

PART TWO: PRODUCER SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Key themes and general results from both the Producer and Public Surveys are presented in the Executive Summary (Part One) of this Humboldt County Agriculture Survey Report. Part Two examines results from both the Public and Producer surveys in greater detail. Part Two results can be used to highlight where group opinions and familiarity with policies differ from one another. A complete list of all survey questions and results is presented in Part Three. Part Two results are categorized and examined in the following order on the following pages:

<u>Agricultural Landowners and Producers</u>	
Producer Groups	16
Acre Groups	19
Zip Code Groups	21
Ag Membership Groups	24
Willing to Sell	27
Conservation Policy Support Index	30
Demographics	33
<u>General Public</u>	
Purchase of Development Rights Program	35
Purchase of Development Rights Support Index	37
Zip Code Groups	40
Demographics	43

Ag Producer Results **PRODUCER GROUPS**

The following ‘Producer Groups’ section categorizes survey results into specific agriculture producer groups represented in the Humboldt County Agriculture Survey.

Producer Group Demographics

Table 1. presents a comparison of producer groups results. The five producer groups include: ‘Dairy’, ‘Beef’, ‘Veg-Fruit’, ‘Nursery’, and ‘Timber’. The Dairy group includes producers in the survey whose primary Ag production is dairy and or hay / pasture feed production. The Beef group includes the cattle ranchers of Humboldt County. The Veg-Fruit group includes producers whose primary Ag operations are row crop vegetables or fruit (mainly apples, blueberries and grapes). The Nursery group includes plant, tree, flower and bulb producers. Sheep and Goat groups had too few primary producers for comparison (13 and 5 respectively). The majority of the Timber group (57%) also produce cattle. The majority of Timber and Beef producers operate on 1000 acres or greater, and the majority of Veg-Fruit and Nursery producers operate on less than 20 acres. The

majority of Dairy producers range from 50 to 499 acres. Beef producers represent over 332,000 acres and Dairy represent over 59,000 acres in this survey.

Table 1. Producer Group Demographics

<u>Producer Group:</u>	<u>Dairy</u>	<u>Veg-Fruit</u>	<u>Beef</u>	<u>Nursery</u>	<u>Timber</u>
% Of total survey respondents	24%	22%	31%	8%	15%
# Survey Respondents	88	78	113	27	54
Avg. (mean) acres in production	704	364	3,077	33	4,222
Avg. (median) acres in Production	200	10	1,150	3	1,300
Total acres (sum) represented	59,103	25,125	332,312	758	206,891
% Affiliated w/ Farm Bureau	78%	40%	73%	19%	76%
% Affiliated w/ Buckeye Conservancy	17%	3%	44%	0%	48%
% Affiliated w/ Cattlemen's Assoc.	14%	4%	49%	0%	41%
% Affiliated w/ Farmer's Mkt. Assoc.	2%	31%	1%	63%	0%
Avg. (mean) age	60	54	60	49	59
% Ag is primary occupation	59%	43%	58%	62%	55%
% Ag primary source of household income	58%	36%	45%	40%	43%
% Total annual income > \$60,000	53%	26%	58%	4%	61%
% Ag Landowners	90%	79%	94%	78%	93%
% w/ increasing profits over past 5 yrs.	22%	44%	11%	42%	12%
% Expecting increasing profits in next 5 yrs.	20%	63%	11%	68%	19%
% Purchasing > 75% of Ag supplies locally	58%	46%	64%	19%	65%
% w/ Ag lands enrolled in Williamson Act	24%	6%	40%	4%	47%
% w/ Ag operations restricted by adjacent land use	30%	19%	25%	19%	27%
% Without an heir to continue Ag operation when they retire	37%	65%	27%	50%	21%
Willing to Sell: 5-15 years	42%	36%	25%	20%	35%
Conservation Index: high support	43%	58%	42%	56%	44%

Attitudes About Agriculture

All producer groups strongly value local agriculture. Over 75% of all groups agree that their Ag properties should be used by future generations for agriculture. Over 80% of all

groups agree that the loss of Ag land is a present threat to production in Humboldt County. The majority of all groups believe that county Ag production will decrease in the next 10 years (high of Beef / Timber 82% to low of Veg-Fruit 56%). All groups strongly agree that Ag land availability is limiting producers from expanding operations (high of Dairy 87% to low of Nursery 60%). Over 80% of all producers groups agree residential development is reducing the amount of productive Ag land. Over 75% of all groups agree real estate prices have made it difficult to purchase or lease land for production (high of Beef 96%, Dairy 95% to low of Nursery 77%). While over 65% of the Dairy, Beef and Timber groups view the conversion of private Ag land to non-Ag uses as an entirely / mostly private decision, the majority of Nursery (66%) and Veg-fruit (59%) groups view Ag land conversion as a more public issue.

Ag Land Conservation: Policies and Programs

Over 75% of all groups (except Timber 67%) agree county zoning should be used to keep Ag land secure for future production. Over 70% of all producer groups agree that urban growth boundaries should be used to protect Ag lands from residential development. Over 70% of Dairy, Beef and Timber groups are familiar with the Williamson Act, compared to Nursery (15%) and Veg-Fruit (44%) groups. Timber (62%), Beef (56%) and Dairy (52%) are most familiar with Ag conservation easements, compared with Veg-Fruit (42%) and Nursery (33%).

Over 70% of all producer groups support the concept of Ag conservation easements (purchase of development rights) to prevent the loss of productive Ag lands (high of Veg-Fruit 84% to low of Dairy 72%). 60% of Veg-Fruit producers would support a local sales tax to fund such a program, compared to Beef (40%) and Dairy (39%) groups.

Over 75% of all groups agree that improving the agricultural economy (through product diversification and value-added processing) will increase profits and keep land in production. Over 80% of all groups have made business improvements over the past 5 years to increase profits.

Regulations and Government

All producer groups rank regulations as the top threat to Ag production in Humboldt County. The majority of all groups agree that government acquisition of Ag land is reducing the amount of land in production (Beef 96%, Dairy 91% compared to Nursery 67%, Veg-Fruit 65%). Even though the majority of dairy, beef and timber producers have participated in government programs to improve their Ag operations, only 30% to 35% of all producer groups agree local government places any priority on keeping Ag land in production. Over 70% of all producer groups agree government should take more responsibility to assist Ag producers.

The majority of Dairy (62%), Beef (57%) and Timber (58%) producers state that current regulations have forced them to think about selling their land or retiring. Over 70% of all groups support more ‘appropriate’ regulations that could have a more positive impact on Ag production and land use. Over 60% of all producer groups agree that regulations currently limit their ability to make business and land improvements. The majority of Dairy, Beef and Timber producers feel that water quality regulations are hurting their Ag business, compared to just 15% of Nursery and Veg-Fruit producers.

Ag Producer Results

ACRE GROUPS

The 'Acre Groups' section categorizes results into six different groups depending on producers' listed acres of land under ownership and agricultural production. Results can be used to highlight where opinions and familiarity with policies differ from one another based on size of Ag operations. The following is a summary of acre group results; a complete list of survey questions and results is presented in Part Three of this report.

Acre Group Demographics

Table 2. presents a comparison of acre groups results. 265 producers are represented in this analysis (approximately 35 producers did not list acreage in the survey). Producers represent approximately 374,037 acres of agricultural land in Humboldt County. The '1000+ acres' group is the largest with 69 respondents, followed by the '1-9 acres' group with 48 respondents. Average and total acres by producer groups are presented in Table 1. Only the 1-9 acre group has been in business less than 20 years. This group is also the youngest in age and makes the least amount of money. This group also ranks highest in expected profit increases and is located closest to residential development. This next generation of Ag producers will most likely need to grow in size over the long term and need affordable and available Ag land to do so.

Table 2. Acre Group Demographics

<u>Acre Group:</u>	<u>1-9</u>	<u>10-49</u>	<u>50-179</u>	<u>180-499</u>	<u>500-999</u>	<u>1000+</u>
% Of total survey respondents	18%	17%	17%	16%	6%	26%
# Survey Respondents	48	45	45	42	16	69
Avg. (mean) age	50	59	61	57	61	58
≥ 20 yrs. in Ag business	30%	71%	92%	80%	90%	92%
>75% operating acres owned v. leased	78%	86%	83%	62%	63%	67%
% Ag is primary occupation	52%	29%	49%	68%	40%	73%
% Ag primary source of household income	36%	29%	39%	59%	44%	62%
% w/ Ag lands enrolled in Williamson Act	0%	0%	20%	33%	50%	61%
% Total annual income > \$60,000	23%	36%	33%	62%	60%	61%
% w/ increasing profits over past 5 yrs.	52%	17%	27%	25%	27%	17%
% Expecting increasing profits in next 5 yrs.	57%	26%	26%	20%	8%	24%
Located w/in 2 miles of urban / res. development	77%	64%	58%	44%	69%	35%
Restricted by adjacent non-Ag land use	19%	14%	18%	28%	43%	22%
Land availability limiting growth of business	43%	50%	46%	58%	63%	62%
Have an estate plan	6%	11%	32%	45%	31%	53%

Table 2. continued...	<u>1-9</u>	<u>10-49</u>	<u>50-179</u>	<u>180-499</u>	<u>500-999</u>	<u>1000+</u>
% With an heir to continue Ag operation when they retire	32%	47%	56%	71%	63%	80%
Conservation policy support index: high	67%	40%	47%	38%	50%	51%
Willing to sell w/in 5-15 yrs.	26%	37%	49%	30%	50%	25%

Attitudes About Agriculture

All six acre-groups are supportive of and strongly value local agriculture. All groups are concerned about the loss of available agricultural lands. The majority of all groups believe that county Ag production will decrease within the next ten years. Over 85% of all groups agree that real estate prices have made it difficult to purchase or lease land for production. In general, the 1-9 acre and 10-49 acre groups are slightly more optimistic about the future availability of Ag land and less pessimistic about current threats to Ag land availability. While over 90% of producers managing 50 acre or greater view government acquisition as reducing the amount of Ag land for production in Humboldt County, the 1-9 acre and 10-49 acre groups feel less threatened (57% and 77%, respectively). The majority of all groups (except the 1-9-acre group at 34%) agree that the conversion of private Ag land to non-Ag uses is 'entirely' or 'mostly' a private matter.

Ag Land Conservation: Policies and Programs

Over 70% of all acre groups agree that county zoning is a good way to keep Ag land secure for future production (high of 1-9 acre group 89% to low of 1000+ acre group 79%, 500-999 acre group 72%). Over 75% of all groups support urban growth boundaries as a means of protecting Ag land from further conversion to non-Ag uses. Over 80% of the 1-9 acre, 500-999 acre and 1000+ acre groups support the concept of a Purchase of Development Rights program, compared to 66% of the 180-499 acre group and 70% of the 10-49 acre group. A large majority of all acre groups are willing to change production or produce value-added products to increase profits (high of 1000+ acre group 87% to low of 1-9 acre 68%). The majority of all groups support increasing local markets (high of 1-9 acre group 94% to low of 500-999 acre group 63%).

Regulations and Government

The majority of all groups agree that local government should take more responsibility to assist landowners (high of 1000+ acre group 78% to low of 500-999 acre group 52%). In general, the more acres owned, the greater likelihood that producers feel overregulated. All groups rank regulations / permitting as the number one threat to Ag production in Humboldt County (except the 1-9 acre group who rank economics as the major threat). The majority of all groups agree that regulations limit one's ability to make business improvements (high of 1000+ acre group 81% to low of 1-9 acre group 50%), and that regulations have forced them to consider selling their Ag land or retiring (high of 50-179 acre group 67% to low of 1-9 acre group 23%). As the size of an Ag operation increases, it is more likely that water quality regulations negatively impact business. At the same time, as the size of an Ag operation increases it is more likely that one has participated in a government program to improve operations and that one has done land restoration work on without government assistance.

Ag Producer Results

ZIP CODE GROUPS

The Ag 'Zip Code Groups' section categorizes survey results into eight groups based on geographic location. Results can be used to highlight where geographic group opinions and familiarity with policies differ from one another. The following is a summary of zip code group results; a complete list of survey questions and results is presented in Part Three of this report.

Zip Code Group Demographics

Table 3. presents a comparison of demographic and attitudinal survey results; it is broken up into two section representing eight different geographic areas. The most represented group is the Ferndale group at 28%, and the least represented group is the McKinleyville group at 5%. Arcata group's largest acre group is 1-9 acres (32% of producers) and is evenly distributed up to 499 acres. Eureka group's largest acre group is 50-179 acres (50% of producers). 49% of the Ag producers in the Redcrest group produce on less than 50 acres and 34% produce on greater than 1000 acres. 71% of the Kneeland group manages over 1000 acres. Eureka, McKinleyville and Fortuna groups have the smallest percentage of full time producers and with Ag as their primary source of household income. 87% of the Ferndale group have an heir to continue operations, compared to Kneeland (66%), Fortuna (47%) and Arcata (46%).

Table 3. Part 1. Zip Code Group Demographics

<u>Zip Code Groups 1.:</u>	<u>Arcata</u>	<u>Eureka</u>	<u>McKinley-ville Group</u>	<u>Orleans Group</u>
Areas represented	Arcata, Bayside	Eureka	McKin, Korbelt, Blue Lake, Orick, Trinidad	Orleans, Hoopa, Willow Creek
% of total survey respondents	14%	8%	5%	6%
# Survey Respondents	34	21	13	14
Avg. (mean) age	58	57	55	53
Average (mean) acres	401	199	214	358
% Ag is primary occupation	56%	38%	31%	57%
% Ag primary source of household income	42%	33%	23%	43%
% w/ increasing profits over past 5 yrs.	30%	37%	15%	36%
Restricted by adjacent non-Ag land use	34%	38%	31%	15%
Land availability limiting growth of business	60%	58%	20%	39%
Real estate prices limit land availability	88%	90%	92%	85%
Support for strong county Ag zoning	83%	71%	82%	86%
Expect land to be in Ag 50 yrs. from now	80%	45%	54%	85%
% w/ Ag lands enrolled in Williamson Act	13%	10%	8%	15%

Table 3. Part 1. continued...	<u>Arcata</u>	<u>Eureka</u>	<u>McKin Group</u>	<u>Orleans Group</u>
% With an heir to continue Ag operation when they retire	46%	47%	55%	55%
Have an estate plan	36%	48%	23%	14%
Conservation policy support index: high	38%	38%	39%	50%

Table 3. Part 2. Zip Code Group Demographics

<u>Zip Code Groups 2.:</u>	<u>Ferndale Group</u>	<u>Fortuna Group</u>	<u>Redcrest Group</u>	<u>Kneeland Group</u>
Areas represented	Ferndale, Loleta	Fortuna, Carlotta, Hydesville	Redcrest, Rio Dell, Weott, Scotia, Piercy, Myers Flat, Redway, Garberville, Phillipsville, Whitethorn	Kneeland, Alderpoint, Blocksburg, Bridgeville, Petrolia, Honeydew
% of total survey respondents	28%	13%	15%	11%
# Survey Respondents	70	32	39	29
Avg. (mean) age	58	64	52	57
Average (mean) acres	1,858	379	2,434	2,667
% Ag is primary occupation	65%	34%	49%	64%
% Ag primary source of household income	65%	35%	39%	48%
% w/ increasing profits over past 5 yrs.	26%	17%	34%	7%
Restricted by adjacent non-Ag land use	11%	31%	17%	17%
Land availability limiting growth of business	60%	60%	44%	58%
Real estate prices limit land availability	94%	93%	97%	97%
Support for strong county Ag zoning	86%	81%	85%	78%
Expect land to be in Ag 50 yrs. from now	87%	57%	78%	75%
% w/ Ag lands enrolled in Williamson Act	41%	23%	19%	64%
% With an heir to continue Ag operation when they retire	79%	47%	57%	66%
Have an estate plan	46%	20%	11%	31%
Conservation policy support index: high	54%	41%	54%	48%

Table 4. breaks down zip groups by producer types. As expected, Ferndale and Fortuna are dominated by dairy and beef producers, Arcata is quite balanced in producer groups, the Orleans and Redcrest groups are dominated by the vegetable and fruit producers, and the Kneeland group is dominated by beef and timber.

Table 4. Producer groups represented within each zip code group

<u>Producer Types:</u>	<u>Dairy</u>	<u>Veg-Fruit</u>	<u>Beef</u>	<u>Nursery</u>	<u>Timber</u>
Arcata Group	28%	28%	23%	12%	9%
Eureka Group	24%	15%	31%	15%	15%
McKin. Group	9%	16%	34%	16%	25%
Orleans Group	0%	64%	12%	12%	12%
Ferndale Group	46%	5%	36%	0%	13%
Fortuna Group	40%	13%	30%	4%	13%
Redcrest Group	7%	50%	22%	4%	18%
Kneeland Group	5%	10%	54%	2%	29%

Attitudes About Agriculture

Over 80% of all zip code groups agree that loss of Ag land is a present threat to Ag production in Humboldt County (high of Eureka 95% to low of McKinleyville group 80%). Over 85% of all groups agree that real estate prices have made it difficult to purchase or lease land for production. Arcata, McKinleyville, Fortuna and Eureka producers, all located around population centers, feel the most restricted by adjacent non-Ag land use. 60% of the Arcata, Ferndale and Fortuna groups feel land availability is limiting their growth, compared to Redcrest (44%), Orleans (33%) and McKinleyville (20%). Zip group responses differ as to whether producers believe that their current Ag operations will be around 50 years from now (high of Ferndale group 87% to low of Eureka 45%).

Ag Land Conservation: Policies and Programs

A significant majority of all groups agree that county zoning is a good way to keep Ag land secure for future production (high of Ferndale group 86% to low of Eureka 71%). Over 85% of the Arcata, Eureka, Orleans and Fortuna groups state that their Ag operations are located within 2 miles of urban or residential development. Over 30% of the Arcata, Eureka, Fortuna and McKinleyville groups have had their Ag operations restricted by adjacent non-Ag land use, compared to 17% of the Redcrest group and 11% of the Ferndale group. Over 70% of most groups support the development of urban growth boundaries that promote the protection of agricultural production (Eureka 86%, Ferndale 80%, Arcata 74%, Fortuna 72% and McKinleyville 67%). Over 70% of all groups (except McKinleyville 63%) support the concept of a purchase of development rights program to protect private Ag land and scenic open space properties in Humboldt County.

Regulations and Government

The majority of most zip code groups agree that regulations have forced producers to think about selling their land or retiring from agriculture (high of McKinleyville group 73%, Eureka 68%, to low of Ferndale group 48%, Orleans group 23%). A majority of all zip code groups agree that regulations limit their ability to make business and land improvements. A strong majority of all groups agree that government should take more responsibility to assist Ag producers in Humboldt County (highs of Eureka, Redcrest and Kneeland groups 85% to lows of Fortuna 63% and McKinleyville 58%). The majority of all groups agree that government acquisition is reducing the amount of Ag land for production in Humboldt County and that these lands are not used effectively.

Ag Producer Results

AGRICULTURE MEMBERSHIP GROUPS

The 'Agricultural Membership Groups' section categorizes survey results into five prominent Humboldt County, non-government agriculture membership organizations. Results can be used to highlight where membership group opinions and familiarity with policies differ from one another. The following is a summary of Ag group-specific results; a complete list of survey questions and results is presented in Part Three of this report.

Agriculture Membership Group Demographics

Table 5. presents a comparison of Ag membership groups results. The five groups include: 1) the Farm Bureau of Humboldt County, 2) the Humboldt-Del Norte County Cattlemens Association, 3) the Buckeye Conservancy, 4) the Farmers Market Association (a.k.a. Northcoast Growers Association), and 5) the Humboldt County Woolgrowers Association. The Farm Bureau is most represented in this section with 49% of the total, and the Woolgrowers Association is the least represented group with 6% of the total. The Woolgrowers average the oldest in age and the Farmers Market group is the youngest. The Buckeye Conservancy (74%) has the highest percentage of members as full time producers and the Farm Bureau (49%) has the least. The Farmers Market group expects the most growth in business and profits over the next five years (61%). The Cattlemens Assoc. has the most members enrolled in the Williamson Act (58%).

Table 5. Ag Membership Group Demographics

<u>Ag Member Group:</u>	<u>Farm Bureau</u>	<u>Cattlemens Assoc.</u>	<u>Buckeye Conservancy</u>	<u>Farmers Market</u>	<u>Woolgrowers Assoc.</u>
% Of total survey respondents	49%	18%	16%	11%	6%
# Survey Respondents	184	65	61	39	23
Avg. (mean) acres in production	1,795	4,625	4,463	252	2,315
Avg. (median) acres in Production	270	2,000	1,700	5	1,700
Avg. (mean) age	59	56	56	47	63
% Ag is primary occupation	56%	69%	74%	72%	61%
% Ag primary source of household income	49%	54%	58%	55%	57%
% Total annual income > \$60,000	55%	70%	64%	14%	54%
% Ag Landowners	89%	89%	87%	72%	96%
% w/ increasing profits over past 5 yrs.	21%	14%	22%	49%	4%
% Expecting increasing profits in next 5 yrs.	22%	21%	25%	61%	23%
% Purchasing > 75% of Ag supplies locally	62%	62%	71%	34%	78%
% w/ Ag lands enrolled in Williamson Act	37%	58%	55%	3%	39%
% w/ Ag operations restricted by adjacent land use	23%	26%	28%	29%	19%

Table 5. continued:	Farm Bureau	Cattlemens Assoc.	Buckeye Conservancy	Farmers Market	Woolgrowers Assoc.
Willing to Sell: 5-15 yr	35%	24%	21%	27%	35%
Conservation Index: high support	45%	51%	56%	67%	65%
% Without an heir to continue Ag operation	34%	24%	25%	52%	38%

Attitudes About Agriculture

All five groups strongly support and value local agriculture. All groups are concerned about the loss of available agricultural lands and real estate prices. The majority of all groups believe that the current pace of Ag land conversion is too fast (high of Buckeye 80% to low of Farm Bureau low 58%). All groups agree that Ag land availability is limiting producers (high of Buckeye 87% to low of Farmers Market Assoc. 66%). Approximately 90% of all groups (except Farmers Market Assoc.) blame real estate prices and government acquisition for limited land availability. When asked if ‘you need to expand operations to have a profitable business’, answers ranged from a Farmers Market Association high of 76% to a Farm Bureau low of 59%. When asked if ‘you expect your Ag land to be productive 50 years from now’, answers ranged from a Buckeye high of 80% to a Woolgrowers low of 66%. Over 80% of all groups agree that their Ag property should be used by future generations for agriculture.

Ag Land Conservation: Policies and Programs

Over 75% of all groups agree county zoning should be used to keep Ag land secure for future production. Over 75% of all groups support ‘urban growth boundaries’. 74% of the Farmers Market Association members are located within 2 miles of urban / residential development, compared to 49% of Farm Bureau and 41% of Buckeye Conservancy members. The Farmers Market Association have been the most restricted by adjacent non-Ag land use, at 29%. 74% of the Farmers Market group is supportive of Ag land protection within city limits, compared to 35% and below from all other groups. Over 70% of all groups support the concept of a Purchase of Development Rights program in Humboldt County (high of Buckeye 91% to low of Farm Bureau 67%). When asked about supporting a local sales tax to fund such a program, support ranged from Woolgrowers and Farmers Market Assoc. high of 64%, Buckeye Conservancy 51% to a low of Farm Bureau low at 40%.

Over 80% of all groups have made business improvements over the past 5 years to increase profits, and over 80% of all groups support improving the agricultural economy (i.e., product diversification and value-added processing) as a way of increasing profits and keeping land in production. 76% of the Farmers Market Assoc. members believe they need to expand operations to have a profitable business, compared to 65% of Cattlemen members and 59% of Farm Bureau members.

A large majority of all groups are familiar with agricultural zoning, the Williamson Act (except for the Farmers Market Association at 31% familiar), and Ag conservation easements (except for the Farmers Market Association at 41% familiar). The majority of all groups are not familiar with right-to-farm laws or Farmland Security Zones. Support for Williamson Act contracts for small acre operations ranged Farmers Market Assoc. high of 86% to Farm Bureau low of 65%. Members of the Cattlemen’s Association (70%) and

the Buckeye Conservancy (83%) have gone to at least one meeting where conservation easements were discussed, compared to the Farm Bureau (42%) and the Farmers Market Association (27%).

Regulations and Government

Less than 35% of all groups agree that local government places a priority on protecting productive Ag lands, while over 70% of all groups agree government should do more to assist Ag producers. Over 50% of all groups have participated in government programs aimed at improving operations (except the Farmers Market Association at 13%). All Ag member groups rank regulations / permitting as the top threat to Ag production in Humboldt County. The majority of all groups feel that regulations limit one's ability to make business and land improvements (high of Cattlemens Assoc. 81% to low of Farmers Market Assoc. 61%). Approximately 80% of all groups agree that 'appropriate' regulations can have a more positive impact on production and land use. Negative impacts from water quality regulations ranged from a Buckeye Conservancy high of 74% to a Farmers Market Assoc. low of 15%.

Ag Producer Results

WILLING TO SELL AG PROPERTY

The ‘willing to sell Ag property’ section categorizes survey results into two groups: 1) landowners who agree that they may sell all or part of their agricultural properties within the next five to fifteen years, and 2) landowners who do not agree to selling their Ag properties within the next five to fifteen years. The following is a summary of ‘willing to sell’ results; a complete list of survey questions and results is presented in Part Three of this report.

Willing To Sell Group Demographics

Table 6. presents a comparison of results with demographic survey questions. Out of the 264 landowners who responded to this survey question, 66% (175 producers) responded that they will not sell, and 34% (89 producers) responded that they may sell in five to fifteen years. Ag producers may cumulatively sell over 28,000 acres in the next five years and over 79,000 acres within the next 15 years. A strong majority of all Ag landowners desire to keep their properties in agricultural production beyond their ownership, regardless of whether they plan to sell their Ag properties (78%) or not sell(84%). Characteristics that define the ‘willing to sell’ group are: 1) more likely to have had decreasing profits over the past five years and to expect decreasing profits over the next five years, 2) much less likely to have an heir to continue Ag operations when they retire, and 3) more likely to be located within two miles of residential development. Attitudes about regulations and Ag being the primary occupation are also defining differences between the two groups. Those willing to sell are less likely to support zoning regulations Ag conservation easements. Age and income are not significantly different between groups.

Table 6. Willing to Sell Group Demographics

	Willing to Sell 5-15 years	Not Willing to Sell 5-15 years
% Of total survey respondents	34%	66%
# Survey Respondents	89	175
Acres Represented	79,019	282,645
Avg. (mean) age	58	57
% Ag is primary occupation	45%	56%
% Ag primary source of household income	42%	46%
% Total annual income > \$60,000	43%	48%
% w/ increasing profits over past 5 yrs.	19%	30%
% w/ decreasing profits over past 5 yrs.	42%	29%
% Expecting decreasing profits in next 5 yrs.	44%	28%
% w/ Ag lands enrolled in Williamson Act	35%	36%
Desire to keep property in Ag for future generations	78%	84%

Table 6. continued...	Willing to Sell	Not Selling
% w/ Ag operations restricted by adjacent land use	23%	22%
% With an heir to continue Ag operation when they retire	34%	73%
Located w/in 2 miles of residential development	65%	49%
Made business improvements over past 5 years	82%	81%
Regulations force early retirement, selling land	70%	40%
Conservation Index: high support	27%	73%

Table 7. presents ‘willing to sell’ results broken down by geographic zip code areas. Over 25% of all zip code groups are willing to sell their Ag properties within the next 15 years. The most secure groups are the Ferndale / Loleta zip code group (26% sell) and the Arcata group (29% sell). The least secure groups are the Fortuna zip code group (45% sell), the Eureka group (45% sell) and the McKinleyville group (46% sell). A surprising percentage of Ag producers in the most suburbanizing areas of Humboldt County are willing to sell within the next five years.

Table 7. Willing to Sell, Geographic Locations

Zip Code Groups	Sell 5-15 yrs. / acres	Not selling 5 -15 yrs. / acres	Yes: Sell w/in 5 yrs.	No: Sell w/in 5 yrs.
Arcata group	29%, 2,572	71%, 9,613	14%	86%
Eureka group	45%, 1,688	55%, 2,050	40%	60%
McKinleyville grp.	46%, 387	54%, 2,103	45%	55%
Orleans group	31%, 1,235	69%, 3,255	15%	85%
Ferndale group	26%, 6,347	74%, 160,468	8%	92%
Fortuna group	45%, 3,772	55%, 6,654	27%	73%
Redcrest group	38%, 26,971	62%, 44,824	15%	85%
Kneeland group	31%, 16,950	69%, 52,439	13%	87%

Attitudes About Agriculture

Both the 'Willing to Sell' group (62%) and the 'Not Selling' group (48%) agree that the pace of Ag land conversion is 'too fast'. Both the 'Willing to Sell' group (81%) and the 'Not Selling' group (75%) agree Ag land availability is limiting operations and is a threat to continued production. 84% of the 'Not Selling' and 78% of the 'Willing to Sell' groups agree that their Ag properties should be used by future generations for agriculture.

76% of the 'Not Selling' group expect their Ag land to be productive 50 years from now, compared to 61% of the 'Willing to Sell' group. A majority of the 'Willing to Sell' group are hopeful that another agricultural operator could buy their property and continue operations. But when properties go up for sale, family financial needs (from health care, retirement or estate taxes) are a priority. In a real estate market where agricultural land values are a far second to residential and speculative development land values, the future transfer of agricultural properties in Humboldt County will continue to result in a cumulative loss of productive agricultural land.

Ag Land Conservation: Policies and Programs

85% of the 'Not Selling' group support county zoning measures to keep Ag land secure, compared to 70% of the 'Willing to Sell' group. Over 75% of both groups support urban growth boundaries to protect Ag land. Both groups rank Ag economic development as the number one solution towards maintaining working landscapes. Both groups support the concept of a purchase of development rights program for Ag lands, ('Willing to Sell' 76%, 'Not Selling' 79%). The 'Not Selling' group would be 10% more likely to support a local sales tax increase to fund such a program.

A notable percentage of the Conservation Policy Support Index 'High Support' group agrees that they may sell their Ag property within 5 years (11%). Even more agree that they may sell their Ag property within the next 15 years (27%). This implies that even though Ag landowners strongly support the values and opinions associated with the Conservation Policy Support Index (described in the following results section), Ag properties will continue to change ownership and will be threatened by conversion to non agricultural uses.

Regulations and Government

70% of the 'Willing to Sell' group strongly agrees that regulations have influenced their willingness to sell, compared to 40% of the 'Not Selling' group. Both groups feel over-regulated (both over 65%). Both groups feel that regulations limit their abilities to improve their operations (both over 70%). Over 70% of both groups agree that local government should do more to assist local agricultural producers and industry. The majority of both the 'Willing to Sell' group (63%) and the 'Not Selling' group (57%) agree private Ag land conversion is a entirely or mostly a private matter.

Ag Producer Results

CONSERVATION POLICY SUPPORT INDEX

The Conservation Policy Support Index ranks a respondent's support for the conservation of agricultural lands in Humboldt County through answers to nine survey questions concerning regulatory policies, conservation easements and personal values about the future of agriculture lands. The following is a summary of the index and key results; a complete list results is present in Part Three. The nine survey questions that comprise the index include:

- 1) Is county zoning is a good way to keep Ag land secure for future Ag production?
- 2) Should towns and cities in Humboldt County develop 'urban growth boundaries' that promote residential growth within the boundary and Ag production outside the boundary?
- 3) Can appropriate regulations have a positive impact on Ag production and land use?
- 4) Do you expect your Ag land to be productive 50 years from now?
- 5) Is loss of Ag land a present threat to Ag production in Humboldt County?
- 6) Would a program to purchase development rights for Ag land (Ag conservation easements) and private open space properties work in Humboldt County?
- 7) Should Humboldt County target existing state and federal programs for funding to purchase conservation easements for Ag land and private open space properties?
- 8) Hypothetically, would you support a one-quarter percent increase in the county sales tax to establish a fund for an Ag conservation easement program?
- 9) Rank ...what you think local government priorities should be: 'protecting Ag lands and open space from development'

In creating the index, an individual's answers to each of the nine questions were given a score ranging from one (lowest support) to four points (highest support). The lowest possible index score is nine and the highest possible index score is 36. Scores ranged from 13 to 36. A 'Low Support' score would range from 9 to 18 points (1 to 2 points out of four on every question), disagreeing or voting down all of the proposed Ag conservation policies or programs. Less than three percent (nine individuals) scored at the 'Low Support' level. The 'Medium Support' group scored from 18.5 to 26.5 points out of 36. This group averaged between 2 and 3 points out of 4 over the nine index questions. They are 'somewhat' supportive of most of the proposed conservation measures and not support of others. The 'High Support' group scored between 26.5 to 36 points and are strongly supportive of most of the index questions (scoring 3 or 4 on every question.)

Conservation Support Index Group Demographics

Table 8. presents a comparison of results between index groups. The Medium Support group contains 158 individuals, 53% of the total. The High Support group contains 142 individuals, 47% of the total index population. Because only nine individuals were included in the Low Support group, they were not included in this comparison. The High Support group averages three years younger in age, is more likely to be employed primarily in agriculture, is more likely to be making a profit, is more likely to have an heir to continue operations when they retire, and less likely to be willing to sell their Ag property. Both groups have similar personal and operational characteristics (i.e., income and education are not defining factors). Both groups agree that Ag land is threatened by conversion and both groups desire to keep their properties in Ag for future generations; the High support groups averages about 10 percentage points higher in most of the above comparisons.

Table 8. Conservation Policy Support Index, Demographics and Attitudes

	Medium Support Group	High Support Group
% Of total survey respondents	53%	47%
# Survey Respondents	158	142
Avg. (mean) age	59	56
% Ag is primary occupation	47%	57%
% Ag primary source of household income	40%	49%
% Total annual income > \$60,000	48%	41%
% w/ increasing profits over past 5 yrs.	21%	32%
% Expecting increasing profits in next 5 yrs.	25%	33%
% w/ Ag lands enrolled in Williamson Act	26%	27%
Willing to sell: 5 yrs	24%	11%
Willing to sell: 5-15 yrs	36%	27%
Pace of Ag conversion: too fast	49%	71%
Ag production will decrease in 10 yrs.	67%	84%
Desire to keep property in Ag for future generations	78%	88%
% With an heir to continue Ag operation when they retire	55%	64%
Located w/in 2 miles of residential development	50%	59%
Made business improvements over past 5 years	74%	90%
Support for stronger Ag zoning	69%	93%

Willingness to sell Ag property increases as the level of Ag policy and program support decreases. A notable percentage of the High Support group agrees that they may sell their Ag property within 5 years (11%). Even more of the High Support group agrees that they may sell their Ag property within the next 15 years (27%). 24% of the Medium Support group agrees to selling their land within the next five years, 36% within the next 15 years.

The Conservation Policy Support Index scores are also listed by producer groups (Table 1) and acre groups (Table 2). For example, the majority of the dairy, beef and timber producers are at the medium support level, and the majority of the vegetable, fruit and nursery producers are at the high support level.

Attitudes About Agriculture

The majority of both groups perceive Ag land as being threatened by regulations, residential development and government acquisition. While both groups strongly value agriculture, groups feel differently about the perceived threat of Ag land conversion and the future of agriculture in Humboldt County. 71% of the High Support group feels the pace of Ag land conversion is currently ‘too fast’, while only 49% of the Med. Support group agrees that the pace of conversion is ‘too fast’. 84% of the High Support groups feels that Ag production will decrease in 10 years, compared to 67% of the Med. Support group. 22% of both groups have had operations restricted by adjacent non-AG land uses.

Ag Land Conservation: Policies and Programs

The Medium Support group values agriculture but is less optimistic about its future, and is less likely to support government conservation incentives and policies aimed at preventing conversion to non-agricultural uses. When asked if Ag land within city limits should be retained as open space, the majority of the High Support group chose ‘open space’ (55%), while the majority of the Med. Support group chose ‘landowner choice’ (60%). The High Support group, more optimistic about the future of agriculture, endorses conservation policies aimed at preventing the conversion of agricultural lands. The High Support group has also had more exposure to conservation easements (High 59%, Med. 44%).

Regulations and Government

A large majority of both groups agree that new and stronger measures should be taken to address the loss of Ag land through conversion to non-agricultural uses. 93% of the High Support group agrees that county zoning is a good way to keep Ag land secure for future production, compared to 69% of the Med. Support group.

The Medium Support group is less likely to have participated in government assistance programs and is a stronger advocate for the separation of government and private property. 80% of the High Support Group agrees that government should take more responsibility to assist Ag producers, compared to 68% of the Medium Support Group. 53% of the High Support group has participated in a government program to improve operations, compared to 33% of the Medium Support group. 46% of the High Support group feel the conversion of Ag lands is ‘entirely / mostly a private matter’, compared to 73% of the Medium Support group.

Ag Producer Results

PRODUCER AND FARM DEMOGRAPHICS:

SURVEY AND CENSUS

The following summary presents demographic results from the Ag Producers Survey. The complete list of demographic survey questions and results can be found in Part Three. Results are compared with the 1997 U.S.D.A. Census of Humboldt County Agriculture. This comparison is made to justify the use of survey results to represent the views and values of the entire Humboldt County agricultural community.

Agriculture Survey Population Demographics:

- **Representation:** 306 respondents out of 797 total county producers (38%)
- **Age:** Average (mean) age is 57; range is from 24 to 91
- **Education:** College degree 28%, Graduate degree 13%
- **Income:** 44% of producers state Ag production as primary source of household
52% state Ag production as primary occupation
35% make less than \$40,000 / year household income;
30% make greater than \$80,000 / year
- **Politics:** 58% Republican, 22% Democrat, 12% Independent and 8% Other
- **Family:** Survey respondents have a total of 1,181 adults and children in their immediate families; 70% have worked in Ag over 20 years; 114 responded with 3 or more generations in county Ag industry
- **Community:** 55% were born / raised in county, 31% have lived here over 20 years, 6% have lived here 10 years or less
- **Ownership:** 68% own 100% of their operating AG lands
72% own 75% or more of their operating AG lands
11% own 10% or less of their operating AG lands
- **Employment:** ± 300 producers representing 1,268 employees
Average of 5.44 employees per producer
- **Profits:** Ag income over past 5 years: 26% increasing, 33% decreasing, 41% even
Projected over next 5 years: 29% increasing, 33% decreasing, 38% even

Demographics Comparison:

**1997 U.S.D.A. Census of Humboldt County Agriculture
and the
2002 Humboldt County Agricultural Producers Survey**

	<u>1997 Ag Census</u>	<u>Ag Producers Survey</u>
Total number of farms:	792	797 contacted, 306 responded
Land in farms:	584,538 acres	374,037 acres represented
Farms by size:		
1-9 acres	134 (17%)	48 (18%)
10-49	190 (24%)	45 (17%)
50-179	200 (25%)	45 (17%)
180-499	108 (14%)	42 (16%)
500-999	45 (6%)	16 (6%)
1000 and greater	115 (14%)	69 (26%)
Average size of farm:	738 acres	1385 acres
Farm is principal occupation:	56.5%	52%

Note: 265 respondents included acreage in survey response data.

PART TWO (continued): PUBLIC SURVEY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

General Public Results PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (PDR) PROGRAM

Part One of this report introduces the concept of ‘purchase of development rights’ (PDRs), also known as agricultural conservation easements. PDRs are a land use planning technique that is gaining support throughout the United States. Several state and local governments use PDR programs as one important tool in a ‘toolbox’ of land use planning policies and programs aimed at the conservation of agricultural lands. Other northern California counties, such as Marin and Sonoma, have PDR / Ag conservation easement programs. PDR programs are often combined with agricultural zoning and economic development projects in an effort to curb the loss of productive soils to non-Ag uses.

Both the Humboldt County Producers Survey and the Public Survey gauge community interest and general support for the concept of a PDR program in Humboldt County. The Public Survey goes into greater detail about how a program could be structured and funded. Neither survey can stand alone as justification for the development of a PDR program in Humboldt County. Survey results conclude that the public values agriculture and the conservation of Ag lands strongly enough to favorably consider the PDR concept. Additional research is needed to determine the feasibility of such a program in Humboldt County.

The following is a summary of the PDR component of the *Public Survey*. A complete list of survey questions and results are presented in Part Three. Written public comments on PDRs are presented in Part Two.

- 71% of the public support the concept of a ‘Purchase of Development Rights’ program (Ag conservation easements) in which landowners would be compensated for giving up their right to subdivide land for non-Ag uses, keeping their land committed to agricultural production.
- 68% agree to targeting existing state and federal PDR programs for funding.
- 47% agree to a hypothetical one-quarter percent county sales tax to establish a fund for the purchase of development rights.
- 46% agree they would voluntarily contribute to a PDR program fund.
- 43% support a local land trust to manage such a program, 36% support city / county government and 4% support state government management.

- Survey respondents were randomly given one of four dollar figures to approve or disapprove as annual household costs for the PDR program (taxed annually for a five-year period):

	<u>Yes</u>	<u># of Respondents</u>
\$25:	61%	44
\$75:	67%	45
\$125:	40%	46
\$175:	33%	44

- If respondents answered ‘No’ to the previous question, they were asked if they’d be willing to pay one dollar each year for the next five years to fund such a program? Results were 55% yes and 45% no.
- The Public was asked the maximum amount (between zero dollars and five hundred dollars) they would be willing to pay each year for the next five years to fund the PDR program. Monetary results were grouped into the following:

\$0:	30%
\$1-\$99:	30%
\$100:	20%
\$101-\$500:	20%

- Which is the most effective funding tool to create this hypothetical PDR program?

Sales tax	22%
Property tax	20%
Voluntary donations	20%
Gov. funding programs	22%
None of the above	16%

General Public Results

PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS: PDR SUPPORT INDEX

The Purchase of Development Rights Support Index (*'PDR Support Index'*) ranks public respondents into three groups based on an individual's support for a hypothetical PDR program in Humboldt County. The PDR Support Index is comprised of seven survey questions (listed below) in which increasing points are given based on responses that support the PDR program. The following is a summary of the index and key results; a complete list of survey questions and results are presented in Part Three.

1. Should Ag landowners be compensated for the public benefits their properties provide?
2. Would a program to purchase development rights to AG lands and private open space properties (described more in survey) work in Humboldt County?
3. Should Humboldt County target existing state and federal programs for funding to purchase development rights to priority AG land and private open space land?
4. Would you support a one-quarter percent (25 cents per 100 dollar purchase) increase in the county sales tax to establish a fund for the purchase of development rights?
5. Would you vote for or against the fictional program (funding a purchase of development rights program for priority Ag and open space properties through an increase in property taxes over the next five years) described above?
6. Would you be willing to contribute to such a (PDR program) voluntarily instead of being taxed?
7. What is the maximum total you would be willing to pay (between \$0 and \$500) each year for the next five years to fund such a program?

Survey respondents' answers to each of these seven questions were given a score ranging from one (lowest support) to four points (highest support). The highest possible index score is 28, the lowest possible score is 7. Survey respondents were categorized into three main groups based on their overall index score. The 'PDR Support Low' group scored between 7.0-14.0. This group does not support most or any of the seven questions regarding a PDR program in Humboldt County. The 'PDR Support Medium' group scored between 14.1-20.9. This group moderately supports most or all of the index questions. The 'PDR Support High' group scored between 21.0-28.0. This group supports or strongly supports all of the index questions.

PDR Support Group Demographics

Table 9. presents a comparison of survey results between PDR support groups. A total of 188 public survey respondents are represented in this index. 29% scored in the Low Support group, 47% scored in the Medium Support group and 24% in the High Support group. Key demographic differences between groups include age, the amount of time one has lived in Humboldt County, education and income. The younger, more educated and higher income individuals are more likely to support the PDR program. The less time spent living in the county, the more likely to support the program. In addition, the more a person feels Ag land is threatened, the higher the support. The Low Support group is less concerned and less threatened by the loss of Ag land. Although these differences are intriguing, they may be due to multiple factors not addressed in this analysis and should not be considered definitive criteria.

Table 9. PDR Support Group Demographics

<u>PDR Support:</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>High</u>
% Of total survey respondents	29%	47%	24%
# survey respondents	55	88	45
Average (mean) age	55	52	46
Gender: male / female	62 / 38%	45 / 55%	50 / 50%
Single-person household	21%	24%	33%
Children in immediate family:	85%	89%	79%
Education: college grad	33%	48%	74%
Household income \geq \$50K	38%	30%	50%
Own property in county	72%	66%	59%
Born / raised in county	32%	20%	7%
Lived in county \leq 10 yrs.	10%	21%	31%
Ag land is threatened by residential development	66%	90%	93%
Stronger zoning to preserve Ag lands	65%	87%	98%

Familiarity With Agriculture

Familiarity with agriculture is not a significant factor influencing individual support for the PDR program. There were no significant differences between PDR support groups and familiarity with agriculture. All three groups were around 45% familiar with Ag issues in the county and about 50% of all three groups had visited a farm or ranch in the past year. A strong majority of all groups expect the amount of Ag land to decrease over the next 10 years.

Attitudes About Agriculture

In general, the Low Support group does not perceive land development as threatening agricultural production, and thus is not as strongly in support for government to intervene with more stringent land use planning. 20% of the Low Support group agrees that the current pace of Ag land conversion is 'about right', compared to 13% agreement from both the Medium and High Support groups. The Low Support group views Ag land as being less threatened by residential development (66% agree development pressure is reducing

county Ag land, compared to Medium Support group 90% and the High Support group 93%). The Low Support group is less supportive of government involvement to address the loss of Ag land (61% of Lows agree more should be done to limit conversion compared to Mediums 85%, and Highs 95%).

All three groups support local agriculture and value its public benefit contributions. 100% of the High Support group agree that it is important to keep private Ag land in production as opposed to being developed, compared to Medium Support group 97% and the Low Support group 82%. 91% of the High Support group agrees that local government should give Ag land conservation a high priority, compared Medium Support group (75%) and the Low Support Group (53%).

Private Lands, Public Benefits

All three groups agree that Ag lands provide public benefits (Lows 77%, Mediums 90% and Highs 96%) and are valuable to our county's rural character (Lows 91%, Mediums 98% and Highs 100%). The Lows are more supportive of a landowner's absolute right to subdivide property (53%) compared to the Mediums (31%) and the Highs (13%). 91% of the Highs agree that open space is a resource to keep available for Ag, compared to the Lows (79%) and the Mediums (83%). 85% of Lows believe residential development has a positive impact on the local community, compared to Mediums (64%) and Highs (44%).

Ag Land Conservation: Policies and Programs

The majority of all groups agree that more should be done to limit the conversion of productive agricultural lands (Lows 61%, Mediums 85%, Highs 95%). The Low Support group is less concerned by the loss of Ag land. The Low Support group is more opposed to the PDR concept of government intervention to purchase rights on private property using public funds. The PDR Low group does not perceive agriculture land as being extremely threatened, thus this group is not as strongly in support of government efforts to assist in economic development and land use policies. The Lows are less supportive of zoning regulations to preserve Ag. 65% of Lows support stronger Ag zoning compared to Mediums 87% and Highs 98%. 54% of Lows support urban growth boundaries to protect Ag lands, compared to 69% of Mediums and 87% of Highs.

General Public Results

ZIP CODE GROUPS

The Public Zip Code Groups section categorizes survey results into six zip code groups based on geographic location. Results can be used to compare attitudes and opinions about agriculture based on where residents live throughout Humboldt County. The following is a summary of key results; a complete list of survey questions and results are presented in Part Three.

Zip Code Group Demographics

Table 10. presents a comparison of zip code groups. 185 public survey respondents are included in this analysis. The most populated areas of the county are the most represented in the survey. For example, Eureka residents represent 33% of total respondents, followed by Arcata (20%) and McKinleyville (17%). The 'Rural South East County' zip group is the oldest in age, averaging 56 years; the Arcata zip group is the youngest, averaging 49 years. A majority of all six zip groups own property in Humboldt County (high of McKinleyville 73% to low of Arcata 56%). A large majority of all groups have children in their immediate families. A majority from four of the six zip groups have graduated from college.

Table 10. Public Zip Code Groups: Demographics and Result Comparisons

<u>Zip Code Group:</u>	<u>Eureka</u>	<u>Arcata</u>	<u>McKinley -ville</u>	<u>Rural North East (N,E) County</u>	<u>Fortuna - Ferndale group</u>	<u>Rural South East (S,E) County</u>
Areas represented	Eureka	Arcata, Bayside	McKinleyville	Blue Lake, Trinidad, Korbel, Willow Crk., Orick, Hoopa, Orleans	Fortuna, Ferndale, Hydesville, Carlotta	Scotia, Weott, Piercy, Garberville, Redway, Alderpoint, Bridgeville, Redcrest, Petrolia, Whitethorn
% of total survey respondents	33%	20%	17%	8%	13%	9%
# Survey Respondents	62	36	31	15	24	17
Avg. (mean) age	53	49	53	51	48	56
Children in immediate family:	89%	74%	88%	67%	100%	90%
Education: college grad	45%	68%	53%	54%	29%	63%
Household income \geq \$50K	42%	39%	48%	20%	31%	34%
Own property in county	69%	56%	73%	60%	70%	71%
Born / raised in county	26%	3%	23%	20%	33%	6%
Lived in county \leq 10 yrs.	11%	30%	14%	27%	25%	24%

continued...	<u>Eureka</u>	<u>Arcata</u>	<u>McKinley -ville</u>	<u>Rural N,E County</u>	<u>Fortuna - Ferndale group</u>	<u>Rural S,E County</u>
Support for stronger Ag zoning	85%	86%	76%	92%	71%	88%
Support for Urban Growth Boundaries	66%	84%	50%	57%	78%	81%
PDR Support Index: Low	34%	14%	32%	13%	33%	41%
PDR Support Index: Medium	45%	42%	45%	67%	54%	35%
PDR Support Index: High	21%	44%	23%	20%	13%	24%

Familiarity with Agriculture

Familiarity with agriculture ranged from a high of Rural S, E County 65% to Arcata 56%, Fortuna-Ferndale zip group 42% to a low of Eureka 33%. The Arcata group responded with the highest percentage of respondents who had visited a farm or ranch in the past year (70%), compared to Eureka (38%), McKinleyville (43%) and the Fortuna-Ferndale group (63%). A large majority of all groups expect the amount of Ag land to decrease in Humboldt County over the next 10 years. It is interesting to note that the Fortuna – Ferndale zip group has the highest percentage of survey respondents active in agriculture (13%), compared to Eureka, Arcata and the McKinleyville groups (all at 3%).

Attitudes about Agriculture

In general, all zip groups are supportive of local agriculture and value its public benefit contributions. A large majority of all zip groups feel that it is very important to keep current Ag lands in production versus being developed for non-agricultural uses (high of Rural N,E County zip group 100% to a low of McKinleyville 83%). A large majority of all zip groups responded that local government should give Ag land conservation a high priority (high of Arcata 83%, Fortuna-Ferndale group 79%, Eureka 69%, to a low of McKinleyville 64%).

Private Lands, Public Benefits

The majority of all groups agree that Ag lands provide public benefits (highs from Fortuna-Ferndale 92%, Arcata 91% to lows of McKinleyville 87% and Eureka 83%). and are valuable to our county’s rural character (over 90% from all zip groups). The majority of all but one zip group agrees that landowners should be compensated for the public benefits their Ag properties provide (highs of Arcata 71%, Rural N,E County 59% to lows of McKinleyville 50% and Fortuna-Ferndale 43%). The majority of all but one group agrees that residential and commercial development have a positive impact on the local community (highs of Fortuna-Ferndale 76%, McKinleyville 73% and Eureka 70% to lows of Arcata 70% and Rural N,E County at 46%). The Fortuna-Ferndale group, at 70%, is most supportive of a landowner’s absolute right to subdivide property, compared to McKinleyville 42%, Eureka 28% and Arcata 19%.

Ag Land Conservation: Policies and Programs

All groups support stronger zoning regulations to preserve Ag lands (high of Rural N,E county 92% to low of Fortuna – Ferndale 71%). Support for urban growth boundaries that protect agricultural lands ranged from an Arcata high of 84% to a McKinleyville low of 50%. A majority of all zip groups support the hypothetical program to purchase development rights from priority Ag and open space properties (highest support from Arcata (85%), Fortuna-Ferndale (82%) and McKinleyville zip groups (73%) and the lowest support from Eureka (65%), Rural S,E county (63%), and Rural N,E county zip groups (62%). A proposed sales tax increase to fund such a program received the highest support from Arcata (64%) followed by Eureka (48%), McKinleyville (46%) to a low of 32% from the Fortuna-Ferndale zip group. Most of the respondents in each zip code group moderately support the PDR index, described in detail in the previous section. The Arcata zip group has the highest percentage of the public strongly supporting the PDR index (44% High support) compared to the Fortuna-Ferndale zip group, which has the lowest (13% High support).

General Public Results

HOUSEHOLD DEMOGRAPHICS: SURVEY AND CENSUS

The following summary presents demographic results from the Public Survey. The complete list of demographic survey questions and results is in Part Three. Results are compared with the 2000 U.S. Census for Humboldt County; this comparison is made to justify the use of survey results to represent the views and values of the entire Humboldt County general public.

Public Survey Population Demographics:

- Representation: 190 respondents out of 402 total sample population (47%)
- Age: Average (mean) age is 51; range is from 19 to 93
- Gender: Male 51% / Female 49%
- Education: College degree 31%, Graduate degree 20%
- Income: 32% less than \$25,000 / year household income,
18% greater than \$75,000 / year household income
- Politics: 40% Democrat, 26% Republican, 17% Independent and 17% Other
- Housing: Own 71% / Rent 29%
- Community: 20% were born / raised in county, 45% have lived here over 20 years,
20% have lived here 10 years or less

<u>Zip Code Group Areas</u>	<u>Survey population</u>	<u># Individuals</u>
1. Eureka	33%	62
2. Arcata, Bayside	20%	36
3. McKinleyville	17%	31
4. Rural North,East County: Blue Lake, Trinidad, Korbelt Willow Creek, Orick, Hoopa, Orleans	8%	15
5. Fortuna, Ferndale, Loleta, Hydesville, Carlotta	13%	24
6. Rural South,East County: Scotia, Garberville, Bridgeville, Petrolia, Alderpoint, Peircy, Weott, Redcrest, Redway, Whitethorn	9%	17

Demographics Comparison:

**U.S. 2000 Census, Humboldt County
and the
2002 Humboldt County General Public Ag Survey**

	<u>2000 Census</u>	<u>Public Survey</u>
Total Population	126,518	402 contacted, 190 responded
Male / Female	49% / 51 %	51% / 49%
Age Groups:		
25-54 years	43%	50%
62 years and over	15%	30%
Housing: own / rent	58% / 42%	71% / 29%
Education:		
K-11	11%	4%
High school graduate	26%	15%
Some college	28%	30%
College Degree	24%	31%
Graduate degree	7%	20%
Household Income:		
Median income	\$31,226	Between \$25,000 - \$39,999
Less than \$10,000	14%	9%
\$10,000 - \$24,999	27%	23%
\$25,000 - \$49,999	30%	31%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	16%	19%
\$75,000 and over	13%	18%
Employed in Agriculture:	5%	4%

PART TWO: PRODUCER COMMENTS

Ag Producer And Landowner Comments

Ag Producers were given the opportunity to communicate their opinions and ideas through written comments solicited in the survey questionnaire. The following comments are direct quotes. The diversity of responses represent the diverse views of Humboldt County agricultural producers and landowners. These comments, along with the survey results, can be considered a documentary of the attitudes and perceptions of Humboldt County agricultural producers and landowners, year 2002.

1. Concluding Comments: The Future of Humboldt County: agricultural lands, open space, land use, etc.

1. Living next to a subdivision has caused us significant money, time and energy to maintain our business. I know right to farm laws exist, but I do not believe they will be honored over time. I believe the large number of neighbors we have will prevail in any dispute. It has already happened and been sanctioned by our local Ag commissioner!

2. We love our way of life. I have been in ranching all my life and I believe it is the backbone of our United States. We do need help to compete with all the outside countries. We hope our future generations can follow our footsteps, but they all need outside jobs if we want to raise families. We may be interested in the program to purchase development rights for ag land.

3. We believe there should be rewards and incentives for good management practices and the preservation of open spaces. These are things that we provide at our expense to the public at large. "Rewards and incentives" do not necessarily mean monetary compensation. Stream-lining and simplification of permit processes and recognition for "doing a good job" are important to most landowners.

4. If some viable pathway is not pursued with vigor quite soon, I believe we will see most of Humboldt's prime agricultural land, with the possible exception of land subject to regular flooding, disappear under development. Although I personally detest the prospect of further governmental control from any level, since 1954 I have seen 90% of the productive land adjacent to my property go to subdivision. The general economy of this area is so season marginal at best, that a property owners only option seems to be immediate profit. Government controls may be the only possibility for retention of open space and small ag endeavors.

5. Public benefits of local ag production are great, therefore public has role to play in maintaining it (as is done in every other nation on earth). It's known as investing in the future.

6. The land belongs to the landowner, first and foremost. If he can't make a profit, he should be allowed to sell it the best way he sees fit. If the public wants open space, they should do all they can to keep that farmer/rancher in a profitable business.

7. One major problem in the dairy industry is the price the dairyman receives for product. Receiving same prices as in the 1980's. Price fluctuates monthly the lows are so low, it takes the highs \$ months to catch up. Makes it difficult to expand or purchase new equipment.

8. I'm torn between protecting the environment and protecting a land owner's right to do what he damn well pleases. Open space, including range and timber is a large part of what makes Humboldt Co attractive. And our prime ag land only constitutes 1% of our area and should remain as ag. I'm not afraid of govt assistance. My projects have all gone great.

9. I feel strongly about preserving our open spaces, or agricultural lands. They are what makes our quality of living so high.

10. Open space is clearly of importance to Humboldt Co for tourism as well as Ag use and our quality of life. Modern agriculture is more profitable if there are value added products and those products can be marketed outside Hum Co.

11. For many ranch families, we have no plans for succession. To have a working estate plan, it must be updated and changed as new laws and regulations become effective. Another contributing factor is family size and interest. For example, in my family there are seventeen stock holders, seven trusts and eleven spouses (non stockholders) that makeup the estate plan. Of the seventeen stockholders, only three are interested in agriculture. The remaining fourteen involved are teachers, civil and environmental engineers, office executives, stock brokers, heavy construction operators, retail sales and truck driver. Although these individuals are tied to the history of the ranch most live out of the area and have their own life styles and interests. Ranchers, farmers or dairyman are definitely a way of life that few outsiders understand. From the outside it appears to be a glamorous existence of the cowboy way of life! Few really are aware of the hard work and the sacrifices that those who work the land endure. Many need to supplement agriculture income with jobs off the farm with either the wife, husband or both having full or part time jobs. Outsiders like to consider farm and ranch land as open space, but fail to realize the impact this may have on a farm family wanting to sell their property for other purposes. Cows or sheep alone, do not support a quality life style. Ranchers must either log timber, sell quarry rock or create some other means of supplementing income.

12. I don't believe the dept of fish & game, usfws, blm, or any of the environmental groups are doing any good in helping us ag landowners stay in business. They are all looking for reasons or ways to kick us off our own land.

13. The environmental extremists in our area and everywhere in US are hurting rather than helping the ag property and the watershed because the only way they can think to improve the environment is to pile on regulations.

They want pristine conditions in the rivers and yet they are causing large landholdings to be broken up for development because ag landowners cannot tolerate the headaches and costs of being over regulated. This is always the worst thing for our environment.

14. Inheritance tax relief, low property taxes, and profit for ag products are all very important issues for our continued existence in the ag business. and although water quality regulations have not yet hurt our ag business, it has become a major concern for our future. Should regulations restrict livestock from streams for example, there is no way we could afford or maintain such a fence in our mountainous area. It would probably force us to sell.

15. We have a problem with ag conservation easements in that the properties value would be considerably lessened in view of the fact that timber operations are now severely limited and not likely to get much better. In the poor overall economy in Humboldt county, it would seem unwise to restrict one's sale potential with a conservation easement. Environmental restrictions are out of control and we need some decent and aggressive representation at the state and federal levels of government. If the money a landowner receives from a conservation easement isn't invested in a prudent manner, he will be The only one to benefit from such a sale.

16. I'm sick and tired of environmental extremists destroying private property, Ruining the economy in Humboldt Co., ruining the sheep ranchers, the timber Industry and the trespassing on private lands. A well planned maintenance program for private lands, would be an asset - if every rancher and dairy men would do it. Clean up the junk and trash, repair fences on their properties. I hope there will never be widespread urban development in Humboldt co.

17. Promote confinements of commercial and residential development.

18. Ag will do fine if we are able to intensify our operations without gov hurting us. Selling any rights to our ag land is a foolish thing that has the potential to hurt opportunities for the future generation. The gov should not own any ag land at all. They take the resource off the tax base, take jobs away, and hurt the volume of ag commodities that might encourage processors to invest in this area.

19. Humboldt county land use should look at compatible use and cross zoning.

20. No longer in business-over regulated. One of primary ag production-crab & salmon fishing-2ndary ag production not enough to carry over to pay bills. So now I'm retired.

21. Williamson act needs to have some teeth penalties for developing properties. Need to have one agency to issue timber harvest plans. One plan fits all.

22. How about info on programs like proposed inheritance tax relief. Speakers for farmers market associations or product a video, website???

23. Thanks! We need to be organized and try to preserve our ag lands for future generations.

24. It is a waste of our natural resources to have government in control of our lands.

25. City of Arcata and HC do not always agree on what constitutes ag use. Without careful attention to our % of land in open space we will not attract outside people who move here to retire - ag does help increase quality of life and improve residential values.

26. Arcata bottom farmers have been hit hard by the jan-april influx of aleutian geese-loss of pasture, the messes they make when 4-5000 land in a 10 acre field

27. The constant rumbling heard from environmental groups about wanting our land for public use. Also-people trespassing, they don't understand our fields are fenced and gated to keep animals in and people out. We need to educate the public as to where/how their food comes from.

28. Farmers need to create a national bill of rights: 1. No lawsuits from developed land next to farms established before developments. 2. Less property taxes - fewer people are paying more taxes for others who live in cities and use county programs, put it on sales tax - everyone is a consumer. 3. The environment agency needs to work with us, not against us. We are after all the stewards of the land, and we have no intention of ruining the very thing that provides our livelihood and food for the nation. 4. Young people interested in agriculture need encouragement and sound financial help. 5. No estate tax if land inherited was kept in agriculture use - when it was used for a purpose other than farming, then all inheritance taxes should apply.

29. Our biggest concern is "big brother regs" - i believe it is totally out of control. I never thought we would be at this level of regulations in our nation during this time period. Realizing that we're over populated and need some regulations but not the level we are now...

30. Low prices for ag products is the most factor in the loss of ag land when you consider that wheat was \$3.00 a bushel in 1946 and now it is \$2.60. All ag products are more or less the same but every thing that you buy is 10-20 times what it was in 1946.

31. Regulations in effect for timber harvest plans are so complex and unnecessary. \$30,000 for a plan is not unusual and takes away a lot of incentive for small landowners to manage their forests properly to attain better yields in the future. It used to be "how can I help you?". Now it's "how can I stop you?"

32. Ag would succeed if:

1. Regulatory agencies encouraged local farming
2. Citizens bought local
3. Daily or public markets available for local producers
4. Tax incentives for ag production and biodiversity enrichment and local economy generation.

33. Many years ago strawberries were grown for market in this area. Also there were many poultry farmers. the strawberries in the markets are shipped in from out of county. They are tough and tasteless, have a hollow center.

I see a large truck trailer from Oregon delivering eggs in Fortuna. We used to encourage egg, fruit and berry production in Humboldt County. We have lots of Himalaya berries growing wild. They are delicious raw, cooked, frozen, canned, in pie, jam, jelly, cobbler etc. Some of my neighbors tell me some varieties of peaches do well here. The peaches shipped in from the south are green, hard as a rock. Many berries and fruits are shipped in from Oregon frozen and/or canned.

Many years ago I was a member poultry producer of northern California. We need such a cooperative again to provide a market for eggs and poultry. We need a model processing facility to encourage production of fruits and vegetables for freezing and canning for local consumption.

We just need to use what we have here.

34. The property rights positions of the farm bureau should be revisited and strengthened.

35. The individual farmer, his family and his freedom to produce and sell his products is the major strength of this USA.

36. The beauty that is unique to Humboldt County is directly related to the amount of land in agriculture. Tourists come to see rural beauty not strip malls. Other areas in the state that have similar aesthetic appeal have been developed so much that the appeal and peaceful lifestyle has gone away.

37. Timber should be considered an ag product and regulated as farmers. All studies and research on farming and timber should accept anecdotal evidence from knowledgeable locals (old timers), as part of their conclusions.

38. For me the Italian hill towns are models of rationally planned urban settlement - very compact townscapes surrounded by uncluttered countryside. Our wantonly prodigal mantling of soil with expansive paving and construction is unconscionable - a Dubrovnik on Trinidad Head and a Venice on the islands in Humboldt Bay could provide congenial habitation for most of Humboldt's population - with only the hard working stewards of the countryside outside of urban settlements - what a pipe dream!

39. Allow land owners to work, create, develop their business without regulations that restrict use such as not allowing use of gravel quarried or not buying permits to harvest gravel off privately owned river bars, without unfair cost to owner. Restrict the powers of the Coastal Commission, water quality, OSHA, fish and game or any other regulatory agency that is simply predatory.

40. Ranch economics are not likely to improve much and certainly not likely to keep pace with the increasing "recreation" value of rural land. Conservation easements will be an important tool to keep subsistence ranchers on the land who could not afford to otherwise stay on the land.

41. Even though ag lands are zoned ag or ae, if assessors' parcels are not large, the parcels are not assessed for present ag production use...they are assessed for rural residential. This affects overhead significantly and is an inducement to sell for "hobby farm" and/or residential purposes.

42. Develop hill & brush property for city expansion and leave the bottom lands

for ag production.

43. The government needs to do three things to help agriculture 1) quit buying up more private property, they own too much already and can't manage what they have. 2) get rid of the death tax once and for all. 3) respect the rights of property owners.

44. We must continue to work closely with supervisors on current issues. We must exert pressure on our legislators to reduce the overwhelming agency regulations. We must somehow be more effective with the non ag community with the positive long term well being of Humboldt agriculture and timber.

45. We are a c.c.o.f. certified farm but we do not make any money from our operation. It is more a philosophical "statement" than anything else. We hope the certification protects our paltry 47 acres from outside contaminants (roadside spraying, aerial spraying of adjoining public lands).

46. If we don't curb the environmental regulations there will be no one staying on their rural property. We spend an inordinate amount of time fighting more regulations - the latest being the tmdl - yet people who want to get (live on) gov and private grants still fight us. We think it is mostly a self serving few.

47. Something should be done about preserving ag areas around McKinleyville

48. The amount of pesticides used is disgusting and polluting. It should be stopped.

49. Humboldt Co farm bureau needs to be more pro-active.

50. I see no way that the encroachment of socialism will slow down let alone reverse.

51. It takes a family's dedication to keep an ag based business going. I was raised on a large cattle ranch owned by my father and his family. My father was killed three years ago in a logging accident. My mother took control of his assets and sold most of the ranch for personal gain. I have three siblings all over the age of 18, all of us wanted to continue the tradition of ranching and logging, but that choice was taken from us the day our father died. Greed is not part of an ag business. A person must love what they do to make a living in agriculture.

52. Ag land in this county is scarce - build and develop on marginal land - leave prime ag land in production - promote ag programs and ag development - limit government involvement.

53. Other than large ranches in outlying areas, ag land that is near residential areas (like McKinleyville or Fortuna) will be developed as population and property values increase. Unfortunately, making money has a higher priority than other equally or possibly more valuable uses.

54. Farmers and ranchers are under constant attack from acquisition programs, water quality programs, air quality fears, refusal by gov't to permit cleaning of ditches, failure to repair roads. BLM expands, RMP expands, city of Arcata expands, coastal conservancy expands, dept of fish & game is now a competing land owner! Nature conservancy expands. There are not enough farmers

for all the expanding regulatory interests. Oh yes federal fish and wildlife expands and they all come up with the idea to tie some farmer and his kids and their kids to a farm so they will be able to justify their existence through something called an agricultural easement. Fuedal kings called us serfs (slaves). Did you ever hear of private property rights?

55. We hope to be a part of a growing Humboldt county ag interest through wine production. We have been organic farming vegetables for about 10 years and have just this year quit. We were not making enough money due to our long commute from orleans. We planted a vineyard four years ago and are focusing solely on wine as a value added product. There is very little ag land available In Orleans due to the majority of land being owned by the forest service. I believe we could make more ag income in Humboldt if some of this public land was opened up for sale.

56. I think this easement program sounds wonderful

57. If the environmental movement is not stopped farming will become extinct. the constant growing beauracricies requiring more and more information on employees and the self employed farmer is extremely frustrating, expensive, and time consuming. They all are after a cut of a persons hard to come by income just to support their jobs. Bottom line, does all their forms and required data do any good for the farmer, hell no!

58. The combination of private farmers with the experience of profit and university trained experts with free advise was instrumentle in providing us with such an abundance of quality food. I would like to see a similar effert applied to biodiversity I believe that ag should present itself as the tremendouse success. it is. Now that we do have such a tremendouse confidence in our food supply that we can voluntarily take land out of production it is reasonable that the public wants more biodiversity.

I think that farming is about life and that farmers would be the best people to protect biodiversity at a reasonable price.

59. The Rowley family has been in the orchard business for over 25 years. Family owned and run by family members. My ancestors were dairy farmers near Fortuna 1880-1960. Farming in humboldt county now is a catch 22.

Increase in population demands building room and expansion. My children's children have to live somewhere and won't want to leave humboldt county. Farm lands in time will be consumed by housing and other forms of development. This we cannot stop. The population will rule - it's survival!!

I will die a farmer, but still my descendants must have housing and jobs.

I do not believe in no growth. Farming in humboldt county is leaving in time, like the lumber industry has.

60. Our biggest and best opportunities are local meat and dairy, including selling direct from the farm. The farther away that food comes from and the more inhumane meat production becomes, the better our local fresh produce, and humanely raised animal products, will look to customers.

61. I think inheritance taxes serve a useful purpose when they help break up extra large land holdings

62. The tmdl process with its increased regulations will put more pressure on us and other ranchers to subdivide. When one can no longer make a profit on a large piece of land, the answer for many is "subdivide".

63. Poor economic conditions in ag operations give little incentive to young people

64. This survey was difficult for me. There is no one that feels stronger about Property rights than I, therefore I think regulation should be kept at a minimum. I do not like the fed gov purchasing large amounts of additional property, but in many cases the regulation is such that the fed gov is the only buyer. (no one wants to buy property they can not use.)

65. The less government intervention the better off youll be.
ask for help, you ask for more regulations!

66. Government regs are the problem and should be limited.

67. I want to mention something very important. At the root of all our problems is overpopulation. We have already surpassed our ability to feed etc the existing people. I feel strongly about land use as i grew up in Palo Alto when it was closer to Ferndale. I was disturbed to see the beautiful fields turn to concrete. I cannot predict but i can say with certainty that when the population continues to grow places like Humboldt will not be able to stop the change. In a way im saddened because i'd love to own a piece of land up on the San Francisco peninsula but it is mostly owned by open space preserves. Yes, it is also fantastic to not see houses up there. But my point is that however we want Humboldt county to be, unless we start thinking about this everpresent issue, all of our comments may add up to nothing. I love this agricultural area, please do not let the developers loose it.

68. Personally we would like to know more about the super williamson act. It is extremely hard to get by on ranching and logging. We also would support any measures which would help raise our profits for ranching and logging.

69. Dont let the urban sprawl go north of little river. Humboldt county is a precious jewel and i hope that the inevitable growth of california stays south of mendicino.

70. Smaller parcels of land should be eligible for the Williamson act tax relief

71. This is an obvious attempt to justify the efforts of some to stop any attempt to subdivide ranch land. I have sons living in a different state where many Agriculture producers are going broke because of low prices. It makes no sense to try to keep lands agriculture production where no money can be made. Many older farmers might want to sell off a piece of property to supplement their retirement but i can see by these questions that this will be impossible in the future

72. Preserving open space in Humboldt is vitally important to the future of this county for wildlife habitat health of the rivers and for the wild and scenic beauty which should be passed on to all future generations of people who live here. Zoning and regulations by themselves seem to often tie

peoples hands without helping them accomplish the zoning goals. A successful plan for the future would i think include the county networking with land trusts, community groups, farmers etc-to determine ways that protect the land and empower the people to do so.

73. In eastern Humboldt county water rights are becoming a key issue. Humboldt County's farm community has not stood up and countered the heavy lobbying effort of the Oregon and central California farm interests. The loss of water in the Klamath Trinity and Eel rivers to farming in other areas has cost hc huge losses in fishing & tourism and soon will impact our water rights & farming industry. HC's farm community needs to see our divergence from the farmers in or & the central valley. We need not only to use our political strength, but to work through larger farm organizations to mitigate their stance which is counterproductive for hc farmers.

74. City of Arcata does not need all wet lands. Too much ag land off pay roll already. Blm, dept of fish & game takes good ag land off tax roll high price paid for it; "tax money" could be used someplace else.

75. We have the potential in Humboldt county to be a very productive agricultural area, as we have been for many years. What we need to encourage is hope. Hope will give rise to imagination and dedication, from these characteristics there is no boundary. If we can find a way to utilize the awesome natural resources this area has been blessed with, the land will share its bounty and in doing so provide economic viability and encourage the perpetuity of agricultural production. But we must start with hope.

2. Additional threats to Ag production in Humboldt County:

1. Urban growth
2. Personal politics
3. Market value of land increases if not used for ag
4. Younger generation of ag families not interested
5. Conversion to residential
6. Housing developments
7. Endangered species-or protected species
8. Fish/game out of control
9. Weather-long wet winters, cool coastal temps in summer
10. Bureaucracy
11. Foreign exports should be slowed down
12. Property taxes based on potential use & not actual
13. Eroding of property rights
14. New neighbor property owners
15. Mismanagement
16. Corporate expansion

17. Timber harvest
18. Urban encroachment
19. Environmental agencies
20. Developments/subdivisions
21. Second homes
22. Restriction on timber companies
23. Predators
24. Land prices
25. Limited market
26. Government intervention
27. Herbicide, fungicide, pesticide overuse, abuse
28. Property values again due to overpopulation/demand
29. Residential development & high land taxes
30. Non government conversion of ag land.
31. Intensive recreation & rural ranchette development

3. Additional types of agricultural production, listed as ‘other’:

1. Fruits/nuts (18)
2. Grapes/wine (14)
3. Horses (12)
4. Medicinal herbs (3)
5. Eggs, poultry (3)
6. Cheese (2)
7. Wildlife habitat (2)
8. Agri tourism (2)
9. Oysters
10. Wool from rabbits, goats, llamas
11. Christmas trees
12. Swine
13. gravel sales
14. Rodeo company
15. Ferns
16. Run cattle for neighbors
17. I’m inventing things in the barn

4. Additional comments: ‘...Ag land conversion occurs because of...’ :

1. Profit too low (15)
2. Government purchases (9)

3. Property value for development (7)
4. Greed (5)
5. Regulations (3)
6. Highest & best use
7. Population growth
8. Salt water intrusion
9. Abundance of food
10. We won't need ag land we will import our food
11. Worn out bodies
12. NAFTA
13. No change in 133 years! Bad question
14. Owner needs to sell due to financial stress
15. Unproductive/overcut timberland
16. Too small
17. Multiple heirs
18. Demand for other use

5. 'Other' approaches and incentives for maintaining productive ag lands:

1. Less government: regulations, taxes, land purchase (26)
2. Community education / increase local marketing (24)
3. Estate tax relief (9)
4. Producer education on incentives, programs (9)
5. Effective urban / ag land use planning (5)
6. Property tax relief (4)
7. Local processing, on-site sales (4)
8. Land conservation (3)
9. Expand coops, cooperative purchases and marketing (3)
10. Payment for public benefits on private Ag lands (3)
11. Food prices=living wage (2)
12. Control of noxious plants (2)
13. Indoor eureka farmers market (like Ithica NY)
14. Government provide medical benefits
15. A city community compost, support it on ag land
16. Research, improve hardy crops high value crops
17. More youth programs
18. Reduction in harvest plan prices
19. Dike repair assist

20. Let some folks get hungry
21. Reseeding
22. No commodity support
23. Fire the lawyers
24. Stronger position on Hum Co water rights in Klamath

PART TWO: PUBLIC COMMENTS

General Public Comments

General Public respondents were given the opportunity to communicate their opinions and ideas through written comments solicited in the survey questionnaire. The following comments are direct quotes. The diversity of responses represent the diverse views of the Humboldt County general public. The following comments, along with the survey results, should be considered a documentary of the attitudes and perceptions of the Humboldt County general public, year 2002.

1. Concluding Comments: The Future of Humboldt County: agricultural lands, open space, land use, etc.

1. Part of the reason we live here is because Humboldt County is beautiful - and beyond "skin deep". Farmlands supporting family farms and producing local products are beautiful parts of our community. Forests and wetlands that provide homes and protection for wildlife are vitally beautiful and necessary as well. I'm much more in favor of protecting farmland and open spaces than building more homes and gas stations.

2. I believe maintaining open space is very important. I also believe personal property rights must be maintained. Balance to controlled growth is the key issue to solve. Where it makes the least impact on existing surroundings, I could support developing open space for other use, ie - acres on butter-milk for sale, now ag - could be developed since it's adjacent (on same street) as Sunny Brae housing. This is little impact and fits surrounding use med to low density housing would work – I could support that before supporting annexing bottom land.

3. I support public/private partnership like the nature conservancy model. The McCloud River preserve brings tourist dollars to Shasta County while providing protection for 3 miles of riparian habitat.

4. I truly hope that we can preserve our ag lands. I hope this helps.

5. People should be allowed to sell or not sell their own land and what is on it. Government has the right to oversee but to decide is not the thing to be done.

6. I think a "hypothetical" sales tax coupled with a property tax would be the ideal way to raise money to purchase development rights from land owners. Our family would definitely support it and would pay extra taxes to keep Humboldt county green.

7. I think this is an important issue and this questionnaire is very good in that it addresses the complexity of the problem - including fiscal issues. I would like to see more of a partnership in ag/public use land. I would like more of my tax dollars used to development maintenance of land for public use.

8. Funding described above should target the most vulnerable properties.

9. An issue that requires attention of a sustained nature over time by knowledgeable people dedicated to preserving the quality of rural life. A non-profit land trust appointed by elected officials for terms of 2-5 years and with good legal advice would work.

10. For qualification, I have a brother who runs a dairy in Ferndale. Because of our poor economy and existing zoning, I do not see this as a large problem. Government purchasing of ag lands is a bigger problem. Gov purchases run up land values. Government is proving to be a poor steward. Humboldt County is not San Francisco County.

11. I expect that land for which property rights were sold would continue to generate revenue for the owner. A mechanism should be created where by those revenues were taxed at a reasonable level to continue to fund the trust or "reimburse" property owners who funded the trust initially.

12. I think land owners should be able to do what they want with the land they own.

13. I have only been here for one year and am not familiar with these issues pertaining to Humboldt County.

14. I think it is most important to develop non-ag land into increasing job opportunities and economic growth for Humboldt Co residents, accommodate for our dying timber and fishing industries, as well needing to protect and possibly increase the ag land(s) in the county. Humboldt County produces some of the best ag products in the state, in my opinion! And deserves to be protected for the future of all California residents.

15. People that sell their development rights to the state and or the federal government for potential subdivision value, at all the other tax payers expense because of this they pay less in property tax. Why would all of the other private property owners agree?? Many foreign governments already own all of their land, but this is still the USA and we still have a few rights remaining. Lets keep it that way with private property rights.

16. We need a few more large-chain shopping outlets (target, home depot, best buy, norstroms, etc.). This would have little or no impact on the amount of ag land and as such should not be used as an argument for or against ag land usage or its future.

17. I believe we need agriculture but I'm sick of funding everyone who decides the government is responsible for their everything. We subsidize farmers to not raise food. I dont want to subsidize other ag to get out from under their burdens any more than i expect you to subsidize us for our financial problems.

18. Get the lands developed in Humboldt County so they can be used by the people even if county, state, federal, or private if purchased by taxpayers funds, even if families still maintain them.

19. Local family farms (dairy) should be kept in production. There has to be a way that we could maintain property with higher property taxes

keep the country for all to enjoy. And keep educating children about farms and agriculture. (show them that vegetables don't magically appear in grocery stores. Someone has to grow them first!)

20. This is a complex issue, and consequently my answers are not entirely consistent. I'm generally opposed to the government dictating land use, since the government displays little wisdom or consistency in implementing its policies (e.g. the weather station on Woody Island - on land that was designated a wildlife preserve - right?)

21. The gov is paying ag people not to produce so why should we pay to preserve ag land? If it is right to protect ag land from development, why should we pay ag people for doing what is right. Because we are greedy? I doubt if any program could effectively circumvent such greed, if indeed that is the case. Balancing development/jobs against preserving the environment is difficult - I like our environment but paying people not to work, or maintain a social ?? Where jobs are scarce and low-wage particularly because I think people need to work - is not wise. There are some good reasons for preservation but I fear those who wish to preserve the past for largely romantic or selfish, anachronistic reasons. Thanks for the ice cream.

22. Non-polluting light industry should be welcomed and restricted to available space already zoned for such use within city and town boundaries. We have one of the most unique and beautiful counties due to our ag and undeveloped forests. We need to preserve what we have, or we will end up being a big urban sprawl like Sacramento County and other California counties.

23. We need to find the proper balance between ag and development public access to beaches important! All public trails should be maintained and protected.

24. The idea of a property tax is very unfair. We all live in Humboldt County but only some would (i.e. property owners) fund the plan. This is not right!

25. Promote this idea to the newer generation such as 4-H, FFA, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, outdoor recreation centers, any person living in this area is exposed to just about everything. If you can't make this area anymore better throw it already now, then something is wrong with our government, and our society as everything usually falls to the best. Good luck.

26. Sad to say environmentalists have shut down the no. 1 industry "timber". They have taken the timber land off the tax roll. That income is impossible to replace

27. I have a problem with government agencies purchasing land with public funds and then shutting out the public i.e. between Table Bluff and Mouth of Eel River

28. Major survey weakness: by including "private timberland" among "agricultural uses", I feel forced to give contradictory and inconsistent answers. I support protection of dairy or crop or ranching uses. But, I believe that the best protection of timberland (for scenic and habitat values) is to allow it to be sub-divided into large (i.e. 40-acre) parcels for residential use. This results in better (i.e. less exploitive) stewardship of the affected lands. Ag lands. Redesign your survey to allow for this distinction.

29. Agriculture is a very important aspect of our society and those places where such practices have minimal impacts to the natural landscape and water quality should be protected. However, i do feel that in areas of high erosion or high impact to wildlife that ag practices should be modified or eliminated

30. Future generations should always be considered in whatever decisions are made.

31. My husband and I retired here from the bay area five years ago to get away from all the problems of a major urban area. It would be nice not to see all those problems repeated in Humboldt County. At the same time it would be nice if the timber companies would leave at least a few trees standing. We have very much enjoyed the diversity of bird and animal life in our immediate vicinity and would be in favor of any measures which would help Protect the wildlife and its habitat.

32. I am not opposed to growth and expansion. I just think there should be a plan and it should not go unchecked.

33. If the farmer and ranchers were paid more for their products and had less restrictions from the government, maybe they would not "throw in the towel" so readily and sell to the subdivision contractors! You must realize the "hypothetical" program would also limit their rights to do as they wished With their own land! I believe the problem really just goes back to the land owners (ag land) not getting "equal" pay.

34. I support growth and development to sustain our future economic viability. We have thousands of protected acres already surrounding most of our local cities. I also believe that local farming families/traditions will not be sold out too easily. The land trust concept is a wonderful option for larger parcels and ranches. It would be a useful tool for families wanting their large parcels to be passed down intact. However, finding the funding could be difficult. It would make sense to use several sources like slight sales and property tax increases over 10 or more years.

35. Why should tax payers pay for ag to not be development and also get a tax cut. All the funds come from tax payers.

36. Doing a voluntary fundraising would be the best way to gather funds and to create a trust for agricultural land.

37. This area needs more corporate growth to survive and needs the corps to support the tourist trade. I do like the open areas, Im an artist, but really I'm here for the coastline. Art reasons only! This county could be a lot better. Needs some development for sure.

38. I have found the incentive for farming in the Orleans Hoopa outside of myself nearly non existent. Is there a local farm report, if so people like myself would be very interested in that. We've grown huge gardens since I was a child!

39. I enjoy the open space of this county, the green hills, trees etc. But also see the need to provide places for people to live. San Diego had some

open areas - mission valley had farms - dairy when i moved there in 1963 - that is gone now - it became business - the house building down there slowed way down - now prices are very high - unreasonable! The prices here are getting high too. We need to build homes for families - stop oppressing the lumber and fishing industry.

40. I strongly favor preservation of ag land and especially open spaces/parks. development is non-reversible and destroys the character of an area that it's most dedicated long-term residents admired enough to make it "home". Towns that slow development voluntarily remain scenic and desirable places to live; towns that allow unrestricted development let a small group of aggressive profiteer developers invent a new character, one which is invariably less original. Just drive the 101 to the bay area and watch the ag land and open space replaced by giant car lots, rv sales outlets, and identical homes.

41. The TPZ and residential zones interface need sensitive and enlightened governmental response.

42. I was willing to sacrifice essentially all of my \$ holdings to return to Humboldt County after attending grad school back east. Specifically, I returned For the quality of life here, which includes the intellectual as well as physical environment. The mindset which allows this type of land preservation initiative is a reflection of that quality of life.

43. Volunteer financing does not work as well as mandatory in my opinion.

44. Yes - our open public lands - why are public forest lands closed behind locked gates - suppose to be our land not the govt's to keep us out! Palco owns some 70 - 80% our eel and van duzen watershed what is to keep them from doing whatever they want with it! (e.g. clear cutting) - helicopter logging near homes and ranches should be prohibited.

45. The land trust idea is a good idea but the key factor is who is going to control it, like so many other govt projects, we end up with no say! When I moved here, I was already dismayed by the strip malls, signage and ugliness of Broadway in Eureka. McKinleyville reminds me of Orange County. I'd rather go visit development down south than live in it.

46. I agree ag lands are vital for Humboldt Co. I just do not like the idea of paying people to keep their property. If they want to sell it fine, but why should they be paid to keep it? I saw similar programs in Mendocino Co. Dairy farmers were paid to not produce milk. They got money and were able to raise other things or their property for profit - for instance, the Galletti's grew sweet peas. Why should I subsidize their way of life? Nobody is subsidizing mine. We work for everything we have - nobody gives us a dime. Not even student grants. (grrrrr!!!)

47. As the world population grows the need for food grows. This, I believe, is and will be the most challenging issue we humans face in the near and distant future. I believe it is our responsibility to preserve "ag" lands. For this reason. Foresight is often lost in this capitalistic society. We have the opportunity to think globally and act locally and we must.

48. I hate the use of pesticides and herbicides so in that way i don't want to live near ag lands. I only support ag land that isn't sprayed. Humboldt could be an organic/non-gmo farming community. That will help to protect our rivers and open spaces from degradation.

49. I fully support the preservation of ag land and open space. I had a hard time answering some of the questions. If we limit growth and dev, then housing prices will keep climbing, forcing local families to leave and only people relocating from large cities could afford to live here. I like the idea of buying development rights, but i don't want corporations like pl/maxam to benefit from this while continuing to devastate our forests, rivers, watersheds. I do think we need to plan for the future, and have control over growth so we don't lose the qualities of rural life that make h co sp special. It sure get complicated! Good luck and thanks for asking.

50. Initiatives proposed w/o the understanding and support of Humboldt Co residents will probably not be supported. A plan such as the one proposed necessitates much more community involvement than putting it on the ballot. Different communities in the area have different ideas of how their neighboring lands should be utilized.

51. The foregoing comments thru-out this survey speak for themselves. There's an obvious bias (anti "taking" of private land for the common good w/out just compensation). That's indicative of the farm bureau's lobbying efforts at state/local/federal governmental levels. They preach local self-determinative control over our destinies, yet crawl in-bed at the federal level to grant the most eggregious subsidies (to the tune of 3/4 trillion \$\$ subsidies over the next 20 years to the richest of the rich). To what ever extent the farm bureau is granted tax-exempt status, it should be revoked! Thank-you for giving me this opportunity to vent.

52. I hope this survey is used by the lawmakers. Good job.

2. Opinions about hypothetical 'purchase of development rights' program and funding options for agriculture land protection.

1. Too many existing taxes already.
2. Preserving open space is important, but I'd rather it were not done by paying private landowners. Better to buy and convert to public lands.
3. I'm not a homeowner so I do not pay taxes, at least not property taxes.
4. Open land and wild land is important to all quality of life.
5. This is extortion - but for a better reason than most.
6. Maintaining ag lands is very important for the quality of life here.
7. Don't have any property and living on social security.
8. Retired and money is tight.

9. People are paying out enough. We are broke!
10. \$100 is a lot, but seems reasonable. \$500-no way.
11. Money not the issue – do I trust the govt to manage such a program is the issue. That depends on specific language.
12. It'd be worth \$250 per year to keep Hum Co from over-development.
13. Let owners have the right to do what they want with their property. No tax.
14. Unclear on different ways Ag and open space lands would be treated.
15. Increase in property tax will hurt.
16. Protection of ag lands & open space is important to all of us and costs should be borne by everyone.
17. Essential to protect land from non-ag development to maintain quality of life in the area
18. It is important to me to keep land/space available for public use as well as ag.
19. No tax increase, private property owners will decide what to do with their property!!
20. Local solutions for local problems.
21. Retired fixed income people and others would support a limited tax (in amt/time) to preserve rural quality.
22. Don't believe the gooberment should have any more of my money.
23. The monies seem to never reach their destination.
24. I believe in individual diverse choice – not in government policies directing our future.
25. Don't like to expand government or taxes.
26. Too poor to pay more.
27. I am a senior citizen and cannot afford an increase in taxes.
28. There is no current or “near future” crisis in land use. Generally less government regulation is better. Land owners should retain full Rights to the use of their property.
29. I don't think property tax should increase. People pay too much as it is. I could see them paying \$10.00 a year but no \$125.00.
30. Enough taxes, each property owner should take care of themselves, without subsidies.

31. This is a subject that needs much thought and consideration – it has unforeseen effects down the road.
32. Government at every level is under financed and taxes are already too high. Way too much mis-use.
33. Realize the need to raise funding from somewhere. should one use surplus funds for such programs.
34. I would set payments @ 5% of property tax currently paid.
35. The gov't needs to stay out of my pocket!!
36. I don't make I to live on as it is.
37. Retired on fixed income
38. Govt regulates too much in private citizen's lives already.
39. I think that between the extra sales tax and the property tax increase of 5 cents per person/property owner, the proposed program would be affordable to residents and be a good source to fund such programs.
40. I believe in private property rights – and not special interest groups.
41. Property taxes are very expensive as it is. Get funds from existing federal & state programs.
42. With proper planning I don't see development a threat. Humboldt county is surrounded by 1,000's of acres of public land. Federal – state – city
43. I think the taxpayer should not have to pay private home or land owners to get rid of their property. I pay my expenses...you pay yours. I don't feel it is up to the tax payers to be taxed for land they will not be able to use.
44. There are a lot of minimum wage residents the proposed higher tax would cause a hardship on these residents
45. Future property owners lose their right to use their property as they wish.
46. Farmers need help and i can't, along with a lot of people, afford more
47. There is no additional land to be had
48. I doubt that any increase in property tax would be terminated after five years, or ever.
49. New taxes seem to expire, so i am leery of them
50. Very low income just able to meet tax obligations now
51. Think 125.00 each year a little too high. School and hospital want to

up taxes to fund them as well.

52. A small sales tax would be better. The burden would be shared by all, not just property owners.

53. The money does not have to come from the local people. It should be already bought and paid for and not tax us anymore.

54. Family farms handed down are saddled with govt sanctions. Government doesn't belong in this at all.

55. If landowners sell their property/rights, they should have first rights to lease the property to continue ag practices. Don't like the sound of a welfare system.

56. The problem is graft, greed and bureaucratic mismanagement. value of preserving productive lands for the next generation is vital and worth and large investment.

57. I am supportive of keeping productive ag lands from commercial development, but I would be more supportive of increasing conversion to protect Wildlife habitat.

58. On limited income – my taxes are hard to pay now. Also, do not trust the government to limit the time of any tax, once imposed.

59. Our property taxes are already too high

60. People who've lived here 10+ or generations shouldn't have to pay to keep the quality for overly wealthy bay area transplants. Charge it to them.

61. Willing to pay a small amount but not a lot!

62. We have many local families that will already maintain their ranches, parcels without government interference.

63. I think that this is a good idea but there are other things that this money could be used for.

64. We are paying too much in taxes already

65. I am already heavily taxed and cannot get ahead because of it. I cant afford any more.

66. We are paying enough already. Wages need to be increased.

67. A sale tax is fairer for all involved

68. Sound like a land grab scheme, and our government is already doing this

69. Against additional property taxes

70. Once the increase was added, I fear it would not go away. I'd rather contribute a set amount independently.

71. Disabled – don't have any money.
72. I believe in private property rights
73. In the long run, a 5 yr tax would benefit the community, however, my finances are tight to pay for additional taxes.
74. I am tired of paying more and more taxes to support every proposition. property owners are going to be over taxed of all proposed taxes
75. The program does not fix the problem. It only bandages the real problem by handing out cash.
76. Farming is very important for my culture. I enjoy farming in my country
77. I am tired of being taxes for things I don't feel are beneficial to me
78. I am alarmed at the forecast of population for his century, not to mention the need to build is great now – or the prices of houses will go very high. – need land to build
79. I favor zoning against conversion to non-ag/open space uses. Every rancher in the world would say yes to the buying of development rights and being able to keep, use, then sell their land.
80. This amount would not be a significant added burden for most, if not all, landowners.
81. \$125 is a huge increase
82. Times are tough, I can't afford more taxes
83. We need less not more government control in all areas.
I already pay state taxes, sales taxes and other taxes that are supposed to do things like this – what happened to tax dollars to build a by pass around Eureka?
84. Not sure money would be spent appropriately may pay for bureaucracy
85. If you want it you have to be willing to pay for it.
86. Do not want more property taxes. I want to be able to afford taxes when I retire.
87. Our taxes are high enough
88. I feel ag land should not be subdivided.
89. I don't think people should get paid to hang on to their property. I would go for the state or county buying the property and leasing it Like USFS and BLM programs.
90. I based my calculations on unknowns – I estimated 200,000 landowners willing to pay 28.00 a month for 1 year = 336.00. This is much cheaper

than the taxes of .25 on all items besides food and medicine.

91. Generally I can't like raising taxes for purposes like these.

92. Pay too much property tax already.

93. I would support such funding if it promoted organic ag practices.

94. Once our land is paved over it's gone forever.

95. If urban sprawl isn't controlled, it will occur in the ugliest of ways.

96. Although I could and would be willing to support this at \$175 per year I think it could be a big burden to those in a lower income bracket that are prop owners. It may also put a large burden on those w/ big properties.

97. Federal and state funding should support this initiative, not local tax increases.

98. It is important to protect ag land. I have witnessed other ag areas destroyed by development. I.e. Santa Clara County and Sonoma I would like to see the beauty of Humboldt preserved.

99. I moved here because of the rural character. I also love supporting local farmers. Without both I would have to move elsewhere.

PART TWO: REFERENCES

Humboldt County General Plan: Public Input on Agriculture

The following is a summary of public comments solicited by the Humboldt County Planning Department as a part of the General Plan Update, to be completed in 2004. Agricultural groups were asked their 'visions for the future'. General public comments were grouped into themes and are listed below. County planners responded to these public comments by suggesting potential recommendations, also summarized below. These and other county planning documents can be accessed via the internet website listed in the following references section.

Agriculture Groups: 'Visions For The Future':

1. What is your organization's vision for Humboldt County 20 years from now?
 - Cattlemens Assoc.: Rural, sustainable Ag economy, exports commodities other than its youth; maintain strong environmental quality.
 - Buckeye Conserv.: Retain existing private open space; minimize conversion of family ranch and timberlands to subdivisions.
 - Farm Bureau: A thriving and diverse Ag industry w/ managed open space, wildlife habitat and farmland protected for future generations. The Ag industry will be a stable source of income and a productive way of life.
 - N.C. Growers Assoc.: Advocating for small farms and more farmers markets.
 - Ag Advisory Comm.: A mixture of economic options with diverse Ag as one important option for its population.

2. What does your organization value most about Humboldt County?
 - Cattlemens Assoc.: Private, high quality, rural environment; strong opportunities for ranching operations.
 - Buckeye Conserv.: Open space; non-industrial ranch and timberlands.
 - Farm Bureau: Opportunities for growth in the Ag industry and positive rural lifestyle for all residents; Ag heritage.
 - N.C. Growers Assoc.: Community support for small farmers who provide quality products; a lifestyle based on productive land and quality environment.
 - Ag Advisory Comm.: To influence and encourage those processes that will allow Ag operations to continue; processes will encourage the coordination of private enterprise with regulatory and taxing factions.

3. What will be your organization's most important accomplishment 20 years from now?
 - Cattlemens Assoc.: Maintain and support a strong grazing economy.
 - Buckeye Conserv.: Establish a 'working' conservancy that demonstrates the balance of ecology and resource production for the public.
 - Farm Bureau: Prevention of urban sprawl and protection of healthy land base that prevents excess development and undesirable growth. Will work in partnership to protect Ag opportunities for future generations.
 - N.C. Growers Assoc.: Taking a leadership role in land conservation for small farmers; encourage local communities to support small farmers.
 - Ag Advisory Comm.: That government and regulators can work with Ag as partners.

4. If your organization could work to change one aspect of H.C., what would it be?
 - Cattlemens Assoc.: Protection of large tracks of land; sustain a grazing industry.
 - Buckeye Conserv.: Over-regulation of private property that causes defacto conversion of ranch and timberlands.
 - Farm Bureau: Restrict further loss of Ag lands – from residential dev., agency acquisition or recreation conversion.
 - N.C. Growers Assoc.: County-wide recognition of small family farm contributions to the health and economy of H.C.; providing opportunities for input into decisions that affect their land and businesses.
 - Ag Advisory Comm.: That government and regulators can work with Ag as partners.

Public Comments: Concerns About Agriculture:

1. Loss of Ag land to development, rezoning, conditional use permits, patent parcels, subdivision
2. Loss of Ag land by public acquisition
3. Affordable Ag land
4. Zoning designations often conflict w/ agriculture
5. How to increase use of Williamson Act
6. Threats: land speculation, land prices, estate taxes, retirement / heirs
7. No modern soil survey means no long-term protection strategy for prime soils
8. Ag landowner compensation for non-Ag public benefits
9. Property taxes, estate taxes convert Ag lands
10. Conflicts bt. Ag and habitat restoration
11. Conflicts bt. Ag and residential, recreation
12. Economic and resource assistance for Ag support, marketing, processing, tourism
13. Transportation costs limit Ag exports
14. Balance of private property rights with Ag land protection
15. Ag policies don't support small acre productions
16. Livestock predation

County Draft Recommendations, Response to Public Input:

1. Stronger policies, zoning to retain Ag land
2. Policy to address lot line adjustments on Ag lands, resource lands, large rural properties
3. County to monitor loss of Ag land to conversion, public acquisition, conditional use permits and Board of Supervisors to objectively review Ag land conversion, conditional use permits, before approval
4. Board of Supervisors to provide input / approval necessary for public acquisition of Ag land
5. Zoning: reduce number of Ag zones, allow Ag use in range of zones
6. Assist California Dept. of Conservation, Farmland Mapping Project to provide data for Humboldt County
7. Develop positions on Conservation Easement Program and Transfer of Development Rights Program
8. Stronger support / outreach for Williamson Act and Farmland Security Zones
9. Urban Growth Boundaries applied: LAFCOs, County-city agreements
10. Economic Development: strategies for new markets, for local cooperatives, value-added products, new farms, new income generators
11. Policies supporting transportation of Ag products

PART TWO: REFERENCES

Recommended Reading

Websites:

American Farmland Trust: www.farmlandinfo.org ; www.farmland.org

Buckeye Conservancy: www.buckeyeconservancy.org

Humboldt County General Plan: www.co.humboldt.ca.us/planning/gp

Marin Agricultural Land Trust: www.malt.org

Books and Articles:

American Farmland Trust. 1997. Saving American Farmland: What Works. Washington, D.C. 334p.

California Agriculture. 1998. Volume 52 #3. Focus on Ag land conservation

California Agriculture 2002. Volume 56, #1. Focus on Ag conservation easements

Daniels, T. and D. Bowers. 1997. Holding Our Ground: Protecting America's Farms and Farmland. Island Press. Washington, D.C. 334p.

Daniels, Tom. 2000a. Integrated working landscape protection: the case of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. *Society and Natural Resources*. V13,#3, Pg. 261-72.

Giraud, D. and M. Smith. 2000. Traditional land-use planning regulation and agricultural land conservation: a case study from a rural northern California county. Humboldt County analysis: Debra Giraud (707-445-7351) and Michael Smith (707-826-4291).

Handel, M. and A. Sokolow. 1995. Farmland and Open Space Preservation in the Four North Bay Counties. University of California, Agricultural Issues Center. 32p.

Humboldt County Farm Bureau. 2000. Food, Fiber and Flowers: A Special Report on Agriculture in Humboldt County. Eureka, CA. 707-443-4844

Humboldt County Planning Department. 2003. *Agricultural Resources and Policies: a discussion paper for community workshops*. Eureka, CA: Humboldt County Planning Department

Kline, J. and D. Wichelns. 1996. Public Preferences Regarding the Goals of Farmland Preservation Programs. *Land Economics* 72:538-549.

Krieger, D. 1999. Saving Open Spaces: Public Support for Farmland Protection. Center for Agriculture In The Environment, American Farmland Trust. WP99-1.

Maynard, L. and T. Kelsey. 1998. Early Experience with Pennsylvania's Agricultural Conservation Easement Program. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. V53#2. pg. 106-113.

Medvitz, Sokolow, and Lemp 1999. California Farmland and Urban Pressures: Statewide and Regional Perspectives. Davis, CA: University of CA. Agricultural Issues Center.

Morehead, Ben. 2004. The Role of Agricultural Lands in Humboldt County. Humboldt State University, Masters Thesis. Arcata, CA.

Olson, R. and T. Lyson, eds. 1999. Under the Blade: The Conversion of Agricultural Landscapes. Westview Publishers. Boulder, CO.

Rilla, E. and A. Sokolow. 2000. California Farmers and Conservation Easements: motivations, experiences and perceptions in three Counties. U.C. Agricultural Issues Center, California Farmland and Open Space Policy Series, Research Paper 4. 49p.

Sherman, R. Milshaw, S. Wagner, R. and J. Freedgood. 1998. Investing in the Future of Agriculture: The Massachusetts Farmland Protection Program and the Permanence Syndrome. Northhampton, MA: American Farmland Trust. 75p.