, Chairman Mahoney closed the public hearing.

Jim Leland noted that staff will incorporate the comments that have been received and will continue working with the farm bureau and the ag advisory committee on the final two items. He stated that staff will bring this back before the commission in the form of a draft ordinance in early September. He also noted that staff will prepare a report showing fee comparisons with other counties.

4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS and REPORTS**

Mike Yankovich noted that the Board of Supervisors will be considering at their next meeting the Tree of Life zoning text amendment that recently came before the commission.

5. Since there was no further business, the meeting was **adjourned**.