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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Investing in and preserving the vitality of the San Francisco Bay Area’s agricultural lands and economy is critical to building long-term regional resilience. A healthy and equitable agricultural sector can store atmospheric carbon in soils and woody biomass and reduce potent greenhouse gas emissions while providing buffers to wildfires, extreme floods and heat while also protecting the well-being of farmworkers. A resilient regional agricultural sector is also a critical source of local food security while supporting the economic viability of the region’s farms and ranches and preserving local knowledge about the region’s unique agricultural resources. With the continued threat of agricultural land loss in the region due to incremental conversion to urban development and lack of investments in the agricultural sector, fundamental changes to regional planning policies along with more robust investment are needed to realize the climate and equity benefits of a healthy agricultural sector and ensure that generations to come can continue to reap these benefits.
This Bay Area Agricultural Framework Plan (Framework) was developed at a pivotal time in the State’s history. In addition to State-level leadership in advancing statewide agricultural solutions to the climate crisis, there is a robust network of partners across the Bay Region that recognizes the need for:

- A unified and collective approach to protecting agricultural land
- Enhancing climate smart agriculture
- Engaging farmers and ranchers as land stewards
- Providing equitable opportunities for diverse limited resource farmers
- Supporting farmworker well-being
- Catalyzing the agricultural economy

The Framework provides a suite of strategies for multi-jurisdictional coordination and investment to make the Bay Area’s agricultural sector a foundation of regional resilience. In addition, the Framework sets out next steps to envision a new regional agricultural resilience entity that could champion and help fund the recommended strategies, convene stakeholders around common issues, and foster awareness and advocacy so that cities, counties and community stakeholders can act collectively. Currently, there are no clear existing regional organizations with the requisite authority that could enfold the interconnected agricultural issues and diverse stakeholders that the Framework strategies seek to address.

Craft a unified regional and organizational framework for the future: Bring together the agricultural sector, regional government agencies and community organizations to, together, address the challenges and opportunities that can only be solved at a regional level.

Recognize the importance of a thriving agricultural sector to a resilient future for the Bay Area: Ensuring the continued health, equity and vibrancy of the Bay Area’s network of agricultural lands is an integral piece in securing a resilient future for the region.

Protect and invest in agricultural lands and the agricultural economy: Amplifying the importance of a coordinated approach in supporting ranch and farm viability in land use and economic policies, preservation strategies, farmworker housing, stewardship approaches, and climate action planning is critical in effectively addressing the climate challenges—together.
The Framework is organized around four Focus Areas with associated goals and recommended strategies. Each of the Focus Areas is interrelated and critical to building a robust regional framework to protect and invest in agricultural lands while prioritizing equity.

**FOCUS AREA 01**

**AGRICULTURAL LANDS CONSERVATION & LAND TENURE**

+ **Goal:** Permanent protection of key farm and ranch lands and capacity for new farmers to access and establish businesses on these lands.

+ **Equity Focus:** Land conservation and access mechanisms should prioritize current low-income/indebted, BIPOC, or other systemically excluded community representative farmers and ranchers.

**FOCUS AREA 02**

**CLIMATE-SMART AGRICULTURAL LANDS & STEWARDSHIP**

+ **Goal:** Implementation of land management practices that benefit water, habitat, and soil health, address climate threats, and provide social benefits.

+ **Equity Focus:** Leadership from Indigenous, BIPOC, women and veteran land managers will identify pathways to address specific local and regional priorities for climate-smart agricultural lands while leveraging partnerships and networks, including philanthropic and NGO partners.

**FOCUS AREA 03**

**AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY & INFRASTRUCTURE**

+ **Goal:** Development of a thriving agricultural economy, including sufficient processing and distribution infrastructure, equitable and sufficient labor and workforce development, and engaged agritourism and agricultural education sectors.

+ **Equity Focus:** Mechanisms and incentives will be inclusive of land-based, capital-focused, and market-driven tactics that can lead to long-term prosperity and improved/safer working conditions for systemically excluded community representatives.

**FOCUS AREA 04**

**AGRICULTURAL SECTOR HOUSING**

+ **Goal:** Sufficient, affordable, and accessible housing for all people working in the region’s agricultural [and food] sectors.

+ **Equity Focus:** Identification of mechanisms to support more affordable agricultural housing will naturally increase housing security for those who need it most. Strategies could ensure robust equitable outcomes by proposing strategies that would lead to high quality, well-located housing.

Finally, this report puts forth the key next steps in implementing this Framework which includes an “incubation phase” in which an advisory body would explore options for the creation of a new “entity”. The incubation phase would be hosted by an existing organization to pursue the establishment of a Bay Area Agricultural Resiliency “Collaborative” to champion and help fund the strategies and actions described in this report.
OVERVIEW OF STRATEGIES

FOCUS AREA 01
AGRICULTURAL LANDS CONSERVATION & LAND TENURE

+STRATEGY 1A. Map and prioritize agricultural lands and their attributes in the nine Bay Area Counties plus the neighboring counties of Santa Cruz and San Benito (the Region). Create a “dashboard” of key data that informs the implementation of the Ag Plan Framework goals and strategies, and tracks and communicates progress on resiliency initiatives for the region.

+STRATEGY 1B. Strengthen Land Use Tools and Agricultural Conservation Programs through shared and aligned planning approaches.

+STRATEGY 1C. Ensure that Plan Bay Area and the PCA and OBAG Programs include enhanced land stewardship, economic vitality, and social equity.

+STRATEGY 1D. Support Indigenous decision-making and leadership around the protection of Native American tribal lands.

+STRATEGY 1E. Support land access and land tenure for diverse limited resource farmers and the next generation of farmers and ranchers.

FOCUS AREA 02
CLIMATE-SMART AGRICULTURAL LANDS

+STRATEGY 2A. Develop a formal regional collaborative network of strategic partners to share Climate Smart Agricultural (CSA) practices and expand funding options to meet demand.
FOCUS AREA 03
AGRICULTURAL LANDS ECONOMY & INFRASTRUCTURE

+STRATEGY 3A. Increase social resilience through equitable labor practices that support upward mobility in the food and agricultural sectors.
+STRATEGY 3B. Remove barriers to agricultural entrepreneurship.
+STRATEGY 3C. Support agricultural entrepreneurship.
+STRATEGY 3D. Identify opportunities and address challenges in a circular economy across the food supply chain.
+STRATEGY 3E. Support local agricultural and food product processing, storage, and distribution.

FOCUS AREA 04
AGRICULTURAL SECTOR HOUSING

+STRATEGY 4A. Develop a legislative and funding strategy for the production and preservation of agricultural employee housing in the Bay Area Region.
+STRATEGY 4B. Facilitate agricultural employee housing development through zoning amendments, permit streamlining, and other incentives.
+STRATEGY 4C. Encourage use of new and innovative housing prototypes for agricultural employee housing.
+STRATEGY 4D. Update and rehabilitate existing agricultural employee housing properties.
+STRATEGY 4E. Encourage the use of public partnerships and resources (i.e., between Cities and Counties) to build agricultural employee housing.
+STRATEGY 4F. Raise awareness about the importance of ag housing through a regional ag housing ombudsman.

THOUGHTS

The Bay Area Agricultural Framework provides a roadmap for the multi-jurisdictional coordination and investments/needed to make the San Francisco Bay Area’s agricultural sectora foundation of regional resilience.
**Purpose**

*The Bay Area Agricultural Framework* (*Framework*) provides a roadmap for the multi-jurisdictional coordination and investments needed to make the San Francisco Bay Area’s agricultural sector a foundation of regional resilience. It is the product of a year-long engagement process with stakeholders across the Bay Area, representing counties, agencies, agriculture-related businesses, and community-based and advocacy organizations. Through the inputs of working group participants and an Advisory Council, the project team identified priorities and opportunities for regional coordination across four focus areas: *Agricultural Lands Conservation and Land Tenure, Climate-Smart Agricultural Lands, Agricultural Lands Economy and Infrastructure,* and *Agricultural Employee Housing.* The *Framework* includes strategy recommendations for each Focus Area and if applicable, details potential cross-jurisdictional mechanisms, funding sources, and partners, as well as precedents for this work. Finally, this report concludes with an outline of the next steps needed to implement and advance the recommendations of the *Framework.*
AUDIENCES

The Framework is intended to catalyze action within public and private organizations to work towards a unified and coordinated approach to investing in and preserving the region’s agricultural lands and economy. Specifically, if you are an:

- **Existing Regional Organization and Coalition:**
  If you are a member of an existing regional organization in the Bay Area, we encourage you to look at strategies in the Framework that would benefit from regional collaboration. Please note any strategies and their respective cross-jurisdictional mechanisms if they align with your organization’s mission.

- **Elected or Appointed Official:**
  Elected and appointed officials are important champions for the agricultural sector and a healthy, equitable food system more broadly. We encourage you to work to utilize this Framework to build cross-jurisdictional partnerships as well as implement applicable strategies at a local level.

- **Jurisdiction Staff:**
  If you are a jurisdiction staff member, we hope the Framework can support existing efforts in your department as well as inform cross-jurisdictional collaborations to support regional initiatives.

- **Community-Based Organization and Agricultural and Food Sector Advocate:**
  As an advocate for agriculture and healthy, equitable food systems in the Bay Area, we hope that you continue to support the Framework through its implementation as well as identify specific strategies that may align with your strategic goals.

- **Indigenous Groups of the Bay Area:**
  As the original land stewards of the region, we hope the Framework will support your ongoing initiatives around sovereignty and stewardship of Bay Area Indigenous lands and culture.
**PROJECT GOALS**

The goal of this Framework is to coordinate Bay Area stakeholders around a unified vision for the agricultural sector. This vision recognizes the intersections between climate resilience, economic development, affordable housing, and other areas that stakeholders identified about agriculture. This Framework builds upon the work that has already been done by local jurisdictions, community organizations, and farmers and ranchers and identifies opportunities for increased capacity and funding. With a focus on the public sector, the Framework features key strategies that can support a vibrant agricultural economy and build more resilient communities. Through a year-long engagement process, this project sought to accomplish three key goals.

01 **CRAFT**

Craft a unified regional and organizational framework for the future: Bring together the agricultural sector, regional government agencies and community organizations to, together, address the challenges and opportunities that can only be solved at a regional level.

02 **RECOGNIZE**

Recognize the importance of a thriving agricultural sector to a resilient future for the Bay Area: Ensuring the continued health, equity, and vibrancy of the Bay Area’s network of agricultural lands is an integral piece in securing a resilient future for the region.

03 **PROTECT & INVEST**

Protect and invest in agricultural lands and the agricultural economy: Amplifying the importance of a coordinated approach in supporting ranch and farm viability in land use and economic policies, preservation strategies, farmworker housing, stewardship approaches, and climate action planning is critical in effectively addressing complex climate challenges together.

The framework is intended to catalyze action within public and private organizations to work towards a unified and coordinated approach to investing in and preserving the region’s agricultural lands and economy.
FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The Framework was developed through the support of an Advisory Group and four Working Groups. The Working Groups consisted of diverse stakeholders from the public sector, non-profit organizations, as well as on-the-ground technical assistance providers. Each Working Group focused on one of the four Focus Areas outlined below. Working Group members identified policies or initiatives that have been impactful historically, discussed current needs that are not being addressed, as well as opportunities to address those needs. Based on these discussions, strategies for the Framework were selected based on three criteria.

For each strategy, we considered whether the strategy is:

+ AT THE NEXUS OF CLIMATE RESILIENCE & AGRICULTURE.
+ A TANGIBLE & SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION, WHERE THE PUBLIC SECTOR PLAYS A SIGNIFICANT ROLE.
+ APPLICABLE AT THE LOCAL OR REGIONAL SCALE.

BAY AREA AG

Stewarding agricultural lands and the State’s invaluable natural resources is not only central to maintaining our economic vitality, it is also key to meeting our climate goals.

-California Strategic Growth Council

BAY AREA REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL PLAN FRAMEWORK
THE FOUR FOCUS AREAS

FOCUS AREA 01
AGRICULTURAL LANDS
CONSERVATION & LAND TENURE

Permanent protection of key farm and ranch lands and capacity for new farmers to access and establish businesses on these lands.

Equity Focus: Land conservation and access mechanisms should prioritize current low-income/indebted, BIPOC, or other systemically excluded community representative farmers and ranchers.

--------+

FOCUS AREA 02
CLIMATE-SMART AGRICULTURAL LANDS & STEWARDSHIP

Implementation of land management practices that benefit water, habitat, and soil; that address climate threats; and that provide social benefits.

Equity Focus: Leadership from Indigenous, BIPOC, women and veteran land managers will identify pathways to address specific local and regional priorities for climate-smart agricultural lands while leveraging partnerships and networks, including philanthropic and NGO partners.

--------+

FOCUS AREA 03
AGRICULTURAL LANDS ECONOMY & INFRASTRUCTURE

Development of a thriving agricultural economy, including sufficient processing and distribution infrastructure, equitable and sufficient labor and workforce development, and engaged agritourism and agricultural education sectors.

Equity Focus: Mechanisms and incentives will be inclusive of land-based, capital-focused, and market-driven tactics that can lead to long-term prosperity and improved/safer working conditions for systemically excluded community representatives.

--------+

FOCUS AREA 04
AGRICULTURAL SECTOR HOUSING

Sufficient, affordable, and accessible housing for all people working in the region’s agricultural and food sectors.

Equity Focus: Identification of mechanisms to support more affordable agricultural housing will naturally increase housing security for those who need it most. Strategies could ensure robust equitable outcomes by proposing strategies that would lead to high quality, well-located housing.
RECOMMENDED STRATEGIES

From the working groups, the project team identified specific strategies for each focus area. For each strategy, a brief description outlining its respective needs and opportunities is provided. Additionally, recommended mechanisms for cross-jurisdictional coordination, and potential partners are provided. A list of potential funding sources for strategies is in Appendix D.

In the accompanying table, each strategy is tagged in two places: 1) at the scale at which it is recommended to take place, and 2) its cross-jurisdictional coordination needs.

1) STRATEGY SCALE: WHAT GEOGRAPHIC LEVEL DOES THIS STRATEGY NEED TO TAKE PLACE AT?

- **City:** Strategy requires City action
- **County:** Strategy requires County action
- **Sub-Regional:** Strategy includes action by more than one jurisdiction or a subset of the nine Bay Area counties
- **Regional:** Strategy requires coordination among all nine Bay Area counties

2) CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL NEEDS: WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED TO IMPLEMENT THIS STRATEGY?

- **No Cross-Jurisdictional Needs:** Strategy can be implemented at a local level and does not require cross-jurisdictional collaboration
- **Coordination Needed Within Existing Structures:** Strategy requires coordinating amongst existing organizations (e.g., CBOs, Counties)
- **Entity Without Statutory Powers:** Strategy requires a coordinating entity to move forward (e.g. requires an entity that can serve as a champion or convener)
- **Entity With Statutory Powers:** Strategy requires a coordinating entity with distinct legislative or financial abilities (e.g., issue bonds). These abilities are granted usually through the passage of a law through state or local legislature.
FOCUS AREA 01
AGRICULTURAL LANDS CONSERVATION & LAND TENURE

STRATEGY 1A. Map and prioritize agricultural lands and their attributes in the nine Bay Area Counties plus the neighboring counties of Santa Cruz and San Benito (the Region). Create a “dashboard” of key data that informs the implementation of the Ag Plan Framework goals and strategies, and tracks and communicates progress on resiliency initiatives for the region.

STRATEGY 1B. Strengthen Land Use Tools and Agricultural Conservation Programs through shared and aligned planning approaches.

STRATEGY 1C. Ensure that Plan Bay Area and the PCA and OBAG Programs include enhanced land stewardship, economic vitality, and social equity.

STRATEGY 1D. Support Indigenous decision-making and leadership around the protection of Native American tribal lands.

STRATEGY 1E. Support land access and land tenure for diverse limited resource farmers and the next generation of farmers and ranchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>SUB-REGIONAL</th>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
<th>NO CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL NEEDS</th>
<th>COORDINATION NEEDED WITHIN EXSTG. STRUCTURES</th>
<th>ENTITY W/O STATUTORY POWERS</th>
<th>ENTITY WITH STATUTORY POWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A: Map and prioritize ag lands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B: Strengthen land use tools and ag conservation programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C: Ensure that Plan Bay Area and the PCA and OBAG Programs include enhanced land stewardship, economic vitality, and social equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1D: Support Indigenous decision-making and leadership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E: Support land access and land tenure for diverse limited resource farmers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY 1A.

Map and prioritize agricultural lands and their attributes in the nine Bay Area Counties plus the neighboring counties of Santa Cruz and San Benito. Create a “dashboard” of key data that informs the implementation of the Ag Plan Framework goals and strategies and tracks and communicates progress on resiliency initiatives regionwide.

An accurate estimate of agricultural lands and systems in the Bay Area is important to inform conservation and climate action goals while identifying opportunities for conservation and investment. However, there is not a comprehensive set of data that is being used in the Bay Area to inform planning, policy, and investment decisions in the agricultural sector. Plan Bay Area offers a regional approach to agricultural and open space land conservation but the data it relies on to set conservation targets does not fully reflect the scope of agricultural lands in the Region.

There is a need to define shared data, methods, criteria, and targets for agricultural land conservation prioritization to locate, quantify and demonstrate the opportunities for investments in land conservation, Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) land management, improved climate resilience, and economic development. Undertaking a comprehensive data and mapping dashboard of the region’s agricultural lands and systems will allow policymakers and the community to understand the inherent complexity and interconnectedness of the challenges and opportunities that transcend county boundaries.

This dashboard will facilitate goal setting and tracking as well as integration with county and regional climate action plans. The data provided by this dashboard will allow for more informed decisions including determining conservation priority areas for agricultural lands, developing prioritization criteria based on climate, economic, equity and social factors (e.g., ecosystem benefits), and assessing and targeting investment needs given current conditions and future projections of climate change impacts. This effort should synchronize with Plan Bay Area’s planning assumptions, Blueprint Update, Horizon 2.0, and ABAG/MTC’s PCA program refresh efforts.

+ **Potential Coordination:** Participation from jurisdictions across the region in sharing the data that they already have will help develop this tool. A coordinating project manager will also be needed to ensure that jurisdictions are aware of how they can use this data to inform their local agricultural goals as well as provide alignment with climate resiliency plans.

+ **Potential Partners:** GreenInfo Network, Carbon Cycle Institute, Santa Clara County Planning Department, PBA project staff, PCA program staff, the Conservation Lands Network project team, Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs), UC Cooperative Extension offices (UCCE), and agricultural associations throughout the region.

STRATEGY 1B.

Strengthen land use tools and Agricultural Conservation Programs through shared and aligned planning approaches.

Local agencies have a variety of regulatory options available to help them to manage the conservation of agricultural lands. However, while many cities and counties across the Bay Area have adopted and implemented land use tools for agricultural conservation with varying degrees of success, they can become more effective, enduring, and gain more support when they are a part of a collective vision and integrated regional approach.

+ **Potential Coordination:** Cities and counties can learn from each other and build effective plans by sharing planning and stakeholder engagement approaches, resources and templates on effective policies, programs and best practices that contribute to the implementation of successful conservation programs and smart growth approaches.

+ **Potential Partners:** County Planning Departments, ABAG/MTC
**STRATEGY 1C.**

Ensure that Plan Bay Area and the PCA and OBAG Programs include enhanced land stewardship, economic vitality, and social equity as necessary foundational goals to achieving scaled and long-term agricultural lands conservation.

Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2050 includes strategies to “Expand Access to Parks and Open Space” and goals of the PCA Program include protecting and investing the region’s agricultural lands. However, the PBA planning assumptions for these strategies show that past PBA efforts have not fully evaluated agricultural lands to develop appropriate conservation objectives for those lands. Additionally, more is needed both in the planning assumptions and within the PBA themes, strategies, and actions to fully capture the potential that agricultural lands must contribute to regional resilience. In 2023, MTC and ABAG will begin the update process for the new PBA 2050+. Appendix A provides recommendations to support the PBA process as it moves into the future to address the conservation of agricultural lands in a broader context that considers enhanced land stewardship, economic vitality, and social equity as necessary foundational goals to achieving scaled and long-term land conservation.

Additionally, in 2022, MTC and ABAG began an effort to refresh the PCA planning framework with more data-driven and science-based approaches, while also incorporating a wider range of policy concerns, such as equity and resilience to climate hazards. In 2024, this effort will conclude with a final report of major findings, including a recommended suite of options for regional policymakers to consider with respect to planning, policy and funding. Findings from this report and this effort should be coordinated with the implementation of Strategy 1A and other strategies in the Framework to refine OBAG funding guidelines to more effectively target investments in priority areas and projects that provide economic, environmental, and social benefits to the region.

**Potential Coordination:** Secure for a Framework representative, a position on ABAG/MTC and PBA advisory committees and working groups that address land conservation and the regional economy, to present the perspective of the Framework goals and strategies.

**Potential Partners:** ABAG/MTC

**STRATEGY 1D.**

Support Indigenous decision-making and leadership around the protection and stewardship of Native American tribal lands

Despite the atrocities of colonization and genocide, Native communities persist today and are active in efforts to preserve and revive their culture. According to the U.S. Census, the Indigenous population in the 9-county Bay Area region is 18,500 strong and is projected to grow over the next few decades. To heal and transform these legacies, there is a growing effort to prioritize the protection of Bay Area Native American tribal ancestral lands for cultural practice, ceremony, tribal management and subsistence hunting and harvesting. Some Native American communities have petitioned for federal acknowledgment of their tribe, which would allow them access to health, housing, and education benefits, as well as funding for land management and conservation efforts. To support federal acknowledgment and reinforce the essential role of Native communities in land conservation, stewardship, and climate action, jurisdictions should engage with Native communities around their priorities and needs for future land use and climate planning efforts.

**Potential Coordination:** In conjunction with other strategies in this Framework, planning and conservation efforts should include shared decision-making with California Native American tribes in identifying critical conservation areas and climate resiliency opportunities for both natural and working lands.

**Potential Partners:** Counties, MTC/ABAG, Sogorea Te’ Land Trust, The Cultural Conservancy
**STRATEGY 1E.**

Support land access and land tenure for limited resource farmers and the next generation of farmers and ranchers.

Land conservation is a foundation for supporting an enduring regional agriculture. Succession of the next generation of farmers and ranchers, many of whom may have limited resources, is also essential for a vital agricultural sector. As it stands, affordable land access and tenure are consistently out of reach for limited resource and socially disadvantaged farmers, including BIPOC, veteran, and women farmers, who would like to maintain or start agricultural businesses, most commonly small- to medium-scale diversified farming operations. Land with sufficient, affordable water and good quality soil is critical to farmers’ success, but throughout the region, there is far little land with these assets on the market at a price point that is affordable for limited resource farmers. In addition, insecure land tenure can limit farmers’ ability to use—and benefit from incentives that support—climate-smart agricultural practices, since many such practices require multi-year investments on the same piece of land to get ecological and economic returns.

**Potential actions that support land access and land tenure could include the following:**

- Sharing information about best practices for equity-building and career-length leases, especially where a landlord provides infrastructure improvements and opportunities exist to earn equity.
- Sharing information about models including buy-protect sell, enhanced easements, farm incubators (and other ‘stepping-stone’ options), agricultural parks (and other congregant lease models), and community land trusts.
- Promote land-linking programs to existing farmers and limited-resource farmers.
- Explore the feasibility of creating a regional community land trust.
- Explore the feasibility of creating a regional funding program to offer financing incentives (down payment assistance, interest rate reduction, longer terms, etc.) to qualifying farmers buying land or building businesses.
- Include in the mapping and data dashboard, information about land prices and trends, and trends in farm size and consolidation.

**Potential Coordination:** A regional hub to share best practices for land access and land tenure can help local jurisdictions expand and build effective programs. A regional organization with the ability to apply for grants or raise funds and convening abilities will be a key part of exploring the feasibility of a regional community land trust or funding program for farmers.

**Potential Partners:** UCCE Offices, RCDs’, CA FarmLink, Kitchen Table Advisors.
**FOCUS AREA 02**

**CLIMATE-SMART AGRICULTURAL LANDS & STEWARDSHIP**

**STRATEGY 2A.** Develop a formal regional collaborative network of strategic partners to share Climate Smart Agricultural (CSA) practices and expand funding options to meet demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>SUB-REGIONAL</th>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
<th>NO CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL NEEDS</th>
<th>COORDINATION NEEDED WITHIN EXISTING STRUCTURES</th>
<th>ENTITY W/O STATUTORY POWERS</th>
<th>ENTITY WITH STATUTORY POWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A: Develop a formal regional collaborative network of strategic partners to share CSA practices.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STRATEGY 2A.**

*Develop a formal regional collaborative network of strategic partners to share Climate Smart Agricultural (CSA) practices and expand funding options to meet demand.*

Across the region there is an uptick of interest among producers in the adoption of carbon farming practices and agricultural climate solutions. Many agricultural practitioners, scientists, policy makers, climate planners, and funders among others are aware of the opportunities to scale CSA practices but efforts are often made at the local level which can stand as a barrier to effectively scaling at the regional level. There is a need to lift these local efforts by aggregating the needs and opportunities to reach to reach potential scale.

**Potential Coordination:** A collaborative regional network could serve as a body to facilitate shared practices, expand funding, promote equitable access to tools and resources, and synchronize policy and planning efforts across the region. It could:

- **Coordinated with CDFA, NRCS, and technical service providers, including RCDs and Cooperative Extension, to aggregate agronomic and economic data on CSA projects across the region to support improved data collection and analysis of CSA projects and impacts across the region.**

- **Serve as an applicant and pass-through entity for regional funding, such as the CDFA Healthy Soils Block Grant Program and other state and federal grant programs.**

- **Coordinate among jurisdictions’ local climate and general planning efforts by sharing data and methods for the development of local goals and priorities around mitigation, adaptation, and resiliency or future investments in CSA.**

- **Design and support the adoption of local-level funding programs for climate-smart agriculture pilot projects and tie those to local climate action plans.**

- **Develop and share templates and best practices around the inclusion of CSA practices in land leases.**

- **Develop and coordinate planning, education, and support programs with technical assistance providers such as Resource Conservation Districts and UCCE to help farmers and ranchers, especially underserved producers and small and mid-scale operations, with planning, funding and implementation.**

- **Codify inclusion of agricultural lands in Climate Resilience Districts (SB 852).**

**Potential Partners:** Counties, Coastal Conservancy, local resource conservation districts (RCDs), County Extension/CSA specialists, North Bay Soil Hub, Carbon Cycle Institute, California Native American Tribes/ABAG/MTC, CDFA, DOC, USDA, NRCS
**Focus Area 03**

**Agricultural Lands Economy & Infrastructure**

**Strategy 3A.** Increase social resilience through equitable labor practices that support upward mobility in the food and agricultural sector.

**Strategy 3B.** Remove barriers to agricultural entrepreneurship.

**Strategy 3C.** Support agricultural entrepreneurship.

**Strategy 3D.** Identify opportunities and address challenges in a circular economy across the food supply chain.

**Strategy 3E.** Support local agricultural and food product processing, storage, and distribution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sub-Regional</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>No Cross-Jurisdictional Needs</th>
<th>Coordination Needed Within Existing Structures</th>
<th>Entity W/O Statutory Powers</th>
<th>Entity With Statutory Powers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A: Increase social resilience through equitable labor practices.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B: Remove barriers to ag entrepreneurship.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C: Support agricultural entrepreneurship.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D: Identify opportunities and address challenges in a circular economy across the food supply chain.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E: Support local ag and food product processing, storage, and distribution</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY 3A. 
**Increase social resilience through equitable labor practices that support upward mobility in the food and agricultural sector.**

The Bay Area’s food economy consists of 468,000 food jobs, representing 13 percent of all jobs in the region. The rate of growth for food jobs is almost double the rate of growth for all jobs in region (The Bay Area Food Economy, 2017). While this shows the strength of the food and agricultural sector, to ensure that the demand for quality, educated labor can be met in a region where the cost of living is often unattainable for lower wage workers, ensuring equitable labor practices and upward mobility will be essential to supporting food and agricultural businesses.

+ **Potential Coordination:** Regional coalition building is needed to build advocacy campaigns that mandate and ensure the right to living wages, benefits, and protections. Coordination across the region is also needed to expand job training, career pathway opportunities and partnerships in all aspects of the food economy, including agricultural production, processing, business development, food retail, food service, consumption, and post consumption. An additional specific need is to identify emerging jobs in the agricultural land and resources stewardship economy, and related needs for job training and career pathways education. The development of a regional agricultural and food sector workforce hub may serve to track data on labor force needs, serve as a clearinghouse for sharing resources across jurisdictions, and serve as a body to coordinate training and partnerships among educational institutions.

+ **Potential Partners:** UC Cooperative Extension; UC Berkeley Labor Center; Bay Region Center of Excellence for Labor Market Research, San Francisco State;

STRATEGY 3B. 
**Remove barriers to agricultural entrepreneurship.**

Limited access to land and markets, hyper land price inflation, high input costs, increasingly unpredictable and more extreme weather events, and a lack of sufficient support networks are just a few barriers agriculture entrepreneurs face in the region (and across the country). For new, minority, veteran, and women farmers, the path to a successful farming career is fraught with even greater challenges, such as struggling to find financing to purchase land, and confronting historical racial and gender inequities. Aggregating the needs and opportunities across the region could be more effective in targeting resources to those agricultural entrepreneurs who seek to benefit the most.

+ **Potential Coordination:**
  - Providing wraparound services for agricultural entrepreneurs, including financial, legal, accounting, marketing, and technical assistance.
  - Fostering multiple pathways to increase land ownership, stewardship, and economic viability including through community land trusts, lease agreements, cultural easements, collective ownership models, affirmative conservation easements, and other strategies.
  - Reducing production risk through local purchasing agreements and forward contracting with local farmers.

+ **Potential Partners:** County economic development departments, UCCE, Farm Bureaus, county agricultural commissioners
STRATEGY 3 C.

Support agricultural entrepreneurship.

In addition to land access and land tenure, diverse limited resource farmers face additional challenges to developing viable farm businesses. Several of these challenges center on financial capacity and the need for capital to support labor and infrastructure development, as well as land access. These challenges are exacerbated for BIPOC farmers, who face historic loss of land and capital. Other needs include assistance applying for grants, mentorship by experienced farmers and ranchers, technical assistance with in-field challenges, market development support, and assistance with business planning and record keeping. Aggregating the needs and opportunities across the region could be more effective in targeting resources to those agricultural entrepreneurs who seek to benefit the most, and who are the back-bone of the small- to medium-scale farming sector.

Potential coordination:

- Jurisdictions can coordinate on a sub-regional and regional level to provide funding, resources, and training to new farmers across the region.
- Reducing production risk by facilitating local purchasing agreements and forward contracting with local farmers.
- Sharing information about best practices for financial sustainability with a focus on building equity in real assets, such as a stake in a farm business, an equity-building lease, land improvements or other farm assets, land ownership, and/or homeownership.
- Tracking needs over time for wraparound services, including financial, legal, accounting, marketing, and technical assistance; and if warranted, developing a services resource information tool.
- Explore the feasibility of creating a regional funding program to offer financing incentives to qualifying farmers aiming to build businesses.
- Promoting success stories of farmers with limited resources and intermediate to advanced farming experience, as a means to create a pathway, network of mentorship, and encouragement for less experienced, early-stage farmers.
- Proactively include limited resource farmers in discussions around policy development.
- Promoting training programs for farmworkers who are interested in becoming farm managers and/or farm owners.

Potential Partners: County economic development departments, Farm Bureaus, UCCE, Kitchen Table Advisors, CA FarmLink
STRATEGY 3D.

Identify opportunities and address challenges in a circular economy across the food supply chain

Senate Bill 1383, or the “Edible Food Recovery Act”, calls for methane emissions reduction targets that require that, statewide, 20% of edible food that would otherwise be disposed of in the garbage or compost be recovered for human consumption by 2025. As cities and counties seek to comply with the requirements of this bill, the regional food supply chain should be evaluated to understand the challenges and opportunities in the local agricultural production economy, including processing, food retail, food service, consumption, and post consumption. A circular economy for food mimics natural systems of regeneration so that waste does not exist but is instead feedstock for another cycle or inputs for other products.

+ Potential Coordination: Cities and counties could coordinate on the development of policies and incentives to promote and encourage a local circular economy for food and food product inputs and address its shared challenges, including alignment of strategies in information sharing, land use, business support, funding, and developing and redeveloping areas with a high percentage of food and beverage production, processing and manufacturing. This could be supported with measures that implement SB1383 organic waste requirements. Jurisdictions could also coordinate to support pilot projects that upcycle and recycle food products and byproducts from across the regional supply chain with specific attention to on-farm processing.

+ Potential Partners: Bay Area Council Economic Institute; East Bay Economic Development Alliance, Food and Beverage Sector

STRATEGY 3E.

Support local agricultural and food product processing, storage, and distribution

The conservation of agricultural lands and strength of the agricultural sector is dependent on the economic conditions of the infrastructure that supports it. With annual revenues over $113 billion for food sector businesses in the Bay Area Region, these businesses are an asset among other leading growth industries in the region and their success relies on a value chain that crosses jurisdictional boundaries.

+ Potential Coordination:
  » To grow and retain businesses in this sector, coordination and information sharing among jurisdictions is needed about existing food industry infrastructure, the needs of food businesses and potential market opportunities, and demand for supply chain facilities. This would involve coordination among economic development and land use agencies as well as economic development organizations to:
    » Identify investments needed in key industrial lands and business clusters to create and expand markets. This includes identifying weak links in the agricultural and food supply chain infrastructure (such as insufficient meat processing facilities).
    » Promote best practices and policies that address barriers to retention and growth of small businesses, especially those in key clusters (e.g., the food sector).
    » Assess ways to expand access to subsidies, low-interest or no-interest loans, and other sources of funding for agricultural processing, cold storage, and distribution.
    » Develop policies and programs that prioritize investment for those agriculture and food businesses that incorporate climate smart and resilient practices into their business models.

+ Potential Partners: Bay Area Council Economic Institute; East Bay Economic Development Alliance, Food and Beverage Sector; California League of Food Producers (CLFP)
FOCUS AREA 04
AGRICULTURAL SECTOR HOUSING

+STRATEGY 4A. Develop a legislative and funding strategy for the production and preservation of agricultural employee housing in the Bay Area Region.

+STRATEGY 4B. Facilitate agricultural employee housing development through zoning amendments, permit streamlining, and other incentives.

+STRATEGY 4C. Encourage use of new and innovative housing prototypes for agricultural employee housing.

+STRATEGY 4D. Update and rehabilitate existing agricultural employee housing properties.

+STRATEGY 4E. Encourage the use of public partnerships and resources (i.e. between Cities and Counties) to build agricultural employee housing.

+STRATEGY 4F. Raise awareness about the importance of ag housing through a regional ag housing ombudsman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>SUB-REGIONAL</th>
<th>REGIONAL</th>
<th>NO CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL NEEDS</th>
<th>COORDINATION NEEDED WITHIN EXSTG. STRUCTURES</th>
<th>ENTITY W/O STATUTORY POWERS</th>
<th>ENTITY WITH STATUTORY POWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4A: Develop a legislative and funding strategy for production and preservation of ag employee housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B: Facilitate ag employee housing development through zoning updates, permit streamlining and other incentives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C: Encourage use of new and innovative housing prototypes for ag employee housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D: Update and rehabilitate existing ag employee housing properties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E: Encourage the use of public partnerships and resources to build ag employee housing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F: Raise awareness about the importance of ag housing through a regional ag housing ombudsman</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY 4A:

Develop a legislative and funding strategy for the production and preservation of agricultural employee housing in the Bay Area.

Currently, the Bay Area does not have a coordinated regional and state-level approach to agricultural employee housing. There is an opportunity to identify the need for agricultural housing in the Bay Area and develop funding sources and solutions to meet the unmet need.

» Regional Needs Assessment: There is not a up-to-date, comprehensive estimate of the need for agricultural employee housing in the Bay Area. Assembly Bill No. 1654 (AB 1654), passed in August 2022, commissions a statewide housing needs assessment by the end of 2023. Jurisdictions should participate and share data best practices at the Statewide level as well as coordinate updated local-level and regional farmworker housing needs assessments. Understanding the total need for farmworker housing in the Bay Area can inform policy change, public awareness, and an appropriate funding ask to meet shared regional targets.

» Funding: Stakeholders have identified that limited funding resources are a barrier to building farmworker housing. Assembly Bill No. 1654 (AB 1654) also has a funding element, requiring that for every year from 2024-2034 that an additional $500,000,000 is allocated in low-income housing tax credits, 5% of that allocation must be set aside to fund projects that provide farmworker housing. These state-level funds in partnership with other regional housing financing efforts can help move housing projects forward.

» Legislative Advocacy: In 2019, Assembly Bill No. 1783 (AB 1783) provides streamlined processes for agricultural employee housing in agriculturally-zoned areas. Bay Area jurisdictions should continue to advocate for more expansive rural development standards that support the development of farmworker housing throughout the state (i.e. also streamlining water and sewer requirements).

+ Potential Coordination: Jurisdictions should anticipate participation in a statewide farmworker housing needs assessment. Additionally, many jurisdictions have completed their own local-level housing needs assessments. Collecting detailed information about local farmworker populations can help a jurisdiction allocate funding and resources to housing projects. In addition to the statewide assessment, jurisdictions should attempt to regularly conduct local-level housing needs assessments as well as share their findings with nearby jurisdictions.

+ Potential Partners: BAHFA

BAY AREA AG THOUGHTS

“Regionally led conservation is critical to achieve 30x30. Local and regional leaders and groups best understand where opportunities exist to conserve land and coastal waters while meeting other priorities. While state leadership and vision are important to drive 30x30, its progress will be made through collaboration in specific regions across the state.”

- Pathway to 30 x 30 - Accelerating Conservation of California’s Nature
**STRATEGY 4B:**

Facilitate agricultural employee housing development through zoning amendments, permit streamlining, and other incentives.

At the local level, jurisdictions can improve the process of approving and constructing farmworker housing. Jurisdictions can adopt initiatives such as:

» Clarify language to specify different types of agricultural employee housing on agriculturally zoned and rural land
» Offer waivers and incentives for housing projects with farmworker housing unit set-asides
» Streamline permitting and reduce permitting costs
» Design and develop pre-approved plans and adopt modified development-by-right for agricultural employee housing
» Support property owners in developing agricultural housing on Williamson Act land

Assembly Bill 1783 (AB1783), the Farmworker Housing Act of 2019, created a streamlined process where agricultural employee housing located on agriculturally-zoned land is subject to expedited approval given that it meets environmental and quality of living standards. Bay Area jurisdictions should update their local jurisdiction codes to reflect and exceed the state-level standards.

Permit streamlining is just one part of the farmworker housing development process. In addition to the above recommendations, jurisdictions should encourage related departments (Environmental Health, Roads and Airports, Buildings, Public Works, etc.) to identify opportunities to streamline their processes to approve farmworker housing. Farmworker housing development can be complex, and jurisdictions should consider delegating a representative or creating resources to help property owners or potential developers navigate this process.

**Potential Coordination:** Under the appropriate convener, jurisdictions can continue to meet through a working group to share best practices.

**Potential Partners:** Napa Sonoma Collaborative Equity Working Group

**STRATEGY 4C:**

Encourage use of new and innovative housing prototypes for agricultural employee housing.

Beyond more traditional dormitory-style farmworker housing options, ADUs and tiny homes present cost-effective opportunities to house employees. ADUs can be a way to increase housing supply in areas closer to services like schools, hospitals, and community resources and provide an additional stream of income for homeowners. Paired with a matching program to place farmworkers in ADUs, encouraging ADU production can be an efficient and affordable option to increase available housing supply. Jurisdictions can support creative housing solutions for farmworkers through funding or supportive permitting processes. Tiny homes and tiny home village concepts can also be applied for agricultural employee housing. This strategy will require both the streamlining of internal processes for these housing typologies as well as education and outreach to farm owners and property owners about these additional strategies.

**Potential Partners:** County of Napa
STRATEGY 4D:
Update and rehabilitate existing agricultural employee housing properties.
Existing agricultural employee housing is often overcrowded and not up to health and safety code standards. In addition to producing more housing, jurisdictions should also consider creating programs and funding streams to rehabilitate existing units for agricultural employers to maintain livable and safe conditions for farmworkers.

+ Potential Partners: County of San Mateo, County of Santa Clara

STRATEGY 4E:
Encourage the use of public partnerships and resources (i.e., between Cities and Counties) to build agricultural employee housing.
Jurisdictions can work together to share resources that are necessary to build farmworker housing. For example, a County could help fund a project that is being built on City-owned land or a City could provide services to a project that is in an adjacent unincorporated county parcel.

» Building on Publicly Owned Land: Counties and cities could encourage development of farmworker housing on applicable parcels that they own. Additionally, jurisdictions could partner with local land trust to fund or permit housing that is on land trust land.

» RHNA Sharing: To encourage collaboration between jurisdictions, another recommendation is to encourage RHNA sharing as an incentive for Cities and Counties to work together to produce farmworker housing. For example, in exchange for a City to provides services to a property located in unincorporated county, the units could qualify for the City’s RHNA numbers instead of the County’s RHNA numbers.

» Water/Sewer Connection: Connecting to water and sewer infrastructure is a major barrier for the construction of agricultural employee housing in the unincorporated area. However, City-County partnerships are crucial to connecting housing with infrastructure. These partnerships can also encourage connecting agricultural housing to other community services, including transportation, grocery stores and schools.

+ Potential Coordination: Through MOUs, jurisdictions can develop agreements to share resources with each other.
+ Potential Partners: Land Trusts in the Bay Area
IMPLEMENTATION OF FRAMEWORK STRATEGIES.

The section above outlines the recommended strategies for achieving the goals and equity outcomes for each of the four focus areas. Each strategy is also described in terms of recommended scale: city, county, sub-region and region. This section presents a foundational recommendation: The creation of a new regional agricultural resilience entity to support realization of the Framework goals and implementation of its strategies across scales and focus areas.

This new entity or “Collaborative” could champion and help fund strategies, convene stakeholders around common issues, and foster awareness and advocacy so that the region and its cities, counties and community stakeholders can act collectively to solve common challenges and leverage cross jurisdictional opportunities. Currently, there are no existing regional organizations with the authority, expertise and network to address the interconnected agricultural issues and engage with the diverse stakeholders that are encompassed in the Framework.

PURPOSE & SCOPE:
THE REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESILIENCY “COLLABORATIVE”

The main purposes of the Collaborative could be the following key areas and their intersection:

+ Preservation of Agricultural Lands and Land Tenure: Identifying, prioritizing and designating areas suitable for agriculture, developing policy to prevent or restrict conversion of farmland, promoting CSA practices and advancing equitable land access and tenure. This work would coordinate with and support Plan Bay Area’s Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) as well as Priority Development Areas (PDAs).

+ Climate Smart Farming and Stewardship Practices: Funding, fostering and promoting CSA practices throughout the region.

+ Agricultural Economic Development: Catalyzing agricultural economic development in the region by facilitating and guiding needed investments. Agricultural economic development is needed across scales from regional- to local-serving infrastructure, and across the supply chain, from production, to processing and distribution, to post consumption.

+ Agricultural Sector Housing: Partnering with regional housing and community organizations to support efforts to provide sufficient, affordable, and accessible housing for all people working in the region’s agricultural and food sectors.

+ Collaboration and Advocacy: Acting as a convener and catalyst to collaborate across jurisdictional, private and public arenas to solve issues that only can be addressed at a regional scale. In addition, it could provide the “agricultural voice” for the region at the local, state and federal levels to represent the collective agricultural interests of the Bay Region.
In addition, the entity could engage in the following:

+ **Research and Innovation**: Facilitating partnerships with academic institutions, farmers, industry stakeholders, service providers and supporting/funding research projects aimed at developing and implementing new technologies, innovative agricultural practices, and/or regional carbon farming efforts.

+ **Education and Outreach**: Raising awareness among the public about the importance of supporting and investing in a vibrant agricultural economy, the benefits of locally produced food, the opportunities that agriculture can provide to climate resilience, and the need for agricultural preservation. This could include working with educational institutions to integrate agricultural programming, convening workshops, training sessions, farm tours, and public awareness campaigns.

---

**Scenarios for Regional Collaborative:**

**Roles & Organizational Structure**

An entity would be responsible for driving priorities in the Framework through a variety of roles:

**Champion**

Serve as a face of the regional agricultural sector, including through planning and lobbying efforts

**Conveners**

Bring together municipalities and partners to advance the Framework’s priority areas

**Coordinator**

Integrate the regional agriculture sector goals and actions with parallel resilience plans

**Funder**

Apply for and/or lobby for funding; fundraise amongst partner entities; generate revenue through fees, voter-approved tax measures or bonds, or other tools

**Capacity-Builders**

Provide technical assistance for municipalities and partners; centralize resources and provide extra capacity for ongoing efforts

**Project Manager**

Fund and/or manage consultants and project teams working to advance the goals, without actually having the resources in-house to do so.
The Collaborative may look different depending on the level of coordination needed to advance each strategy – there are three levels on which the Collaborative could act.

**01**

Coordination Within an Existing Structure: Some strategies require coordination amongst existing organizations (e.g., cross-county projects, city-county projects, CBO-county projects), but the involved organizations do not have the capacity to drive strategies forward.

- **Key Roles:** convener, coordinator, project manager
- **Potential Structure:** dedicated FTE(s) at an organization with overlapping roles
  - **Government:** California Coastal Conservancy, BAHFA, MTC/ABAG
  - **Institution:** University, UC Cooperative Extension
  - **Nonprofit:** North Bay Soil Hub
- **Precedent:** SACOG Coordinated Rural Opportunities Plan
- **Feasibility Considerations:**
  - **Annual Funding Need:** Low
  - **Staffing Need:** Low
  - **Governance Need:** Low

**02**

Entity Without Statutory Power: Many strategies require a level of coordination that existing entities do not have the capacity or expertise to lead; a new entity is needed to centralize and execute strategies, but does not need any new authorities (e.g., issuing bonds, creating new revenue sources, contracting and procurement, zoning and land use authority).

- **Key Roles:** champion, capacity-builder, project manager
- **Potential Structure:** 501(c)3, Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP)
- **Precedent:** San Joaquin Valley Land and Water Conservation Collaborative, Bay Area Climate Adaptation Network
- **Feasibility Considerations:**
  - **Annual Funding Need:** Medium – High
  - **Staffing Need:** Medium
  - **Governance Need:** Low

**03**

Entity With Statutory Power: In a few cases, the Framework identifies the need for an entity with distinct legislative or financial abilities. This entity would create new authorities for individuals and agencies involved in the Bay Area agricultural sector (e.g., issuing bonds, creating new revenue sources, contracting and procurement, zoning and land use authority).

- **Key Roles:** champion, funder, project manager
- **Potential Structure:** Joint Powers Authority, State-Chartered Entity
- **Precedent:** South Sacramento Conservation Agency JPA, San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority, Bay Area Regional Collaborative
- **Feasibility Considerations:**
  - **Annual Funding Need:** Medium – High
  - **Staffing Need:** Medium
  - **Governance Need:** High
Section V

Next Steps

This Framework outlines strategies and scenarios for implementing these strategies through multi-jurisdictional coordination and new funding mechanisms. The next step is an incubation phase in which an advisory body would explore options for creation of the new “entity” and/or “Collaborative” and would also advance selected strategies that are ready for implementation in the short- to medium-term. The incubation phase would be hosted by an existing organization or entity (i.e. an academic institution, regional organization, etc.).

During this incubation phase of 1-2 years, the advisory body would be responsible for refining the scope and purpose of this new entity through the following tasks:

- Refine the scope and purpose of the new entity; including a needs statement that positions this entity in the context of existing organizations and demonstrates its value in addressing critical regional and state initiatives around climate and equity
- Identify key community partners and engage with stakeholders
- Based on scenarios above, explore preliminary organizational structures: Determine roles, responsibilities, and structure for the entity
- Explore pathways for establishing the entity within an existing organization or for establishing a whole new entity.
- Identify initial projects, (e.g. development of a mapping and data dashboard).
- Identify initial and long-term budget and funding opportunities (Climate Resiliency District et al, SB 852)
- Potential funding/grant programs for incubation phase: Regional Resilience Planning and Implementation grant program (OPR)
- Retain personnel to work on the tasks above

Procuring funding for this Incubation Phase Scope of Work will entail the following next steps:

- Evaluating options for and identifying a lead applicant for funding and for managing the Incubation Phase: MPO, NGO, Special District, or jurisdiction
- Identify capacity needed to manage the Incubation Phase: Advisory Council, personnel (staff and/or contractors), budget (personnel, special projects, direct expenses, etc.)
- Developing proposals
APPENDIX A:
BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

PLAN BAY AREA (PBA) AND CALIFORNIA’S NATURAL & WORKING LANDS CLIMATE SMART STRATEGY

As a roadmap for multi-jurisdictional coordination and investments needed to make the San Francisco Bay Area’s agricultural sector a foundation of regional resilience, an important component of the Framework is to build on and integrate with existing strategic regional plans, such as Plan Bay Area (PBA), and identify opportunities to implement the State’s Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy.

Developed by the Bay Area’s regional planning agencies, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Plan Bay Area (PBA) is a regional long-range plan for the Bay Area that focuses on housing, economic development, transportation, and environmental resilience. Plan Bay Area 2050 was adopted in 2021, proposing policies and investments that can be adopted at the city, county, regional, or state level for the next 30 years. Looking ahead to Plan Bay Area 2050+, a component of this Framework includes targeted recommendations that outline opportunities for the PBA process to accelerate collective action to conserve the region’s agricultural lands and highlight the intersections between climate resilience and the agricultural sector. As PBA moves into the future, it is critical that it addresses the conservation of agricultural lands in a broader context that considers enhanced land stewardship, economic vitality, and social equity as necessary foundational goals to achieving scaled and long-term land conservation. This Framework provides several recommended strategies to support opportunities for PBA to move in this direction. See Strategies 1B and 1C below that recommend collaboration with MTC and ABAG and Appendix B for recommendations specific to PBA and its planning assumptions.

The State’s 2022 Climate Change Scoping Plan and 30x30 Initiative set targets for agricultural land conservation, climate smart agriculture management adoption, and the expansion of organic agriculture as part of the state’s efforts to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045. The state’s 2022 Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy also identifies natural and working lands as a critical yet currently underutilized sector in the fight against climate change. As the Strategy states, “Managing our lands to address climate change requires urgent and sustained action (time and effort) across all regions and sectors of California. Communities, businesses, farmers and ranchers, land managers, investors, tribal/state/local/federal governments, special districts, youth, philanthropists, scientists, planners, volunteers, and more can all play a role. The pace of implementation depends on the level of our collective commitment and availability of resources.” At its core, this Framework and its recommended strategies and their implementation are designed to accelerate the collaboration, coordination, and funding that will be needed to address the conservation of agricultural lands in a broader context that considers enhanced land stewardship, economic vitality, and social equity as necessary foundational goals to achieving scaled and long-term land conservation.
CROSS JURISDICTIONAL COORDINATION

We recognize that building a resilient, sustainable agricultural sector in the Bay Area is a vision that requires buy-in and support from local jurisdictions. This Framework focuses on identifying opportunities for cross-jurisdictional coordination. Historically, regional collaboration has been a strength of the Bay Area and we have identified several regional-level organizations already working within or in proximity to our four Focus Areas.

This Framework builds on the existing work of previous and current regional collaborations. However, through the process of developing the Framework, we recognized an opportunity and the need for a regional champion for the agricultural sector in the Bay Area Region. We envision a potential new umbrella entity or “Collaborative” that could move forward the interconnected Focus Areas that are included in this Framework. Below, we explore a few organizational structures that could achieve the cross-jurisdictional coordination needed to implement Framework strategies without competing with existing organizations (whether for funding, authority, staff, or otherwise). These options and relevant examples include:

01 JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

Two or more public agencies may jointly exercise any power common to the contracting parties by (1) contracting to jointly exercise common powers or (2) forming a separate legal entity with independent legal rights. A JPA allows members with common interests to lead or support projects in tandem, thereby creating capacity and reducing individual risk without compromising any of the authorities that partners already hold. These are common throughout California for a number of projects, from housing and transportation construction to groundwater conservation, and could be applied to agricultural strategies as well.

CASE STUDY | SOUTH SACRAMENTO CONSERVATION AGENCY JPA

Purpose: The purpose of the South Sacramento Conservation Agency JPA is to oversee implementation of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan (SSHCP) including the acquisition of land or easements to form the SSHCP preserve system; implementation of proposals for restoration of species habitat and aquatic resources; formation of management and monitoring plans to maintain the preserve system; and ensuring compliance with the conditions of the SSHCP and associated permits. The JPA facilitates a streamlined permitting process that encourages mitigation projects to occur on larger, interconnected scales.

Funding: The JPA is funded by mitigation fees that are collected from project applicants. Previously, the project was funded by funding agreements between the JPA parties.

Staff/Governance: The County of Sacramento, City of Rancho Cordova, and City of Galt were the primary parties responsible for forming the JPA. The Implementation Review Committee is responsible for making recommendations regarding fees, operating budgets, acquisition of land and/or easements, as well as modifying documents and reports before they are submitted to the JPA Board.
02 STATE-CHARTERED ENTITIES

Any agencies, commissions, and authorities created by and through the California state legislature. These can vary widely in both scale and powers, depending on the intent of the legislation. Creation of a state-chartered entity must go through the California state legislature, including introduction of a bill in either the House or Senate. Often, these entities have been established to align projects over a wider geography, create new authorities (e.g., funding tools), and streamline decision-making and executive function.

CASE STUDY | SAN FRANCISCO BAY RESTORATION AUTHORITY

Purpose: The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority (Authority) was created in 2008 in the state legislature by AB 2954 to protect, restore, and enhance the San Francisco Bay including habitat, flood, and shoreline access. In the legislation, it was granted the unique capacity to raise funds from local sources throughout the Bay Area, including the power to levy a benefit assessment, apply for grants, solicit and accept gifts/grants, incur general obligation bonded indebtedness, and issue revenue bonds.

Funding: In 2017, voters passed Measure AA, creating a 20-year $12 parcel tax projected to raise $25 million annually to fund restoration projects. Each year, the Authority can allocate their funds to different projects through a competitive grant process. The Authority grants funding to both public and private entities.

Staff/Governance: The Authority is staffed by the San Francisco Estuary and guided by a board of local elected officials. The Governing Board of the Authority is made up of local elected officials and responsible for management and funding decisions for the Authority.
**03 OTHER COLLABORATIVES**

Other entity types, including 501(c)3 organizations and federally created partnerships, can collect and distribute funds without necessarily creating any new authorities for partners and stakeholders. These entities can vary dramatically in scale and influence depending on the mission, staffing, and capacity of the entity.

---

**CASE STUDY | SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY LAND & WATER CONSERVATION COLLABORATIVE**

In 2020, American Farmland Trust partnered with diverse stakeholders to create a new $27 million San Joaquin Valley Land and Water Conservation Collaborative. The funding was provided by a $10 million Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from the USDA’s Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), with an additional $17 million coming from a variety of state and local partners. American Farmland Trust will collaborate closely with local NRCS field offices, East Stanislaus, East Merced, Madera/Chowchilla, Sierra (Fresno County) and Tulare Counties RCDs, The Freshwater Trust, Conservation Biology Institute, and California Farmland Trust on the ambitious five-year initiative. Collaboration focuses on data analysis, agricultural conservation easements, conservation planning, and on-farm conservation practices.

**Funding:** The funding was provided by a $10 million Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from the USDA’s Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), with an additional $17 million coming from a variety of state and local partners. The collaboration also received funding from private and corporate partners.

**Staff/Governance:** The Coalition is spearheaded by staff from the American Farmland Trust, but also includes participation from a coalition of government agencies, businesses, non-governmental organizations, researchers, scientists, and other partners.

---

**CASE STUDY | BAY AREA PLANNING DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION (BAPDA)**

The Bay Area Planning Directors Association is a non-profit network of planning directors and community development directors in the Bay Area. BAPDA hosts General Assembly meetings twice a year and also provides opportunities for professional growth and mentorship. BAPDA promotes the exchange of best practices and ideas as well as encourages alignment on any proposed legislation or policy that may affect planning in the Bay Area.

**Funding:** MTC and ABAG provide administrative and logistical support to BAPDA.

**Governance:** BAPDA has a Steering Committee that is representative of each of the nine counties in the Bay Area. Officers for BAPDA are nominated and elected by voting members.

These case studies demonstrate the different forms of regional collaboration as demonstrated by the success of multijurisdictional work throughout the Bay Area and California. These three structures vary in terms of their legislative and fundraising abilities as well as the staff and community support required to stand them up. We detail our recommendation for our recommended regional agricultural entity above in Section 5. Implementation of Framework Strategies and Section 6: Next Steps.
The Framework for a Bay Area Regional Agricultural Plan is a roadmap for the multi-jurisdictional coordination and investments needed to make the San Francisco Bay Area’s agricultural lands a foundation of regional resilience. As such, an important component of the Framework is to build on and integrate with existing strategic regional plans, in particular Plan Bay Area (PBA). In looking ahead to Plan Bay Area 2050+, the following recommendations offer an opportunity for the PBA process to increase its role in accelerating collective action toward scaling the conservation region’s agricultural lands and while doing so, addressing conservation with a more holistic approach. As PBA moves into the future, it is critical that it addresses the conservation of agricultural lands in a broader context that considers enhanced land stewardship, economic vitality, and social equity as necessary foundational goals to achieving scaled and long-term land conservation. The State’s Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy, which responds directly to Gov. Gavin Newsom’s nature-based solutions Executive Order N–82–20 and the State’s 30x30 Initiative, identifies natural and working lands as a critical yet currently underutilized sector in the fight against climate change. As the Strategy states, “Managing our lands to address climate change requires urgent and sustained action (time and effort) across all regions and sectors of California. Communities, businesses, farmers and ranchers, land managers, investors, tribal/state/local/federal governments, special districts, youth, philanthropists, scientists, planners, volunteers, and more can all play a role. The pace of implementation depends on the level of our collective commitment and availability of resources”.

**APPENDIX B: FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESILIENCE THROUGH PBA 2050+**

PBA's strategies to “expand access to parks and open space” and the PCA program are starting points for protecting and investing the region’s agricultural lands. However, an analysis of the PBA planning assumptions for these strategies shows that past PBA efforts have not fully evaluated agricultural lands to develop appropriate conservation objectives for those lands. Additionally, more is needed both in the planning assumptions and within the PBA themes, strategies, and actions, to fully capture the potential that agricultural lands have to contribute to regional resilience.
Simply protecting agricultural lands does not in itself improve the capacity of these lands to contribute to climate resilience, mitigation, and adaptation. When agricultural lands are managed with climate smart agricultural practices (CSAs), they have the potential to sustainably increase agricultural productivity and incomes; adapt and build resilience to climate change; and reduce and/or remove greenhouse gas emissions. Accelerating the adoption of CSAs in the region will improve water quality and availability; increase water storage for flood and drought resilience; improve water and air quality; support biodiversity; and on rangelands, can reduce the risk of extreme wildfire. While several initiatives to implement CSA are happening at the local level in the Bay Area (through climate action plans and other efforts), PBA 2050+ can elevate the potential of these efforts to contribute to regional resilience by synchronizing the role that these lands can play in addressing the region’s climate challenges within the suite of existing (and future updates) PBA strategies. While the PBA Technical Assumptions Report (October 2021) acknowledges that “the Plan Bay Area strategies would support conservation and management to enhance wildland fire resilience, provision of ecosystem services, and carbon sequestration”, PBA 2050 does not offer specific actions that coordinate or accelerate efforts to these ends.

Similarly, protecting agricultural lands does not in itself improve the economic stability and resilience of the farmers and ranchers that work the land. Without economic opportunities and risk management mechanisms, meaningful investments in the agricultural sector, and equitable access to landownership, agricultural lands are at greater risk to urban conversion. Additionally, the unique housing needs and circumstances for agricultural workers need to be considered. The environmental, economic, and social aspects of agricultural lands together, are a critical part of a dynamic system that land conservation relies upon. PBA 2050+ is an opportunity to integrate these dynamics into the conservation objectives that PBA has addressed in the past.

The following recommendations are intended to enhance MTC’s process for developing the Blueprint and to complement existing PBA strategies. These recommendations should serve as a guide for targeted updates to the Technical Planning Assumption and Blueprint Strategies so that the Bay Area region can successfully increase its level of support and commitment to the conservation of agricultural lands. With this support, the region will open more doors to resources to “Accelerate Regionally Led Conservation”, which is emphasized as a critical pathway to meeting the State’s 30x30 Initiative objectives.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PBA PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS UPDATE

To successfully update and develop Blueprint Strategies that accurately reflect the region’s agricultural landscape, the following recommendations are offered to better support the technical assumptions for future versions of PBA. The assumptions identified in the Technical Assumptions Report (October 2021) for Strategy EN5 are deficient in reflecting regional priority areas for conservation of agricultural lands such as cultivated cropland and grazing lands. Any updates to Blueprint Strategies or the development of new strategies and actions, as recommended in Section X below, would be better supported by the following recommendations.

+ Collaborate with the appropriate stakeholders and mapping experts to conduct an agricultural lands prioritization and optimization mapping of the Bay Area, to be used for both the PBA assumptions and the PCA Program. The Conservation Lands Network (CLN) 2.0 Report and data framework were utilized to identify regional priority areas for conservation in PBA 2050. However, the CLN 2.0 only identified 8,658 acres of agriculture as the remaining goal to protect. Yet this acreage does not account for the full scope of agricultural lands in the Bay Area as it only represents “Coastal Grasslands and Marin Coast Rangeland” (i.e. it does not account for any cultivated croplands or other grazing lands). This finding reveals that PBA, to date, has not fully identified priority areas for the region’s cultivated agricultural lands. To wholly evaluate the current and future agricultural landscape and determine conservation priority areas for agricultural lands, develop prioritization criteria based on climate, economic, and social factors, for identifying and prioritizing agricultural lands for their best use (e.g. ecosystem benefits) and for targeting investment and policy given current conditions and future projections. The result of such work will broaden the understanding of agricultural lands conservation in the context of current urban pressures and in the context of planning for climate, housing, economic development, and housing needs. This is a necessary step to set up future iterations of the PBA with a sound basis for setting objectives for conservation of the region’s agricultural lands.

+ Develop a more comprehensive understanding of the costs associated with the conservation of agricultural lands and agricultural land management practices that support climate resilience. This information is needed to appropriately inform PBA 2050+ and future policy decisions for and investments in agricultural lands. The current technical assumptions state that the cost per acre for land protection was based on a Horizon analysis, using an average of actual costs for land acquisition by several local conservation agencies. It is not clear whether this cost is based on land protection for agricultural lands (versus natural lands), nor whether the cost considers easement acquisition (versus fee simple acquisition). The costs associated with agricultural lands versus natural lands will be different and the analysis should segregate land types to set more accurate conservation objectives. Likewise, the technical assumptions for land management of agricultural lands should consider the cost of implementing broad scale climate smart agricultural practices. This is in line with the Technical Assumptions Report that states, “Plan Bay Area strategies would support conservation and management to enhance wildland fire resilience, provision of ecosystem services, and carbon sequestration.” (The recommendations below for future PBA strategies support these goals.) The current assumptions for land management are based on regional parks and open space districts which may not reflect the costs for stewarding agricultural properties, nor properties where climate smart practices are adopted.

+ Develop a regional housing needs assessment specifically for farmworkers that identifies housing solutions by type and geography. This housing needs assessment could be conducted in parallel with the State-level farmworker housing needs assessment as mandated by Assembly Bill 1654 (AB 1654). The results from this assessment can also inform future funding asks for regional and state-level funds, including the Bay Area Housing Finance Authority.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BLUEPRINT STRATEGIES UPDATE
The following recommendations are sorted by the themes identified in the **Framework** for a Bay Area Regional Agricultural Plan.

**Agricultural Lands Conservation and Land Tenure**

**Update Strategy Name: EN4 Maintain Urban Growth Boundaries while Encouraging Infill and Compact Development**

+ **New Implementation Action:** Advocate for the continued reinforcement of the Urban Growth Boundaries by providing relevant case studies and potential tools to strategic partners to address urban edge issues and the continued conversion of agricultural lands, such as Right-to-Farm Ordinances, updated zoning approaches that utilize smart growth policies, conservation easement programs and agricultural buffer zones.

**Update Strategy Name: EN5 Protect, Invest in and Manage High-Value Natural and Agricultural Lands**

+ **New Implementation Action:** Continue refinements of the PCA program and OBAG grant guidelines to accelerate on-the-ground projects for both natural and agricultural lands that deliver climate smart benefits across the region’s diverse landscapes.

+ **New Implementation Action:** Advocate for implementation of durable agricultural lands protection measures, such as acquisition and/or voluntary conservation easement programs among strategic partners. Compile assessments and resources that describe the implementation of successful conservation programs and smart growth approaches to bolster greater collective action in preserving both natural and agricultural lands.

+ **New Implementation Action:** Advocate for the protection of California Native American tribal ancestral lands for cultural practice, ceremony, tribal management and subsistence hunting and harvesting. Support shared decision making with California Native American tribes in identifying critical conservation areas for both natural and agricultural lands.

**Climate Smart Agricultural Lands**

**New theme: Environment: Increase Uplands Resiliency, Mitigation, and Adaptation**

**New Strategy: EN10 Fund education, technical assistance, and adoption of climate smart agricultural practices on regional agricultural lands.**

+ **Implementation Action:** Convene a series of Regional Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) Working Group meetings comprised of diverse partner agencies and organizations to develop shared Climate Action Plan methods and strategies for agriculture and agricultural lands, and to synchronize local goals and priorities around mitigation, adaptation, and resiliency into regional goals and priorities for future investments in CSA.

+ **Implementation Action:** Collaborate with the Coastal Conservancy, local resource conservation districts (RCDs), counties, California Native American Tribes, and PCA program staff to catalog planned and conceptual CSA projects and develop regional cost estimates to implement education, technical assistance, and adoption of practices.

+ **Implementation Action:** Establish an Uplands Funding & Investment Framework in collaboration with Coastal Conservancy, BARC, MTC/ABAG and other community partners by establishing a regional funding body to apply for and disperse awards to local projects from the CDFA Healthy Soils Block Grant Program and other resources as available.

+ **Implementation Action:** Support multi-benefit, multi-jurisdictional uplands CSA efforts, working in partnership with counties and other key partners, with a goal of supporting CSA education, technical assistance, and adoption projects in each Bay Area County.
Agricultural Lands Economy and Infrastructure

New theme: Multibenefit Economic Development and Environmental Stewardship Resiliency

New Strategy: EC7 Promote Circular Economy

+ Implementation action: Incentivize a circular economy across the food supply chain through agricultural production, processing, food retail, food service, consumption and post consumption.

+ Implementation action: Develop, disseminate and support policies that are supportive of a circular economy in the food system.

+ Implementation action: Support pilot projects that demonstrate the economic and environmental benefits of upcycling and recycling food products and bi-products from across the supply chain previously treated as waste. Include specific attention to on-farm processing challenges and opportunities.

Implementation action: Consider circular food economy function in developing and redeveloping areas with a high percentage of food and beverage production, processing and manufacturing.

Update Strategy: EC2 Expand Job Training and Incubator Programs

+ New Implementation action: As a critical incubation structure for new farmers, support equitable access to land through the growth of new farms and creation of pathways for new farmers to provide diversity and long-term resiliency in the local agricultural economy by developing a plan for addressing prioritized needs for affordable land, technical assistance, and financial assistance.

+ New Implementation action: Support urban agriculture as a mechanism for community revitalization, job training, and farmer incubation, by creating a repository of models and best practices, for codes, site identification, technical assistance, and financial assistance.

New Implementation action: Support workforce development research and dissemination around the jobs and training programs and career pathways needed to implement emerging initiatives such as California’s Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategies and related state and federal climate-smart agriculture.

+ New Implementation action: Create a mechanism to provide annual funding for UC Cooperative Extension, Resource Conservation Districts, and other public/nonprofit organizations to build capacity and catalyze job growth in the conservation sector to better support land stewardship around climate-smart agriculture planning, training, implementation and monitoring.

Update Strategy EC6 Retain and Invest in Key Industrial Lands

+ New Implementation action: Identify the key industrial lands and business clusters used for local agricultural product processing and distribution; and the key infrastructure development and improvements investments needed to keep this sector vital and responsive to the needs of farmers of all sizes.
Agricultural Housing

Update Strategy H2: Preserve existing affordable housing.
+ Identify funding to help jurisdictions rehabilitate existing affordable housing units that do not provide safe and dignified living situations, with a focus on workforce housing.

Update Strategy H4. Build adequate affordable housing to ensure homes for all.
+ New Implementation action: Explore dedicated funding streams for farmworker housing, including collaboration with BAHFA and the state.


Recommendation to add to Implementation Action 3f: Advance an initiative identifying challenges and opportunities for catalyzing the reuse of public and community-owned land by partnering with local jurisdictions, community members, public landowners, community land trusts and a broad range of other stakeholders
+ Prioritize the development of farmworker housing projects on public and community-owned land. Disseminate resources and encourage jurisdictions to identify relevant agriculturally-zoned land that may be suitable for farmworker housing.
## APPENDIX C: PARTNERS LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name First</th>
<th>Name Last</th>
<th>Community Partner Organization</th>
<th>Type of Org</th>
<th>Partner Role</th>
<th>Engagement Status</th>
<th>Framework MTG 1</th>
<th>Framework MTG 2</th>
<th>Vulnerable Community Climate Resiliency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marit</td>
<td>Doshi</td>
<td>UC Berkeley, ESPM</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torri</td>
<td>Estrada</td>
<td>Carbon Cycle Institute</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Meehan</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara Planning [project lead]</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>Tomkat Ranch</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Schuchat</td>
<td>Formerly CA State Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamyar</td>
<td>Aram</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>Arellano</td>
<td>Muwekma Ohlone</td>
<td>CNAT</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misti</td>
<td>Arias</td>
<td>Sonoma Ag &amp; Open Space District</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adria</td>
<td>Arko</td>
<td>San Mateo Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry</td>
<td>Beemiller</td>
<td>Nella Terra Cellars/Alameda County Ag Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Bennaton</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breann</td>
<td>Boyle</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Office of Sustainability</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Brastow</td>
<td>San Francisco Department of the Environment</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Brooks</td>
<td>Bay Area Regional Collaborative (BARC)</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Brown-Stevens</td>
<td>Greenbelt Alliance</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Burgess</td>
<td>Fibershed</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME FIRST</td>
<td>NAME LAST</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARTNER ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF ORG</td>
<td>PARTNER ROLE</td>
<td>ENGAGEMENT STATUS</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK MTG</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK MTG</td>
<td>VULNERABLE COMMUNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>TOGETHER Bay Area</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Calder</td>
<td>Solano County</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>2/10/23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Carrasco</td>
<td>Napa County Housing &amp; Homeless Services</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Carresse</td>
<td>SF Bay Center of Excellence for Labor Market Research</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Castillo</td>
<td>Office of Supportive Housing, County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>Chan</td>
<td>ABAG/MTC</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>2/10/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>Coon</td>
<td>Alameda Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnathan</td>
<td>Cordero</td>
<td>Ramaytush Ohlone</td>
<td>CNAT</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Contra Costa County Planning</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Diekmann</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td>Solano Land Trust</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Fanous</td>
<td>Community Alliance with Family Farmers</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guido</td>
<td>Frossini</td>
<td>True Grass Farms</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>County of Sonoma</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>2/10/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Garrod</td>
<td>Garrod Farms</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>San Mateo County Health System</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>2/10/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Gosselin</td>
<td>Alameda Cty., Ag Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrina</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>Sogorea Te’ Land Trust</td>
<td>CNAT</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>Harkleroad</td>
<td>Agriculture and Land-Based Training Association (ALBA)</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td>Hawkes</td>
<td>Napa County Planning Division</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara</td>
<td>Heckert</td>
<td>American Farmland Trust</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME FIRST</td>
<td>NAME LAST</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARTNER ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF ORG</td>
<td>PARTNER ROLE</td>
<td>ENGAGEMENT STATUS</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK MTG 1</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK MTG 2</td>
<td>VULNERABLE COMMUNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consuelo</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Office of Supportive Housing at County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Hugg</td>
<td>Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Janis</td>
<td>San Francisco Wholesale Produce Market</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrone</td>
<td>Jue</td>
<td>San Francisco Department of the Environment</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Valley Vision</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Kimball</td>
<td>Center for Land Based Learning</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Solano County Agricultural Commissioner</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggie</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>CA FarmLink</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irina</td>
<td>Kogan</td>
<td>Peninsula Open Space Trust</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kopchik</td>
<td>Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>2/10/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Landgraf</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Open Space Authority</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar</td>
<td>Lara</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Central Labor Council</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jered</td>
<td>Lawson</td>
<td>Pie Ranch</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Contra Costa County Sustainability Office</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Amah Mutsun Land Trust</td>
<td>CNAT</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suguet</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Lideres Campesinas</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Louie</td>
<td>Contra Costa County Department of Conservation and Development</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Lum</td>
<td>AFT, Solano Land Trust Board, RCD, SID, Farm Bureau</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Lyddan</td>
<td>formerly BALT, DOC</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME FIRST</td>
<td>NAME LAST</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARTNER ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF ORG</td>
<td>PARTNER ROLE</td>
<td>ENGAGEMENT STATUS</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK MTG 1</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK MTG 2</td>
<td>VULNERABLE COMMUNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Mancera</td>
<td>Kitchen Table Advisors</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grecia</td>
<td>Marquez-Nieblas</td>
<td>SPUR</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moira</td>
<td>McEnespy</td>
<td>CA State Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise</td>
<td>Miranda Ramirez</td>
<td>Ohlone Costanoan Esselen Nation</td>
<td>CNAT</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Moncada</td>
<td>The Cultural Conservancy</td>
<td>CNAT</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension, Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Naja-Riese</td>
<td>Agriculture Institute of Marin</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Nakahara</td>
<td>Kitchen Table Advisors</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Noce</td>
<td>City of Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>2/10/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>Norris</td>
<td>CA Indian Environmental Alliance</td>
<td>CNAT</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>O’Donaghue</td>
<td>The Nature Conservancy</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Olstein</td>
<td>Peninsula Open Space Trust</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janelle</td>
<td>Orsi</td>
<td>Sustainable Economies Law Center [SELC]</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Parenti</td>
<td>County of San Mateo Department of Housing</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Patzek</td>
<td>Napa County Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>Pinto</td>
<td>SPUR</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirag</td>
<td>Rabari</td>
<td>MTC/ABAG</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Rademacher</td>
<td>GreenInfo Network</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Riodan</td>
<td>Berkeley Climate Change Network</td>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doria</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Urban Tilth</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamesine</td>
<td>Rogers Gibson</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME FIRST</td>
<td>NAME LAST</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PARTNER ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>TYPE OF ORG</td>
<td>PARTNER ROLE</td>
<td>ENGAGEMENT STATUS</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK MTG 1</td>
<td>FRAMEWORK MTG 2</td>
<td>VULNERABLE COMMUNITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorelle</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria</td>
<td>CNAT</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Not engaged yet</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Schafer</td>
<td>CA Rangeland Trust</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Schuchat</td>
<td>CA State Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liya</td>
<td>Schwartzmann</td>
<td>CA FarmLink</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasneet</td>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Office of Sustainability</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Silva</td>
<td>Green Star Farm, Bay Area Ranchers’ Cooperative, Inc.</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharat</td>
<td>Singh</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>City of Livermore</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leelee</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Community Development Agency</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>2/10/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Toms</td>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>2/10/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vince</td>
<td>Trotter</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension, Marin County</td>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Van Soelen</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension, Marin County</td>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>Watt</td>
<td>Terrell Watt Planning Consultants</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Weise</td>
<td>Contra Costa Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>Public entity</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Wente</td>
<td>Alameda Cty., Ag Advisory Committee, Wente Vineyards</td>
<td>Professional expert</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>100k Trees for Humanity</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadie</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>Greenbelt Alliance</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>11/15/22</td>
<td>5/25/23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND CONSERVATION & ACCESS OVERVIEW

Over the last 30 years, the Bay Area has lost 217,000 acres of agricultural land to sprawl development (low-density residential and commercial development on the edges of towns and urban areas). Preserving agricultural lands is critical to keep locally- and globally-significant productive lands off the speculative market and keep agricultural land affordable to producers. In addition, farmlands and rangelands mitigate climate change impacts and provide other ecosystem services. Research in Santa Clara County has shown that agricultural areas emit nearly 77 times lower greenhouse gas emissions than low-density urban lands.

Each county has its own definitions and related zoning regulations for agricultural lands (see Table 1). The American Farmland Trust defines agricultural land as nonfederal cropland, pastureland, rangeland and woodland used to support agriculture. In California, converted agricultural land is most often developed for commercial, industrial, or residential uses.

WORKING GROUP OUTCOMES

Goal Statement: The goal of this Working Group is to identify existing and needed local and regional mechanisms to support the permanent protection of existing farm and ranchlands and enable new farmers to access and establish businesses on these working lands.

Equity Outcomes: Land conservation and access mechanisms should prioritize current low-income/indebted, BIPOC, or other systemically excluded community representative farmers and ranchers.

Meeting Sequence:

1. KEY TOPICS

We will discuss related topics at the intersection of climate and agriculture that present solutions that are tangible, specific, and have potential for regional collaboration.

2. COORDINATION WITH PLAN BAY AREA

We will discuss how our key topics align with existing and ongoing efforts for Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2050.

3. CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL COLLABORATION

We will explore coordinated approaches to address zoning issues, establish/expand farmland conservation programs, and identify funding.
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES
What are the main challenges and gaps to conserve land for agricultural uses and increase access to working lands in the Bay Area? How can tools, like those identified, help address major issues?

Note: For a more detailed description of each tool/resource, please refer to page 2.

KEY QUESTIONS

ZONING
What zoning and regulatory shifts are needed to address the lack and loss of large, contiguous agricultural areas?

Consistent agricultural zoning

How can the region work together to address increased development on agricultural lands? (i.e. rural ranchettes)

Agricultural lot size requirements

What templates and resources can be shared across Counties?

Designated agricultural sub-areas

FARMLAND CONSERVATION
What would a regional conservation easement entity look like?

Agricultural Conservation Easement

What are the most successful examples of farmland conservation in the Bay Area and around the country?

Carbon Lease

Williamson Act, Farmland Security Zone, Open Space Easement

Overlaps with Plan Bay Area/Priority Conservation Areas

How can the Bay Area anticipate and create legacy & succession plans for aging farmers?

Buy-Protect-Sell

FUNDING
What are sources to finance land conservation?

Joint Powers Authority

How can we support small farmers and new farmers access land?

Local or regional funding sources for conservation easement programs

What incentives can local jurisdictions and regions provide to increase access to land and protect existing farmlands?

County-wide mitigation fee for development of agricultural lands

Low or no-interest loans

Voluntary financial mechanisms

This working group was convened to inform the preparation of a draft framework for a regional Bay Area Agricultural Plan. There are four working groups in total: Agricultural Housing, Land Conservation & Access, Land Management & Improvement, and Agricultural Supportive Uses. The framework will build on and integrate with existing strategic plans, in particular Plan Bay Area 2050 and County Climate Action and Sustainability Plans. This framework will identify priorities and potential opportunities for regional coordination across these areas.

This work is funded by the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) Grant, led by the County of Santa Clara Planning & Development Department, and supported by consulting services by HR&A Advisors, Inc. and Cultivate, Inc.
TOOLS AND RESOURCES

In this section, we lay out a few examples of different local and regional tools that governments can use to protect farm and ranchlands (linking to relevant case studies in and out of the Bay Area). We then describe the existing mechanisms regarding land conservation and access in the nine Bay Area counties (Table 1) as well as related resources and funding sources available.

ZONING | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL + REGIONAL (CITY + COUNTY)

Agricultural Zoning & Size Requirements: Each county has its own definitions and related zoning regulations for agricultural lands. For example, in Santa Clara County, there are four primary rural land use designations – Exclusive Agriculture, Agricultural Ranchlands, Hillsides, and Rural Residential and prevents the subdivision of land into lots smaller than 20 or 40 acres (Table 1). In Alameda County, agricultural land (“A” Zoning District) must have a minimum area of 100 acres.

- Coordination between Cities and Counties: One of the recommendations from the Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan is to share consistent language for designating agricultural areas in County and City General Plans. The Agricultural Plan also suggests increased coordination at the City and County level.

- Designated Sub-Areas & Sizing: Another recommendation of the Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan is the designation of agricultural sub-areas based on specific characteristics. For example, these designations could be based on cluster/size requirements, agricultural industrial zones, agricultural tourism areas, and more.

- Zoning Restrictions: Jurisdictions can also consider using zoning to restrict the establishment of incompatible uses in agricultural areas.

CLIMATE ACTION PLANS | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL

- Tools/funding/solutions for land conservation included in climate action plans: Marin County includes Agricultural Land Preservation as a strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in their Climate Action Plan.[iv]

- Estimates of economic and environmental value of agricultural lands & open space: The Healthy Lands & Healthy Economies Initiative works to quantify the economic value and benefits (described as “natural capital”) provided by working lands and natural areas. In 2018, they found that in Sonoma County, Santa Cruz County, and Santa Clara County, the ecosystem services provided by working and natural lands are valued at up to $11.2 billion.[v] Protecting farmlands and ranchlands reduces wildfire risk, captures and sequesters carbon, and provides habitats for threatened and endangered species.[vi] These analyses can provide policymakers with key data points to support conservation-related measures and discourage new development by showing the existing economic value of the land.

JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY (JPA) | FOCUS SCALE: REGIONAL

A JPA made up of different County representatives can serve as a central clearinghouse for technical assistance as well as serve as an administrator for regional efforts like the “Regional Agricultural Conservation Easement” program suggested in the Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan. Example: The purpose of the South Sacramento Conservation Agency JPA is to oversee the implementation of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan, a regional effort to streamline permitting processes for development and infrastructure projects to protect open space and agricultural lands. Participating entities in the JPA include the City of Galt, City of Rancho Cordova, and the County of Sacramento. The JPA is funded by developer fees and will not be dependent on County or City operating budgets (after initial 2 year start-up period).

FARMLAND CONSERVATION | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL

Farmland conservation attempts to compensate for and prevent the loss of farmland via multiple forms – conservation easements, purchase of properties, or in-lieu fees paid to the county. Counties decide the appropriate mitigation ratio, although many jurisdictions use a ratio of 1:1. Counties should consider exceptions for cases where...
farmland is converted for processing or agritourism. Farmland mitigation via in lieu fees or through easement purchases is one example of a tool to conserve farmland. Additional examples are included below:

**AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT (ACE) | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL**

ACEs consist of a legal agreement between a land trust or a government agency and a landowner to purchase all or a portion of development rights to limit certain uses of land. For landowners, donations of easements to qualified organizations are considered charitable gifts and reducing development potential can also lead to a lower property tax assessment. ACES can be funded by private or public funds. For example, in 2011, Sonoma County approved Measures A and C to fund Ag + Open Space (their ACE purchaser) using a quarter-cent sales tax through 2031.

Adding an Option to Purchase at Agricultural Value (OPAV) provision to agricultural conservation easements can help make sure that agricultural land is made available to qualified farmers first. This provision helps keep farmland affordable for buyers that intend to use it for agricultural purposes.

**BUY-PROTECT-SELL | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL**

This strategy involves the purchase of agricultural land by an agency or organization, which then places appropriate protection on the land to ensure it remains in agricultural use when it is sold. This is an important tactic to increase access to land for new farmers.

**WILLIAMSON ACT (WA), FARMLAND SECURITY ZONE (FSZ), OPEN SPACE EASEMENT (OSE) | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL**

- **Williamson Act:** Tax incentive program for people who keep their land in commercial agriculture production for ten years. As of 2021, the Bay and Central Coast Region (includes nine Bay Area counties + San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Cities of Fremont and Palo Alto) reported 2.8 million enrolled acres.
- **Super Williamson Act contracts/Farmland Security Zone (FSZ):** Cities and Counties can offer 20-year contracts for certain types of agricultural lands defined by the CA Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
- **Open Space Easement (OSE):** Conservation easement applied to open space.

**LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO) | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL**

Each County is required to have a Local Agency Formation Commission that helps guide development and approve/deny City boundary decisions. Among the Bay Area LAFCOs, only the Santa Clara LAFCO has a stand-alone agricultural policy. This policy discourages development on prime agricultural land and encourages urban-agricultural buffers. Marin County has agricultural policies in their “Policy and Procedures Guidelines” that set barriers to protect prime agricultural lands.

**FUNDING | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL**

Local funding sources for conservation easements

- **Marin County Measure A:** Passed in 2012, Measure A is a quarter-cent local sales tax of which 20% of receipts is allocated for the Marin County Farmland Preservation Program.
- **Sonoma County Measures A and C** to create Ag + Open space, quarter-cent sales tax for the purchase of conservation easements
- **County-wide mitigation fee** for development that converts agricultural land to other uses (limited use in providing/acquiring additional easements)
- **Low or no-interest loans** for new farmers to access land
- **Speculation or Fallow Tax:** Incentivize landowners to keep agricultural land in production.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is agricultural land...</th>
<th>Alameda County</th>
<th>Contra Costa County</th>
<th>Marin County</th>
<th>Napa County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...designated and prioritized?</td>
<td>Zoning for Agricultural District requires a minimum land area of 100 acres.</td>
<td>Zoning for prime productive agricultural land requires a 40 acre minimum parcel size.</td>
<td>90% of agricultural land in the county is covered under A-60 zoning, which requires a minimum lot size of one unit per 60 acres.</td>
<td>Agricultural Preservation and Land Use Element outlines different regulations to preserve agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List preservation/conservation goal (if applicable) or minimum parcel sizes</td>
<td>Between 1990-2008, Alameda County lost 53% of prime cropland. Changes occurred due to development low density housing, “ranchettes,” parks, golf courses, commercial development.</td>
<td>Between 1990-2008, Contra Costa County lost 37% of prime cropland. Brentwood has one of the most productive agricultural regions, but noted as an area that has lost prime agricultural land to urban development.</td>
<td>Between 1990-2008, Marin County lost 96% of prime cropland (represents less than 1% of County’s agricultural land). Average farm size relatively large compared to Bay Area counterparts: 588 acres</td>
<td>Between 1990-2008, Napa County gained 12% of prime cropland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...at risk of development? At what scale so far and at what risk in the future?</td>
<td>Alameda LAFCO and RCD received funding from the California Climate Investments Program to review and update policies to preserve agricultural land. Measure D: Save Agriculture and Open Lands Initiative (2000) South Livermore Valley Area Plan (1993): Density bonus that allows reduction in minimum parcel size if majority of parcel is protected by easement &amp; development fee. In 1983, Board of Supervisors passed resolution (No. 83/407) to discourage production of rural ranchettes. In the 1970s, created County Agricultural Core. In 1994, created urban limit line and limited subdivision to greater than 40 acres. In 2002, City of Brentwood created agricultural mitigation program. The mitigation fees fund agricultural conservation easements.</td>
<td>In 1983, Board of Supervisors passed resolution (No. 83/407) to discourage production of rural ranchettes. In the 1970s, created County Agricultural Core. In 1994, created urban limit line and limited subdivision to greater than 40 acres. In 2002, City of Brentwood created agricultural mitigation program. The mitigation fees fund agricultural conservation easements.</td>
<td>Marin Agricultural Land Trust Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program</td>
<td>In 1968, Napa County passed an ordinance that created an Agricultural Preserve District with an 160-acre lot minimum. In 1980, Measure A, restricted growth in unincorporated areas of county to 1% annually. In 1990, Measure J required 2/3 electorate vote to rezone agricultural land. 2016 LAFCO Agricultural Open Space Preservation Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...supported by local policies and programs?</td>
<td>*This list is not comprehensive. Please let us know if we are missing any key programs in your County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from 2011 “Sustaining our Agricultural Bounty: The Bay Area Agricultural Sustainability Project” White Paper (by SAGE, AFT, and Greenbelt Alliance)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Francisco County</th>
<th>San Mateo County</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th>Solano County</th>
<th>Sonoma County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>County adopted Planned Agricultural District (PAD) Zoning Designation (implemented through several tools discussed above)</td>
<td>Four rural land use designations- Exclusive Agriculture, Agricultural Ranchlands, Hillsides, and Rural Residential</td>
<td>Zoning designations of-Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland</td>
<td>Sonoma County operates permits for agricultural preserves through the State Williamson Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>General Plan, Local Coastal Program, and Planned Agricultural District prevents subdivision of agricultural lands.</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Habitat Conservation Plan (protect 18 special status wildlife and plant species) Morgan Hill Agricultural Lands Preservation Program- land use policies to promote agricultural activities, acquisition of ACES San Jose’s Envision 2040 General Plan- directs development inward, preserving a greenline (urban growth boundary) Santa Clara Valley Greenprint-roadmap for conservation, identifies strategies</td>
<td>Solano County Code Chapter 2.2: Right-to-Farm Ordinance Orderly Growth Initiative</td>
<td>All nine cities in Sonoma County adopted urban growth boundaries. In 1990, created Sonoma Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, which uses sales tax to protect conservation easements. Ag + Open Space: The Vital Lands Initiative (2019): Summarizes work to use easements and other tools to protect highest priority grazing lands and croplands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND MANAGEMENT & IMPROVEMENT OVERVIEW

Agriculture is a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions (the fifth largest source statewide). However, agricultural production can contribute to climate change mitigation through practices like carbon sequestration, improved nutrient management, emissions reductions from stored manure and industrial fertilizer production, and more. In addition, well-managed croplands create healthier ecosystems that support plant and animal populations and reduce risk from climate disasters. Although the Bay Area is a leader in climate-conscious farming practices, sustainable land management needs to be implemented and funded at scale in order to comply with updated State regulations and offset the emissions produced by the agricultural sector.

Investments from California climate smart agriculture programs in the Bay Area include (as of 2019):

- 25 Healthy Soils Program projects in 2018, representing 5771.4 metric tons of CO2 equivalent of emissions reduction;
- three Alternative Migration and Modernization Program (AMMP) projects in 2018, representing CO2 emissions reductions over the next five years of 13,590 MtCO2e; and
- one State Water Efficiency & Enhancement Program (SWEEP) project in 2018.

*From SAGE’s Bay Area Food Futures Roadmap

WORKING GROUP OUTCOMES

Goal Statement: The goal of this working group is to identify existing and needed programs, funding, and best practices to support farmers in implementing land management practices that benefit water, habitat, and soil as well as address climate threats.

Equity Outcomes: Pathways identified will be tailored to address specific local and regional priorities for climate-smart working lands and informed by Indigenous community leadership engaged in land stewardship; as well as leveraging partnerships and networks, including philanthropic and NGO partners.

Meeting Sequence:

1. KEY TOPICS
   We will discuss related topics at the intersection of climate and agriculture that present solutions that are tangible, specific, and have potential for regional collaboration.

2. COORDINATION WITH PLAN BAY AREA
   We will discuss how our key topics align with existing and ongoing efforts for Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2050.

3. CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL COLLABORATION
   We will explore coordinated approaches to encouraging the adoption of climate-smart practices through County/Regional prioritization, funding, and technical assistance.
CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

What are the main challenges and gaps in streamlining and encouraging climate-smart agricultural practices in the Bay Area? How can technical and financial tools, like those identified, help decrease the climate impacts of farming?

Note: For a more detailed description of each tool/resource, please refer to page 2.

### KEY QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITYIZATION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE TOOLS AND RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can local jurisdictions and counties prioritize and support carbon-smart farming?</td>
<td>Climate Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can governments proactively reduce permitting and financial barriers for interested farmers?</td>
<td>Carbon Farm Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Bay Area/Priority Conservation Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are incentives and funding sources for carbon farming practices?</td>
<td>Joint Powers Authority (JPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State and Federal Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Resilience Initiative (ARI) Grants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What kind of technical assistance do potential participants need?</td>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do climate-smart practices also include stakeholders in</td>
<td>Regional Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution, processing, or other sectors of the food economy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SB 1383 COMPLIANCE

SB 1383 is a State bill to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, mainly from organic landfill waste. SB 1383 has three key goals:
- By 2020, reduce organic materials in landfills by 50%.
- By 2025, reduce organic material in landfills by 75%.
- By 2025, recover 20% of edible food that would otherwise be disposed of in the garbage or compost for human consumption.

---

This working group was convened to inform the preparation of a draft framework for a regional Bay Area Agricultural Plan. There are four working groups in total: Agricultural Housing, Land Conservation & Access, Land Management & Improvement, and Agricultural Supportive Uses. The Framework will build on and integrate with existing strategic plans, in particular Plan Bay Area 2050 and County Climate Action and Sustainability Plans. This framework will identify priorities and potential opportunities for regional coordination across these areas.

This work is funded by the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) Grant, led by the County of Santa Clara Planning & Development Department, and supported by consulting services by HR&A Advisors, Inc. and Cultivate Studio.
TOOLS AND RESOURCES

In this section, we lay out a few examples of different local and regional tools that governments can use to encourage climate-smart agricultural practices (linking to relevant case studies in and out of the Bay Area). We then describe the existing mechanisms regarding land management and improvement in the nine Bay Area counties (Table 1) as well as related resources and funding mechanisms available.

CLIMATE ACTION PLANS | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL

Including agriculture as a goal or priority in Climate Action Plans is an important first step that can unlock additional funding or support. Climate Action Plans can help garner support to allocate municipal resources for the implementation of these priorities (i.e. financial incentives to encourage farmers and producers to adopt more sustainable techniques.) In December 2020, Marin County adopted an updated Climate Action Plan. The plan includes an entire chapter on “Agriculture and Working Lands,” recognizing that agriculture is an integral part of reducing carbon emissions.

CARBON FARM PLANS | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL

The Marin County Climate Action Plan mentions the completion of 19 carbon farm plans. Carbon farming is a method of farming that absorbs more carbon than it releases. In addition to carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas reductions, carbon farming can also provide co-benefits that improve agricultural operations. A carbon farm plan outlines the specific practices that farmers and ranchers can implement to remove CO2 from atmosphere and converting into plant material and organic soil matter. With sufficient funding and staffing, jurisdictions can help produce carbon farm plans for interested participants. As of 2021, Sonoma County also has 24 carbon farm plans.

PLAN BAY AREA (PBA)/PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA) | FOCUS SCALE: REGIONAL

JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY (JPA) | FOCUS SCALE: REGIONAL

A JPA could serve as a regional clearinghouse for technical assistance (in regard to the permitting and implementation of climate-friendly agricultural practices) and additional sources of funding. Example: The purpose of the South Sacramento Conservation Agency JPA is to oversee the implementation of the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan, a regional effort to streamline permitting processes for development and infrastructure projects to protect open space and agricultural lands.

FUNDING | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL

Leveraging local, state, and federal funding sources:

- As part of the Marin Carbon Project, the Marin Resource Conservation District and its partners distributed $1.5 million in Stategarants to Marin ranchers to implement carbon farming practices across 16 different projects.
- In 2022, the Sonoma-Marin Ag and County Climate Coalition was awarded a federal grant of up to $10 million to support climate-smart agriculture in regional farms. The funding will be used to fund staff to support farmers as they navigate through the permitting and approval system, project design, and implementation funding. In addition, funding will also go towards a region-wide marketing and education campaign about climate-smart agriculture.
- Participating in carbon markets: The Marin Climate Action Plan recommends several opportunities to participate in the voluntary carbon market—developing a local carbon marketplace, partnering with local businesses focusing on carbon neutrality, revolving loan funds, matching funds, etc.
AGRICULTURAL RESILIENCE INITIATIVE (ARI) GRANTS | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL

In 2020, Santa Clara County adopted the Agricultural Resilience Incentive (ARI) Grant Program to fund climate-smart farming practices. The Santa Clara Board of Supervisors approved $220,000 to fund the program. The ARI Program awards voluntary financial incentives (up to $30,000) for 27 pre-approved agricultural resource management practices that promote soil health. Applicants fill out a simple 2-page application and get funding upfront. Farmers and ranchers are also connected with free technical assistance from the UC Cooperative Extension.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL

Connecting farmers with scientists, engineers, and planners is important for accurate and efficient implementation. Technical assistance can take the form of mapping and modeling to identify appropriate land for land management practices and estimates for GHG reductions. Jurisdictions and organizations can also develop and share sample carbon farm plans and template language to use on a regional level. Partners can also serve as resources for farmers and ranchers to comply with updated regulations (like SB 1383) and grant requirements. Providing technical assistance can build the capacity of local producers to implement, monitor, and succeed in their interventions.

REGIONAL DATA COLLECTION | FOCUS SCALE: REGIONAL

Collecting data to track projects, monitor progress, as well as measure success on a local and regional level is valuable information for stakeholders. As an example, SPUR’s Bay Area Good Food Purchasing Dashboardis an example of a regional level dashboard that collects data related to public institution food purchasing.

Carbon Farm Plan - Marin County

- As of 2020, Marin RCD has a waitlist of 68 parcels interested in receiving a Carbon Farm Plan.
- A Technical Advisory Committee helps to select which farms receive a Carbon Farm Plan from Marin RCD.
  - The selection criteria includes “the potential GHG sequestration potential of the farm, co-benefits including wildlife habitat and hydrologic improvements, and the landowner’s commitment to the planning and implementation process.”
### Does the County include climate-smart agriculture policies...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the County include climate-smart agriculture policies...</th>
<th>Alameda County</th>
<th>Contra Costa County</th>
<th>Marin County</th>
<th>Napa County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...in climate action plans or other countywide policy documents?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>According to the 2021 Contra Costa County Interim Climate Action Plan, the County is in process of developing a carbon sequestration feasibility study (through a grant from the CA Dept. of Conservation)</td>
<td>Climate-smart agricultural practices included in Chapter 4: “Agriculture &amp; Working Lands” Goal to expand Carbon Farm Planning and implementation to 180 Marin farms and ranches by 2045</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...that supports compliance with SB 1383?</td>
<td>Alameda County Community Development Agency-Planning is responsible for mandating/arranging organic collection services in unincorporated county areas. TBD on ag-specific services.</td>
<td>As of 2022, Contra Costa cities at different levels of compliance and preparedness across the County.</td>
<td>In 2022, Marin County adopted amendment to adhere to SB 1383 requirements. This applies for waste management franchise located in unincorporated areas of the county.</td>
<td>Napa County and Upper Valley Waste Management Agency are responsible for providing updated services to unincorporated areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...supported by local policies and programs?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In 2018, the Contra Costa RCD wrote the first Carbon Farm Plan in Contra Costa County with Frog Hollow Farm. This plan identified existing carbon sequestration estimates as well as recommendations to improve.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Huichica Creek Demonstration Vineyard-21 acres managed and operated by Napa RCD demonstrates practices to promote soil health, carbon farming, and erosion control.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This list is not comprehensive. Please let us know if we are missing any key programs in your County.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Francisco County</th>
<th>San Mateo County</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th>Solano County</th>
<th>Sonoma County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A Climate Action Plan states goal to become reach net-zero by 2040. In 2019, agriculture emissions accounted for 2% of San Francisco’s total emissions. These are mostly from animal waste and urban soils.</td>
<td>In the 2022, Community Action Plan, San Mateo County recognizes working lands as one of the main pathways to reaching the County’s goal of 45% emissions reduction by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2040.</td>
<td>In 2022, the County presented their draft strategies for the County’s Climate Roadmap 2030. One strategy includes “expanding the County’s agricultural resilience incentive program”.</td>
<td>In their 2011 plan, agriculture is mentioned as an area with a huge GHG reduction potential (10,510 MT CO2/year). Priorities include developing technical assistance for soil management/carbon sequestration techniques, reducing emissions from field equipment, and more.</td>
<td>In the 2016 Regional Climate Action Plan, carbon sequestration is mentioned as a possible strategy. Estimates show that carbon farming could sequester an average of 65 metric tons of carbon per acre across 264,693 acres of agricultural land in Sonoma County. In 2021, Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority adopted plan for carbon neutrality by 2030.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco has one of the longest-running curbside organics programs.</td>
<td>Compliance is supported through the County Office of Sustainability Waste Reduction Program. Discussion to develop inspection and enforcement programs, outreach, and compost/paper procurement.</td>
<td>In 2021, the Board of Supervisors adopted a Food Recovery Ordinance. This ordinance requires certain large scale businesses in unincorporated County areas to recover and donate their surplus edible food.</td>
<td>In 2021, Solano County established the Organics Waste Reduction Program through Ordinance No. 2021-1825.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A San Mateo Resource Conservation District- compost-brokering pilot program for farmers</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District Open Space Credit Program – caps water rate at 1/10th water amount for agricultural use versus what is paid by industrial/municipal water users</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Implementing 16 carbon farm plans in Sonoma County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BAY AREA AGRICULTURAL SUSTAINABILITY PLAN RESOURCE GUIDE | AGRICULTURAL SUPPORTIVE USES

AGRICULTURAL SUPPORTIVE USES OVERVIEW

The food economy includes not only agricultural production, but also all the steps of processing and distribution. Agricultural supportive uses can be defined as any combination of farm economics, processing and distribution infrastructure, on-farm infrastructure, agritourism and agricultural education, and labor and workforce development. This resource guide discusses the above topics as they relate to farm business viability, regional food supply chain resiliency and equity, and public engagement.

According to the 2019 “Bay Area Food Futures Roadmap,” the Bay Area food economy has an annual value of around $113 billion and employs almost half a million people (around 13% of region’s workforce). Alameda County has greatest number of food system jobs (notably, jobs in Alameda and Santa Clara County combined account for 46% of Bay Area food system jobs).

WORKING GROUP OUTCOMES

Goal Statement: The goal of this Working Group is to identify needed mechanisms to ensure food production, processing, and distribution operations in the Bay Area have durable economic viability, equitable and sufficient labor and workforce development, as well as robust community education and engagement opportunities.

Equity Outcomes: Mechanisms and incentives will be inclusive of land-based, capital-focused, and market-driven tactics that can lead to long-term prosperity and improved/safer working conditions for systemically excluded community representatives.

Meeting Sequence:

1. KEY TOPICS
   We will discuss related topics at the intersection of climate and agriculture that present solutions that are tangible, specific, and have potential for regional collaboration.

2. COORDINATION WITH PLAN BAY AREA
   We will discuss how our key topics align with existing and ongoing efforts for Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2050.

3. CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL COLLABORATION
   We will explore coordinated approaches to support the growth of agricultural supportive uses through zoning, funding, and technical assistance.

This working group was convened to inform the preparation of a draft framework for a regional Bay Area Agricultural Plan. There are four working groups in total: Agricultural Housing, Land Conservation & Access, Land Management & Improvement, and Agricultural Supportive Uses. The Framework will build on and integrate with existing strategic plans, in particular Plan Bay Area 2050 and County Climate Action and Sustainability Plans. This framework will identify priorities and potential opportunities for coordinated approaches to support the growth of agricultural supportive uses across these areas.

This work is funded by the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation (SALC) Grant, led by the County of Santa Clara Planning & Development Department, and supported by consulting services by HR&A Advisors, Inc. and Cultivate, Inc.
AGRICULTURAL SUPPORTIVE USES OVERVIEW

The food economy includes not only agricultural production, but also all the steps of processing and distribution. Agricultural supportive uses can be defined as any combination of farm economics, processing and distribution infrastructure, on-farm infrastructure, agritourism and agricultural education, and labor and workforce development. This resource guide discusses the above topics as they relate to farm business viability, regional food supply chain resiliency and equity, and public engagement.

According to the 2019 “Bay Area Food Futures Roadmap,” the Bay Area food economy has an annual value of around $113 billion and employs almost half a million people (around 13% of region’s workforce). Alameda County has greatest number of food system jobs (notably, jobs in Alameda and Santa Clara County combined account for 46% of Bay Area food system jobs).

WORKING GROUP OUTCOMES

Goal Statement:
The goal of this Working Group is to identify needed mechanisms to ensure food production, processing, and distribution operations in the Bay Area have durable economic viability, equitable and sufficient labor and workforce development, as well as robust community education and engagement opportunities.

Equity Outcomes:
Mechanisms and incentives will be inclusive of land-based, capital-focused, and market-driven tactics that can lead to long-term prosperity and improved/safer working conditions for systemically excluded community representatives.

Meeting Sequence:

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

What are the main challenges and gaps in ensuring the economic viability of agricultural production and its supportive uses in the Bay Area? How can tools, like those identified, help address existing issues?

Note: For a more detailed description of each tool/resource, please refer to page 2.

**KEY QUESTIONS**

**EXAMPLE TOOLS AND RESOURCES**

**ZONING**

Where are major hubs of distribution, processing, and manufacturing? How can we streamline processes for farmers to add value-added processing and distribution facilities?

What templates and tools can we make to simplify the zoning processes for agricultural supportive uses?

County-City Coordination
Zoning Ordinances
Pre-Approved Development Plans for Processing/Manufacturing
Permit Streamlining

**FUNDING**

What other funding sources are available for farmers?

How can we support for new farmers and entrepreneurs in the food and agriculture space? (i.e. opportunities for farmworkers to access land ownership and agricultural opportunities)

How can we help facilitate partnerships between producers with institutional and corporate purchasers/distributers?

In regard to both funding & and technical assistance, What do operations in the food economy need to be supported through a complete COVID-19 recovery?

Incentives/Grants
Low-interest Loans
Partnerships with private sector, universities, non-profit organizations
Interagency Coordination

**TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

What tools and programs are needed to help existing farmers access new markets? Across the region, how can we assess interest and share best practices?

How can we explore cooperative models on a regional level?

Small Business Education & Outreach
Branding/Marketing Assistance
Cooperative Organizational Structure
Regional distribution/manufacturing/processing data collection
Farmbudsman
TOOLS AND RESOURCES

In this section, we lay out a few examples of different local and regional tools that governments can use to encourage the viability of different agricultural processes (linking to relevant case studies in and out of the Bay Area). We then describe the existing mechanisms regarding agricultural processes in the nine Bay Area counties (Table 1) as well as related resources and funding mechanisms available.

ZONING | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL

Different zoning & permitting processes for different agricultural uses are often complicated for applicants to navigate. For example, zoning and permitting for industrial uses may be widely different than for production uses. In a study by Contra Costa County in 2015, the cost and complexity of the permitting processes is commonly cited as a barrier for growers to expand their agricultural enterprises.

Streamlining processes can help promote the economic sustainability of food related enterprises. For example, the Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan recommends revising County zoning ordinances to streamline the establishment of agriculture supportive uses like processing and research within agricultural production areas.

FUNDING | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL

The costs of adding value-added processing or expanding operations is often inaccessible to farmers. Incentives or grants can encourage farmers to grow their businesses. For example, local tourism boards can identify funding sources to promote agricultural tourism activities. Additional sources of funding can help interested farmers access the necessary land and capital to develop processing and distribution facilities.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL

Farmers, especially small farms, could benefit from increased education, awareness, and training about the technical and financial aspects of running an agricultural business. This technical assistance could take the form of branding/marketing education, exploring cooperative processing and distribution models, or compiling data to build the case for investment in the agricultural sector. This technical and financial assistance can be tailored for either existing or new farmers. Some examples of mechanisms to build capacity are included below:

PARTNERSHIPS | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL

Institutional purchases from schools and hospitals can drive economic growth for local farms. Counties and local jurisdictions can work to build partnerships with universities, cooperations, and other large purchasers to strengthen local producers. For example, university partnerships can help advance research topics, and large purchasers like cooperations, schools, and hospitals can build relationships with small farmers to increase opportunities for equitable procurement.

COOPERATIVE MODELS | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL

Cooperative structures can allow participating farmers and ranchers to have greater ownership and agency with their operations. In 2022, the Bay Area Ranchers Cooperative opened a mobile processing plant in Sonoma County. The processing plant allows farmers to reduce the transportation costs and distance of sending their animals to slaughterhouses farther away and direct more revenues to farmers.
FARMBUDSMAN | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL
A farmbudsman acts as a liaison between farmers, agricultural businesses, and government. Different farmbudsman have varying responsibilities, but most play a role on the local level in helping farmers and ranchers navigate the permitting system, improving the economic viability of food businesses, and helping to streamline existing processes. A regional farmbudsman can also link growers with potential wholesalers, distributors, retailers, and institutional buyers. See Table 1 for an overview of existing farmbudsman roles and responsibilities across the Bay Area.

REGIONAL DATA CREATION AND COLLECTION | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL & REGIONAL
Understanding the overall economic contributions of the agricultural sector and the needs of producers, distributors, processors, and more will help jurisdictions tailor their policies and programs to meet regional gaps. The 2019 “Bay Area Food Futures Roadmap” recommends a Bay Area food goods movement study that maps out existing strengths and gaps of food distribution and manufacturing clusters. Another example is SPUR’s Bay Area Good Food Purchasing Dashboard, a regional level dashboard that collects data related to public institution food purchasing.

BEYOND THE FARM
Farms are just one element of a larger food system including processors, distributors and support industries that refine, enhance, and move food products from farms to consumers. Together these industries form the food and agriculture economic cluster.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE
DOMESTIC TRADE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE
DOMESTIC TRADE

DISTRIBUTION

SUPPORT INDUSTRIES

PRODUCTION

PROCESSING

OTHER FOOD PROCESSING

FRUIT & VEGETABLE

WINERIES

CANNING

FARM LABOR SERVICE

NURSERIES

FARMS

PACKERS

PRODUCE DISTRIBUTION

The Industries within the Food and Ag. Cluster facilitate:
- aggregation
- marketing & distribution
- processing
- storage
...all the processes that move food from farm to table.

Source: Rural-Urban Connections Strategy - SAGG

From Santa Clara Valley Agricultural Plan (2018)
### Are agricultural supportive uses...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Alameda County</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contra Costa County</strong></th>
<th><strong>Marin County</strong></th>
<th><strong>Napa County</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
<td>50,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
<td>16,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
<td>21,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and distribution of wine and livestock. Agritourism in Livermore Valley.</td>
<td>Produces a wide variety of specialty crops – fruit, vegetable, nut, and field crops. Currently has 21 Certified Farmer’s Markets</td>
<td>Ranching and grazing land for cattle as well as milk production. Dairy is mainly sold regionally. Increase in direct market outlets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ...a significant part of the regional economy? Which industries and occupations? 

- A significant part of the regional economy. Managed by the County Agricultural Commissioner.
- Production and distribution of wine and livestock. Agritourism in Livermore Valley.

### ...integrated with each other? What opportunities and/or gaps have been identified? 

- Loss of cropland, need to increase capacity to grow food crops.
- Interest in growing local food enterprises.
- Strengthen rural/urban relationships.

#### Alameda County
- Interested in growing agritourism industry.
- Lack of relationship between food processors and local growers.
- Regulations and permitting is difficult to navigate for different uses.

#### Contra Costa County
- Organic and value-add operations to expand dairy operations. Need for streamlined permitting process.

#### Marin County
- Little infrastructure for direct sales, marketing, and distribution.

### ...supported by existing/central leadership? Who is the coordinating body? (i.e. farmbudsman) 

- Agricultural industry is supported by County Agricultural Commissioner.

#### Alameda County
- Farmbudsman assists in navigation of online permit portal.

#### Contra Costa County
- Administered by University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE). Neutral, non-enforcement person who works as a consultant with farmers and ranchers to navigate permitting process. Funded by County General Funds + State Ag. Commissioner’s Office.

#### Marin County
- County Agricultural Commissioner is responsible for implementing local, State, and Federal regulatory programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>San Francisco County</th>
<th>San Mateo County</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th>Solano County</th>
<th>Sonoma County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
<td>40,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
<td>92,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
<td>21,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
<td>39,000 agricultural and food sector employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage establishments &amp; food manufacturing uses (i.e. Golden Gate Produce Terminal for wholesale distribution)</td>
<td>Variety of vegetable and fruit as well as flower and nursery crops. Growing agritourism, increased direct market outlets (strengths in farmer’s markets)</td>
<td>Vegetables, orchards, mushrooms, and nursery crops</td>
<td>Wide variety of crop production, including a strong distribution sector</td>
<td>Wine grapes, beef, lamb, goat, hay milk, yogurt, cheese Agritourism + agricultural processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing programming related to urban agriculture</td>
<td>Grow distribution and procurement opportunities (i.e. central distribution facility for local foods, government procurement of local foods, etc.) Transition to high value crops.</td>
<td>Little agriculture tourism or agricultural marketing Recommendation to conduct needs assessment for agricultural distribution and processing.</td>
<td>Desire to help farmers access direct consumer markets</td>
<td>Interest in protecting grasslands (providing rangelands for cattle/communities, conversion rate is high) Building on rancher cooperative example in Sonoma County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (No farmbudsman)</td>
<td>Administered by San Mateo Resource Conservation District Assists local producers with permitting process and County staff understand agriculture needs. More focused on permitting process. Funded by County BOS allocated funds.</td>
<td>Administered by UCCE or SBDC Provides permitting and regulatory advice as well as economic development assistance to new farmers. Funded by County.</td>
<td>Administered by Solano Small Business Development Center (SBDC), hosted by Humboldt State University Serves as liaison between agricultural business and government. Advisor for farmers and ranchers to navigate permitting/regulatory process. Funded by Solano SBDC.</td>
<td>Administered by UCCE Assists agricultural operations (mostly small) navigate permitting process. Serves on County Planning Department’s Director’s Advisory Group. Funded by County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stakeholders include: San Francisco County Agricultural Commissioner San Francisco Environment Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGRICULTURAL HOUSING OVERVIEW

Agricultural housing is defined as housing units occupied by farm laborers and their immediate family members. Farmworkers can live in housing that is occupationally restricted to farmworkers, privately-"settle" or permanent farmworkers as workers that live within 75 miles of their work.

1. More farmworkers are settled in one location. Only ~5% of workers are now “follow the crop” migrant farmworkers, and most workers are permanent residents. The USDA defines “settled” or permanent farmworkers as workers that live within 75 miles of their work.

2. Farmworkers are more likely to have families and looking to live in locations that provide community services like schools.

The changing farmworker landscape has transformed housing needs “from seasonal housing for migrant workers to permanently affordable housing for low wage working families.” As more farmworkers seek to live in urban communities and find permanent housing outside of on-site options in rural/unincorporated County areas, addressing farmworker housing issues will require collaboration between Counties and local jurisdictions.

WORKING GROUP OUTCOMES

Goal Statement: The goal of this Working Group is to identify local and regional mechanisms to streamline and encourage the production of affordable agricultural housing in the Bay Area.

Equity Outcomes: Identification of mechanisms to support more affordable agricultural housing will naturally increase housing security for those who need it most. This Working Group could ensure robust equitable outcomes by proposing strategies that would lead to high quality, well-located housing.

Meeting Sequence:

1. KEY TOPICS

   We will discuss related topics at the intersection of climate and agriculture that present solutions that are tangible, specific, and have potential for regional collaboration.

2. COORDINATION WITH PLAN BAY AREA

   We will discuss how our key topics align with existing and ongoing efforts for Plan Bay Area (PBA) 2050.

3. CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL COLLABORATION

   We will explore coordinated approaches to streamline processes, create templates, and conduct stakeholder outreach.
### CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

What are the main challenges and gaps in streamlining and encouraging the production of affordable agricultural housing in the Bay Area? How can tools, like those identified, help meet the need?

Note: For a more detailed description of each tool/resource, please refer to page 2.

#### KEY QUESTIONS

**Example Tools and Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use and Permitting Strategy</th>
<th>County-City Agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there established measurements of how many agricultural housing units are needed per county, and is it separate from affordable housing?</td>
<td>Overlay Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What coordination exists between cities and counties in zoning and streamlining agricultural housing?</td>
<td>Pre-Approved Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permit Streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best Practices and Templates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure and Water**

| Is housing being provided where farmworkers want to be (e.g., nearby to schools and external job opportunities)? | Hard/Social Infrastructure |
| Do existing housing plans incorporate wrap-around services and/or tie into existing community services? What coordination exists between cities and counties? | Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) |
| Do existing environmental and water infrastructure plans take farmworker housing into account? What coordination exists between cities and counties? | Legislative Agenda |
| Is there sufficient infrastructure for transit from housing sites to agricultural workplaces? | Transportation |

**Funding**

| What incentives and processes exist to coordinate delivery of agricultural housing either countywide or regionally? | Assessment Districts |
| Where are counties providing general affordable housing? How is it funded, and can these funds be used to deliver agricultural housing? | Private Sector Fees |
| From a funding and delivery perspective, should agricultural housing be treated as any other affordable housing user? | Joint Power Authorities (JPAs) |
| | Commercial/Industrial Linkage Fees |
| | Financing and Underwriting |
| | County-City Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) |
| | General Affordable Housing Tools (Low Income Housing Tax Credit, Typology-Based Credits, Underwriting Income Guidelines for Farmworker Housing, Parcel Tax, Inclusionary Housing Programs) |
TOOLS AND RESOURCES

In this section, we lay out different local and regional tools that governments can use to implement and fund farmworker housing projects (linking to relevant case studies in and out of the Bay Area). We then describe existing work related to farmworker housing in the nine Bay Area counties (Table 1) as well as related resources and funding mechanisms available on a regional, state, and national level. A more comprehensive list of tools and strategies can additionally be found on Pg. 11-18 of the ABAG Farmworker Housing Toolkit and Pg. iii-x of the Farmworker Housing Study and Action Plan for Salinas Valley and Pajaro Valley.

LAND USE AND PERMITTING STRATEGY | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL

Governments can proactively reduce siting and regulatory barriers to developing farmworker housing within cities and unincorporated counties.

- **County-City Agreements**: Agreements that encourage development of farmworker housing by connecting contiguous, unincorporated county land to city infrastructure.

- **Overlay Zones**: Creating an overlay zone for parcels in unincorporated county areas that have potential for farmworker housing and reducing regulatory barriers. This can be in tandem with identifying high-priority areas for affordable housing generally.

- **Pre-Approved Development Plans**: Pre-approved plans allow for faster permitting and cheaper housing to be built. In 2017, Ventura County created pre-approved standard plans for farmworker housing and accessory dwelling unit configurations. The standardized plans are available for 1, 2, and 3-bedroom units, and applicants can save on review fees and time as well as the need to hire an architect.

- **Permit Streamlining**: Incentivizing development of agricultural housing by reducing barriers to development and/or relaxing restrictions on residential use of agriculturally-zoned land.
  - San Mateo County adopted a Farm Labor Housing policy that eliminated Planning and Building Department fees, removed redundant requirements, and extended permit renewal time frames. The County commissioned an assessment of difficulties in the permitting process for agricultural workforce housing in 2016, responding to recommendations to create a comprehensive application guidebook and increase outreach efforts.

- **Best Practices and Templates**: Develop and share collaborative resources available to counties on approaches and policies for land use and permitting.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND WATER | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL AND REGIONAL

Farmworker housing in unincorporated areas often lack connections to sewer, wastewater, and water infrastructure. As a result, efforts to build farmworker housing could conflict with a jurisdiction’s environmental guidelines.

- **Hard/Social Infrastructure**: Placing agricultural housing near schools, community resources, healthcare, parks/open space, retail, and other amenities.

- **Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)**: Garner support for water and sewage availability for agricultural housing.

- **Legislative Agenda**: Establishing collaborative partnerships to overcome challenges with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the California State Water Resources Control Board and regional water boards to provide services to agricultural housing.

- **Transportation**: With housing in different areas, public-or private-led creation of transit to take farmworkers from housing to employment.
FUNDING | FOCUS SCALE: LOCAL AND REGIONAL

Farmworker housing projects can rely on governmental and non-governmental sources.

+ **Assessment Districts (Napa County CountyService Area No.4):** Through a state bill passed in 2017, the state of California approved an increase in the amount of annual benefit assessment from $10 to $15 per vineyard acre. These funds are allocated for acquiring, building, leasing, and providing maintenance to farmworker housing.

+ **Private Sector Fees:** Leveraging fees on large-scale agricultural operations to support development of agricultural housing.

+ **Other Tools:**
  - **Joint Power Authorities (JPAs):** JPAs are a governance and financing mechanism that allows jurisdictions to jointly issue bonds and hold property. Counties could study the application of JPAs to build farmworker housing.
  - **Commercial/Industrial Linkage Fees:** A commercial/industrial linkage fee program to meet housing needs of employees.
  - **Financing and Underwriting:** Explore mechanisms that can be applied to agricultural housing particularly with precedents in affordable housing development.
  - **County-City Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs):** In order to encourage the development of farmworker housing, counties and cities establish agreements that allow unincorporated county land to connect to existing city infrastructure.

+ **General Affordable Housing Tools**
  - **Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC):** Including agricultural housing in the delivery of the LIHTC program, including scores and tax credits.
  - **Typology-Based Credits:** Incentivizing development of certain types of agricultural housing as desired by land-use planning, ranging from single-family homes to larger apartment-or dormitory-style buildings. This could also include incentives for residents to build Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) for agricultural housing.
  - **Underwriting Income Guidelines for Farmworker Housing:** Preventing farmworkers from losing their housing if they change jobs and go above income limits for their housing.
  - **Parcel Tax:** Explore parcel taxes that would tax land rather than new development.
  - **Inclusionary Housing Programs:** Strengthen local Inclusionary Housing Programs to provide affordable housing that could also be targeted for farmworkers agricultural Housing.
## Is farmworker housing...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alameda County</th>
<th>Contra Costa County</th>
<th>Marin County</th>
<th>Napa County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...identified as an issue/priority at the county level?</td>
<td>Included in their housing element under Ag zoning and special needs housing</td>
<td>Included in land use element; “Develop programs with the assistance of the County and other appropriate agencies and non-profit organizations to provide adequate housing for transient farm workers.”</td>
<td>Included in their housing element under special needs housing; calls for needs assessment; Program 1.5 enhances affordability for farmworker housing</td>
<td>Included in their housing element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...evaluated qualitatively and/or quantitatively with an estimated need?</td>
<td>Conducted a needs assessment of agricultural workers</td>
<td>Classified as a special needs group; analyzed needs via an agricultural census</td>
<td>Conducted a special needs assessment (included in Housing Element)</td>
<td>Completed detailed Napa County Farmworker Housing Needs Assessment in 2012. Conducted community workshops on housing needs including an equity working group session on farmworker housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...supported by local policies and programs?</td>
<td>Residential zoning is allowed by right in A districts; housing element has detailed plans and policies for Ag Housing County also has an Ag Element</td>
<td>Proposed zoning amendment to remove requirement to secure land use permit for farmworker housing in ag zones Farmworker housing program goal to increase supply of housing</td>
<td>Program 1.5: housing for farmworkers and hospitality workers; sets aside a % of affordable housing units for farmworkers Affordable housing incentives including density bonuses, fee waivers, priority processing, etc.</td>
<td>Special housing needs policies including working with ag industry to assess/meet needs of farmworkers; ensure farmworker housing meets health standards; housing element has numerous programs/policies for farmworker housing H-3g (housing element) prioritizes funds to support new farmworker housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...distinctly funded separately from affordable housing?</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Development funds via HOME or CDBG may be applicable to ag housing Affordable housing trust fund “Boomerang” Program for county-wide affordable housing projects</td>
<td>CDBG and HOME funding for affordable homeownership and rental opportunities for low-income households including farmworker families</td>
<td>Program 1.5 proposes partnering with other jurisdictions, farm operators, and hotels to contribute to an affordable housing fund or CLT</td>
<td>Farmworker Tax Credit set asides Affordable Housing Fund Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Grant to facilitate development of farmworker housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco County</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>Solano County</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Identified as priority in housing element. HMB’s Coastal Land Use Plan: local workforce housing overlay zone Included in 2014 Housing Element under various policies and programs around affordable housing and workforce housing</td>
<td>Included as special needs population in housing element</td>
<td>Included in their housing element in programs for affordable housing and for special needs housing Has a separate section specific to ag housing</td>
<td>Included in housing element and ag resources element; listed as special needs group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2014 Housing Element called for a farmworker housing needs study in unincorporated County including analysis of housing quality and recommendations for improvement As well as a detailed needs assessment (2016). Conducted an online survey on housing issues</td>
<td>Targeted outreach to special needs groups including farmworkers for 2015 Housing Element Housing Element calls for Farmworker Housing Needs Assessment (Program 4.09.16)</td>
<td>Farmworker Housing is identified in Housing Needs Assessment (Appendix A of housing element)</td>
<td>Outreach at local day labor centers on farmworker needs Housing element calls for an inventory of existing farmworker housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>San Mateo County also has an ombudsman for farmworker housing. In 2022, San Mateo County Supervisor approved a resolution establishing the San Mateo County Farmworker Advisory Commission. The County exempts “all units used for farmworker housing from the County’s density allocation requirements, by waiving fees and by providing an Agricultural Ombudsman.” Housing Element includes recommendation to allow permanent farmworker housing as permitted by right in any multifamily zone; proposes working with community partners to ID new potential sites, funding opportunities, and to share information with farmworkers.</td>
<td>2015 Housing Element includes 2 programs for farmworker housing (Strategy 8): Program 4.09.07 explores reductions in permit requirements Program 4.09.03 allows ag worker housing to be occupied by ag workers not employed by the operator/owner</td>
<td>Housing element commits to providing development incentives via expediting permits; allows farmworker housing as of right Discusses outreach about housing assistance programs</td>
<td>Priority processing for affordable and farmworker housing; working on streamlining; review existing zoning around ag housing; farmworker housing task force; numerous recommendations regarding farmworker housing in housing element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>San Mateo Grant Programs San Mateo County &amp; HMB Affordable Housing Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital financing for farmworker housing via Rural Development Loans &amp; Grants</td>
<td>Considering assessment district to help fund farmworker housing projects Various affordable housing streams listed in housing element may be applicable to farmworker housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGRICULTURAL LANDS CONSERVATION AND LAND TENURE

Sources and References

- Sonoma County Ag + Open Space, “Healthy Lands & Health Economies” (2018).
- Contra Costa Recommendations (2019).
- Alameda County, “Zoning Regulations”
- Sacramento County, “South Sacramento Conservation Agency – Joint Powers Authority (JPA)”.
- Solano County General Plan, “Chapter 3: Agriculture”.
- Alameda County Zoning Regulations (2022).
- Napa County Agricultural Preservation and Land Use (2013).
- Smart Preservation, San Mateo County, 2022.
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AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY & INFRASTRUCTURE

Sources and References

- The Press Democrat, “Bay Area ranchers open their own mobile meat processing plant, filling key gap for local industry” (2022).
- Contra Costa County, “Recommendations on Reforming Agricultural Land Use Policies in Contra Costa County To Improve Both Economic Vitality and Sustainability” (2019).
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APPENDIX E: FUNDING RESOURCES

THE FUNDING RESOURCES ARE DIVIDED BY THE FOUR MAIN STRATEGIES: AG LANDS CONSERVATION & LAND TENURE, CLIMATE SMART AG LANDS & STEWARDSHIP, AG ECONOMY & INFRASTRUCTURE, AND AG SECTOR HOUSING.

- We list both state and federal funding resources. Some grant programs will have eligible project types that could serve multiple strategies.
- Program funding levels vary from year-to-year and program websites may change. This document will benefit from crowdsourcing over time as new and old funding resources are added and changed.
- The list of eligible project types and applicants is intended to provide an overview but may not be exhaustive. We encourage potential applicants to read through the latest request for proposals and contact the administering agency for more details.
Federal

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

Agricultural Land Easements help private and tribal landowners, land trusts, and other entities such as state and local governments protect croplands and grasslands through conservation easements. Landowners are eligible to receive non-agricultural uses of the land through the easement program.

State of California:

California Department of Conservation (DOF) - Strategic Growth Council (SGC)

The California Strategic Growth Council funds projects that support the Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy (NWLCSS). These projects fall under one of the following five themes:

1. Planning for multi-benefit nature-based solutions projects
2. Implementation of multi-benefit nature-based solutions projects
3. Ancestral land return for the purpose of advancing multi-benefit nature-based solutions projects

State of California - Department of Conservation

The Wildlife Conservation Board also funds conservation, primarily of open space but some working lands projects. The application form is due on or before August 1, 2023.

State of California - Department of Water Resources

See: https://www.dwr.ca.gov/acep-agricultural-and-ranch-conservation-basics/

Eligible Applicants:

Private and tribal landowners, land trusts, state and local governments, and others by limiting non-agricultural uses of the land through conservation easement programs.

Contact:

CACE@sgc.ca.gov

Ag Lands Conservation & Land Tenure Program Name: Agricultural Conservation Easements Program (ACEP)

Program Website: https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/acep-agricultural-and-ranch-conservation-program/

Federal: USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)

State of California: California Department of Conservation - Strategic Growth Council (SGC)

Contact your district conservationist with the Strategic Growth Council, Strategic Growth Council of California, and the State of California Department of Conservation for more details.

Agency Contact: Contact your district conservationist with the Strategic Growth Council, Strategic Growth Council of California, and the State of California Department of Conservation.

Agency Contact: contact your district conservationist with the Strategic Growth Council, Strategic Growth Council of California, and the State of California Department of Conservation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Admin.-Stering Agency</th>
<th>State or Federal</th>
<th>Eligible Project Types</th>
<th>Eligible Applicants</th>
<th>Program Website</th>
<th>Agency Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Manure Management Program</td>
<td>CA Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>Financial and technical assistance for dairy and livestock producers to transition to dry manure handling and storage as well as pasture-based management. For details on eligible practices see the latest RGA.</td>
<td>California farmers, ranchers, and California Native American Tribes are eligible to apply. Individuals and business entities receiving grant award funds must be located in California with a physical California business address</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/AMMP/">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/AMMP/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdfa.oefi_ammpp@cdfa.ca.gov">cdfa.oefi_ammpp@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Agriculture Planning Grants Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The Conservation Agriculture Planning Grants Program (CAPGP) is a new program in the Office of Environmental Farming and Innovation. This program will fund the development of plans that will help farmers and ranchers identify actions for climate change mitigation and adaptation, further environmental stewardship on farms and ranches and ensure agricultural food security into the future.</td>
<td>Eligible entities include Tribes, technical service providers (TSPs) registered with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), professional certified crop advisors, pest control advisors, rangeland managers, non-profit organizations, Resource Conservation Districts, California Public Universities, agricultural cooperatives, groundwater sustainability agencies, and farmers and ranchers in collaboration with a qualified planner. All eligible applicants will be required to demonstrate qualifications.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/planning/">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/planning/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdfa.oefi_cagpp@cdfa.ca.gov">cdfa.oefi_cagpp@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Soils Incentives Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The HSP Incentives Program provides financial incentives to California growers and ranchers to implement conservation management practices that sequester carbon, reduce atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHGs), and improve soil health.</td>
<td>California farmers, ranchers, business entities, and California Native American Tribes are eligible to apply. Nonprofit organizations as agriculture operations are eligible to apply. Grant Recipients must be at least 18 years old. Cannabis cultivation operations are not eligible to apply. Hemp cultivation operations are eligible to apply.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/healthysoils/IncentivesProgram.html">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/healthysoils/IncentivesProgram.html</a></td>
<td>cdfa.hsp <a href="mailto:tech@cdfa.ca.gov">tech@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Soils Block Grant Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The Healthy Soils – Block Grant Pilot Program is part of the Healthy Soils Program (HSP), which stems from the California Healthy Soils Initiative, a collaboration of state agencies and departments that promotes the development of healthy soils on California’s farmlands and ranchlands. The Block Grant Pilot Program is designed to facilitate financial assistance to California agricultural operations through regional block grant administrators.</td>
<td>The following entities are eligible to apply for the Block Grant Program: - Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs) - University of California (UC), California Community Colleges, or California State Universities (CSU) - Federally- and California- Recognized Native American Indian Tribes - Local or regional government agencies such as air pollution control districts. - State agricultural marketing programs, and federal marketing programs that represent California commodities (California Commodities) - Nonprofit organizations including, but not limited to: - Groundwater Sustainability Agencies of Irrigation districts of Land trusts</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/healthysoils/Resources-HSPBlockGrantProgram.html">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/healthysoils/Resources-HSPBlockGrantProgram.html</a> AND <a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/healthysoils/BlockGrantProgram.html">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/healthysoils/BlockGrantProgram.html</a></td>
<td>cdfa.hsp <a href="mailto:tech@cdfa.ca.gov">tech@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Soils Demonstrations Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The Healthy Soils (HS) Demonstration Program funds on-farm demonstration projects that collect data, showcase conservation management practices and create a platform promoting widespread adoption of conservation management practices throughout the state.</td>
<td>Nonprofit entities, University Cooperative Extensions, Federal and University Experiment Stations, city and community colleges, Resource Conservation Districts (RCDs), California Native American Tribes, and farmers and ranchers in partnership with one of the aforementioned entities are eligible to apply.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/healthysoils/DemonstrationProjects.html">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/oefi/healthysoils/DemonstrationProjects.html</a></td>
<td>cdfa.hsp <a href="mailto:tech@cdfa.ca.gov">tech@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Administering Agency</td>
<td>State or Federal</td>
<td>Eligible Project Types</td>
<td>Eligible Applicants</td>
<td>Program Website</td>
<td>Agency Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Farmer and Farmworker Training and Workforce Development Grant Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>This program provides support to organizations to enhance or expand beginning farmer and farmworker training/apprenticeship programs. The overall goal of the program is to ensure that resources are dedicated to strengthening support for socially disadvantaged and/or beginning farmers and ranchers in the first ten years of business, and for farmworkers who can improve job security with additional skills training. A secondary goal of the program is to build and grow regional networks to ensure organizations can provide adequate support and training opportunities for those most underserved in the agriculture industry.</td>
<td>The CDFA encourages applications from organizations who serve small to medium sized and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and farmworkers, including but not limited to BIMPOC (Black, Indigenous, Multiracial, and People of Color), LGBTQ, women and veterans.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/bfttp/">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/bfttp/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:thea.rittenhouse@cdfa.ca.gov">thea.rittenhouse@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Underserved and Small Producer Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The technical assistance (TA) program funds non-profit organizations, resource conservation districts, Tribal Governments and county ag commissioner's to assist farmers and ranchers with application assistance to the CUSP Drought Relief Direct Producer Grant program, federal and state economic and disaster relief programs, and technical assistance related to farm business management, financial planning and marketing assistance TA to individual agricultural producers as tools to mitigate immediate concerns and needs related to the drought.</td>
<td>See the program website for more on eligible applicants.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/CUSP/">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/CUSP/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:thea.rittenhouse@cdfa.ca.gov">thea.rittenhouse@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairground and Community Resilience Centers Programs</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The Fairground and Community Resilience Centers Program focuses on improving both local fairground and other community facilities to enhance the state’s emergency preparedness capabilities, particularly in response to climate change. The program has been split into two tracks for awarding facilitation purposes.</td>
<td>CDFA offers two sub-grants under this program. See the program website for more on eligible applicants.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/FairsAndExpositions/fccrp/">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/FairsAndExpositions/fccrp/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:crccprogram@cdfa.ca.gov">crccprogram@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm to Community Food Hubs Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>CDFA’s Farm to Community Food Hubs Program was established in the 2020-21 state budget (Assemblymember Bloom) to pilot investments in food aggregation and distribution infrastructure needed to increase purchasing of local, environmentally sustainable, climate smart, and equitably produced food by schools and other institutions, build a better food system economy, support the local farming economy, accelerate climate adaptation and resilience, and employ food system workers with fair wages and working conditions.</td>
<td>See the program website for more on eligible applicants.</td>
<td><a href="https://cafarmtofork.cdfa.ca.gov/F2CFHP.html">https://cafarmtofork.cdfa.ca.gov/F2CFHP.html</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cfoodhubs@cdfa.ca.gov">cfoodhubs@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Farm to School Incubator Grant Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>To support a systems approach to advancing farm to school throughout the state, the 2022 California Farm to School Incubator Grant Program offers four funding tracks. See the latest Request for Applications for details.</td>
<td>See the program website for more on eligible applicants.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/caf2sgrant/">https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/caf2sgrant/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cafarmtoschool@cdfa.ca.gov">cafarmtoschool@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Refrigeration Grant Program</td>
<td>CDFA</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The Healthy Refrigeration Grant Program (HRGP) funds energy efficient refrigeration units in corner stores, small businesses, and food donation programs in low-income or low-access areas throughout the state to stock California-grown fresh produce, nuts, dairy, meat, eggs, minimally processed, and culturally appropriate foods.</td>
<td>See the program website for more on eligible applicants.</td>
<td><a href="https://cafarmtofork.cdfa.ca.gov/hrgp.html">https://cafarmtofork.cdfa.ca.gov/hrgp.html</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cafarmtoschool@cdfa.ca.gov">cafarmtoschool@cdfa.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Agricultural Sector Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Administering Agency</th>
<th>State or Federal</th>
<th>Eligible Project Types</th>
<th>Eligible Applicants</th>
<th>Program Website</th>
<th>Agency Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Home Weatherization Program, Farmworker Component</td>
<td>Department of Community Services Development</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The Farmworker Component of LIHWP funds HVAC and other home weatherization and energy efficiency upgrades for farmworker housing.</td>
<td>The LIWP Farmworker Housing Component is administered by La Cooperativa de Compesina de California and currently provides services in two regions that include 18 counties in California that have the highest farmworker populations. Eligible Bay Area counties include Sonoma, Napa and Santa Cruz counties.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.csd.ca.gov/Pages/Farmworker-Housing-Component.aspx">https://www.csd.ca.gov/Pages/Farmworker-Housing-Component.aspx</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.csd.ca.gov/Pages/Contact-Us.aspx">https://www.csd.ca.gov/Pages/Contact-Us.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Serna Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program</td>
<td>Department of Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>The FWHG Multifamily program helps fund new construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of owner-occupied and rental units for agricultural workers, with a priority for lower income households.</td>
<td>See the Super NOFA for more details:<a href="https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-and-funding/supernofa">https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-and-funding/supernofa</a></td>
<td><a href="https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-and-funding/programs-active/joe-serna-jr-farmworker-housing-grant">https://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-and-funding/programs-active/joe-serna-jr-farmworker-housing-grant</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sema@hcd.ca.gov">Sema@hcd.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>