

Status: The Committee may consider whether to recommend adoption of the revised proposed resolution, with or without further revisions. The Committee may also consider the filing of County Communication 18-116 and other related action.

1. MORE revisions are needed in the proposed resolution.
2. These revisions concern the following information that is not being provided. No reso should be approved until this info is provided.

- a. Clarification of the expected market and need for the new Ag park
- b. Archaeological study for the proposed land- did A&B provide and AIS or survey? Land parcel includes several prominent gulches, which are commonly places where archaeological sites are found

c. guarantees that the park will include areas suitable for and available to lease to organic farmers

NOTE: Key info for Council members is how the ag park needs to be set up to have organic farmers be able to lease lands and grow organically certified crops that are not contaminated by pesticides etc.. Ask the this specific arrangement be included in any approvals for the new ag park.

d. Is there a plan to reduce Ag crop theft at the existing park before we we expand the park. Since farmers cannot live on their land, this is a major issue.

e. The irrigation water system proposed for the park, its capacity and the cost per 1000 ga of water should be something that is known to council members BEFORE and agreement is finalized. Modifications to the Reso may be needed to insure that farming in the new area would be viable.

f. Is there a reason that the county did not want to negotiate for land designated IAL ("Important Ag Lands"). The Ag potential of lands being proposed for ag park expansion is unknown, and it should be known.

g. Comparatives sales of several ag parcels that set the price for this

RECEIVED AT PER MEETING ON 9-17-10
(BILL GREENLEAF FOR MAMI TOMORROW)

land referred to lands with greater Ag potential, or land that was worth more because it had some development rights. This land appears overpriced.

10. Additional 500 acres of ag land being offered on 10 year lease basis, is not the type of arrangement farmers are seeking. The reso should specify longer term leases if these lands are part of the Ag park.