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1.0 Executive Summary

The South Coyote Valley Greenbelt Research Report was produced for the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP). The CVSP is being prepared by the City of San Jose’s Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, with the guidance of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan Task Force. The Task Force consists of 19 members with Mayor Ron Gonzales and Councilmember Forrest Williams as the co-chairs. The CVSP Coyote Valley Specific Plan is expected to be finalized and presented for City Council approval by March 2006.

The purpose of the Research Report is to provide background data and stakeholder perspectives that inform and help achieve the San Jose City Council’s Vision and Expected Outcomes for the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt. The 16-point Vision and Expected Outcomes provides the roadmap for developing the CVSP, and includes four points that pertain to the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt. As numbered in the Vision statement (and slightly condensed), these points are:

1. The Plan will include Central and North Coyote for land planning and will include South Coyote only to determine financing and other mechanisms to secure it as a permanent Greenbelt.
2. The line (Greenline) between Central and South shall not be moved.
11. The Plan must be financially feasible for private development.
14. The Plan should facilitate permanent acquisition of fee title or conservation easements in South Coyote.

The Report used the Vision Statement from the Coyote Valley Greenbelt Interim Planning Principles, prepared by a number of government and non-profit agencies including the County of Santa Clara, City of San Jose, and City of Morgan Hill in August 2001 as an additional focus for research. A slightly condensed version of this statement follows:

The South Coyote Valley Greenbelt should be a unique, rural place of countywide importance, providing permanent separation between the urban areas of the North County and South County. It should be a special place that:

- Clearly delineates a permanent, non-urban buffer between the urban areas of North County and South County
- Supports and celebrates small scale agriculture and Santa Clara County’s agricultural heritage
- Provides safe, convenient recreational linkages to trails and open space lands and to the urban areas to its north and south
- Provides a positive, memorable experience for those who visit or pass through it
- Contributes to the quality of life of nearby urban neighborhoods

Research was conducted in three primary areas: Existing Physical, Jurisdictional, and Land Use Conditions; Stakeholder Input; and Greenbelt Case Studies. Through research and interviews, the Report identified implementation challenges and opportunities. These are outlined in this Executive Summary along with ‘lessons learned’ from the case studies. Appendices to the Report substantiate and extend the research and document the interviews, and include: A) Images of current land use and case studies/examples that illustrate key findings; B) Research on Small

---

1 The 2001 report includes 5 additional bullet points in the same vein.
2 In presenting the Greenbelt Vision, the CVSP uses the word ‘non-urban’ instead of the word ‘rural’.
Farm Challenges and Opportunities; C) Transcripts of Stakeholder Interviews; D) List of Resources; and E) Study of an ‘Agricultural Park’ as a potential land use concept.

Existing Conditions: Physical, Jurisdictional, Current Land Use, and Historical Land Use
Sources used in compiling the existing conditions data include research reports, maps, databases, and technical memos prepared for the CVSP, as well as other publications as noted. The Report categorizes and outlines existing conditions in considerable detail. Implementation challenges and opportunities extrapolated from the data are summarized below.

Implementation Challenges
• Soils: property owners’ testimony contradicts Prime Farmland classification; remediation may be required where restricted materials have been applied in order to accommodate some possible land uses (e.g. natural resource mitigation and/or organic farming).
• Hydrology: flood prone and high water table areas (i.e. around Fisher Creek) compromise agricultural use and have resulted in failed septic tests; many wells require expensive retrofitting; in some areas high nitrate levels are problematic for water quality; and potential competition for water allocation.
• Jurisdictional and regulatory frameworks: multiple jurisdictions (i.e. Santa Clara County and the Cities of San Jose) complicate Greenbelt planning and implementation.
• Land use: “Agriculture” is the predominant land use designation and the predominate zoning, and historically has been the predominant land use. However, in the past two decades for a variety of reasons, many agricultural operations have ceased. A predominance of small parcels, a patchwork development pattern, presence of industrial land uses, and lack of buffering from non-farm residences, present additional challenges for agriculture.

Opportunities
• The Greenbelt already has elements of ‘unique rural character’ at its edges and within its view-shed: large acreages of public open space, private recreation, range land, and permanently protected open space.
• Agronomic conditions range from sufficient to excellent. Testing is needed to resolve site-specific issues about quality of soils and water. Water supply is expected to be sufficient and affordable. General soil classification is Class 2 Prime Farmland. Climate conditions are excellent for a wide range of crops.
• Approximately 2,214 acres of land are potentially available in the Greenbelt for mitigation, restoration, and wetland habitat creation. This includes 850 acres of undeveloped agricultural land. It also includes 1364 acres of annual grassland, oak woodland, open water, riparian areas, and ruderal herbaceous fields, most of which are located in what is currently the Coyote Creek Parkway.
• Potential for wildlife movement corridors.

Stakeholder Input
The Greenbelt Research report solicited input from three categories of stakeholders: 1) Governmental jurisdictions and agencies; 2) Greenbelt property owners and farmers; and 3) Environmental, agricultural and food system interests. The primary communication method was in-person and phone interviews in which Stakeholders were asked for their feedback on the Vision Statement from the Coyote Valley Greenbelt Interim Planning Principles. Input was also provided in more informal discussions and in focus group meetings. Public position statements and relevant reports were also reviewed.
Implementation Challenges

- Strong objection from many property owners to the City Council’s Vision and Expected Outcomes for the Greenbelt. Reasons cited include exclusion from previous planning processes, disenfranchisement in City process due to County jurisdiction, anger at exclusion from potential profits that may accrue from urban development, sense of being ‘condemned to farm’, and perception of no fair and feasible alternative vision and plan.
- Traditional agriculture is no longer viable (e.g., prunes, generic flowers and nursery crops). Reasons cited include rising input costs, decreasing market prices, overseas competition, loss of infrastructure, labor hard to attract and sustain, regulatory barriers, and traffic constraints on moving farming equipment.
- Barriers to the entry of alternative agriculture (e.g. specialty, organic, direct market forms of agriculture). These include: lack of affordable land for purchase or lease; lack of affordable housing for family and farm employees; insufficient information about soil quality and water supply; paucity of data about alternative crops such as profitability, practices, and markets; and concern about cumbersome regulatory process and regulatory barriers for agri-tourism operations.
- Uncertainty and concern about development impacts not conducive to investment. These include: uncertain regulatory context; loss of quality of rural life; traffic congestion; air quality concerns; and potential land use conflicts and buffer issues between housing, agriculture, and wildlife uses.
- Potential resource allocation conflicts. Hillsides and Coyote Creek Parkway might get priority for preservation resources.
- City and County have trouble collaborating. An agency (or nonprofit or ‘Joint Powers Authority’) is needed to develop and manage an implementation plan to realize the vision.

Opportunities

- High stakes: a successful Greenbelt could foster success in other county greenbelts. Coyote Valley is the only area of the County formally recognized by County, City of San Jose, and City of Morgan Hill as a Greenbelt. There is a sense of a highly challenging but golden opportunity.
- Engaged stakeholders: key agency stakeholders share common objectives, including promotion of smart growth, discouragement of urban sprawl, and preservation of agricultural land, open space, and natural resources. Groups of property owners and Greenbelt advocates are engaged in developing approaches to address sticking points; they also share a key common objective – a call for a feasible plan that retains market value of Greenbelt properties while meeting goals for Greenbelt’s overall public value.
- Synergy with ‘sense of place’, sustainability-oriented, multiple-land use development plan for the north/mid Coyote Valley. The multi-functional concept for the Greenbelt includes residential, conservation, recreation, and agricultural land uses that would add significant value to the Greenbelt itself and to the new development and surrounding urban areas.
- Potential for an aesthetic agricultural and natural landscape to raise homesite values.
- Excellent potential for linkages between, and augmentation of, regional trail systems, regional parks, and natural habitat areas.
- Potential for numerous conservation, restoration, and habitat preservation strategies to be integrated into a holistic plan (e.g. percolation ponds and creek restoration could include habitat and recreation functions; on-farm conservation could meet mitigation requirement).
• Barriers to alternative agriculture outweighed by opportunities. These include: urban-edge location; favorable agronomic conditions; suitable scale, receptive market, interest on the part of a few current farmers/property owners/ag businesses; demand from new farmers; potential for pro-active ‘streamlined’ regulatory process; burgeoning interest in agricultural education; and potential technical and financial support. A proposed $15 million preliminary estimate for greenbelt preservation could seed strategic purchases of easements and/or fee title farmland in the Greenbelt and be used to leverage other funding.

Greenbelt Case Studies
The Report looked at six case studies that provide illustrative examples of tools and strategies that could be applicable to the Coyote Valley Greenbelt. They include: Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District; Tri-Valley Conservancy; Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust; Capay Valley Vision; Marin Organic; and Solano Land Trust. These case studies were selected for the relevance of their successes - and challenges – and for the diversity of their preservation, conservation, education, agriculture promotion, and funding tools. A summary of the lessons learned from the case studies is below.

Summary of Lessons Learned
• Nearby/adjacent preserved farmland and/or open space are valuable amenities to some homebuyers. This value can be used to compensate for high agricultural land prices.
• Conservation easements are successful in many cases. However, easements alone may not ensure that properties will be actively farmed, and may need to be combined with incentives, program funding and/or negotiated public access to be able to support ongoing agriculture.
• Outright acquisition is also an important tool, especially when market value of the land far exceeds the agricultural land value.
• Development rights exchange programs give incentive to developers to place agricultural land under conservation easement in return for additional development rights within urban boundaries. This tool is being used in Brentwood and South Livermore.
• Agricultural tourism and public access increase support for local farming projects and public appreciation of agriculture.
• Critical to the success of relatively small-scale agricultural projects are practices such as: crop diversification (with an emphasis on specialty crops), low-input or organic farming methods, direct and diversified marketing strategies (with an emphasis on niche markets), on-farm programs and services, farm identity development, participation in regional branding programs, branding/identity, and value-added production based on farm products.

Conclusion
The City Council’s Vision and Expected Outcomes for the Greenbelt faces many difficult and complex implementation challenges. However, for the City, County, and many other key stakeholders, the Greenbelt offers an important opportunity - to create a unique non-urban environment supportive of high value rural home sites, active open space, conservation areas, and vibrant small-scale agriculture – that is worth the effort of working through these challenges. The development of a Greenbelt land use concept and implementation plan, called for by various stakeholders, was beyond the scope of this Report.

3 This proposed allocation was included in a budget presented by the CVSP to the Task Force in January, 2005.
2.0 Existing Conditions

Existing Conditions: Physical, Jurisdictional, Current Land Use, and Historical Land Use

Sources used in compiling the Existing Conditions data include research reports, maps, databases, and technical memos prepared for the CVSP, as well as other publications as noted. The Report categorizes and outlines Existing Conditions in considerable detail. Implementation challenges and opportunities extrapolated from the data are summarized in the Executive Summary.
2.1 Existing Conditions: Physical conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Analysis</th>
<th>Planning Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sunset New Western Garden Book, Zone 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainfall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o In the CVSP area (i.e. development area and Greenbelt), mean annual precipitation is 21”. Mean annual evapo-transpiration is 49”, making for an average annual moisture deficit of 28”. Most precipitation (90%) falls between November and March.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Provision Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Wells: Almost every Greenbelt parcel has at least one well. Groundwater tables are generally higher in the eastern section of the Greenbelt and get deeper toward the western hills. Anecdotal: ▪ A few property owners state that their wells are not sufficiently productive for agriculture. ▪ Growers report flow ranging from 40-100 gpm (gallons per minute). ▪ Others say that the depth to water varies with recharge programs. ▪ Many wells are in need of retrofitting for casing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Most farmers say water availability is sufficient. Some farms are getting water from neighbor’s wells through underground pipes, e.g. Joe Cosby (parcel # G300)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainfall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o This rainfall is sufficient for growing many kinds of crops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Provision Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Wells: ▪ Retrofitting of wells can be expensive ($25-50 K). Such an expense needs to be financially feasible based on expected return. ▪ The intensive agriculture production being considered for the Greenbelt requires wells to deliver at a minimum of 10 gallons per minute per acre, and ideally deliver 15 gallons per minute per acre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Percolation/ recharge ponds will be located in the vicinity of and take water from this cross-valley pipeline. There will be several such ponds, each several acres in size. It has not yet been determined to what extent these locations could be flexible to accommodate other land use needs (e.g. be developed with adjunct recreational, habitat, and wildlife corridor uses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ From Coyote Valley Hydrology Study, Administrative Draft, Schaaf & Wheeler, November 21, 2003, maps, anecdotal as noted
- Urban services will not be extended into the Greenbelt area.
- Some parcels in the Greenbelt get piped water from the Great Oak Water Company.
- A few other parcels, through which the SCCWD cross-valley pipeline passes, have entitlements to metered water from the pipeline.

### Current Water Use
- Current water use in the CVSP area is ~1.1 acre-feet per acre per year.
- Average agricultural water use in Santa Clara County categorized by crop type:
  - Deciduous: 2.2-3.2 acre-feet/year/acre
  - Grain: 0.2-0.3 acre-feet/year/acre
  - Pasture: 3.0-4.0 acre-feet/year/acre
  - Row: 2.4-3.0 acre-feet/year/acre
  - Sugar Beets: 2.4-3.0 acre-feet/year/acre
  - Tomatoes: 2.3-3.0 acre-feet/year/acre
  - Vineyard: 1.0-2.4 acre-feet/year/acre
- Golf course in Greenbelt currently uses approximately 1.1 acre-feet per acre per year.
### Site Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrology (con’t)</th>
<th>Planning Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned water use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planned water use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The total projected water demand in the CVSP area is 18,000 acre-feet per year. This is double the amount currently used, meaning that the water table will be lowered and will require an increase in recharge. Without an increase in recharge, there is only enough water in the basin to support the CVSP area at the 18,000 acre-feet level of water demand for 2-3 years.</td>
<td>- The CVSP planning process must include enough water for the Greenbelt to support the amount and the specific types of agriculture planned there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projected water demand in the Greenbelt (after Specific Plan complete) is 4,000-6,000 acre-feet per year.</td>
<td>- A reasonable assumption is that there will be 750-1350(^5) acres of agriculture in the Greenbelt, with annual water use at 2.5-3.0 acre-feet per acre per year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water quality**

- Nitrates are the contaminants of primary concern.
  - Fertilizer for agriculture is a major source of nitrates.
  - Even after land is converted from agricultural to residential use, nitrate concentrations in groundwater may continue to increase due to residual nitrate in soil.
  - Over half of the 600 private wells tested in the Llagas Sub-basin and Coyote Valley Sub-basins in 1997 exceeded the federal safe drinking standard for nitrate.
  - Limit for nitrates in drinking water is 10mg/L.

- Perchlorate has been identified in the Llagas Sub-basin, but not in the CVSP area.

- Nitrate: in the event that nitrate concentrations over the limit of drinking standards are eventually found in Coyote Valley’s groundwater supply, it is possible to treat and remove nitrate. Three processes are: ion exchange, reverse osmosis, and electrodialysis at the affected well head.

- Further steps desirable to establish agricultural potential include systematic testing of water quality.

\(^5\) The higher figure is a Dahlin Group estimate.
Drainage
- The Valley drains from South to North and away from Monterey Hwy in both directions: west towards Fisher Creek and east towards Coyote Creek. The western hills drain east into Fisher Creek, which empties into Coyote Creek at the north end of the valley. (See image 2.1 Environmental Footprint Hydrology Map).
- As development of Morgan Hill increases, impervious surface areas increase, thus increasing surface water flow into the Coyote Valley.
- Several branches of Fisher Creek run through the Greenbelt. During the rainy season, ground water levels are high in places and some areas around the Creek are prone to flooding. During the dry season, areas of the Creek are dry.
- To date, there are 17 locations within the Greenbelt that failed the wet weather tests for installation of septic systems. There are most likely additional undeveloped parcels that might fail this test.
- Anecdotal: There are some developed parcels that passed the septic test and had septic systems installed that are now problematic, especially in wet weather.

Drainage
- In the siting of new homes, drainage and septic factors will need to be taken into consideration.
- The Greenbelt makes a contribution to the drainage/hydrology of the valley as a whole by minimizing areas of impervious surfaces and maximizing recharge opportunities.
- Fisher Creek has potential to be further developed for flood control management and as a mitigation area.

---

6 From Failed Septic Tests Map, HMH
### Site Analysis

#### Geotechnical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seismicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Greenbelt has areas of high and very high susceptibility to seismically induced liquefaction.(^7,) (^8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils(^9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sedimentary deposits in the Greenbelt area are made up of Upper Pleistocene alluvial fan deposits. These deposits are older, denser stream deposits that vary from clay to cobble size material.(^10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The California Storie Index expresses numerically the relative degree of suitability of a soil for general intensive agricultural uses at the time of evaluation. The rating is based on soil characteristics only and is obtained by evaluating such factors as soil depth, texture of the surface soil, subsoil characteristics, and surface relief. An average value for Santa Clara County is approx. 35, with the highest value 100 and lowest 3. |

### Planning Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seismicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A consideration in the placement and/or design of improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil quality is critical in the determination of potential for agricultural success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The data and maps that this information (in the left column) was drawn from are on a gross scale. Therefore, it is difficult to make confident conclusions about the agricultural value of the soils in the Greenbelt area. |

| The maps and corresponding data suggest that there is substantial high quality soil in the Greenbelt. However, the property owners’ testimony is largely to the contrary. |

| On account of this discrepancy and the generality of the existing data, more detailed soil tests are recommended in the Greenbelt. |

---

\(^7\) From *CVSP Planning Consideration Matrix*

\(^8\) See *Liquefaction Susceptibility Map*, Engeo Incorporated, June 2004

\(^9\) From NCRS East Santa Clara County Area, CA Soil documents provided by Ken Oster, NRCS, and from *Coyote Valley and Environs, Map 9*, BAZ, Santa Clara County Planning Office

\(^10\) From *Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation*, Engeo Incorporated, 6.14.04 and *Regional Geology Map*, Engeo Incorporated
The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) classifies certain soils as being of statewide importance or prime farmland soil. In general, the soils classified as prime farmland soil are class I or II soils, where class I soils have few limitations that restrict their use and class II soils have moderate limitations that reduce the choice of plants or that require moderate conservation practices. These classifications assume irrigation.

Most of the soil types that exist in the Greenbelt from the east side Santa Teresa Blvd./ Hale Ave. to the Coyote Creek, are classified as prime farmland. (See Image 2.2: Coyote Valley and Environs Map 9) These soil types, along with their Storie Index values, and NCRS classifications (if there are any) are below:

- ZbA: Zamora, 80 (prime farmland soil)
- PoA: Pleasanton, 85 (prime farmland soil)
- CrA: Cropley, 47 (prime farmland soil)
- SdA: San Ysidro, 51 (statewide important farmland soil)
- PpC: Pleasanton, 68 (prime farmland soil)
### Geotechnical (con’t)

- The soil types west of Santa Teresa Blvd./Hale Ave. in the Greenbelt are more varied in their agricultural values. There are a number of soils with low Storie Index values, and some with high values. The soil types, Storie Index values, and NCRS classifications (if there are any) for this area are:
  - LoE: Los Osos, 38
  - MwF2: Montara, 8
  - LfG: Los Gatos, 11
  - IsG3: Inks, 3
  - GoG: Gilroy, 8
  - GeE: Gaviota, 29
  - VaE2: Vallecitos, 14
  - ZbA: Zamora, 80 (prime farmland soil)
  - LrC: Los Robles, 77 (prime farmland soil)

- **Anecdotal:** Many of the current landowners in the Greenbelt area state that there are a variety of problems with their soils. These include: lack of fertility, clay soils prone to saturation especially towards the west side, and soils that don’t hold water well.
### Biological

- No documented special species status plants occurrences in Greenbelt area.
- No documented special status wildlife occurrences in Greenbelt area, except for along Coyote Creek, where there are documented occurrences of the Western pond turtle, the Central California coastal steelhead, the California tiger salamander, and the Great blue heron.
- The Greenbelt includes a large portion of Coyote Creek. The area between Coyote Creek and 101 is a directly accessible area qualified as potential wetlands.
- In the area between Coyote Creek and 101, there are some potential breeding habitats, upland habitats and dispersal habitats for the Red-legged Frog.

- While there are no special species status plants or wildlife occurrences in the Greenbelt, there may be significant potential for restoration of native species (e.g. valley oaks) and for restoration of riparian habitats along Fisher Creek and around the percolation ponds.

---

There are 19 hazardous materials users and/or spill incidents documented on Greenbelt.

There are 20 potential hazardous materials users observed in Greenbelt.

Most of the potentially hazardous sites listed above are dangerous on account of Above-Ground Storage Tanks (ASTs) or Underground Storage Tanks (USTs), which may contain pesticides. Also among the hazardous materials are water tanks and farming machinery.

While most of the contamination from leaking storage tanks can be attributable to agricultural uses within the Valley, the use of fertilizers, pesticides, and herbicides for agricultural uses is also likely. Pesticides that persist in the environment and that have been banned for use, such as DDT, were likely used throughout the Valley. These pesticides were commonly applied in mixtures that also contained metals (arsenic, lead and mercury.)

New farmers, especially organic farmers, will require documentation of any recent applications of restricted materials (e.g., copies of use permits for restricted pesticides, herbicides, or fungicides), of materials not allowed under organic certification, and of any “hot-spot” spill areas.

Land that has been fallow and has had no application of restricted materials within the last 3 years can be transitioned to certified organic within 1 year.

Land that has had application of restricted materials will require a 3-year transition period from the most recent application.

Areas where there have been hazardous material incidents may require remediation if they are to be developed as natural resource mitigation areas.

---

There are approximately 2,214 acres of land available in the Greenbelt for mitigation and restoration. This includes approximately 850 acres of undeveloped agricultural land, 517 acres of annual grassland, 59 acres of oak woodland, 90 acres of open water, 151 acres of riparian areas, and 547 acres of ruderal herbaceous fields. The majority of the annual grassland, oak woodland, riparian, and open water parcels are located in what is currently the Coyote Creek Parkway, owned by the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department.

Within the 2,214 acres, there are approximately 500 acres of land potentially suitable for wetland habitat creation to mitigate for impacts to Wetlands in the Urban Reserve. Parcels are selected as suitable for mitigation if they are comprised of open space and undeveloped agricultural land.

Wildlife movement corridors through the Greenbelt would be valuable as mitigation for any wildlife species. Some potential movement corridors were identified by linking adjacent undeveloped parcels in the Greenbelt. However, wildlife movement through the Greenbelt would require modification of Monterey Highway.

While it is possible that agencies may require additional land for mitigation, the Coyote Valley Greenbelt contains enough suitable mitigation land to mitigate for most, if not all, of the impacts associated with the development of the Urban Reserve.

There is potential for mitigation as a significant element in the Greenbelt. In keeping with the multi-functional land use concepts of the CVSP as a whole, opportunities for on-farm mitigation should be seriously explored.

---

### Cultural Resources

1. **19** prehistoric archeological sites are present or partially within the Greenbelt. 2 of these are also classified as including some historic materials. These mostly consist of flakes and flake scatters. Aside from the 2 sites deemed eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, none of the sites have been evaluated for inclusion on the National or California Registers.

2. **2** locations within the Greenbelt were identified as having potential for historic archaeological deposits associated with the Hispanic period.

3. **4** locations within the Greenbelt were identified as having potential for historic archaeological deposits associated with the American period. These are structures.

4. **2** arboricultural resources are present in the Greenbelt. These are: Keesling’s Shade Trees and Landscaping trees at Fisher Ranch.

5. The Greenbelt was not reviewed for architectural resources.

### Planning Considerations

- Opportunities for prehistoric resource protection, including open space and other easements to conserve and preserve these resources should be evaluated during the planning process.

---

Image 2.1 Environmental Footprint Hydrology Map
Prepared by KenKay Associates
2.2 Existing Conditions: Jurisdictional and Regulatory Frameworks

Land Use Jurisdiction and Plans  

**Greenbelt Gross Acreage:** 3,657 acres  
**Overall Greenbelt Property acreage:** 3,559 acres  

- 69% of the Greenbelt area is privately owned  
  - 21% under jurisdiction of the City of San Jose  
  - 79% under jurisdiction of Santa Clara County  
- 31% of the Greenbelt is in public ownership

Approximately 75% of the privately owned land in the Greenbelt area is unincorporated and thus is under the County’s land use jurisdiction. The other 25% has been annexed into the City of San Jose. Within the Eastern Section of the Greenbelt (located east of Monterey Highway), land use jurisdiction over privately-owned lands is divided evenly between the City and the County, with each having jurisdiction over about 50%. Within the Western Section of the Greenbelt (located west of Monterey Highway), 93% of the land is under the County’s land use jurisdiction and 7% under the City’s jurisdiction.

Land Use Designations

**County General Plan Land Use Designations**
The County’s General Plan Land Use Map designations for the Greenbelt are “Agriculture – Large Scale” (40-acre minimum parcel size), “Agriculture – Medium Scale” (20-acre minimum parcel size), “Other Public Open Lands”, “Major Gas and Electric Utilities”, “Hillsides”, “Roadside Service”, “Ranchlands”, and “Regional Parks, Existing”. The lands east of Monterey Road are designated “Agriculture – Large Scale”, whereas those west of Monterey Road are designated “Agriculture – Medium Scale”.

**City of San Jose General Plan Land Use Designation**
The City’s General Plan land use designations for the Greenbelt include “Agriculture,” “Private Recreation,” “Public Park/ Open Space” and “Public/ Quasi Public”. Privately owned lands located in the eastern section of the Greenbelt include the Coyote Creek Golf Course, which is designated as “Private Recreation” with the adjoining properties designated as “Public Park/ Open Space”.

Zoning

Existing Zoning within the Greenbelt includes the following designations for the City of Jose: “Agriculture”; “Planned Development for Industrial and Golf Course”; “Heavy Industrial”; “Low to Medium Density Residential”; and “Medium to High Density Residential”.

---

15 Most of the following section is taken verbatim from the Coyote Valley Greenbelt Implementation Challenges report.  
16 Database provided by HMH Engineers
Existing Zoning within the Greenbelt includes the following designations for the County: “Exclusive Agriculture”, “Agricultural Ranchlands”, “Roadside Services”, and “General Use”. Currently there are two parcels with Ranchlands zoning and one parcel (a trailer park) with the Roadside Services zoning.

The predominant zoning in the Greenbelt in terms of number of parcels is “Exclusive Agriculture – Medium Scale” with a 20-acre minimum. However, of the approximate 255 parcels with this zoning designation, the average parcel size is a little less than 5 acres. There are only 3 parcels in the entire Greenbelt which are eligible for subdivision under current County zoning regulations. Two of these are designated “Agriculture” and “R-1-1 Residential” and are under City of San Jose jurisdiction. The other is designated “Exclusive Agriculture – Large Scale” and is under County jurisdiction.

General Plan Policies

County General Plan Policies

The County’s General Plan contains the policies that relate to the Coyote Valley Greenbelt in the following sections: Countywide “Growth and Development” Chapter; Countywide “Parks and Recreation” Chapter; Rural Unincorporated Area “Parks and Recreation” Chapter; and “South County Join Area Plan” Portion of the General Plan.

These policies address issues including promotion of jobs-housing balance, resource conservation, preservation of scenic gateways, land uses that result in permanent preservation of substantial areas of open space, and recommendations for further definition of land uses and for adoption of design guidelines to preserve and enhance the rural landscape.

San Jose General Plan Policies

The City of San Jose’s General Plan contains the following policies within the “Land Use/Transportation Diagram” Chapter that relate to the Coyote Valley Greenbelt:

This overlay designation depicts the area in the Coyote Valley proposed as a permanent, non-urban buffer between San Jose and Morgan Hill. Allowed uses and development standards in this area should be consistent with the base land use designations (Agriculture and Rural Residential) covered by the overlay.

City of Morgan Hill General Plan Policies

The City of San Jose’s General Plan includes only lands that are within its sphere of influence. Consequently, its delineation of the Coyote Greenbelt intended to serve as a non-urban buffer between itself and Morgan Hill does not include lands within the sphere of influence of Morgan Hill.

The City of Morgan Hill’s General Plan contains policies supporting the 1984 establishment of a Coyote Valley Greenbelt, but does not delineate a specific location for this greenbelt in its General Plan. As described in Morgan Hill’s General Plan, the Coyote Valley Greenbelt should be comprised of “agricultural uses, rural estates and the Coyote Creek Park chain.”
Additional Stakeholder Agencies and Organizations

The following is a preliminary list of some of the jurisdictions, departments, agencies, and organizations whose decisions and activities currently impact the Greenbelt and/or whose decisions and activities could potentially impact implementation of the Greenbelt in the future.

**County of Santa Clara:** Planning Department; Parks and Recreation Department; Roads and Airports Department; Agricultural Commissioner; Environmental Health Department

**City of San Jose:** Planning Department; Parks and Recreation Department

**City of Morgan Hill:** Planning Department

**School Districts:** Morgan Hill Unified School District

**Special Districts and Authorities:** Santa Clara County Open Space Authority; Santa Clara Valley Water District; Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)

**Joint Powers Agencies:** CalTrain

**State Agencies:** CalTrans; Department of Fish and Game; Resources Agency; Department of Food and Agriculture

**Federal Agencies:** Fish and Wildlife Service; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Department of Agriculture; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries

**Organizations:** Greenbelt Property Owners for Smart Development; Greenbelt Alliance; Land Trust for Santa Clara County; Santa Clara County Farm Bureau; Sierra Club, Committee for Green Foothills, Friends of the Greenbelt (FROGs)
2.3 Existing Conditions: Current Land Uses

Zoning
The predominant zoning in the Greenbelt in terms of number of parcels is “Exclusive Agriculture” with a 20-acre minimum. However, of the approximate 255 parcels with this zoning designation, the average parcel size is a little less than 5 acres. There are only 3 parcels in the entire Greenbelt that are eligible for subdivision under a 20-acre minimum parcel standard. Two of these are in the City of San Jose, with the other in the County.

City and County General Plan Land Use Designations
The City’s Current Land Use classifications for the Greenbelt are “Agriculture,” “Private Recreation,” “Single Family residence,” “Public Open Space,” and “Industrial”. (See Table 3.1)

The City’s General Plan Land Use classifications for the Greenbelt are “Agriculture,” “Private Recreation,” “Public Park/ Open Space,” and “Public/ Quasi Public”. (See Table 3.2)

The County’s General Plan Land Use Map classifications for the Greenbelt are “Agriculture – Large Scale” (40-acre minimum parcel size), “Agriculture – Medium Scale” (20-acre minimum parcel size), “Other Public Open Lands”, “Major Gas and Electric Utilities”, “Hillsides”, “Roadside Service”, “Ranchlands”, and “Regional Parks, Existing”. (See Table 3.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 City of San Jose Existing Land Use Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSJ Existing Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2 City of San Jose General Plan Land Use Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSJ General Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park/Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3 Santa Clara County General Plan Land Use Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCC General Plan</th>
<th># acres</th>
<th>% acres</th>
<th># parcels</th>
<th>% parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture – Large Scale</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture – Medium Scale</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Open Lands</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Gas and Electric Utilities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsides</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadside Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchlands</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks, Existing</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,359 acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>401 parcels</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of San Jose Land Use Classifications: Detailed Explanations

Agricultural
The parcels classified as “Agriculture” under the City of San Jose Land Use designation break down further into the following uses. All parcels are designated or used for agriculture with some of them containing incidental residential or industrial buildings.

General Agriculture: includes small agricultural parcels (under 15 acres) falling mostly on Kalana, Dougherty and San Bruno Avenues. Observed practices include row crop, greenhouse, hay, and fallow land.

Orchard: Observed uses include only 5 large parcels (those 20 acres or more and totaling ~250 acres) still in production. Four of these parcels are cherry orchards east of Monterey Highway. One is a fig orchard west of Hale. Most other parcels designated with an orchard use now have other uses, including sod production. A few parcels have abandoned orchards.

Pasture: The largest parcel is 200 acres, which is the Greenbelt-designated portion of 804-acre Tilton Ranch.

Animal Farm: Observed uses include a chicken ranch and a goat operation.

Truck Crops: Largest lot 22 acres. Observed uses include sod production, row crop (peppers and Asian vegetables), hay, and fallow land.

Residential: Sixteen parcels are from 5 to 10 acres. The remaining parcels are from 5 acres down to .4 acres.

Utilities: These parcels are of negligible size.

Food Processing: All parcels in this category are owned by Monterey Mushrooms.
Vacant: Largest parcel is 19 acres. Owners include Victory Outreach, Monterey Mushrooms, and Bay Area Chrysanthemum Growers Association Cooperative. Uses include hay, fallow, row crop, and mushroom compost storage.

Unclassified: Largest parcel 81 acres. Owners include City of San Jose, Southern Pacific Transportation Co. (train tracks) and the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

Additional Observed Agricultural Uses: Approximately 24 parcels have collectively more than 50 greenhouses on them. About half (~50%) of these seem to be in use for cut flowers, nursery plants, orchid production, and Asian vegetable production. About 30% of the greenhouses are not in current use and about 20% are derelict.

Private Recreation 313 acres
All parcels in this category are parts of the Coyote Creek Golf Course.

Single Family Residence 243 acres
This category includes small parcels (most under 5 acres, one 9 acres) with single-family residences on them, most of which have little or no current agricultural uses. Parcels that are more highly associated with agriculture are not classified in this category, even if they contain houses.

Public Open Space 729 acres
Most parcels in this category are parts of the Coyote Creek Parkway and are owned by Santa Clara County and the Santa Clara Valley Water District. The largest parcel in this category is 178 acres.

Industrial 56 acres
The parcels in this category include lumber yard, prefabricated concrete, and prefabricated wood tresses uses.

Unclassified 86 acres
The largest parcel in this category is 80 acres in the northern part of the Greenbelt and is owned by PG&E. The other parcels in this category are owned by Water Works San Jose, State of California and City of San Jose.
Residential Buildout Analysis
The Coyote Valley Greenbelt Implementation Challenges report uses several key assumptions to make a preliminary conclusion about anticipated residential buildout.

Assumptions
A threshold value of $50,000 was used as the dividing line between the “developed” and “undeveloped” categories. No distinction was made between residential and nonresidential improvements. Development constraints, such as septic limitations were not considered.

Preliminary conclusion
The residential buildout analysis for privately owned unincorporated parcels located in the South Coyote Greenbelt indicates that 111 of the 265 parcels are “undeveloped”, and 154 are “developed.” At total buildout, the Coyote Greenbelt could have as many as 265 residences located within it, under current County policies.

Other Estimates
The Dahlin Group estimates a residential buildout of 340-360 residences in the South Coyote Greenbelt as whole. This estimate was determined using different assumptions than the previous estimate: it assumes that there are 383 parcels in the Greenbelt, 349 of which are privately owned. 285 of these have improvements on them (residential or agricultural) and 64 are vacant. Of the 285 improved parcels, 37 do not have residences on them. The 64 vacant parcels and the 37 non-residentially improved parcels could all potentially have residences built on them, for a total of 101 additional residence, and a total residential buildout of 349 residences. The key difference between these estimates is the total number of privately owned parcels in the Greenbelt (265 as opposed to 349).

Non-Designated, General Land Use Resources and Relationships
The Coyote Valley Greenbelt Interim Planning Principles report identifies and briefly describes a number of existing general land use relationships and resources that are not included in designated land use categories. A list of these resources and land use relationships follows:

- General Areas bordering the Greenbelt: Urban Areas; Hillsides
- Sensitive Areas: Aquifer Recharge Areas; Riparian Zones; Wildlife Migration Corridors
- Interfaces between Areas: Gateways; Edges; Buffers
- Mobility – Vehicular: Major Roads; Transit Facilities; Views and Vistas from Roadways
- Mobility – Pathways: Barriers; Pathways

---

17 This is a companion document to the Interim Greenbelt Planning Principles. Produced by County of Santa Clara, City of San Jose, and City of Morgan Hill, August 2001.
2.4 Existing Conditions: Historical Land Uses

Historical Agricultural Uses
Coyote Valley in the context of the Santa Clara Valley

Pre Settler Use of the Land
“For the most part the creeks had no channels but flowed at will over the surface of the plains just as they had done for centuries, bringing down the rich topsoil from the mountains. “In later years this alluvial fill would become the legacy passed on to the industrious family farmers.

“Indians lived for centuries in these fertile lands and benign climate. From present-day San Mateo County to Gilroy was then a majestic oak forest. The valley oak (Quercus lobata), the coast live oak (Quercus agrifolia), and the black oak (Quercus kelloggii) provided the Indians with food in different seasons. Beneath the oaks grew poison oak and the bunch grasses that attracted game: antelope, tule elk, and deer. The Indians, who defined their territory by the streams, including the headwaters, came to the same location to hunt and to gather acorns. In turn the feared grizzly would come to feed on animals and man.”

Late 1700s to late 1900s: Two Centuries of Agriculture
At the southern end of the legendary Valley of Heart’s Delight, the Coyote Valley was been a prime agricultural region for over two centuries. Deep fertile level soils, a moderate climate, and plentiful water made the valley well suited for many types of agricultural production: grain and forage crops, orchard and row crops, and nursery products.

“Fruit flourished from the first plantings of the padres in 1777. The orchard plantings began on a vast scale in the 1880s and orchard trees were the mainstay of the landscape until the 1980’s. During that time prunes were the number one crop; Santa Clara Valley controlled the market for prunes in the United States and had a major influence on the world market. Other crops like apricots, pears, and cherries, flourished as well. The whole effect of such an orchard haven, encircled by mountains and bounded by sparkling San Francisco Bay, prompted the romantic title, ‘Valley of Heart’s Delight.’ Given early in the century, the title stuck.

“Santa Clara County was characterized by an adherence to the small family farm tradition. Up until the mid-century, 5- and 10-acre farms were not unusual, while 20- and 30- acre farms were large enough to support a family.” Proximity to major, growing urban markets as well as to transportation hubs, gave farmers additional competitive advantages.

Late 1900s: Agriculture in Decline
Agriculture in the Coyote Valley, as on edges of metropolitan regions elsewhere, has been in accelerating decline over the past twenty-five years. Primary causes are escalating urban-edge land values and diminishing returns due to competition from agricultural areas with lower production costs in California and abroad. These primary causes have been compounded by logistical challenges including operational restrictions required by urban-edge farming conditions and loss of agricultural support facilities and infrastructure.

---

18 Passing Farm Enduring Values by Yvonne Jacobson.
19 This section is taken from the Agriculture section of Getting it Right
During the twenty years since the City of San Jose changed the agricultural preserve designation of the northern and mid sections of the Coyote Valley to allow industrial and urban development, the area’s long-time farmers have sold more than half of the agricultural land to developers. Pending development, the land is being farmed in annual row crops and forage crops.

In the area of the Valley designated as Greenbelt, limited agriculture has continued, although increasingly, land is fallow and greenhouse operations abandoned. The Greenbelt designation is not strictly agricultural. In a patchwork development pattern, approximately thirty percent of the Greenbelt is developed with older housing tracts and industrial businesses\textsuperscript{20} as well as with recently constructed and in-construction housing developments.

\textsuperscript{20} The parcels in this category include lumber yard, prefabricated concrete, and prefabricated wood trusses uses.
3.0 Stakeholder Input

The Greenbelt Research report solicited input from three categories of stakeholders. The primary communication methods were in person interviews, phone interviews, informal email and phone conversations, and focus group meetings. Public position statements and relevant reports were also reviewed. Within each stakeholder category, findings are organized into key implementation challenges and opportunities. In many cases, direct comments are listed under findings headings.

Stakeholder categories and their subcategories are as follows:

3.1 Governmental Jurisdictions and Agencies:
   a. County of Santa Clara (various departments)
   b. City of Morgan Hill (various departments)
   c. Special Districts and Authorities

3.2 Greenbelt Property Owners and Farmers:
   a. Property Owners not farming or no longer farming
   b. Property Owners still farming
   c. Farmers leasing land and/or farming in the Coyote Valley beyond the Greenbelt
   d. Agricultural businesses
   e. Non-agricultural businesses

3.3 Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests
   a. Agricultural Agencies
   b. Local Farmers & Farmer Demand/Land Access Facilitation Organizations
   c. Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups
   d. Food System Groups
3.1 Governmental Jurisdictions and Agencies - Summary of Findings

Greenbelt Implementation Challenges

➢ Development pressures
  • High land prices that prevent ‘new’ farmers from buying lands within the Greenbelt
  • ‘Conventional wisdom’ that agriculture is on longer a profitable activity/land use
  • Potential to build large expensive homes in the Greenbelt

➢ Potential land use conflicts
  • Potential conflict between rural residential and agricultural uses
  • Wildlife corridor through greenbelt may not be feasible because of traffic.
  • Increased traffic may negatively affect serpentine habitat which is nitrogen poor
  • Decorative lake in the urban development may have potential for invasive fauna.

➢ Potential resource allocation conflicts
  • Needs to be an adequate water supply for current and planned uses

➢ Need for common vision, a strategic plan, commitment, resources, and ongoing effort
  • No accepted and plausible positive vision for the future of agriculture in the Greenbelt.
  • Lack of a lead agency focused on the Greenbelt
  • Conflicting priorities for use of limited local land acquisition funds
  • Lack of local government agency promoting and supporting small-scale agriculture
  • Expense of appraisals for easements and limited number of qualified appraisers
  • Getting people thinking beyond the past
  • Limited County planning resources
  • Incredible number of independently-minded folks; consensus is almost impossible
  • People doubt that Greenbelt designation will hold over time
  • Establishment of a Greenbelt is a positive aspect of the CVSP; to ensure its preservation, a vision and strategies need to be developed

Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities

➢ Only area of the County formally recognized by County, City of San Jose, and City of Morgan Hill as a Greenbelt; its success could be a model for other greenbelts in the County and in the region.
  • There is an opportunity to really create something – a greenbelt that could be a great model for similar urban edge areas
  • Gateways or entrances into Greenbelt should contain visual features that “announce” to travelers that they are entering
  • Existing developed uses should be upgraded, screened by landscaping and abated as opportunities arise

➢ Potential for links between and augmentation of trail systems and natural habitat areas.
  • Multi-use trails and pathways should be planned to connect the urban areas to the South Coyote Valley Greenbelt and Coyote Creek Park Chain and increase linkage to the Santa Cruz Mountains, Western Hillsides, Coyote Ridge, and Diablo Range.
  • Coyote Creek Park Chain should be enlarged to protect habitat, preserve the scenic corridor, and provide additional recreational opportunities
  • Recreation areas should be limited to passive recreation
  • Concept of on-farm habitat could fit into natural resource agency goals
• Opportunities exist for regional trail systems through the Greenbelt
• Fisher Creek has significant potential for restoration and for interpretive education
• Potential for funding from SCVWD Environmental Enhancement and Trails programs

➢ Promotion of smart growth, discouragement of urban sprawl, and preservation of agricultural land and open space resources are common objectives.
  • Agriculture should be encouraged to provide opportunities for farmers, as well as an amenity for surrounding urban communities. Uses could include specialty crops, community supported agriculture and u-pick/agritourism, preserving the small-family farm as part of our culture
  • Preserving the small family farm as part of our culture and local tradition
  • Explore specific creative ideas of Greenbelt land owners; research innovative regional agricultural programs elsewhere
  • Public acquisition of land to make the land available to farmers through resale or lease with conservation easements on the land. Mitigation could provide funding source

➢ Potential linkages with agricultural education, farm-to-school, and health initiatives.
  • Synergy with dynamic Ann Sobrato High School Agriculture Program
  • School district would be open to local purchases as long as price was not a major problem; would like to put on school lunch menu ‘locally-grown’; taste tests would be necessary for kids to tell the difference

➢ Greenbelt could add value to new development and surrounding urban areas.

Based on Interviews: Bill Shoe, Santa Clara County Planning Department (9/29); Neelima Palacheria, Executive Officer LAFCO (11/04); Pat Congdon, Executive Director, SCC Open Space Authority (11/03); Janet Felice, Director of Food Services, Morgan Hill Unified School District (10/19); Vera Gomes, Director of Ann Sobrato HS Agricultural Program (10/20); Debra Cauldon, Santa Clara Valley Water District (11/4); Dave Johnston, CA Fish & Game (11/8)

Informal communications: Pat Dando, Ex Vice-Mayor, San Jose; Mark Frederick, Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department; Don Weden, retired Santa Clara County planner (8/20, 8/24, 10/14; & other times)

Documents: Coyote Valley Greenbelt Recommendation, August 26, 2004, Santa Clara County Open Space Authority; Coyote Valley Greenbelt: Interim Planning Principles, County of Santa Clara, Cities of San Jose and Morgan Hill, August 2001; Coyote Valley Greenbelt Implementation Challenges, Santa Clara County Planning Office, December 2000; Coyote Valley Specific Plan: South County Interests and Concerns. Joint statement from Cities of Morgan Hill and Gilroy, Santa Clara County, the Morgan Hill Unified School District, Gavilan Community College, the Open Space Authority, and the San Martin Neighborhood Association, 5.19.04; Preliminary Comments on San Jose’s Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP), LAFCO 10.20.04; Countywide Fire Protection Service Review, SCC LAFCO, April 2004

Recommendations for Further Research: Gilroy’s agricultural mitigation policy; East Bay Regional Park District – Bay Shoreline Interpretive Trail in Richmond; Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP); Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP); Marc Klemencic, SCVWD Coyote-Uvas-Llagas Watershed Manager; Yves Zutti, San Jose Public Works; Darryl Boyd, San Jose Planning Department; Kings County, CA Farm Day; Prairie Crossing model near Chicago
3.2 Greenbelt Property Owners and Farmers - Summary of Findings

3.2. A. Property Owners Not or No Longer Farming

Background/Current Conditions: Approximately half of the respondents in this category reside in the Greenbelt area. Others have previously lived there, or have never lived there, and currently live in San Jose and elsewhere. Respondents have owned property in the Greenbelt for a range of years—with purchase dates from 1920 through 2000. The majority have owned property in the Greenbelt for over 20 years. The majority of respondents in this category of non-farming Greenbelt property owners have farmed at one time or another. These farming activities range from greenhouse operations to locally-marketed produce, but have all diminished. Currently, land use is primarily fallow, with minimal use for non-market crops: animals for residents’ children, hay grown by leasing farmers, or fruit trees supplying produce for family and friends.

Greenbelt Implementation Challenges

- Anger and distrust due to exclusion from previous planning process
  - Outsiders are dictating land use
  - San Jose doesn’t want to work with us
  - Slapped with the Greenbelt designation
  - We are out of the process
- Unfair exclusion from profits
  - The guy across the street can tap into great market for his land, while they are prohibited
  - We should be able to subdivide.
- Agriculture is no longer feasible
  - Not profitable: “The bottom line is zero”, “Can’t make a dime off of this land”, “Trees aren’t doing well”, “Tried agriculture, and it failed”, “Water problems: bad for agriculture”, “Operational costs are too high”,
  - Adjacency to houses is bad for farming
  - Small acreage is useless for agriculture
  - North of Palm Avenue is where the prime agricultural land is

Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities

- Willingness to lease agricultural land given availability of land at fair farm land rates
- Potential for an aesthetic agricultural and natural landscape to raise homsite values

Based on Interviews: Coyote Valley Alliance for Smart Planning - Lee Wieder, Tedd Faraone, and Jack Faraone (many communications); Alliance meeting with CVSP team (10/19); Jojhar Dhillon (10/14); Jenny Sakauye (10/14); Mike Zanotto (10/15); Tony (A.J.) Intravia (10/15); Jenny Sakauye (10/14); Eric Flippo (10/18); Don Christopher, Richard Barberi, Richard DeSmet (11/4); Ray Malech (10/28); Dan Carroll (8/20); Don and Joyce Mirassou (8/20); Bob Nagahara (9/6, 10/19); Dan Perusina (10/12); Frank & May Fong (10/14); Jo Crosby (10/28). Additional interviews planned.
3.2. B. Property Owners Still Farming

**Background/Current Operations:** Respondents in this category tend to be over fifty years old and fall into two groups: those who have been landowners/farmers in Coyote Valley for multiple generations, and those who began farming in the area as adults, primarily in the 1980’s and 1990’s. The former group includes operators of a cow-calf operation and of cherries orchards. The later group includes a number of greenhouse growers who previously specialized in flowers (including chrysanthemums), and currently grow Asian vegetables and flowers. The majority of farmers in the Greenbelt own the property on which they farm, and reside in Coyote Valley. The respondents in this category tended to be over 50 years old.

**Greenbelt Implementation Challenges**

- **Experience of traditional agriculture and current agricultural practices as no longer being feasible**
  - Discontent with over-regulation (e.g., of permitting process, application of restricted materials, and of water monitoring requirements of pesticides and pest control, primarily)
  - Shrinking habitats for, and over population of, wildlife
  - Concerns about effect of impending development: increased traffic, trespassers
  - Hard to make a living, some are working very long hours at older ages
  - Labor concerns: expensive, hard to find (especially seasonally), cannot afford to live nearby
  - Ground/soil: too heavy, ‘a mixed bag.’
  - Greenbelt designation is mandating major sacrifice

- **Anger and distrust due to exclusion from planning process**
  - Would like City to know of their problems
  - Want to be part of the plan

- **Sense of being unfairly excluded from profits**
  - Want to sell and retire: “land is my retirement plan.”
  - Want to have options
  - Want zoning for housing (such as 1-3 residential)

- **Development will mean loss of rural quality of life**

**Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities**

- **A couple of farmers would like to continue with agriculture**
  - Do not want to move: this is a good location for customers
  - Want to expand market, maybe expand into organics
  - Would like to see incentives to retain, produce, and enhance agriculture in the area.
  - Would like to see place-based/regional marketing, greenbelt-supportive programming, marketing assistance. (See Appendix A.3.1)
  - Would like to collaborate with other local businesses
  - Would like to see more produce stands, agricultural tourism (See Appendix A.3.c)

**Based on Interviews:** Violet Johnson (9/15); Liz Hirata (9/1, 9/9); Chris Marchese (9/9); Harold and Barbara Baird, Janet Burbback, Sally Baird – Tilton Ranch (10/8); Yen Luong – Valley Orchids (9/30); Dan Carroll (8/20); Joyce and Don Mirassou (8/20); Asian Greenhouse Growers (10.6.04) - Wing Mok, Bun Luong, Yik Bun Law, Kai Hoi Ynag, Sin Wah Mok, Alum Mok, Ted Leung, Wayland Tam, Eddie Osaka, Roy Kikinaga, Xay Due Houng, Chow Ho Mock, Gou Ping Yuan, Samuel Kwang, Heng Tan
3.2. C. Farmers leasing land and/or farming in the Coyote Valley beyond Greenbelt

**Background/Current Operations:** Respondents in this category primarily come from families that have farmed in the Coyote Valley area for a long time - some for multiple generations, one since 1870. Of the four farmers interviewed in this category, one leases, one owns, and two both own and lease land. Two of these farmers also farm in Gilroy. Current crops include apricots, pumpkins, corn, peppers, alfalfa, safflower, oats, and wheat (mainly grown for animal feed).

**Greenbelt Implementation Challenges**

- **Agriculture is already challenging**
  - Imports are killing California, we can’t compete.
  - City indicated that it would provide sewer upon annexation, but this has not happened
  - Cost of farming has gone up
  - Effects of urban expansion: can’t move farm equipment except on Sunday mornings
  - Organic farming requires transition period
  - Feel sorry for people who got stuck in the Greenbelt zone

- **Development will make agriculture impossible**
  - Agricultural Greenbelt is “a joke” because of: water problems, no large parcels, no buffers, too many houses, businesses that smell bad, traffic, and regulations that are not farmer-friendly
  - The area will no longer offer the option for the lifestyle they want

**Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities**

- **Maybe some things are worth trying**
  - Cross-valley trails, recreational trails
  - Pilot programs for small-scale intensive/innovative agriculture, possibly including on-farm housing for farmworkers (See Appendix A.3.e)
  - Specialty nursery crops (See Appendix A.3.b)
  - Development that has a little of everything

- **Hate to see the Valley change but have to accept it.**

**Based on Interviews:** Kip Brundage (9/29); Joe Gonzales (9/30); John Spina (9/30)
3.2. D. Agricultural businesses

**Background/Current Operations:** Monterey Mushrooms is Coyote Valley’s largest agricultural business. Established in 1971, it is the world’s largest mushroom producer, with locations in the US, Canada, and Mexico. The company employs over 400 people on its 40-acre Coyote Valley facility. Fifteen trucks of mushrooms are shipped from this site on a daily basis.

**Greenbelt Implementation Challenges**

- **Labor: hard to attract and sustain in a high-priced area**
  - Employees cannot afford housing in the area; have to travel longer distances to work.
  - New, higher paying jobs in the new development will draw potential employees away
- **Regulatory barriers: too many, too expensive, too time-consuming**
  - Expensive implementation of mandated practices (such as construction of a pond for waste water)
  - Lengthy permitting process of receiving building permits for expansion
  - Potential for heightened complaints about odors
  - Uncertainty not conducive for expansion and investment

**Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities**

- **Would like to continue and perhaps expand operations**
- **Affordable nearby housing for employees would be a plus**

**Based on Interviews:** Bob Wright, Monterey Mushrooms (9/22); Shah Kazemi, Monterey Mushrooms (9/20)
3.2. E. Non-Agricultural businesses

Redwood Empire: This business has been located in the Greenbelt since 1976. The owner’s family lives in Morgan Hill. The owner, Joe Burch, plans to remain in Coyote Valley, and hopes to expand his business to include the production of products made from lumber scraps, such as lattices and planter-boxes. His primary concern is the uncertain nature of his renewable non-conforming use permit and of continued permitting to remain in business on this location. He urges the Greenbelt to permit existing businesses to remain, and to include wood products in its description of agricultural products.

Victory Outreach Church: Having purchased land in the Greenbelt under the impression that a large group assembly (LGA) could be built on-site, the Victory Outreach Church learned that this was not the case. Since that time, the congregation has struggled with permitting and county ordinances, and has been operating out of a large tent, illegally constructed on the property. The Reverend and others in the church express their hopes that, if not allowed to build on site, they could find a location for their church and community program facilities in the developed part of Coyote Valley. In this case, they hope for their land to remain a valuable investment, and would entertain the idea of establishing farm or garden programs on-site.

Greenbelt Implementation Challenges

➢ Uncertainty not conducive for expansion and investment

Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities

➢ Potential for expanded agricultural-related business opportunities
➢ Possibilities for agriculture as community service enterprise and education

Based on Interviews: Reverend Paul Quijada and Jerry Amaro, Victory Outreach Church (11/4.); Lizanne Reynolds; SCC Deputy Counsel (regarding litigation on Victory Outreach Church); Joe Burch, Redwood Empire (10/13)
3.3 Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests - Summary of Findings

3.3. A. Agricultural Agencies
This category of interviewees includes agricultural extension agents, researchers, and farm organization staffs.

Greenbelt Implementation Challenges

- **Organic, specialty crop production is a valuable niche, but also competitive**
  - The farmers who succeed are highly driven, expert marketers and growers
- **Lack of data on small farm/organic/specialty crop practices and successes**
  - Specialty crops and direct marketing have been done in nearby counties, but have not, historically or typically, been done in this area
- **Insufficient information about Greenbelt soils and water quantity and quality**

Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities

- **Marketing for the rural/urban connection: rural success linked to urban needs**
  - A prime location for development of CSA operations
- **A stabilized and evolving agricultural sector is possible with sufficient support**
  - An agriculture ‘hub:’ such as agricultural ombudsman and center for regulatory and permitting information
  - Support and involvement of ethnic farmers
  - Support for agricultural literacy and awareness

Based on

**Interviews:** Jenny Derry, Executive Director, Santa Clara County Farm Bureau (9/22, 9/27); Desmond Jolly, Director, Small Farm Center (9/8)

**Informal conversations:** Maria de la Fuente, County Director, UC Cooperative Extension, Santa Clara County (8/30); Ron Voss, UC Davis Vegetable Crop advisor, former Director, Small Farm Center (8/3)

**Documents:** *The Feasibility of Maintaining and Enhancing Agriculture in Santa Clara County*, prepared by AgInnovations Network for Santa Clara County and SCC Farm Bureau.

**Recommendations for Further Research:** San Jose Community Gardening Program; National Agricultural Statistical Service; Economic Research Service (UC Davis); Small Farm Viability Study for CA (1980); Tom Haller, former ED, California Alliance with Family Farmers; Small Farm Center Database, UC Davis; Mary Ellen Dick, coordinator of agricultural water use classes in Santa Clara County
3.3. B. Local Farmers & Farmer Demand/Land Access Facilitation Organizations

Interviews in this category included local farmers growing specialty and organic crops, as well as representatives of organizations working to facilitate land access for small farmers.

**Greenbelt Implementation Challenges**

- Affordable land for purchase or lease
- Affordable housing for farm family and farm employees
- Liability issues involved with trails next to farms and on-farm habitat programs

**Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities**

- Demand from new farmers and farmers wanting Coyote Valley climate and resource
  - FarmLink and ALBA have dozens of farmer clients who are seeking land access for farm operations on 5-25 acres and who have strong interest in urban edge agricultural opportunities
  - Local farmers assess CV micro-climate and greenhouses for potential expansion
- Urban edge location offers unique opportunities
  - Farm programs for social service organizations (e.g. horticultural therapy, job training, enterprise development for at-risk groups and youth)
  - Opportunity for landscaping/crop sharing businesses serving rural ranchettes
  - Possibility of a center that combines consumer education with farmer support for distribution, technical/operational issues, and ongoing training
  - Opportunity for major educational/visitor gardens (such as COPIA or Fetzer Vineyards Garden)
  - Agritourism of all forms, especially for seasonal activities (e.g. harvest, holiday, spring flower, summer camp)
- Small-scale agricultural models seen as feasible for this location
  - Pastured poultry and small-scale animal operations (see App. A.3.k); collective creamery
  - Specialty nurseries with wholesale/retail businesses
  - Equestrian programming, riding schools
- Possibility for on-farm conservation as part of mitigation requirement
  - Farm water catchment ponds could combine sediment-catching function and provide wildlife habitats
  - Farmlands as mixed habitat for wildlife
- Beneficial uses for existing local resources:
  - Mushroom compost and clay made into finished compost product

**Based on**

- **Interviews:** Brett Melone, Agricultural and Land-Based Training Association (10/28); Reggie Knox and Steve Schwartz, California FarmLink (several communications); Greg Beccio, Happy Boy Farms (10/20); Phil Foster, Foster Ranch (10/12); Paul Hain, John Hain & Son Farms (10/20); Peter Van Dyke (10/12)
- **Informal conversations:** Dale Coke, Coke Farms (10/28)
- **Documents:** Letter to Eric Carruthers and Citizens’ Advisory Committee of Santa Clara County Open Space Authority, from Steve Schwartz, California FarmLink (8/2); Annotated List of Sample Aspiring Farmers from CA FarmLink’s Database, from Reggie Knox (10/8); Feasibility Study for Urban Edge Agricultural Parks, Overview of Farmer Demand, prepared by Brett Melone of ALBA, for SAGE.

**Recommendations for Further Research:** Bob Bugg, UC SAREP; Bleck and Harris, agricultural property managers in the Central Valley
3.3. C. Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups

Greenbelt Implementation Challenges

- **Buffer issues between housing, agriculture, and wildlife uses**
  - Wildlife corridor needs to be buffered from small animal husbandry, equestrian facilities, and residences
- **Need an agency to manage plan, monitor easements, and monitor for invasive species**
- **City and County have trouble coordinating/collaborating**
  - Need an entity to promote the Greenbelt Plan
- **Need to come up with a different model of agriculture**
  - Can’t go back to traditional agriculture
- **Hillsides and Coyote Creek Parkway should have priority for preservation and resources**

Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities

- **Numerous potential habitat preservation strategies**
  - Multiple farmers coordinating on a larger scale - WildFarm Alliance likes this idea
  - Habitat preservation could be rolled into new water quality control requirements - multiple uses for runoff ponds
- **Intensive agriculture could contribute to the workforce goals of Coyote Valley**
  - Maximize opportunities for agricultural enterprise
- **Strong support for Santa Clara County Open Space Authority goals**
- **An opportunity to celebrate sense of place and the land**
- **Potential for iconic design features in the landscape** (See Appendix A.3.f)
- **Likely pond creation and creek restoration as potential wildlife habitat and natural landscape feature** (See Appendix A.3.j).

Based on

**Interviews:** Erik Vink, Trust for Public Land (10/8, 10/15)

**Informal conversations:** Tim Wirth, Trust for Public Land (9/24); Tom Cronin, Committee for Green Foothills (9/28); Greenbelt Alliance (10/27); Craig Breon, Lloyd Wagstaff, Tom Cronin (CGF), Michelle Beasley (Greenbelt Alliance), Jeremy Madsen, Melissa Hippard, Eric Carruthers; Tim Frank, Sierra Club; Nancy Richardson, SCC Land Trust; Kathryn Lyddan, Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust (11.4.04)

**Documents:** Organic Farmers’ Guide to Conservation of Biodiversity on Organic Farms, Wild Farm Alliance; Letters to Laurel Prevetti, Trixie Johnson, Friends of the Coyote Valley Greenbelt; Mission and Positions Statement, Friends of the Coyote Valley Greenbelt

**Recommendations for Further Research:** Randy Gray, USDA-NRCS; Santa Clara NRCS and RCD; Sustainable Conservation, a NGO helping to streamline paperwork; Packard Foundation; Silicon Valley Conservation Council; Marketing study being conducted by Stanford graduate students, for San Mateo County; King County, Washington; Peconic Land Trust, Suffolk County, New York (Long Island)
3.3. D. Food System Groups

Respondents in this category represent local restaurants and food service companies that want to expand their support for local farmers.

Greenbelt Implementation Challenges

➢ Lack of information and insufficient distribution channels can impede local buying

Greenbelt Implementation Opportunities

➢ Socially responsible, green businesses are the wave of the future
  • Developing niche: “Food services for a sustainable future”
  • Greenbelt seen as possible venue for “ag-tainment’ events for clients, managers, and workforce

➢ Participation in local economy as a public relations opportunity
  • Bon Appetit has a large “Farm to Fork” program. Their effort to “go seasonal, go regional” helps strengthen their market while helping to preserve small farms. “We are stakeholders in the local economy”.
  • Respondents want to use purchasing power to support local agriculture and struggling family farms
  • More chefs are aware that gourmet food is locally produced. – Jesse Cool

Based on Interviews: John Dickman, District Manager, Marc Zammit, Director, Culinary Support and Development, Maizie Ganzler, Director of Communications & Strategic Innovations, Bon Appetit Management Company (11/8); Brian Gardener, CEO, America Fresh (produce supplier to restaurants) (10/6); Bart Hosmer, Chef, Parcel 104 (a Lark Creek Consortium restaurant) (10/6); Jesse Cool, Palo Alto restaurateur (9/23)
4.0 Greenbelt Case Studies

The Report looked at six case studies that provide illustrative examples of tools and strategies that could be applicable to the Coyote Valley Greenbelt. They include: Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District; Tri-Valley Conservancy; Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust; Capay Valley Vision; Marin Organic; and Solano Land Trust. These case studies were selected for the relevance of their successes - and challenges – and for the diversity of their preservation, conservation, education, agriculture promotion, and funding tools.

A summary of the lessons learned from the case studies is below (and in the Executive Summary) followed by the studies themselves. Appendix A, Section 3 consists of images of farms and places utilizing the tools described below and Section 4 consists of images of the Case Study sites themselves.

Summary of Lessons Learned

Farmland Preservation/Retention
- Nearby/adjacent preserved farmland and/or open space are valuable amenities to some homebuyers. This value can be used to compensate for seemingly high agricultural land prices. (See Appendix A.3.a for examples of the aesthetic value of small scale agriculture)
- If zoning allows for development, the price of agricultural easements is relatively high.
- Conservation easements alone may not ensure that properties will be actively farmed, and may need to be combined with incentives, program funding and/or negotiated public access to be able to support ongoing agriculture (See Appendix A.3.g and A.3.h for examples of farmland preservation and of preservation combined with open space/public access)

Increased Public Access and Education
- Agricultural tourism and public access increase support for local farming projects and public appreciation of agriculture. (See Appendix A.3.c and A.3.d for examples of farms that practice agritourism.)
- Collective operations and ownership support farm/project viability and community investment in some cases.

Limited Resource Farmer Assistance to Land, Markets or Training
- Critical to the success of relatively small-scale agricultural projects are practices such as: crop diversification (with an emphasis on specialty crops), low-input or organic farming methods, direct and diversified marketing strategies (with an emphasis on niche markets), on-farm programs and services, farm identity development, participation in regional branding programs, branding/identity, and value-added production based on farm products. (See A.3.b for examples of specialty-crop producers.)
- Projects utilizing a combination of affordable leases and structured, collaborative marketing have been successful.
These examples, all from the greater Bay Area, highlight several strategies for agricultural preservation in areas under pressure from urban development.

- Conservation easements have been successful in many cases, especially in Sonoma County and South Livermore Valley. The Solano Land Trust is also beginning to utilize this mechanism.
- Outright acquisition is also an important tool, especially when current agricultural use is not competitive.
- Development rights exchange programs give incentive to developers to place agricultural land under conservation easement in return for additional development rights within urban boundaries. This tool is being used in Brentwood and South Livermore.
- Regional Branding is a useful support mechanism for local agriculture, if there is a positive and coherent identity to the agriculture, as in the case of Marin Organic, Sonoma Select, and Capay Valley (See Appendix A.3.1 for examples of regional marketing).
4.1 Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District

About the District

The formation of the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District was the result of the public’s concern over the urbanization and displacement of agricultural land and open space in Sonoma County. In November 1990, Sonoma County voters approved Measures A and C. The purpose of Measure A was to establish the District while Measure C called for a ¼ percent sales tax over a 20-year period to fund agricultural preservation and open space acquisition. The sales tax provides an annual allocation of approximately $13 million to the District’s land conservation program.

The 17-member Open Space Advisory Committee, appointed by the District Board of Directors, is comprised of representatives from various interest groups and the cities. The Advisory Committee is responsible for advising the District Board and staff on policy matters as requested, and making recommendations for proposed land and easement acquisitions. The District has no power of eminent domain. The District can only purchase interests in real property from willing sellers. The principal focus of the program is to acquire conservation easements, but the District may acquire fee titles in property where the project is in conformity with the Expenditure Plan.

Methods of Land Conservation

Conservation Easements

The District’s primary land acquisition tool is a legally binding deed and agreement between a landowner and the District in which the landowner voluntarily limits development and other uses of the property to protect its conservation values. A conservation easement granted to the District runs with the land in perpetuity. Conservation Easements are beneficial to landowners and to the public for several reasons:

- Conservation easements are an efficient use of public funds. They save taxpayer money by costing less than buying land in fee.
- Conservation easements help keep land in the family because a landowner can generate needed capital without selling the land.
- By acquiring a conservation easement, the District accomplishes its land conservation goals without owning and managing the land. Land management continues to be the responsibility of the landowner, subject to the terms of the conservation easement agreement.

Land in Fee

The District also acquires land outright for public purposes, such as for a park or wildlife preserve. The District may on occasion purchase land in fee and resell it with conservation easement restrictions that achieve the District’s agricultural preservation and open space purposes.

Acquisition Plan

Acquisition Plan 2000 directs the land conservation efforts of the Sonoma County Agriculture Preservation and Open Space District ("District") and assists the District in carrying out the 1990 voter-approved measures for preserving agricultural and open space lands in Sonoma County. The District uses various factors to guide the evaluation
and selection of properties including adjacency to protected lands, ecological value (unique site, beneficial habitat, species diversity, protection of endangered species, etc.), strong landowner commitment to protecting conservation values, high risk of loss without District participation, and development potential, including certificates of compliance that could undermine conservation values

**Highlights of Acquisition Plan 2000**

- Acquire open space throughout Sonoma County within each of the four acquisition categories: Agriculture, Greenbelts, Natural Resources, and Recreation.
- Double the extent of District-protected lands from 27,000 to 54,000 acres within the next five years.
- Allocate a minimum of $10 million within each open space category every three years for high priority land acquisitions.
- Pro-actively solicit willing seller participation in the District's land conservation program.
- Utilize a Geographic Information System (GIS) and Property Evaluation Method to review and prioritize conservation projects.
- Establish key conservation partnerships with public agencies and private organizations to complete significant land acquisitions.
- Set annual acquisition goals within each category and evaluate District progress in each category on an annual basis.

**Acquired Lands**

To date, the District has protected 30 Agricultural properties, totaling 21,161 acres, and 36 Greenbelt properties, totaling 7,332 acres.

**Small Farms Initiative**

The Small Farms Initiative was developed by District staff and agricultural experts, who were concerned about agricultural diversity, and specifically the future of local vegetable farms. Land values for Sonoma's quality wine grapes are so high that vegetable farmers are unable to compete. The Small Farms Initiative recognizes that vegetable farms provide a valuable benefit to the community, and contribute to the local economy.

The Small Farms Initiative allows the District to lease land to farmers who want to grow vegetables, flowers, herbs, and berries. The leases preserve some lands zoned for agriculture in production and provide access for experienced farmers who may not otherwise be able to find affordable land. This initiative aims to ensure and enhance the continued diversity of agricultural products and viability of agricultural lands in Sonoma County. Currently, Tierra Vegetables is the only participant in the Small Farms Initiative program.

**LandPaths**

LandPaths, founded in 1996 is the District's non-profit land stewardship partner. It leads year-round outings and organizes educational tours to properties protected through District conservation easements that would otherwise be off limits to the public. This enables people to learn about the many scenic and natural resources in Sonoma County. LandPaths creates ways for people to experience the beauty, understand the value, and assist in healing the land in Sonoma County.
4.2 The Tri-Valley Conservancy: South Livermore Valley

History and Background
The South Livermore Valley Agricultural Land Trust (SLVALT) was established in 1994 subsequent to the County's adoption of The South Livermore Valley Area Plan (SLVAP) to preserve and protect important agricultural and open space lands. The Land Trust's original goal was to permanently protect and steward 5,000 acres of land within the SLVAP. As of 2003, over 3,700 acres are under conservation easement.

In early 2003, a strategic plan process was initiated and the land trust board recognized the need to have a greater conservation presence in the region. The SLVALT became the Tri Valley Conservancy with an expanded mission and an expanded geographic area.

The Conservancy's mission is to permanently protect the fertile soils, rangelands, open space and biological resources and to support a viable agricultural economy in the Tri Valley area. The Conservancy accomplishes this mission by providing landowners with a flexible, voluntary alternative to subdividing or developing their property.

One facet of the Conservancy's work is acquisition. Working with willing landowners, the Conservancy acquires property development rights through the legal arrangement of a conservation easement. In so doing, the Conservancy ensures that a property will be protected from future development.

The Conservancy works with developers in a unique model to conserve the Valley's important lands. Through county and city programs, developers in the region are required to mitigate their projects by fee payments and/or by replacement of agricultural acreage covered by a conversation easement. The Conservancy was established as the recipient of those mitigation fees and the custodian of the conservation easements on replacement acreage within the SLVAP. The Conservancy will continue its original mission to preserve 5,000 acres within the SLVAP until completed. All monies received by the Conservancy for the SLAP will be restricted funds used for only that purpose.

Conservation Easements
The Conservancy operates by acquiring conservation easements from willing landowners. A conservation easement is a legal agreement between a property owner and the Conservancy. The easement places permanent restrictions on future use in order to maintain the property's agricultural, scenic, or habitat value. As a legal deed restriction, the easement runs with the land in perpetuity.

The Conservancy becomes the custodian of all or part of a property's development rights through the conservation easement. One development right equals the ability to add one buildable subdivision parcel to a property. The number of development rights on a given property depends on the property's size and zoning designation. The easement details property-specific restrictions on future development. For example, the easement may limit or prohibit future subdivision and may restrict non-agricultural improvements to defined areas. The easement need not change the current use of the property and does not limit the owners' right to lease or sell. The owner retains fee title and can continue to live...
on and use the property. As the custodian of the property's development rights, the Conservancy is responsible for stewardship of the easement in perpetuity.

The Conservancy acquires conservation easements through purchase or donation. The value of the easement is mutually agreed upon by the landowner and the Conservancy and is based upon the development potential and conservation value of the property.

In addition to receiving possible property and estate tax benefits, landowners dedicating easements to the Conservancy play a vital role in protecting the Valley's agricultural productivity and open space character for present and future generations.

**Acquired Lands**
To date, the Tri-Valley Conservancy holds 53 properties in conservation easements, totaling over 3,700 acres.

**Financial Programs**
Recognizing that development pressures in the South Livermore Valley are intense, county and city planners developed the Bonus Density Program and the South Livermore Specific Plan. The purpose of these programs is to assure that conservation happens in concert with development, that development is carefully planned and managed, and that the Conservancy has a funding base to use towards its acquisition and stewardship activities.

Through [Alameda County's South Livermore Valley Area Plan](#), landowners may qualify to receive additional property development rights in exchange for planting a portion of the property in cultivated agriculture and placing that portion under conservation easement. For example, a 100-acre property zoned for agriculture normally has one development right. Under the Bonus Density Program, an additional four development rights may be placed on the property and each of the resultant 20-acre parcels granted a 2-acre building envelope. In exchange for the newly granted development rights, each parcel's 18 un-developable acres must be planted and placed under conservation easement.

Through the [City of Livermore's South Livermore Valley Specific Plan](#), developers are required to carry out agriculture mitigation financing in the following ways: 1) paying the Conservancy a fee sum for every home lot developed; or 2) placing one acre of cultivated agriculture land under conservation easement for every house constructed, and placing one acre of cultivated agriculture land under conservation easement for every acre of cultivatable land developed.
4.3 Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust

The fast-growing City of Brentwood in northwest Contra Costa County is home to high-producing orchards and row crops. Regional agricultural production generated $51.2 million in 1998. Local farming is being threatened, however, as San Francisco Bay Area suburbs expand eastward. The city’s population has grown more than 200 percent since 1990 and its current population of 23,000 is expected to nearly double again before the city reaches its anticipated build-out population of 43,000.

Land Conservation Program

Existing Land Conservation Program
The Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust (BALT) is a 501c3 California nonprofit corporation. BALT was created, in part, to implement the farmland conservation program adopted by the City of Brentwood (the “City”) in September 2001 pursuant to Ordinance No. 683. The City’s farmland conservation program seeks to conserve productive agricultural farmland in the 11,000-acre County Agricultural Core (the “Agricultural Core”) to the east and the south of the City.

The Ordinance provides:
- *Agricultural Mitigation Fee*. Developers in the City must pay an agricultural mitigation fee of $5,500 for each acre of prime agricultural land converted to urban uses.
- *Farmland Conservation*. The agricultural mitigation fees collected are to be used to preserve agricultural land through the purchase conservation easements and fee title.
- *Transferable Agricultural Credit Program (TAC)*. When certain valuable agricultural land in a 2,600-acre area south of the City is permanently preserved, the property owner gains two TAC credits for each acre preserved. Each credit may be used to build one unit of above mid-range density in developments within the City. The current program anticipates a private market in credits between property owners and developers.

Status of Land Conservation Program
To date, BALT has not completed any conservation easement transactions. However, BALT is currently negotiating two conservation easements.
- *TAC transaction*. A developer in the City is required to provide twenty TAC credits prior to grading its project. The developer has purchased a twenty-acre parcel in the TAC area and will place a conservation easement on the property to gain the TAC credits required for its project in the City. It is anticipated that this transaction will be completed by November, 2004.
- *Vineyard property*. BALT is also working with the owner of an 80-acre parcel in the Agricultural Core. A portion of the property is planted in vineyards. The property owner is interested in recording a conservation easement on the property in favor of BALT.
Challenges to Implementing the Current Land Conservation Program

- **Uncertainty regarding future zoning in the County Agricultural Core.** The County General Plan will be reviewed in 2010. There is a strong public perception among property owners that the urban limit line will be pushed out into the Agricultural Core and/or that the zoning in the Agricultural Core will be changed to allow for more development.

- **Rapid increase in land values.** In the past couple of years, property values in the Agricultural Core have increased at a rate of twenty-five percent a year. Large parcels of agricultural land (i.e. over fifty acres) are selling for approximately $27,000 an acre. Small parcels for much more. Ten acres parcels with a single home site are selling for $70,000 an acre. A fallow, vacant twenty acres parcel in the TAC area to the south of the City reputedly just sold for $1,600,000.

- **Small parcel size in the Agricultural Core.** Minimum zoning in the Agricultural Core is 40 acres but many parcels are much smaller. South of the City in the TAC Area, most parcels are ten or twenty acres. This results in higher values and more difficulty preserving productive agriculture.

- **County’s nonparticipation in the land conservation program.** While the County has restricted development in the Agricultural Core, it has not participated in any other land conservation efforts.

- **Restrictive agricultural enterprise zoning in the County Agricultural Core.** Current zoning in the Agricultural Core prohibits many agricultural enterprise activities such as commercial kitchens and special events that are essential to the economic viability of family farms.

Agricultural Enterprise Program

Through a strategic planning process, BALT has defined its mission as “to protect productive agricultural land and to promote the economic viability of agriculture in East Contra Costa County.” Based on the conviction that creating a vibrant agricultural economy is essential to preserving prime farmland, BALT has formed the Agricultural Enterprise Committee to bring farmers, the community and local governments together to promote local agriculture and remove regulatory restrictions to agricultural enterprise. The committee, which meets once a month, is well attended by an extraordinarily diverse group of family farmers, from large conventional wholesale marketers to small-scale organic farms. The group has worked cooperatively to identify projects that would benefit all Brentwood farmers.

Through a consensus building process, this committee has identified goals and has begun to implement several projects. Specifically, the farmers identified three goals they felt were essential to preserve and promote the economic viability of agriculture in East Contra Costa County.

- **Create a Brentwood Farmers’ Market.** The Brentwood Certified Farmers Market opened on June 2004. This community building accomplishment reverses three decades of opposition by local u-pick farmers who were concerned that a farmers market would bring competition from out-of-town farmers. Because BALT’s Agricultural Enterprise Committee is farmer based, the committee was able to give all
Brentwood farmers a voice in how the farmers’ market was structured resulting in a unique farmers’ market that features primarily local farmers.

- **Develop a regional marketing identity or ‘terroir’ for East Contra Costa agriculture.** BALT has applied for several grants to fund a comprehensive regional marketing program to create a unique regional identity for Brentwood agricultural and to increase consumer awareness of the fresh local produce grown in Brentwood, both in the burgeoning nearby suburban population and in the nearby Bay Area markets.

- **Lobby to change existing county zoning laws that prohibit commercial kitchens, special events and other agricultural enterprise activities on local farms.** BALT is working closely with the County to revise restrictive agricultural zoning and to streamline agricultural enterprise permitting.

The primary obstacle to the Agricultural Enterprise Program is a lack of funding. The mitigation fees levied from developers are primarily earmarked for the land conservation program. BALT is seeking other sources of funding for the Agricultural Enterprise Program.
4.4 Capay Valley Vision Plan

Capay Valley Vision provides a forum for Capay Valley residents, from Madison to Rumsey, to examine the issues of agriculture, transportation, economic development, recreation and housing through a community-engagement process. This translates into community forums, trainings, and planning meetings by community residents and organizations that are leading to sustained projects in the community.

Capay Valley Vision was created to enhance ongoing communication within the diverse community of the Capay Valley, to reflect all opinions and to search for common ground on the vision for the Valley's future. Recognizing that change is inevitable, the organization works to manage and guide change in a way that best preserves the Valley's rural character, agriculture, history and natural environment, while supporting a vital local economy.

Goals and Strategies for Agriculture and the Environment

- Farming and ranching become more profitable in the Capay Valley preserving and enhancing the Valley’s rural character and way of life.
- Land, air and water are preserved and maintained in a manner that supports long-term agricultural viability.
- The historic knowledge base, skills and experience of those who work the land is recognized, nurtured and passed on.
- Capay Valley agricultural products increase in recognition in the greater regional marketplace for their excellent freshness, flavor, quality and diversity.

Strategy 1: Education and Workshops

*Host a series of educational workshops for area growers, ranchers and Community members on innovative production, stewardship and marketing practices.*

Educational workshops engage growers in working together to improve the conditions for production and marketing of local crops and improve stewardship of natural and agricultural resources. They also offer opportunities for non-farming community members to learn about local agriculture. Workshops will be designed to support each goal and strategy in the Plan.

Strategy 2: Production, Processing, and Marketing

*Investigate and develop innovative marketing, production and processing techniques for Capay Valley ranchers and farmers.*

Small-scale, owner-operator, cow-calf operations dominate the hills on both sides of the Capay Valley. The preservation of these operations is key to maintaining the character of the community and the economy of the Valley. Many Capay Valley ranchers are already using innovative techniques to protect the Valley’s natural resources and maintain high quality grasslands. Some of these producers have begun to investigate possibilities for grass-fed beef marketing, mobile processing facilities and organic beef production.
**Strategy 3: Farmland and Agriculture Resource Protection**

*Protect and maintain the affordability of farmland and agricultural resources.*

For agriculture to remain viable in the Capay Valley, land prices will need to reflect agricultural value rather than development potential, farm labor will require affordable housing, and new or growing farms will require access to land.

Agricultural conservation easements are a tool to keep agricultural land affordable to farmers and ranchers. Easements compensate landowners for the development rights of a parcel, helping to capitalize the farm, retire debt, lower tax liabilities and aid in estate planning – while protecting farmland over the long-term. Until four years ago little money was available for agricultural easements in California. New state bonds and federal legislation have created a narrow window of opportunity, offering easement money for the next two to three years.

Decent and affordable farm labor housing is critical to perpetuating the knowledge, skill base and culture necessary to sustain the Capay Valley agricultural economy. A comprehensive program to strengthen the economic position of farm workers in the community should include an element that would assist farm workers in acquiring land and adequate housing of their own.

**Strategy 4: Regional Branding and Promotion**

*Form a Capay Valley brand identity to market local goods and farm products.*

To preserve the agricultural economy and rural character of the Capay Valley, local farmers and craftspeople must be able to capture more of the consumer dollar. Capay Valley producers in partnership with restaurants and retailers have the potential to meet market demand in the Sacramento Metro Area and beyond for high quality products that are fresh and grown locally.

In the past five years several efforts to develop regional and local food brands have been met with enthusiasm. As agriculture globalizes, food has become increasingly anonymous to the consumer. People often don’t know how their food is grown, who grows it, the land that it comes from, or how it is processed and distributed. Place-based labeling allows farmers to differentiate their product and to help consumers identify with a place. Recent consumer research confirms that the public identifies with “buying local” and “supporting their local economy”, has strong compassion for family farmers and their contributions and, given the choice, will support them with their purchases. *(FoodRoutes Network 2002).* The natural beauty, rural character and community values that characterize the Capay Valley position it well for a place-based labeling strategy. Helping consumers make the connection between the food they purchase and the story of the Valley and its farmers will allow a greater number of farms more options to be profitable and viable.
4.5 Marin Organic

Marin Organic is a bold new concept for preserving farmland and farming as a way of life, focused on environmental soundness and economic profitability. This organization has been developed over five years by an association of farmers, ranchers, agriculture advisors and marketing experts to serve Marin County's producers and consumers. It is supported by the UC Cooperative Extension (UCCE), Office of the Agriculture Commissioner, Marin County Board of Supervisors, Marin Agricultural Land Trust, Marin Food Policy Council, and consumers throughout the county.

Goals
- Create a sustainable local food system that ensures a wholesome, diverse and nourishing food supply for all residents.
- Practice responsible stewardship of natural resources and wildlife.
- Practice organic farming in a way that strengthens the local economy and supports the broader community.
- Preserve the beauty and landscape of Marin County for future generations.

Goals for 2004
1. Continue to increase the number of organic farms in Marin County and expand outreach to farmers and ranchers who are interested in transitioning to organic.
2. Develop and begin implementation of land management projects that result in environmental sustainability and increased biodiversity, including projects such as restoring riparian habitat, soil fertility, and creating a pollinator corridor.
3. Collaborate with UCCE on a series of "On the Farm" education workshops for growers and processors.
4. Work with Marin Food System Project to increase the amount of organic food served in Marin County schools.
5. Increase the number of farm tours for school children
6. Raise $100,000 in private support.

Farmer Programs
Marin Organic offers certification to local farmers of any category - growers, ranchers, and processors who believe in the importance of a local food system and whose growing practices are organic. Members receive labels and twist ties with the Marin Organic logo.

Marin Organic, in partnership with UCCE and Marin Agricultural Land Trust, offers valuable workshops on crop diversification geared toward farmers and ranchers of all sizes. Workshops take place on Marin's organic farms and ranches and feature growers and scientists presenting best organic practices.

Retail Programs
Marin Organic offers a comprehensive education program for both natural food retailers and conventional retailers interested in increasing their organic food segment. Individualized classes and presentations cover the history and current status of the organic marketplace, background information on organic food production, organic labeling and sales, and consumer trends.

Public Programs
Marin Organic offers farm tours, an all-organic farmers’ market, organic farm-stands, a Harvest Festival, bird walks and farming workshops to the public.
4.6 Solano Land Trust

In 2002, Solano Land Trust completed an evaluation of the state of agriculture in Solano County and developed a plan for protecting this valuable resource using conservation easements as the primary tool. The Agricultural Conservation Easement (ACE) Plan proposes to protect lands with highly productive soils and adequate agricultural water. The ACE Plan also seeks to protect large, contiguous areas that can support economically viable agricultural operations.

Today's Solano County farmers face a challenge never experienced by earlier settlers: they must compete for land with families seeking affordable homes. This began in the 1950s when tract housing swallowed orchards in the Fairfield area to meet the needs of the Travis Air Force Base, dam construction workers, and returning veterans. Since then, an influx of Sacramento and Bay Area commuters has increased the population of the county threefold. Over 12,951 farmland acres have been converted to urban uses in the county since 1984. Development pressures and the problems that accompany urban encroachment, combined with rising farm labor costs and declining prices, spur farmers to question the economic viability of agriculture - and create a dilemma about what to do with their land.

Farming has always demanded flexibility. Faced with changing markets, fickle consumer preferences, foreign competition, regulation, and rising costs of inputs, equipment and labor, farmers are forced to evaluate their resources and consider what will be profitable. Solano County farmers first depended on cattle for their livelihood, then wheat, followed by the fruit boom, the crushing depression, and the tremendous growth of the many commodities afforded by irrigation. Among all these variables, the great constant has been Solano County's most important agricultural resource: its excellent Class I and Class II soils. These are the most versatile soils, providing a strong resource base as growers adapt to changing conditions. The future of Solano County agriculture will depend on the outcome of this latest period of re-evaluation -- determining whether farming or development will be more profitable.

SLT will focus its efforts on acquiring conservation easements over farmland with highly productive Class I soils and reliable water sources that are facing a significant degree of threat. Other lands will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Goals

- Over the next 20 years, to permanently protect between 20,000 and 40,000 acres of Solano agricultural land with conservation easements, approximately 12.4% to 25% of County’s prime and important farmland.
- To target high preservation priority areas, containing high quality soils, available water in areas such as Dixon Ridge, Winters, Vaca/Lagoon Valley and Suisun Valley.
- To consider agricultural conservation easements in the medium and low priority areas as appropriate.
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1. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT HISTORICAL LAND USES

Fox’s nursery along the Coyote River
2.a.i. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USES
Agriculture: General Agriculture & Truck Crops
2.a.ii. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USES
Agriculture: General Agriculture—Greenhouses
2.a.iii. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USES
Agriculture: Orchard
2.a.iv. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USES
Agriculture: Hay, Pasture & Animal Farm
2.a.v. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USES
Agriculture: Food Processing
2.b. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USE
Industrial and Non-Agricultural Business
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2.c. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USES
Rural Residential
2.c. Coyote Valley Greenbelt Current Land Uses

Rural Residential
2.d. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USES
Hillsides and Coyote Creek Golf Course
2.e. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USES
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Corridors
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Corridors
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2.g. **COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT CURRENT LAND USE**

Recreation

- Coyote Creek Parkway
- Coyote Creek Golf Club
3.a. **COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES FOR LAND USE**

**Small-Scale Urban Edge Agriculture**

---

**Happy Quail Farm**
East Palo Alto

**Size:** 3 acres  
**Years in Operation:** 25  
**Products:** Specialty peppers, eggplants, cucumbers, and regional specialties from Japan and Zimbabwe  
**Outlets:** Farmers’ markets and direct to restaurants

---

**Fairview Gardens**
Goleta

**Size:** 12.5 acres  
**Years in Operation:** 10  
(Agricultural land for 119 years)  
**Products:** 100 varieties of fruits and vegetables, small livestock  
**Outlets:** Produce stand and direct sales, feed approximately 500 families
3.b. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES FOR LAND USE

Specialty Crop Production

Jacob’s Farm
Pescadero

Size: 300+ acres
Years in Operation: 24
Products: Culinary herbs, edible flowers, beets, carrots, peas, fava beans and blackberries

Marin County Organic nursery featuring herbs and California natives

Star Route Farms
Marin County

Size: 40 acres
Years in Operation: 30
Products: Specialty lettuces and greens, herbs and vegetables
3.c. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES FOR LAND USE

Agricultural Tourism

Purple Orchid Inn and Resort
Livermore
Size: 21 acres
Operation: Spa and Bed & Breakfast set on an agriculture preserve, olive farm

The Apple Farm
Philo
Size: 32 acres
Operation: Bed and breakfast, cooking classes, orchards
3.c. Coyote Valley Greenbelt Illustrative Examples for Land Use
Agricultural Tourism

Bed and Breakfast located in a historic farmhouse

Green Gulch Farm and Zen Center
Marin County
Size: retreat center, preserved hill-sides, 5+ acres of gardens
Years in operation: 32
Operation: Meditation retreats, work days, retail nursery. Farm supplies Greens restaurant in San Francisco, Zen Center, and sells at farmers’ markets.

Families explore a strawbale maze at an agricultural fair.
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3.d. Coyote Valley Greenbelt Illustrative Examples for Land Use

Agricultural Education

Swanton Berry Farm
Santa Cruz
Students on an educational field trip to strawberry farm

Ardenwood Historic Farm
Fremont
205-acre working farm and historical interpretive center. Site hosts students and families on educational visits. Features animals, heirloom kitchen garden, on-site farm stand, historical house and train station, picnic areas, trails, tennis court, gazebo, farmyard café, country kitchen, blacksmith shop.

Hidden Villa
Los Altos Hills
Educational farm with year-round programming, Community Supported Agriculture program, hiking trails, animals, community events
3.e. Coyote Valley Greenbelt Illustrative Examples for Land Use

Agricultural Housing

Findhorn EcoVillage
Scotland
Integration of agriculture and low-impact housing, forming an “Eco-Village” community

Image: Findhorn EcoVillage

Frog Hollow Farm
Brentwood
Strawbale house provided for year-round farmworkers on this organic fruit orchard.

Image: Frog Hollow Farm
3.f. Coyote Valley Greenbelt Illustrative Examples for Land Use
Sculpture and Design Features in the Landscape

Storm King Sculpture Park
New York
Sculpture museum set amongst 500 acres of fields, woodlands, and lawns.

McEvoy Ranch
Petaluma
Sculptural elements in the landscape, and beautiful “viewsheds,” are celebrated on this 550-acre ranch and olive orchard.
3.g. **COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES FOR LAND USE**

**Farmland Preservation**

**King County Farmland Preservation Program (FPP)/Indochinese Farm Project**

King County, WA

Farmland preservation combined with land access for immigrant farmers

**QROE**

New England

Farmland preservation and integrated housing development
3.h. COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES FOR LAND USE
Integration of Housing, Open Space, and Farmland Preservation

Prairie Crossing

Suburban “conservation community,” featuring farmland, conserved prairie, condominiums, 359 energy-efficient single-family homes, and direct commuter lines to Chicago and Milwaukee.
3.i. Coyote Valley Greenbelt Illustrative Examples for Land Use
Corridors and Buffers

Walkable landscaped edges

McEvoy Ranch
Petaluma

Hidden Villa
Los Altos Hills
3.1. Coyote Valley Greenbelt Illustrative Examples for Land Use
Corridors and Buffers

Before and After
Drainage ditch revegetation

Young native plants, with protective sleeves, will connect wildlife areas in riparian zone.
3.j. Coyote Valley Greenbelt Illustrative Examples for Land Use

Water Features

Water feature restoration as wildlife habitat and natural landscape
Portable “chicken tractors” allow poultry to be pasture-fed, while simultaneously fertilizing fields. Pastured poultry is marketed as a specialty meat product.
"Buy Fresh Buy Local" regional labeling, and other local/regional marketing programs, develop both “sense of place” and customer loyalty.
COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT — CASE STUDIES

a. Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District

b. Tri-Valley Conservancy

c. City of Brentwood
Frog Hollow Farm
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**COYOTE VALLEY GREENBELT — CASE STUDIES**

d. Capay Valley Vision

e. Marin Organic

f. Solano Land Trust
Appendix B. Sector Research: Small Farm Challenges and Opportunities

Small Farm Challenges

There are numerous challenges facing small farmers today. These challenges are playing out in various ways as national trends, California trends, and local trends within Santa Clara County, and include:

- **Consolidation is resulting in increasing farm size and decreasing number of farms.** The 2002 Census of Agriculture – Preliminary Data Report (see Table below) shows a nearly 10% decrease in the total number of farms in California between 1997 and 2002, compared with a 4% decrease nationally. The total acreage in agricultural production during the same period dropped 4% in California, compared with a 1.5% decrease nationally. The average farm size during the 1997-2002 period grew in California from 327 to 347 acres, compared with 431 to 441 acres nationally. In California during the same period, the number of farms of 1-9 acres decreased nearly 20%, while the number of farms of 10-49 acres decreased approximately 5%. Nationally, the number of 1-9 acre farms decreased by about 13% while the number of 10-49 acre farms increased by 6%, for the same period. In general however, the trends are clear: nationally, average farm size is increasing, and in California the number of farms, particularly, those less than 50 acres, is decreasing significantly. In Santa Clara County, the total number of farms decreased by 8% from 1997 -2002.

- **Population growth and urban sprawl are fueling loss of prime agricultural land, especially of small farms.** The Bay Area population is expected to grow by over 1 million people to 7.5 million in the next 15 years. Resulting development will mean the loss of over 500,000 acres of agricultural land, both crop and grazing land. Over 20% of this development is expected to take place in Santa Clara County, where 75% of the existing farms are 50 acres or less.

- **Rising production costs and increased competition from larger farmers and from imported crops threaten small farm viability.** Production costs including equipment costs, inputs, and regulatory compliance, can be higher for operations that do not have the advantage of efficiency of scale. Imported crops are threatening many California commodities, but can be particularly undermining for smaller farms that can not hedge low margins with the profits from vertically integrated operations.

- **Urban edge farming conditions bring additional challenges.** The greatest challenge for urban edge farms is escalating urban edge land values. Even in Agricultural Preserves and designated greenbelts, uncertainty about zoning can fuel speculative land values. Additional challenges include difficulty in finding affordable labor, loss of agricultural services, intolerance from urban neighbors, smog, and increased traffic that impedes movement of farm equipment.
Table 7.1: Number and Size of Farms in USA, CA, and Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th></th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # of farms</td>
<td>2,215,876</td>
<td>2,128,982</td>
<td>87,991</td>
<td>79,631</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 9 acres</td>
<td>205,390</td>
<td>179,346</td>
<td>27,151</td>
<td>21,827</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 acres</td>
<td>530,902</td>
<td>563,772</td>
<td>28,613</td>
<td>27,307</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 179 acres</td>
<td>694,489</td>
<td>658,705</td>
<td>14,874</td>
<td>14,356</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 499 acres</td>
<td>428,215</td>
<td>388,617</td>
<td>8,055</td>
<td>7,741</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 acres</td>
<td>179,447</td>
<td>161,552</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 to 1,999 acres</td>
<td>103,007</td>
<td>99,020</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 acres or more</td>
<td>74,426</td>
<td>77,970</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold in USA, CA, and Santa Clara County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th></th>
<th>CA</th>
<th></th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value of Agricultural Products (in $1,000)</td>
<td>201,379,812</td>
<td>200,646,355</td>
<td>23,280,110</td>
<td>25,737,173</td>
<td>194,848</td>
<td>208,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per Farm</td>
<td>90,880</td>
<td>94,245</td>
<td>264,574</td>
<td>323,205</td>
<td>156,882</td>
<td>203,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Farm Opportunities
For small-scale farmers, all indications are that traditional agricultural practices are no longer economically viable and that problems facing small farmers are exacerbated on the urban edge. Despite this trend, there are counter-indications that small-scale farmers who practice non-traditional diversified marketing and non-traditional diversified production can be and are being successful.

Diversified Marketing
In a traditional marketing scheme, a farmer might sell to one or just a few wholesalers or brokers. Diversified marketing simply means selling products through a variety of marketing outlets, often including wholesale outlets. However, implicit in a diversified marketing strategy is using a number of direct marketing outlets, which maximize return to the farmer. Examples of direct marketing include Farmers’ Markets, Farm-to-School programs, Community Supported Agriculture, Farm-to-Restaurant programs, and a variety of on-farm or Agritourism strategies. Table 7.3 shows how these direct marketing strategies are helping farmers’ bottom lines.

---

21 From 2002 Agricultural Census, USDA, National Agricultural Statistics Service
Table 7.3: Number and Profit of Farms Selling Direct in USA, CA and Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th>Santa Cruz County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Farms Selling</td>
<td>110,639</td>
<td>116,733</td>
<td>7,268</td>
<td>6,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of Ag products</td>
<td>591,820</td>
<td>812,204</td>
<td>78,712</td>
<td>114,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sold directly (in $1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average value of Ag</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>10,830</td>
<td>17,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>products sold directly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,725</td>
<td>18,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per farm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32,140</td>
<td>34,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Farmers’ Markets are the most common and the most rapidly increasing form of direct marketing. Farmers like this strategy because it allows them to have frequent and regular contact with many consumers. Communities support farmers’ markets because they offer many benefits including provision of fresh food, agricultural education, development of sense of place, and community building.

National: The number of farmers markets in the United States has grown dramatically, increasing 79 percent from 1994 to 2002. According to the 2002 National Farmers Market Directory, there are over 3,100 farmers markets operating in the United States. For the year 2002, 19,000 farms reported that they sold their products only at farmers’ markets.

State: There are around 441 Certified Farmers’ Markets in California. Approximately 3,000 farmers are certified to sell direct at markets.

Local: There are 23 farmers’ markets in Santa Clara County. Between these 23 markets, approximately 300 farmers sell each week, averaging $500 per market day. One of these markets was recently started at a Kaiser medical facility. Kaiser is now in the forefront of the promoting the connection between good health and eating healthfully.

Agritourism (i.e., agricultural tourism) refers to businesses conducted by farmers and ranchers on their working agriculture operations for the enjoyment and education of visitors. The purpose is to promote farm products and generate additional farm income. Types of agritourism include u-pick operations, roadside stands, seasonal activities (e.g., pumpkin patches, corn field mazes, Christmas tree farms), farm tours often targeted to students, bed and breakfast operations, working farm stays (e.g. dude ranches), and special event facilities (e.g., weddings, company picnics). Some agritourism businesses operate in the context of a regional agricultural marketing effort, such as a farm-trail organization, appellation, or regional product/practice identify (e.g., Marin Organic, Apple Hill in El Dorado County). Sometimes these regional agricultural marketing efforts produce region-wide agricultural promotion events and seasonal festivals, ranging from simple almond blossom tours to elaborate harvest festival. Some agricultural regions have special cultural facilities and museums that orient visitors to the region and broaden their experience. Examples include COPIA in Napa and the Steinbeck Center in Salinas. In internationally renowned areas, (e.g., Tuscany), agricultural tourism offers integrated cultural, historical, culinary, and agricultural experiences for visitors.
Nature Tourism is a related business. This term refers to a commercial operation that works toward a visitor’s enjoyment, understanding, and appreciation of natural areas while conserving local ecological, social and cultural values. Usually nature tourism is offered for a region or nature area of some kind. However, some individual farms that have significant natural areas promote on-farm nature tourism, with activities ranging from bird-watching to duck hunting. Nature tourism is the fastest growing sector in tourism, which overall accounts for 11% of the global economy.

It is well beyond the scope of this project to track national trends in agritourism. California agritourism trends are perhaps best measured by the emergence of new resources designed to support farmer entry into agritourism businesses and to promote agritourism to consumers. These resources include a University of California agritourism workgroup, the development of an agritourism manual for farmers, the development of an agritourism database and website by the UC Small Farm Center, and increased listings in the annual California Agricultural Directory published by the Farm Bureau. At least 600 farms in CA incorporate agritourism into their farm businesses.

Two additional resources that list South Bay agritourism offerings include the Country Crossroads Map and the Central Coast Agritourism Council. There are currently several agritourism operations in the Coyote Valley including nurseries open to the public, a Christmas tree operation, and a farm stand. Live Oak High school is in the planning phases for an extensive school farm that will also function as a community agricultural education resource. Other types of agritourism related operations that are allowable by Santa Clara County land use regulations (Chapter 4.10) include bed and breakfast inns, camps and retreats, seasonal outdoor entertainment, equestrian event facilities and stables.

Steps towards the creation of a successful agritourism operation include development of business and marketing plans, assessment of people skills, permit approvals, purchase of liability and licenses, and not the least understanding of unique features and benefits.

Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) is a partnership of mutual commitment between a farm and a community of supporters that provides a direct link between the production and consumption of food. Supporters help cover a farm’s yearly operating budget by purchasing a share of each year’s harvest. The farm delivers this ‘share’ in the form of a weekly box of in-season food to the supporters. The CSA concept depends on and fosters a strong sense of community and cooperation.

CSAs thrive where small farms can provide a diverse array of consumer-ready products such as vegetables, fruits, herbs, meats, honey, milk products, and eggs to large urban populations (the market) in close proximity to the farm. Most successful CSA farmers have highly developed people skills and information-gathering skills, and enjoy the complex scheduling and task management that goes with CSAs, including computer literacy. Part of the original aim was to enlist urban people in support of local agriculture.

National: As of December 2001, a total of 761 CSA farms had registered.
State: Currently there are at least 100 CSA programs in California, although updated information is not readily available.

Farm-to-School programs facilitate purchases from local farmers by school food services. Many of these programs have corollary curriculum elements including school gardens, cooking classes, nutrition education, and visits to farms and farmers’ markets. This US Department of Agriculture program is a win-win, providing new markets for farmers and helping children eat more healthfully. Broad implementation of the program is challenged by the minimal food cost allowances in most schools, minimal or non-existent school kitchens, untrained staff, and established contracts with one-stop-shopping vendors. Despite these challenges, the program is growing.

National: 16 states have Farm-to-School programs

State: 30 School Districts in California have Farm to School programs. In Davis, farmers sell $100-$800 of produce per month to the school lunch program. On average, this outlet represents approximately 2% of participating farmers’ annual income.

Local: There are currently no farm-to-school programs in Santa Clara County. However, the Morgan Hill Unified School District Food Service is eager to explore possibilities. Communication is also planned with the San Jose School District Food Services.

Farm-to-Restaurant relationships are generally one-on-one rather than institutionalized. However, collectively the growing commitment of white table cloth restaurants to supporting locally and sustainably produced farm products is a prominent trend. Restaurants gain by being able to source top quality, fresh, and sometimes custom grown or harvested products and by appealing to a socially and environmentally conscious customer base. Farmers gain from selling to restaurants that appreciate and often pay a premium for differentiated, high quality products, and that sometimes promote the farms by name on menus or in publications.

The ingredient-focused California Cuisine movement was founded in the Bay Area and inspired similar movements across the country. Today, top restaurants throughout the county commonly seek out and feature in their menus the best locally produced foods. The restaurant’s distinction has become synonymous with the distinctiveness of the ingredients used.

This approach is standard practice for dozens of high end restaurants in San Francisco and the East Bay. In the South Bay, the number of restaurants that follow this philosophy is increasing. Examples include Parcel 104 and Eulipia in San Jose and Bay Leaf Café, Cool Café, and Stoa’s Restaurant in Palo Alto.

Often, there is an intermediary business – restaurant jobber or broker - that facilitates farm to restaurant connections. America Fresh has played that role in the South Bay and now delivers fresh, local, organic food to 45 restaurant customers from Menlo Park to Santa Cruz.

A parallel trend is the emergence of Farm-to-Food Service connections. Bon Appetit Management Company, which has its national headquarters in Palo Alto, is a leading socially
responsible food service company. With its motto “food services for a sustainable future”, this $300 million per year company serves educational institutions and businesses from coast to coast. Bon Appetit is now bringing its signature “Farm to Fork” program to the cutting edge cafes of its many South Bay clients including Yahoo and eBay. To date, Bon Appetit has only been able to source a small percentage of its food from local, organic sources. Company managers are eager to explore the possibilities for new, entrepreneurial farmers in Coyote Valley to help meet some of this demand.

**Diversified Production**

Along with diversified marketing, diversified production is the other key strategy for small farm success. Diversified production commonly means production of a wide array of products. It can also mean production of differentiated specialty crops and of value added products. Finally, often diversified production refers to alternative production practices, particularly organic production.

**Specialty Crops**

are fruits, vegetables, and herbs that are either imported or grown on a limited scale in the United States. An item that is a specialty or minor crop in this country could be quite common in another part of the world. More specifically, specialty crops can be defined as the following:

- Unusual or exotic crops
- Unusual or heirloom varieties of common crops
- Unusual maturity at time of harvest (e.g. baby vegetables; tree-ripened fruit)
- High-quality produce due to primarily to flavor and also freshness, appearance, and handling

Dairy and animal products can also be differentiated as specialty often by means of specific production methods that help impart distinctive quality to the products. In the U.S. and California, the number of artisan producers is rapidly increasing, as is a receptive marketplace. The vibrant Slow Food movement seeks out and celebrates artisan products and producers.

**Value-Added**

Many farmers are producing value-added products as another marketing niche and sometimes as a way to extend their marketing season and reach. Value-added means any activity or process that allows farmers to retain ownership and that alters the original agricultural product or commodity for the purpose of gaining a marketing advantage. Common examples of value-added products are processed products, such as jams, juices, pastries, condiments, gift items, etc.

Product labeling is a relatively simple way for farmers to differentiate and add value to their products. By labeling products with information including crop cultivar name, geographical origin, and growing practices, farmers establish their identity in the marketplace. Farmer brand labels also help educate consumers about where the foods come from, who grew them, and what production practices were used.

As noted elsewhere in this report, there is a significant dearth of research about specialty crop production and consumption on a regional basis, a crop/product basis, and certainly on the basis of diversified production operations.

**Organic**

agriculture is an ecological production management system that promotes and enhances biodiversity, biological cycles and soil biological activity. ‘Organic’ is a labeling term that
denotes products produced and certified under the authority of the National Organic Foods Production Act. The principal guidelines for organic production are to use materials and practices that enhance the ecological balance of natural systems and that integrate the parts of the farming system into an ecological whole.

*Table 7.5: Number and Profit of Organic Farms in 2002 in USA, CA and SCC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>SCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Farms Certified Organic</td>
<td>116,733</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of certified organically produced commodities (in $1,000)</td>
<td>812,204</td>
<td>149,137</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value of certified Organically produced commodities per farm</td>
<td>6,958</td>
<td>103,352</td>
<td>69,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.6: Number and Profit of Organic Farms in 2002 in San Mateo, San Benito, Monterey, and Santa Cruz Cty.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>San Mateo</th>
<th>San Benito</th>
<th>Monterey</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Farms Certified Organic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of certified organically produced commodities (in $1,000)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5,823</td>
<td>9,941</td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Value of certified Organically produced commodities per farm</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>161,750</td>
<td>382,346</td>
<td>74,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the U.S., sales of organic products increased by 20%-25% annually during the 1990s, and were about $7.8 billion in 2000. This represents between 1% and 2% of total U.S. food sales, an order of magnitude larger than the share of farmland that is organic.

With the growing health awareness movement, more consumers are interested in eating organically grown produce. Regions where there are not yet many organic farms (such as Santa Clara County) offer a potential marketing opportunity for organic production.
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Background:

- A leading Coyote Valley farming family has let it be known that an easement is what they would like to do with their property, eventually. This will need to be worked through, somewhat. Haven’t yet pursued it.
- Silicon Valley Conservation Council:
  - Silicon Valley Conservation Council formed when Cisco had first proposed the development. The Nature Conservancy, OSA, and Greenbelt Alliance, etc., agreed to stay neutral in exchange for the preservation of the uplands areas in CV. Money was given up front.
  - $60,000,000 is long term goal
  - Seed money was produced for an Executive Director
  - The agreement is up for renewal again next year, but the SVCC is fizzling out.
- OSA has very limited funding.
  - Two benefit assessment districts of $4.2 M and $8.2 M
  - Both have limited areas.
- One of our assessments is in litigation.
- There are not many available appraisers, especially to conduct 3 appraisals per parcel. Brigantino & Co. is a main appraiser.
- Difficult to look at creating a wildlife corridor because of traffic. It will be a hard sell for The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and US Fish & Wildlife.

Vision:

- The OSA is interested in conservation easements in the upland areas surrounding both sides of CV
- District 1 Jurisdiction of the Authority has started looking at property acquisition and management; OSA would like to be a player in CV
- Suggests we become familiar with Gilroy’s agricultural mitigation policy:
  - Has to mitigate acre for acre for bought-out land
  - Looking at getting 3 appraisals per parcel: development value, productive agricultural value, and finished use value.
- Potential funding sources:
  - Development
  - TNC (has identified a habitat corridor)
- Opportunities may exist with Parks & Rec
- Restoration, wetland, buffer opportunities
- “We have an opportunity to really create something that could be a great model.”
Suggested Contacts/Follow-ups:

- Potential partners: Water District (must be adjacent to a creek), Valley Oak woodland organizations (such as CA Oak Foundation), Valley Floor riparian species organizations
- Suggests contacting US Fish and Wildlife, CA Fish and Game (Dave Johnston), biologist Gail Rankin
Background:
- There are 8600 students in the Morgan Hill Unified School District, which consists of ten elementary schools, two middle schools, and two high schools, as well as a continuation high school.
- MHUSD Food Service currently buys food from a major food service company.
- 2800 lunches and 1500 breakfasts are served daily.
- A central commissary pre-packages most of the food for the schools.
- Monthly menus are posted on the internet.
- Food services buys the following fresh produce:
  - Pears*
  - Apples ($22.30/case)**
  - Bananas ($19.50/case)**
  - Orange Juice*
  - Tangerines
  - Kiwis*
  - Strawberries ($12 per flat)**
  - Grapes
  - Avocados
  - Celery
  - Carrots
  - Lettuces (Salad Mix)*
  - Zucchini
  - Jicama
  - Peas (frozen/canned)
  - Beans (frozen/canned)
  - Peppers (on occasion)
  - Corn (frozen)
  - Cherry tomatoes (on occasion)
  - Regular tomatoes
  - Eggs

* Indicates that these items are sometimes received from the government, in which case Food Service pays $2.70/case, whatever the product.
** Indicates a recent/average wholesale price

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Organic produce is generally expensive. Where it is affordable, the school district would be interested to purchase it.
- In order to make locally grown and/or organic program work, Janet recommends introducing the food with taste tests at schools and with advertising at the schools.

Vision:
- School district would be open to buying local foods
- Would be great to put “locally grown” on the menu

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up: Bonnie Tognazini, Deputy Superintendent of Business Services.
Background:
Current Coyote Creek and Coyote Valley recreation areas:
- Bike trail along Coyote Creek (10 foot wide) includes part of the Juan Bautista DeAnza National Historic Trail and Bay Area Ridge Trail.
- There are a number of special recreational uses along Coyote Creek operating under long term leases or annual permits.

Master Plan for Coyote Creek and Coyote Valley recreation areas:
- SCC Parks and Rec is preparing an integrated Master Plan and Natural Resources Management Plan for the Coyote Creek Parkway. This will be a 2-year or so process involving collaboration with local, state and federal agencies and the general public.
- Master Plan covers the stretch from Morgan Hill through Hellyer Park in San Jose.

Vision:
- The creek has open ponds which are remnants of quarries. The water district has the responsibility to protect/enhance the habitat for the steelhead and other endangered and/or threatened species in the creek and ponds. The Master Plan will explore partnerships to enhance and/or reconfigure the creek to accommodate these species and provide potential for expanded recreational opportunities.
- As to the West Side of Coyote Valley (the East-facing hills), these are primarily privately owned, and a good deal is owned by the Lakeside Development Corporation. [SCC Parks and Rec does have two parks there: Calero and Chesbro Reservoir.]
- The Greenbelt would be a nice trail connection between East and West park/trail areas.
- City will build an interchange at Coyote Valley Parkway to accommodate a 12-foot wide trail. This concept is memorialized in an agreement22 between the city and the county and the CV research partners.

---

22 Recital I of the Agreement for Bailey Avenue Overcrossing Easement executed July 9, 2001 states: "The parties acknowledge the importance of a continuous, safe, multi-use alignment for the Juan Bautista deAnza National Historic Trail and Bay Area Ridge Trail. Accordingly, City agrees that if, and when, it designs and constructs, or causes to be designed or constructed, the Coyote Valley Parkway Overcrossing, it shall include as part of such a project the design and construction of a multi-use trail linking the Campus Trail and Coyote Creek Trail ("Parkway Trail"). The design and construction of the Parkway Trail (and any remedies of the County in connection therewith, so long as they do not affect this Agreement) would be subject to a later agreement regarding the Coyote Valley Parkway Overcrossing." [Footnote provided by Mark.]
Background:
- Serpentine habitat on periphery of CV
- May or may not be red-legged frog and/or salamander in this habitat
- Shriek, horn lark, sparrow, burrowing owl all need/like CV vegetation

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- General scale of the project represents a barrier to East-West movement
- What could result from amenities? A decorative lake could be a problem.
- Scientific evidence about increasing traffic and pollutants: serpentine habitat is nitrogen-poor, traffic and pollutants can enable non-serpentine species to out-compete.

Vision:
- Fisher Creek has significant potential for restoration, interpretive education, habitat, etc.
- Concept of on-farm mitigation could fit into the goals of the Habitat Conservation Plan and the Natural Communities Conservation Plan.
- City purchase of habitat land?

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
- Ken Schreiber at the County; Darryl Boyd at the City
Background:
- The majority of the CV area contains prime agricultural land.
- LAFCO’s power comes from CEQA

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- In so far as the city is expanding into agricultural lands, mitigation will likely be required.
- Need assurance for ability to supply services; a major concern is whether there is an adequate supply of water
- Infill as an alternative; need an inventory of vacant land
- Moving the growth boundary is not an option

Vision:
- LAFCO policy requires mitigation for loss of agricultural land.
- Would like to have developers (and property owners) see how this (mitigation) would potentially have value.
Background:
- Up until now, the Greenbelt has been below political radar, so it has been hard to get focus on it as being of any importance.
- There has been an understanding from the earliest plans that this would be a non-urban buffer. Greenbelt is a handier term, a default term.
- The planning principles were originated by Don Weden in order to get a focus on what would be necessary if the Greenbelt was to have a future. Don took the lead; staff helped out. At one point they even thought about fanciful sculptures in the landscape.
- Development patterns occurred before the 1984 San Jose General Plan. The parcel patterns have been there for a long time.
- The Greenbelt has been in the General Plan for a long time—codified in 1984, reaffirmed in 1994.
- Before 1984, it was possible to obtain a zoning change from agriculture to development. This was stopped since it was undermining stability.
- The two reports (Implementation Challenges and Interim Planning Principles) were never floated with the property owners. The basic impetus was to be a starting point.
- The reports were a “booster rocket,” but where will this go from here?

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- A key challenge is to get people thinking beyond the past.
- CVSP has reached a juncture with the Greenbelt; he is interested to see where it will go.
- One issue is the County’s fundamental policy for no urban services in the area.
- What alternative vision might emerge? We don’t have an imperative to modify the plan.
- The dialogues on CV have not yet jelled. The City is starting them.
- Where is the imperative? The county has 1/5 of a planner on the Greenbelt, and it is premature to jump in. He is just following along, for now, holding back.
- Putting focus on the Greenbelt magnifies interest in both the Greenbelt and the Southeast quadrant area of the County. Over several years, speculative buying has doubled the prices. Even with prices high to start with, speculative buying is going to make implementation difficult. Property values are inevitably rising.
- People are buying in both Morgan Hill and Coyote Valley.
- With an incredible number of independently minded people, consensus is almost impossible.
• Gilroy has been under similar pressures. Partially prompted by LAFCO, the city adopted a policy for agricultural mitigation, modeled on Davis. Some momentum is building in that direction.
• Morgan Hill’s proposal is an enhanced rural landscape. More intensively developed, it would urbanize the area, but still be called a greenbelt; almost akin to what CVGB property owners would like to see.
• Regarding agricultural housing, he is concerned that if dense housing is allowed, it opens doors to more density. Second units (Granny units) are allowed on many properties—this could be a possible option for farm employee housing.

Vision:
• Conservation (of hillsides, ranchlands, etc.)
• The County is not going to change anything. The policy is what it is. County will watch discussion as it evolves, and once there is a mature/ripe vision, then the county will give the airing.
• County is also looking at what Morgan Hill is going to propose. Needs to look at it from the perspective of the whole South County. Think about situation around San Martin and Gilroy.
• County will not change zoning designations; they don’t want new “ranchette” zoning.
• We (county) have only begun to scratch the surface.
• In response to comments on overregulation: There are several different agencies governing uses and regulations (such as fire, pesticides, waste water, etc.). County can perhaps facilitate and streamline a multi-agency permitting process.

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
• Suggested stakeholders to contact:
  o Water District
  o SCC Parks and Recreation
  o Dave Bischoff, former Community Development Director of Morgan Hill
  o Neelima Palacherla, LAFCO
Background:
- There are two program areas:
  - Environmental Enhancement (e.g. wetlands)
  - Trails
- Brian Mendenhall, SCVWD Environmental Planner, has manages the grant program for trail-building and water projects
- 11 trails projects are underway in the first phase.

Vision:
- It is their goal to construct 70 miles of trails over the course of 15 years.
- Getting ready to issue another project RFP, the city could submit something for CV

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
- Yves Zutti, with San Jose Public Works/Parks & Recreation
- Darryl Boyd, Principle Planner, lead CV environmental analyst
Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:
- Alliance for Smart Planning put some vague but attractive ideas on the map.
- The high cost of the plan may affect mitigation.
- Regarding market value, the tax roll is not reflective of the market value, since properties purchased prior to Proposition 13 have fixed low assessed property values and tax rates rise very slowly. For houses sold prior to 1972, the current assessed value is about 25% of the market value. Since then, properties, when they sell, get assessed at market value.

Vision:
- Trail connections: farmers who owns land on the hillside just west of the developed portion (between Bailey and Palm Avenues), may be prepared to accommodate trails across his land.
- Hoping to put mitigation of agricultural land into the plan
- Open Space Authority is generally concentrated on buying land in the hills/mountains, so adopting a vision for the Greenbelt has been a radical departure. Some have said that a Greenbelt is impossible. Participation in taking a position was a transformative experience for some of the OSA board.
- FROGs (Friends of the Greenbelt) have emerged: people who are supportive of the main greenbelt goals.
- Needs to be a strategic public purchase.
- Could be accomplished with a joint powers agreement.

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
- Research Gilroy’s Greenbelt situation
- FarmLink and Rural Development Center
- Contact Land Trust Alliance for possible models
Stakeholder Category:
Governmental Jurisdictions & Agencies

Person:
Pat Dando, Vice Mayor
City of San Jose

Discussion Date: 10/13/04

Contact Information:
(408) 277-5251 #2210

Recommendations:
Pat got in touch on two occasions with recommendations.

- She recommended contacting Joe Burch, owner/operator of Redwood Empire, a lumber company that has a plant in the Greenbelt. She encouraged follow up on his idea for manufacturing wood byproducts into stakes and planter boxes useful for the nursery business. We also talked generally about various allowable kinds of agricultural uses.
- She recommended research into the Kings County Farm Day as a possible model for activities that could take place in the Greenbelt. (See links below and Attachment Appendix for brief descriptions.)

http://www.metrokc.gov/wsu%2DDee/farmtour/

**Stakeholder Category:**
Governmental Jurisdictions & Agencies

**Person:**
Vera Gomes, Science Teacher and Head of Student Farm Program, Ann Sobrato High School
Morgan Hill Unified School District

**Discussion Date:** 10/20/04

**Contact Information:**
408-201-6200

**Background:**
- There are two high schools in Morgan Hill: Live Oak High School and Ann Sobrato High School, which just opened.
- Live Oak has an 8-acre farm, all volunteer, with livestock and pasture.
- There is a committee for planning the new farm at Ann Sobrato High. Aziz Baameur, UCCE Small Farm Advisor, serves on that committee.

**Vision:**
- Both schools should have their own farms.
- Concept for a new 20-40 acre farm, with public garden, orchard, to be constructed at Ann Sobrato High.
- The idea of linking this school-public farm and garden to agricultural activities in the Greenbelt is appealing.
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In the introductory meeting (8/20/04), Tedd and Lee explained their interest in coming to a consensus on mission and goals, and their demand for equitable development. Sibella explained what the upcoming Greenbelt research would entail.

In subsequent discussions, the following topics and issues were raised:

Constraints/challenges/concerns:

- Taxes are exceeding income
- Garlic was small, prunes were small; obviously some sort of bad soil conditions
- The Greenbelt is currently a “hostile” environment for agriculture.
- Question is, how do you get value from the Greenbelt itself.
- Being categorized as permanent agriculture has made the property owners militant.
- Want more information about water production, crops, land use, etc.
- Include ag-economics in the research: can’t separate land use from finance

Vision:

- Looking for a total of 800 housing units; in exchange would give development rights to what land is left.
- Want to open up discussion with the city. Want to work as a group. There is a sense of cooperation. Needs to be a sub-committee for the Greenbelt.
- Exhaust all tools short of land conservation. “Not asking for transfer of development rights.”
- Aren’t there septic alternatives that could handle new houses? Sand, package treatment?
- Would love to see property values go up, public benefit increase, ambiance go up
- Want to orchestrate an approach. Put all the options on the table.
- Goals:
  - Take us out of the Greenbelt designation
  - Fair market value
  - ½ acre lots
  - Some sort of upside value
- Would like to help sponsor an informational forum on viability of agriculture.

23 Initially, the group called itself “Alliance for Equitable Development.”

---

**Stakeholder Category:**
Property Owners & Farmers
Greenbelt Property Owners (Non-Farming)

**People:**
Alliance for Smart Planning
Tedd Faraone, Jack Faraone, Lee Wieder, and Chris Allen, Richard DeSmet

**Discussions:** ongoing

**Contact Information:**
408-867-0360

**Parcel Number/Address:**
Faraone- G221/ Hale Ave.
Allen-G191 / 626 San Bruno

**Acreage:** 5.8, 9.7
Background:
- 15 years ago, the valley was 100% prunes.
- Has been a 4-H’er and future farmer from the age of 10 years old.
- Planted prunes in approx. 1957
- Yield was 1-2 tons per acre, dried
- Removed prune trees in 1998
- Sunsweet left in 1988

Current Farming/Ranching Business:
- Regulatory problems: can’t work the land, can’t disc, and can’t burn. Can do some of this with permits, but not without complaints. You can’t farm.
- Now has walnut orchards in San Benito; almond orchards in Merced County.
- Have transmission wires over land, through easement.
- Labor is tough.
- Orchard needs 3 acre feet of water per acre per year.

Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:
- Lease costs are low. Can get only $200, $75, per acre, and falling.
- Over past 30 years, development has chopped up land.
- Would like to see infill.
- Insufficient water
- Regulations require casing of wells to 50 feet, and sometimes 125 feet.

Vision:
- Something like Cordevalle (vineyard estates, etc.) might be possible.
- Wish it was how it used to be.
Background:
- Joe is a geotechnical engineer.
- Bought 15 acres in 1975, farmed it in prunes.
- Left about 10 years ago.
- Today the land is fallow.
- There is an older house on site that we rent out.
- No well except for the house. Wells aren’t productive. Water is a problem, used to get water from Perusina’s property across the street. The water table has gotten lower.
- After a heavy rain, you could find near saturation at ground level, which can lead to septic system problems.
- Soil is fair; silt ranging into clay. Not worn out soil.
- Greenbelt is a misconception.
- Land purchased as an income producer, not for speculation.
- Moderately productive land at best. Would take a huge investment to turn it around.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- San Jose wants to do great stuff for us but doesn’t want to work with us.
- There are certain features that aggravate me to the utmost. The City dictates what we have to do, but is not talking responsibly. Total outsiders are dictating. We are out of the process.
- LAFCO was set up to deal with sphere of influence. San Jose has no legal right to dictate to us.

Vision:
- Would be interested in talking to potential renters.
- We would all jump up and do something new if someone would show us the way.
- Wife would like to move down there. He is 76, wife is 75. Both are still working.
- Believes that a fair value for the land is $75,000 - $100,000/acre.
- Has a document of $130,000/acre offer, but he thinks they’re not likely to be offered more than $10,000 if the Greenbelt designation goes through.
- Can’t do anything with the land. Would like to build on one 5-acre parcel, selling the other 10 acres to subsidize building.
- This is making progress; [the interview process] makes him feels more at ease.
- Glad the Greenbelt process is happening.
Background
The Christopher family first purchased land in Coyote Valley two generations ago, in 1920. Al and Art Christopher started with 50 acres and then added another 30 acres. They mainly farmed prunes. Both parcels remain in the family. The larger parcel, bordered by Palm Avenue on the north side, is in the Greenbelt. The smaller parcel, bordered by Palm Avenue on the south side, is in the Urban Reserve Area.

Since the prunes got pulled 10-15 years ago, the family has tried growing other crops with limited success. The garlic, corn, and tomatoes were all harvestable, but on the small side. The Gilroy area proved to be much better garlic ground.

Conditions
- Soil is fairly gravely and alkaline in some areas. There is good drainage and plenty of good water.

Current
- Today, Christopher Ranch has 3,000 acres of garlic in CA, mostly on leased land in the Central Valley.
- The family property in the Greenbelt is leased to the Grass Farm for sod production.

Concerns/Challenges/Constraints
- Homesites on 5 and 10 acres are often problematic. Homesites of more than a couple of acres are not viable for good financial, aesthetic, and operational management.

Vision/Outcome
- Keep the Greenbelt green by having campus style churches and schools and maybe a golf course. Gavilan College is looking for about 80-100 acres of land. If located in the Greenbelt, Gavilan College could offer horticultural education as part of its extensive vocational education program. Name of the contact person at the College: Steve Kinsella.
- Could also have an estate home with agriculture element like Cordevalle.
- Expectation is that they should receive $1.6 M - $2 M per acre.
- Thinks that family could get the value they want out of their land, without subdivision, providing that there was a well-planned and managed agricultural element and overall design elements. This could give the homesites a valuable and beautiful setting.
**Stakeholder Category:**
Property Owners & Farmers  
Greenbelt Property Owners (Non-Farming)

**Person:**  
Jojhar Dhillon

**Interview Date:** 10/14/04

**Contact Information:**  
(408)782-3570

**Parcel Number / Address:**  
G101 / 613 Palm Ave.

**Acreage:** 19.1

**Background:**
- Bought land in 1995, lives on land in an old house  
- Planning to farm, but he couldn’t farm it himself  
- Came from a farming family in India, wanted to grow peppers, green vegetables for wholesale  
- Now leases for hay, at $15/acre  
- Hasn’t used any pesticides on the land for the past few years

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- Water problem: well is shallow. In winter there is high water.  
- Bottom line: you need to make a living  
- Land needs to support the crop

**Vision:**
- Would like to grow greenhouse tomatoes and cucumbers  
- Would be interested in talking with farmers who might want to lease from him.
**Stakeholder Category:**

Property Owners & Farmers  
Greenbelt Property Owners (Non-Farming)

**Person:**

Eric Flippo

**Interview Date:** 10/18/04

**Contact Information:**

(408) 833-9628 mobile

**Parcel Number/Address:**

G93, 104 / 615 Palm Ave

**Acreage:** 15 acres

---

**Background:**

- General contractor, builds large developments for developers such as K&B Homes
- Bought an old dairy, lives there in the 4,000 square foot house on Palm
- Used to farm 150 acres in Coyote Valley
- Some wildlife comes through: deer, pigs, a few mountain lions. Not much, they mostly stay in the hills.

**Current farming/ranching business:**

- Grows hay all along Palm Ave.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**

- Pumpkins, cucumbers, they’re all “bad deals” for High Rise Farms in Coyote Valley.
- Need to have huge volume and more production to sell to grocery chains, etc.
- Water problem: some parcels can’t get water, others get lots of water
- His soils are adobe, they hold water. This leads to root rot on trees and on vineyard. Lost the prune trees.
- Upset about annexation. Properties annexed into the city, have been paying in good faith, but haven’t seen promised septic.
- Problems with adjacency: Residential people complain about farming’s dirt, dust, noise. Simultaneously, as a rural person, he doesn’t want to raise his kids next to the city.
- There are some people who have been waiting for a generation to do something with (i.e. sell) their land.

**Vision:**

- Talks with Santa Clara County Supervisor Don Gage, trying to come up with something reasonable.
- If they want to do something here, make parks and bike trails. Maybe riding trails.
- He would do a small sub-division, or sell his parcel for a park.
Stakeholder Category: Property Owners & Farmers  
Greenbelt Property Owners (Non-Farming)

Person: May Fong

Interview Date: 10/14/04

Contact Information:  
(408) 253-9166

Parcel Number/Address:  
320 Kalana

Acreage:

**Background:**
- Now lives in San Jose
- Used to have a mushroom farm; a heated shiitake operation.
- Grew top quality mushrooms for high-end restaurants
- Had strong partners.
- 10 acres, built 6 or 7 greenhouses—heat and temperature controlled. Lots of investment, put in a well. No chemicals were used. For shiitakes, oak saw dust is used.
- Cost of labor was high.
- Went out of business because undersold by Chinese imports
- Rented for one year to another mushroom grower, who stopped 3 years ago. Greenhouses are now empty.
- When Cisco came in, thought land was probably worth $200,000/acre

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- Concern about renting greenhouses is that the renter might leave a mess that wouldn’t be covered by the rent
- Energy costs are high

**Vision:**
- If someone were willing to rent the greenhouses, they’d like that.
- Would rent for $3,000/month
- Worth a try to consider leasing
**Stakeholder Category:**
Property Owners & Farmers
Greenbelt Property Owners (Non-Farming)

**Person:**
Tony A.J. Intravia

**Interview Date:** 10/15/04

**Contact Information:**
(408) 463-8717
cell: (408) 316-1583

**Parcel Number/Address:**
G90 / 240 Palm

**Acreage:** 4.5

**Background:**
- 84 years old
- Been on property for 15 years
- Born and raised in Coyote Valley; born and raised on ranching.
- Worked with San Jose Public Works; now retired.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**

**Soil:**
- Let’s get reasonable. North of Palm, they’ve got adobe. Holds water, stays moist.
- Indians call this (Greenbelt area) “useless territory.”
- Can’t make a dime off this ground. You can plant, but nothing comes up. My trees are at a standstill, the ground doesn’t hold water.
- Greenbelt should be north of us. This ground holds too much water. North of Palm grows anything.
- Big rocks, plenty of water (his parcel)
- Need a soils analyst. Soil is a mystery

**Scale:**
- Can’t do anything on 5 acres.
- To make a living you need 40-60 acres and good ground.

**Vision:**
- At my age, would like to make a deal, get a few dollars and go to Las Vegas.
Background:
- Have been in Coyote Valley since 1965
- Had a house in South San Jose, at Tully, where they grew a number of varieties of pears and prunes.
- His great grandfather brought pears to the valley. In those days, they made a living on 30 acres, selling fruits fresh (even shipping to England), and processed.
- In Coyote Valley, prunes did well, and then labor became expensive.
- Had to contend with deer, raccoons, and wild pigs
- Sunsweet closed the dryer in the late 80’s or early 90’s, and then they shipped prunes to Winters for awhile.

Current farming/ranching Business:
- Have rented land for row crops for awhile, with a ground lease.
- Receive $1,650 per year for 22 acres, and pay $1,859 in taxes—even as a Williams Act parcel.
- Well draws over 300 gpm, and pumps at a depth of around 200 feet.
- The soil is real good—“doesn’t get much better than what we’ve got.”

Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:
- Not vineyard ground

Vision:
- This land is an investment for our children
- Would like to see land value of $100,000 per acre

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
- Get a soil map of the County from the Resource Conservation District
- Visit the Anderson Reservoir, an aqueduct starts there and then crosses through the Greenbelt
**Background:**
- Moved here in 1955
- Williamson Act property
- Fisher Creek runs through his property.
- Grew prunes until the market went bad.
- Started raising strawberries back in the 70’s. It was a family operation. All roadside sales.  
  Made their wages. Grew 2-3 acres around the house, until there was a regulation on fumigation. They had to stay 30-50 feet, and then 100 feet away from the house. This cut their acreage in half.
- Water is really good now. They used to get seepage off the hill, now get San Luis water. The percolation ponds have changed the hydrology.
- In the 1990’s there were some dry years and the well went down. When they put the check dam there, water started flowing to Cochran Road. The hydrology is complicated.
- There are about 5 kinds of soil on site—he had it analyzed one year. By the road it is loamy; by the hill it is gravelly, rockier and sandy; and by Fisher Creek it is adobe.
- Being a neighbor to Monterey Mushrooms doesn’t bother him. He doesn’t mind the smell.
- He came from farming in Almaden Valley in the 50’s. Sold out in Almaden.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- Feels they slapped owners with the Greenbelt designation. Feels no one will take over farming.
- He didn’t encourage his children to farm. The bottom line was zero. Even in a good year, he would break even. Sold for between $13- $20/flat
- If I knew what was good, I’d try it. At my age, I don’t want to take risks.
- Greenbelt will be a bad situation for us.
- On a small acreage, forget farming.
- The pigs, deer, turkey and starlings were a headache. Bill Quaglia has trouble with birds. You need a 7’ high fence for deer.
- It’s a rough, tough deal. Wouldn’t recommend anyone farming. It’s been a headache, mainly because of pesticides.

---

24 Note: many residents/interviewees have mentioned the delicious, high quality strawberries he sold.
Background:
- Began farming with his father and brother in the Cambria Park area, and farmed all the way South. Farmed quite a bit around IBM, which was the best land.
- Started with prunes, walnuts, apricots.
- Peppers: to grow these you got to have a contract. They used to raise cucumbers for Del Monte, but there are no more canneries.
- Used to sell to Lucky Store and other big markets.
- Lucky required that the farm carry a $5 M liability policy (for food-borne illnesses, etc.), which cost them $3,500. Everything goes through a broker there.

Current:
- Lives in San Jose, is currently retired. He is 74 years old.
- Owns 3 pieces of land in the Greenbelt, which he leases to others. These include: the lot (with old farm machinery and a rail car) at Live Oak and Monterey Highway; 14-15 acres to a farmer who grows peppers; 5 acres at Willow Springs and Hale (where Spina grows corn).
- Most parcels don’t have enough water
- Some wells get 250-300 gallons/minute
- Soil is mediocre: clay ground. Not best/not worst.
- Fair soils on the plot Spina leases.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Wells are expensive and Santa Clara County mandates that they seal them
- Moving farm equipment in and out is expensive, and becoming a problem. It’s not feasible with all the houses in the Greenbelt.
- Fresh markets are an up and down deal—uncertain income.
- Brokers (middlemen) have it all tied up
- At farmers’ markets you can’t sell enough
- What we did 10 years ago doesn’t work
- People have gone to drip from sprinklers on farms. Drip is best but is expensive to set up.
- With drip, you have to pump to tanks, and tanks have to have filters.
- If you don’t make enough money, you get a ‘wife problem.’ He says he was lucky that his wife put up with what he did.
- You’ve got to get a wife that loves farming.
Vision:
- Doubts if agriculture will continue
- A fair price is a half million per acre
- We have been farming all our lives. Land, more than farming, has made money for these guys. Most of the younger generation doesn’t want to work that much: we’re talking 10 hours per day.
- When they started out, nobody had any money. Today, people need their new cars and houses.
Stakeholder Category:
Property Owners & Farmers
Greenbelt Property Owners (Non-Farming)

Person:
Jenny Sakauye

Interview Date: 10/12/04

Contact Information:
(408) 652-8583

Parcel Number/Address:
G111 / 10090 Dougherty Ave.

Acreage: 5 acres

Background:
• Lives there with her husband and mother-in-law
• Husband and family have lived there for 20 years

Current:
• Pear trees are dying. They have 3 or 4 varieties, with blight.
• Also have apples, grapes, walnuts
• Not doing anything commercial: previously sold crops, now just for family and friends
• Still farming the fruit orchard and looking into other varieties.
• Pretty much low-input (of pesticides, etc.)
• They’re looking into getting compost for the orchard to see if that helps with fertility.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
• Problem is most of their trees are pears, which are not doing well.

Vision:
• Husband likes farming.
• “We plan to live here and have our children here. It makes such a difference eating food we grow.”
• Would like to help come up with a plan to help farmers here keep farming.
**Stakeholder Category:**
Property Owners & Farmers  
Greenbelt Property Owners (Non-Farming)

**Person:**
Robert Snively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Date:</th>
<th>10/28/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell: 408-835-4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land line: 408-333-8135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home line: 408-779-4321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number / Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G151 / 10155 Dougherty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:**
- Have lived at 1015 Dougherty since 1971
- He is an electrical engineer, not a farmer
- He commutes up Hwy. 85, to work, in his hybrid car.

**Current Farming/Ranching Business:**
- Grows grapes for commercial wineries
- About 7/10 acre of grapes – zinfandel, quality very good
- However, person he was selling to went bankrupt
- Grapes gross about $1000/year, net negative $5000
- Makes a little wine himself, and grows fruit for his own use
- Used to grow prunes before they shut down the dryer
- Has a house well, that can run 5 sprinklers at a time. Pump works on the order of 2-3 gpm, but they could do ten times that with a better pump
- Water at 20 feet

**Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:**
- Soil is not very good for grapes, in general. He’s probably at about the best location for growing grapes.
- Entire area has a clay pan of 3-5 feet. Water sits on top of it; for percolation, the pan would have to be cut through.
- There is not enough water for grapes.
- Plans: wife is saying that we couldn’t tolerate the density of development in the area. If the triggers that were originally defined for the north Coyote Valley are used, it’ll be 2020 before the necessary conditions are met
- By the time business development, housing, everything met will be another 15 years before we even see the development
- What I see is hands grabbing for the money from all directions. I’m afraid that those triggers will be set aside.
- Hitachi development being proposed for the IBM campus (in North Coyote)—they have this huge beautiful industrial development area there- they’re saying let’s maximize the profit by building housing development
Example of a case where that’s already happened- golf course near Kaiser, disappeared from greenbelt and reappeared as development area over last 10 years

Silver Creek area, strong pressure to violate plan to increase residential density where they were hoping to create downtown center.

San Jose doesn’t have the guts to stand up for plans. The whole city won’t be able to resist the grabbiness.

Other issue is the mayor. Trying to create a legacy, CV is part of it; legacy isn’t complete until dirt is turned. How will the city fight that?

Has a self-proclaimed cynical view.

Wife says she couldn’t tolerate living there.

Over the next 5 years, in 7 years, we’ll see these beautiful plans unraveled by economics—lake might be replaced by housing, because they can make more money off it.

Monterey Road is an example: it is the only part that the city has control over, right now. There is a place where they’re storing cars. Why is the city permitting a polluting use in an area that they’re trying to make a greenbelt?

Church is another example. They haven’t had the guts to stand up to the church, which is an illegal use. He thinks the County is going to lose the lawsuit. Sees the tent as a permanent structure.

Other thing: philosophical problem with development of the area—the part that makes sense for agriculture is the part that they’re planning to develop. The plan can be a thing of beauty; the execution can be overturned by money.

Skeptical of the plan for the same reasons. Area most closely resembles the Berryessa area 15-20 years ago. You’ll see what happened to green-space there. A lot of the land is owned by nursery, flower grower people—looks like land banking from overseas financial sources.

Setting it up, going to make a living off it, pay taxes, the value is the rising equity of the land.

One guy put his 3 kids through college on strawberries (Nagahara) but his future is in the equity of the land. True of all the flower growers there. What can they do? Flowers generate a lot of $ per acre. Also a lot of pollution that needs to be regulated.

Not a traditional agricultural view of the world. Apples and xmas trees look different. Also relatively high value. Look of the ag land in this area is light industry. If you’re going to continue an agriculture business there, flowers are going to be a mainstay. Neighbor used to grow hay, but let it go fallow b/c he couldn’t find anybody to come in and bale such a small space.

“Greenbelt” is going to look like low density residential, not look like agriculture

To pretend that it’s a greenbelt is at best optimistic. Used to think it was naïve [to do research] but now I see you’re doing the best you can.

What I saw in terms of your thoughts on the cross-valley wild-way, it was all off land that is more or less unoccupied. A big part controlled by the sod people. But there are already houses coming up, there. That’s the kind of situation where you’re going have to talk people into finding – (another place?).

House on 2 ½ acres. Going to work out well in terms of value. Afraid that they won’t be able to put together the money to work with large plots.

Lived in San Fernando Valley, so smoggy that the kids couldn’t go outside and play.

We’re worried about Dougherty because it’s already used as an escape route.

Probably have one of the best water supplies in the county. The question is: who’s ripping it off. What are those new pumps for? (municipal water, for the development) His bet was that
they were providing emergency supplies to the power plant, because they look like private building, not the municipal stuff that they usually see.

- Certification for development of some parcels is questionable. They should’ve fallen into the greenbelt.

Vision:

- Would we still live there? The answer is probably yes. Until pollution becomes so intolerable
- Does see a growing demand for fresh produce, etc.
- The Greenbelt plan is worth pursuing. “As long as it didn’t screw me up or my neighbors. As long as it would be structured such that people whose equity would be compromised by it would be compensated.”
- Saw FROG’s letters. Their convictions are closer to the goals that he has.
- Yes, Alliance for Smart Planning is looking for economic outcome. Both groups (Alliance and FROGS) are looking at the issue of uncertainty.
- Looks forward to continued interactions because he thinks this is really important.
- “We’re not farmers in any realistic sense, but we reflect the community of the non-farmers in a realistic sense.”
**Stakeholder Category:**  
Property Owners & Farmers  
Greenbelt Property Owners (Non-Farming)  

**Person:**  
Mike Zanotto  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Date: 10/15/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(408) 219-1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number/ Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G92 / 230 Palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acreage: 4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:**  
- Bought 15 acres in 2000 with his father and Tony [Intravia].  
- Received permit (one of the last to be issued) to split land into multiple parcels  
- Previously lived in Campbell  
- Has three children (ages 13, 8, and 5) who still attend school in Campbell  
- Water is good

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**  
- Whole plan doesn’t make any sense  
- It’s not a greenbelt, it’s a brown belt.  
- Found out that across the street they can split property, and he’s stuck.  
- Inherently unfair—guy across the street can tap in.  
- Everything is stagnant out there.  
- Soil is hard because very compacted. Land in greenbelt is conducive to homes.  
- It’s the exclusion that’s gotten people irritated.

**Vision:**  
- Wants to be able to split property.  
- Wants City to consider some compromise.
Background:
Tilton Ranch has been in the family for almost 100 years and 5 generations. The family is related (via the Tiltons and Shelonds) to Henry Miller, purportedly California’s largest land owner at the turn of the 20th century. Two books that capture some of the family history in the area are East of the Gabilans and In the Shadow of El Toro.

Janet Burback is a former board member of the Santa Clara Land Trust, is a leader of a local 4-H group, and a school bus driver in the Morgan Hill School District. She is actively engaged in agricultural education. She organizes tours of the Tilton Ranch for her children’s classes and other groups of school kids. She understands children’s almost instinctive interest in animals and mentioned that there are several popular horse camps for children in the area.

Family mentioned that they thought the City should have asked their permission to use a picture of their land and house as the central photo in the CV Community Outreach Bulletin.

Current farming/ranching business:
Main business of Tilton Ranch is a cow-calf operation. Ranch has 200 cows and sells the calves at the public auction year in Aromas. Bulls are borrowed as ranch doesn’t have sufficient fencing to keep bulls and safety is a concern.

Market has been strong in recent years for a couple of reasons: imports from Canada are banned because of potential for BSE spread (hoof and mouth disease); mid-western cow-calf businesses suffered a serious drought right after the Utah Winter Olympics that depleted herds. Tilton calves are high quality due to their good health, which is a factor of their environment (e.g. range for grass-fed cows) and sound animal husbandry (e.g. conscientious vaccination protocol).

Market price is the primary factor in determining the profitability of the business. Water and quality of rangeland is also an important factor. Sufficient rainfall keeps springs productive; late spring rains are important for grass production. They have an entitlement to metered water from the water district pipeline that crosses through their property.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
Shrinking habitats for and overpopulation of wildlife:
- Population of around 500 wild turkeys is beginning to have negative impact on grass production because the turkeys eat the grass seed
- Coyotes can be kept in check at their ranch, but constraints on trapping in developed areas nearby (e.g. Almaden Valley) is causing a population rise
- Wild pigs can be kept in check at their ranch because they are allowed to hunt them; but fees are rising for other people to hunt the pigs.
- Canadian geese – 200-300 hundred at a time – land all through October in the field of corn stubble in northern Coyote Valley. They land to rest more than to eat. But where will they land now? They need a large enough open area so they can feel protected from predators.
- Squirrel population is getting out of hand.

**Over-regulation:**
- Want to be able to use more effective poison to control squirrel population
- Want common-sense regulation for coyote control in the area
- Pesticide regulations are getting too restrictive for farmers in the area

**Concerns about effect of impending development:**
- Increased traffic
- Increased problems with trespassers

**Opportunities:**
- Due to BSE, cattle system is moving to adopt an ID system so that every animal can be traced. This will be good for Tilton Ranch. People trust local and USA grown.
- Organic and grass-fed cattle are growing niche markets.
- Big idea is to develop some kind of resort in the valley at the end of their parcel G199. This could be a place for taking people on rides, for hunting, for R&R, etc. They plan to start looking into options soon. However, they are wary about constraints (e.g. cost of insurance, fire regulations, health requirements, building permits, etc.)

**Vision:**
- Most of all, would probably like development not to come.
- As development is coming, hope there can be incentives to retain, protect, and enhance agriculture.
Background
- Family in business for 3 generations.
- Our worst enemy was mother nature.
- Sold Central Valley (apricots, cherries) to pay off bank loan.

Current farming/ranching business:
- On land, tenant manages the cherries, under annual contract. Contract is now year-to-year because they don’t want to be locked into a 5 year lease.
- Cherries are sprinkler-irrigated; furrow irrigation would cause neighbors to complain.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Not a valley of ‘heart's delight' anymore.
- Feel like an American Indian - stripped of our rights. The general plan agricultural zoning has taken away our rights to develop.
- Cherries don’t put kids through school. Don’t have man-power or equipment to make a go of it. Used to have a packing shed. Way too costly. So many regulations.
- Can’t compete with foreign countries
- Elgin Martin (pick – your – own pears) can’t make a living. Too high of a risk.
- All of us into other ventures. I’m into rental business.
- I’m 53, seen lots of changes.

Vision:
- Zoning for housing. Want to be creative and keep 1-acre parcels.
Background

- She and her partner both grew up on farms in England, and wanted to have land around them and raise their children in this setting. So that’s what they’ve done.
- They moved to the area about 20 years ago, with 3 boys who were little when they moved in. She lives right along the creek (Fisher), and it goes naturally through her property.
- She has some acreage around her house. She loves the area and its rural qualities.
- People visit and say “oh I just love it here, it’s so pretty!”

Current farming/ranching business:

- Coyote Gardens- makes, sells, and teaches classes on English hanging flower baskets
- This is her 6th year in business. She began because she missed the baskets from England, which line the street, etc. Her background is in chemistry, not horticulture. But she wanted to do what she loves, and that is to work with plants.
- Used to sell at Farmers’ Markets in Morgan Hill, Willow Glen, and Los Gatos, for about 2 ½ years, but she quit because she found them very restrictive, due to all the inspection/certification required. She would have to be checked to make sure she grew everything on-site, etc. If she wanted to add an additional plant, she couldn’t, because of regulations regarding what kinds of things she could or could not sell.
- So she opened the on-site business. She has return customers, as well as a lot of drive-by customers.
- She was recently featured in both This Old House magazine, and in Family Circle Magazine, so figured she ought to start a website.
- The idea of area-specific “Agritourism” has come up before; a woman from an info center in Gilroy mentioned it. She thinks she fits the bill pretty well for “agritourism”
- Already, when groups come, she provides tea and they make the baskets in a group. She can leave, come back, they’re fine. She gives lessons, people come as a group. They return as a group.
- She’s in a field she’d love to expand. She provides lots of trailing plants, window boxes, etc.
- She’s open only April – September, because the baskets don’t last much longer than that. She’s worked in a very customer-service oriented way.
- She works another job as well. Staying small can be good because you avoid so much hassle and legislative stuff.
She thinks there is potential for a business that would deliver fresh produce weekly to people’s doorsteps in nearby cities.

Someone started a pet and feed store but it got shut down because it needed handicapped access, a big tank, etc. She tries to avoid these things.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**

- Violet began by mentioning flood-related concerns. Doesn’t see any work re: flood control in the greenbelt area, as she does in the area slated for urban development.
- Went to one of the meetings, showing the planning for North of Palm, and they were only giving “lip service” to the greenbelt area. Saying “tell us what you want” but it was all already designed. People are being just as greedy as those on the other side.
- “We didn’t come here for the money,” she says, “we came here because it’s a beautiful, quiet place to be.”
- Don’t want to lose what’s there (coyotes come through, animals, etc)
- There is an easement through her property to put in a re-constructed Fisher Creek. When they bought the property, at signing time, she saw a dotted line running through the property. She asked the realtor what it was, she said it was nothing, but then went and looked it up, and it turned out to be an easement to build a drainage creek 150 feet wide. They almost didn’t buy the property because of it. Between Santa Theresa and Palm Ave, you can see houses that back up to an unbuilt area, that’s the easement.
- She asked about traffic, saying that when 101 was having trouble at one point in the past, people would cut through, and Monterey, etc., would get very backed up. People crawled past her site, so that was good for her business, but she’d like it if traffic could be directed out of the greenbelt area, “we” don’t want all that. Santa Theresa was also supposed to be built all the way down, but hasn’t been.
- Planners say they’re going to use the natural creek, but where is the natural creek? Where would it go?

**Vision:**

- She feels/hopes that the more people there are living north of Palm, the more they’ll want plants. If progress happens, it happens.
- On vegetable stands/nurseries/garden visit places: People really like to visit these places, there was one produce stand on a corner near her house but it is gone, there’s just the Spina farm-stand which isn’t as good, according to her. They could do with a good produce stand in the area; the other products were so good. And the strawberry farm closed down—they were amazing too. The strawberry farmer closed because he was restricted in his spraying and he didn’t think he could do it without the spray.
- More produce stands and on-farm businesses would be great.
- She needs ADVERTISING HELP. It’s so expensive. Place-based advertising, collaborating with other local businesses, etc. would be good. Advertising help would really help her. Just getting the word out so that people will come. She says, you can do the “build it and they will come” thing, but that really, unless they know about it, they won’t come.
- She’d like to expand, carry English teas, English products. Make a quality place for people to go. She could use some business advice—that would be great.
- She is very positive about the idea of regional marketing, of greenbelt-supportive programming, of ag-tourism, of bike paths, etc.

**Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:** Grass Valley Studios on Dougherty
Background:
- Established 1991
- Partners with Benny Ooi in Chino
- Rents 4.5 acres, and uses 2.5-3 acres.
- Landlord is Yik Bun-Law, who lives on the property. Yik used to grow sunflowers and chrysanthemums.
- Her children live in Sunnyvale with her mother.

Current farming/ranching business:
- Every year, business is getting better
- Sell to Home Depot, Enright Nursery, and the SF Flower Market
- Primary crop is wholesale orchids, which sell for $12 for a 5.5” pot
- Employ 4 people plus the owners
- Import bare roots from Taiwan and grow them out.
- The flowers are high quality, last a long time.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Sometimes hard to find seasonal employees

Vision:
- Don’t want to move, because customers don’t want to drive further. This is a good location.
- Would like to expand market.
- Would be interested in expanding into organics.
Background:
- Originally had around 350 acres and a packing shed
- Quality was always better than other CA cherries; there were no splits in the fruit, or doubles.
- Almost always got a premium price and had a good market in Japan; contracted with a packing company in the Central Valley
- Our land was part of the San Jose strip annexation. Have 1:1 zoning under city, but general plan zoning gives them 1:20 zoning.

Current farming/ranching business:
- 220 acres of cherries; 10% replacement of trees per year
- This year was a good year. In the last 10 years, they’ve had 3 decent years. The 7 bad years were all weather-induced.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- This is like farming in an urban area. Urban residents feel entitled to the land. They want and need more area to recreate in.
- In the Central Valley, growers started using gibberellic acid to firm and increase the size of the fruit. It delays the harvest, and has taken away Coyote Valley’s competitive advantage.
- Have to look at consistency of the soil; ground too heavy and mixed bag
- The Greenbelt is a farce. County roads and other impacts and spillover will come from the city. They’ve chosen the most developed section to designate as Greenbelt
- We should’ve had representation; this is the 4th attempt to go forward.

Vision:
- Wanted 1-3 rural residential zoning, thought we were working towards a compromise
- Want to stick to our plan for our land. We are the largest land-owner out here. Have to be realistic economically. We are the ones who would sacrifice.
- Lifestyle agriculture is more realistic; maybe weekend/hobby businesses: lamas, bees, vineyards, small-scale nursery
- Getting it Right report was ok.
- Catch-up: we need to be a vital part of the plan
- Need to look at alternatives. San Jose, is not the most moral & ethical place.
**Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:**
- Would like to see a photo of high-end nurseries, such as Western Hills.
- Historian Ken Sasso knows the history.

* * *

**Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04**

**Names:** Bun Luong, Yik Bun Law

**Contact Information:**
408-778-3174

**Parcel Number / Address:**
G-276 / 635 B Miramonte Ave.

**Acreage:** 9 acres

**Background**
- Started in 1986. Used to grow mums until virus problem made that difficult.
- Kids used to help out but now they are gone.

**Current farming/ranching business:**
- Grows Asian vegetables; sells them through a Morgan Hill broker.
- Bun makes no living at all. Has a health problem.
- Yik is almost 80 years old. He kept losing money and then leased the greenhouse to someone else who also lost money.
- Land is covered under the Williamson Act; taxes are around $2000 year.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- Wants to the city to allow development.

* * *

**Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04**

**Name:** Kai Hoi Yang

**Contact Information:**
(408) 463-8755

**Parcel Number / Address:**
10360 Dougherty Ave.

**Acreage:** 5 acres (with a trailer)
**Current farming/ranching business:**
- Grows Asian vegetables

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- High property taxes
- Works every day, to make a living; very hard to keep going.
- Works long days—from 3 am to 11 pm.
- Workers can’t stay more than 7-8 hours
- The government is killing us with regulations; Chris Allen has had trouble with regulations
- Need pesticide permits from USDA, building permits are less of a problem.

* * *

**Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04**

**Name:** Wing Mok  
**Contact Information:** 408-778-6127  
**Parcel Number / Address:** G-305 / 530-2 Live Oak Ave.  
**Acreage:** 12 acres

**Background**
- Started in 1984. First few years grew mums, and then switched to miscellaneous flowers, then to snap dragons. Prices dropped from $3.50 to $1 per bunch.
- Tried to keep ahead of the market. Developed a contract with Safeway for a consumer flower bunch (5 stems) for which he got $2.50 per bunch.
- At one point he grew over 100 varieties.

**Current farming/ranching business:**
- Still grows flowers and some vegetables.
- Half land is greenhouse; half land is stake-house (greenhouse with plastic sheeting for roof and often wooden supports).
- Makes a living, but not much.
- His kids work in high-tech.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- Spray regulations; can’t get control for aphids.
- He is 58 and works 14-hour days.
- Hard to find good labor. He rents a house to one worker but generally, workers can’t afford to live anywhere close by.
- His land is his retirement plan.

**Vision:**
- “There are thousands of years of farming experience in this room.”
He is 60 years old. Use to grow flowers, but lost money and switched to Asian vegetables in '98.
Mums have lots of pesticides; vegetables have fewer poisons.
All his children have moved away.
He wants to sell and retire.
Would like the city to know his problems.

Background
• 17 years in field-grown seasonal crops
• In the fall season, the market used to be there.

Current farming/ranching business:
• Wholesale for the seasonal vegetables.
• 2/3 of the greenhouses are in seasonal flowers, the rest in vegetables
• Has no knowledge about growing something else
• Unlicensed wholesale dealers have been dishonest with us and not paid us. Market enforcement is supposed to collect money, but often can’t track down these kinds of dealers.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
• Now flower competition from South America
• Wholesalers are closing, and they take/keep our money when they close
Background:
-Began 20 years ago, 1984

Current farming/ranching business:
- Best chrysanthemum grower in the area

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- All the expenses have gone up – labor, chemicals, all inputs.
- It’s unfair to be in the greenbelt.

* * *

Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04
Name: Ted Leung
Contact Information:
(408) 778-0388
Parcel Number / Address:
G165 / 285 San Bruno Ave.
Acreage: 10 acres trailer on site

Background:
- 26 years, chrysanthemums

Current farming/ranching business:
- Decided to abandon business, because of regulations and desire to retire

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Labor problem for seasonal labor
- Government regulations, we can’t spray material
- Greenbelt Alliance says that our land is worth only $6,000 per acre.

* * *
Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04
Name: Eddie Osaka, Osaka Nursery
Contact Information:
Parcel Number / Address:
Acreage:

Background:
• 37 years, on 13 acres
• Grew chrysanthemums, then carnations, then cut flowers
• Moved to hydroponics in 1990
• Once NAFTA passed, wholesale houses closed down, imports went up

Current farming/ranching business:
• Coops are helpful
• California Cut Flower Commission helps a little with advertising

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
• Clients want cheaper products

Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04
Name: Roy Kikinaga
Contact Information: 779-4672
Parcel Number / Address:
Acreage:

Background:
• 5 years, has a house
• 35 years growing

Current farming/ranching business:
• Last carnation grower, has been cut down to 1/7 of original business

** * **
Background:
- Still has mortgage payments
- Five years ago, was doing ok

Current farming/ranching business:
- Grows oriental vegetables
- Cost to grow is $9-10 for a box; sells below cost
- Sells at markets, including Oakland Chinatown

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Losing $40,000/year
- Barely makes his monthly mortgage

Vision:
- Wants to sell and retire

* * *

Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04
Name: Chow Ho Mock
Contact Information:
Parcel Number / Address: 10370 Dougherty Ave
Acreage:

Background:
- 85 years old
- Has 5 acres, which he has owned for 20 years.
- Has a house and greenhouse
- Grew chrysanthemums

Current farming/ranching business:
- Now grows vegetables

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Regulations are hard for live animals

Vision:
- Wants to develop and sell his place
Background:
• Before 1998, grew chrysanthemums
• Was very efficient, labor cost $4 – $6.75

Current farming/ranching business:
• Sell Asian vegetables to San Jose and San Francisco Chinatowns, and market

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
• All inputs have gone up. Seed costs $8 - $18/lb
• Competition from Fresno, etc., is ruining the market. There is an over-supply. Also Asian vegetables are coming from Mexico.
• He barely breaks even.

* * *

Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04
Name: Gou Ping Yuan
Contact Information:
(408)778-9992
Parcel Number / Address: 620 San Bruno Ave.
Acreage:

* * *

Meeting with Asian Greenhouse Growers, 10/6/04
Name: Samuel Kwong
Contact Information:
Parcel Number / Address: 259 San Bruno Ave.
Acreage: 5 acres

Background:
• 25 years on site

Current farming/ranching business:
• Greenhouses are all broken; Has no money to fix them
• Makes 70 cents/bunch

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
• Labor, gas, imports
Background:
• Has been there for 20 years; grows flowers

Current farming/ranching business:
• Greenhouses collapsed 2 years ago

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
• Sold to San Francisco, but the big shippers are all gone
Background

- A long-time farmer in the area; family started out farming in San Jose.
- Long-time member of the SCC Farm Bureau, and former president
- Kip’s partner Gary (the “G” in G&K) was killed in 1992. The tractor he was driving was hit by a transit bus in Coyote Valley.

Current farming/ranching business:
- Farms 500 acres in Morgan Hill and 500 acres in Gilroy.
- Crops are mainly oats and alfalfa. He used to sell to dairy and cattle operations. Now he mainly sells to the horse market which can pay a higher price. The recreational equestrian business is strong.
- Only reason the company keep farming, is that it has a niche.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:

Traffic
- He can no longer move farm equipment between his parcels in the South County, except between 6-9 am on Sunday mornings. This equipment is often wide (up to 20’) and usually slow.
- There has been an accident with farm vehicles almost every year.
- The “ranchette zone” (Kip’s name for the Greenbelt) will be slammed by traffic. People like me will sell because the area will no longer offer the life-style we want.
- Coyote Valley development will put tremendous pressure on Morgan Hill.

Economics
- All farming expenses are up.
  - Have 17 employees: workman’s compensation up from $9000 in ’98 to $101,000 in ’05.
  - Cost of fuel is up from $2000 month in ’03 to $7000 month in ’04.
  - One of the pesticides he uses costs $750 gallon.
- Unimproved land is going for around $40,000 - $50,000 an acre for 10-20 acres. Knew of a 2.5 acre parcel that passed septic test that went for $165,000.
- His property taxes are pre-Prop 13 ($2000 year for 5 acres with a house). Once land sells, that protection will be gone.
• A few years ago there were offers way over the property value (e.g. 5 acre parcel with 2100-sf residence appraised at $750,000 was receiving offers of $1.5 M.) Hasn’t heard about this happening recently.
• Organics is not a solution because organic food is too expensive and consumers won’t put up with the worms.
• Flower growers can’t compete with 50 cent an hour labor that is standard in Columbia.

Aesthetics
• No future in farming with the aesthetics people want. This has got to be an area for high value residents with agriculture as landscaping (e.g. vineyards).
• New small farmers won’t develop and maintain the aesthetic expected by the new urban community.
• Urbanites make a hassle about agricultural noise and pesticides.

Agricultural Infrastructure
• Wells are shot and need more repair (e.g. casing) than farmers can afford. Water availability is not a problem.

Over-regulation:
• Farmers are now responsible for all the water leaving their land. Have to install a monitoring system for silt, run-off, etc. One more piece of paper-work to contend with.

Loss of agriculture
• Scared by loss of agriculture to overseas markets (e.g. tomato processing to Turkey, then we import the tomato paste).
• Only 20 acres of garlic left in Gilroy when there used to be 6000.

Vision:
• Develop the greenbelt; don’t force an agricultural greenbelt that does not work.
**Background:**

Joe’s family has been farming in Santa Clara County for several generations. He can remember relatives making a decent living on 20 acres of fresh vegetables. The beans did taste really good.

Joe holds the following appointments/positions in Santa Clara County Agriculture:
- SCC Water District, Member Agricultural Water Advisory Committee
- Santa Clara County Farm Bureau, Vice President and President Elect
- USDA Farm Services Agency, Santa Clara County Committee, Minority Advisor

**Current farming/ranching business:**

Joe operates several farm and related businesses, including:
- Leases 90% of the land in northern and mid Coyote Valley from the land owners. Some he leases to smaller farmers (e.g. John Spina) other land he farms himself.
- Operates Calero Stables as a concession with the SCC Parks and Rec in the Calero County Park. This stables is full to capacity with 100 horses boarded there, and a summer camp full to capacity with 500 children annually. Calero Park and the adjoining Canada de Oro Open Space Preserve together have 25 miles of riding trails.
- Owns a 200 acre farm in Gilroy.
- Leases an additional 2,000 acres in Hollister and Gilroy.

Primary crops include oats, safflower, alfalfa, and wheat, much of it for horse feed.

At one time he grew some vegetables, including green beans and zucchini. The zucchini was grown for Del Monte, which used his mom’s recipe for their canned zucchini.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**

Considers the agricultural greenbelt to be “a joke”, because there are no large parcels to farm, too many houses are being built, several businesses make it smell bad, and regulations are not farmer-friendly.

**Opportunities:**

Recreational trails:
- Thinks there is a need for a cross-valley trail through the Greenbelt that could connect Calero Park and the Coyote Creek Parkway. Suggested SCC Measure B as a possible source of funds, since its mandates among other things, development of another 150 miles of trail.
Also suggests the cross-valley water pipe as a possible route since it already has easements on the properties over which it passes. Suggests contacting Rick Callender at the Water District and Rick Linquist, associated with Measure B.

Agriculture:
- Thinks it would worth trying our some kind of pilot program for small-scale intensive agriculture with innovative practices, specialty crops, and direct marketing.
- Thinks specialty nursery crops might survive.
Background:
- Family has been in the area since 1870. They grew apricots, prunes and walnuts. In the old days, you could raise a family on it.
- Ray says he’s “getting up in age like all of us.”
- Now he is a building contractor—not farming.
- South of Palm, the soil has lots of gravel and clay. North, it’s more alluvial. Look at the walnut trees along Monterey, since they reflect the soil qualities of the north and south parts of the valley.
- “Imports are killing California. We can’t compete.”
- He feels sorry for the people that got stuck in the greenbelt zone.
- “The city planner is crazy, he’s dreaming.”

Current farming/ranching business:
- Currently grows apricots on site, selling them for $300/ton and netting $150/ton after labor.
- He says, “I’ll furnish the crop, you furnish the pickers,” regarding farm day/u-pick event, etc.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- The city promised us sewer back when they annexed. That has been annoying to him and others.

Vision:
- “Hate to see the valley change, but have to accept it.”
Background:
- He has been in Coyote Valley for 35 years.
- His father farmed in the area beginning in 1949

Current farming/ranching business:
- He farms 200 acres, all of which are leased. He farms with his son. His wife operates the farm stand at Bailey Avenue and Santa Teresa Boulevard.
- Most of the land he farms is in the North, there is a small part in the South that he leases from Ray and Dan Perusina.
- Grows pumpkins, corn, peppers.
- Sales: peppers sold through contract with Pace Salsa; corn sold retail and wholesale; pumpkins sold to stores; farm-stand on-site in Coyote Valley
- We took mushroom compost from Monterey Mushrooms, and had a person hauling every day.
- Water: 6 wells, at 200 feet, producing at rate of 800-1,000 gallons per hour

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Agriculture won’t work South of Palm Avenue.
- Need larger parcels and buffers between houses
- Water quality is very important to them. The wells are shallow and septic systems are shallow, which has potential for contamination.
- Sprays pumpkins by helicopter, but you need buffers for that. You also need buffers to pollinate by bees (1,000 feet from residences)
- Small parcels are problematic because of dust, spraying, and noise
- On the 10-acres he farms in the Greenbelt, the septic used to run down onto the property.
- Drip/ filtration systems are expensive, but they use drip on the Greenbelt parcel so there won’t be runoff.
- Neighbors complain about the dust in the day and noise at night.
- Questions about change. Organic requires the transition.
- South of Palm wouldn’t work for me.
- Congestion and traffic are not what he wants to deal with
- Quality of life is going downhill. It comes down to the dollars and cents.
Vision:

- With development, he is going to relocate to the southern San Joaquin Valley; he has land lined up in Bakersfield
- “Farming is our livelihood, we’re not going to walk away from it, but the handwriting is on the wall for this area.”
- Development has got to have a little of everything. Farmers are great environmentalists.
Background:
- Monterey Mushrooms was established 1971
- Largest mushroom producer in the world
- 11 fresh mushroom growing facilities, mainly throughout U.S. and also in Mexico and British Columbia
- First, and only, company to produce a clean and ready-to-eat mushroom

Current farming/ranching business, Coyote Valley plant:
- ~ 40 acres, with a 4 acre leach field area
- Load and ship 15 trucks of mushrooms daily
- To be competitive, have to be fast, innovative, and efficient.
- Have 80 growing rooms, at 5,000 square feet each, and need to build rooms and a new packing plant.
- Employees include a lot of families (husband and wife); 90% Hispanic and 10% Punjabi.
  The average duration of employment is 15 – 18 years, and the median age is mid-40. This is a fairly old work force.
- Use wheat straw as main input.
- Outflow is about 100,000 gallons of water every day. This is high in nitrogen.
- Another outflow is 2 truckloads of mushroom (waste) compost—or 70 cubic yards—a day.
  This goes to local farmers and nurseries. Will give it free to whoever hauls it.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Coyote Valley facility will be impacted by the development.
- Odors: When compost is done correctly, there is a sweet smell. When it becomes anaerobic, it smells sour. “Some people hate us. We’re not the best neighbors.”
- More development will lead to more complaints.
- Regulations that apply to this operation require the same scrutiny as a business
- Waste water problems: land application of water byproduct was not allowed, so forced to build a $3 M pond, which is now empty.
- Permit regulations should be expedited. “We can’t wait 1 1/2 years for a building permit.” These are ridiculous timetables.
- Building new rooms: huge dilemma. Will it be worth the investment?
The biggest problem is going to be wage pressure. Who will work if they can work in better paying jobs in the new development?

It is easier to find labor at our Watsonville and Arroyo Grande facilities. The Watsonville farm draws workers from the salad industry.

Vision:
- In the near future, they want to get more efficient, more automated.
- They have looked into leaving California. Costs for workers’ compensation - the dream of any employee – are really high.
- A filter to cut down on smells costs ~ $2.5 M, a cost they could consider if they were going to stay in the CV long-term.
- Need affordable housing for workers

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
- Suggests we research the ag-business Natural Selection as a prototype operation, and get photos of their headquarters building, which is apparently beautiful and well-sited in an agricultural area. (preliminary research below)

Natural Selection Foods took root on a three-acre raspberry farm. Today it's a leading supplier of packaged organic salads to retailers nationwide. The company's products are sold in more than two-thirds of US grocery stores under the Earthbound Farm brand name. Natural Selection also operates around 13,000 certified organic acres.

Natural Selection Foods
San Juan Bautista
831-623-7880
Stakeholder Category:  
Property Owners & Farmers  
Agricultural Businesses  

Person:  
Shah Kazemi, owner  
Monterey Mushrooms

Discussion Date: 9/20/04

Contact Information:  
(831) 763-5300

Parcel Numbers / Address:  
G236-242, G278, G279, G291 / 642 Miramonte Ave.

Acreage: 70

Background:  
• See website (http://www.montereymushrooms.com/)

Current farming/ranching business (at the CV Plant):  
• Over 400 employees.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:  
• Concerned about additional restrictions  
• Have a hard time attracting people to CV facility because the rents are high.  
• Housing is a significant issue; has always been an issue.

Vision:  
• Have plans to be there  
• Would like to see low income rental housing
Background:
- Founded 1976
- Have forest land in multiple counties including Santa Clara, Mendocino, and Humboldt.
- His whole family lives in Morgan Hill

Current business:
- Lumber business at 10 Madrone, off Dougherty.
- Renewable non-conforming use permit expires November 2005.
- Already do some production of wood-scrap related products: make boxes and lattice on site.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- How has the Greenbelt been defined? The Greenbelt has never thought of wood as an agricultural product. Would like people to start thinking in this direction.
- Seems like the land where they want to do the building is the ‘real greenbelt.’
- Feels like playing Russian Roulette all the time, to have this renewable non-conforming permit
- We’ve run a business here for 30 years; we want to be allowed to stay.

Vision:
- Wants to capture the market for production of wood scrap products
- Has an option on property just to the south of current property. On this property he is considering starting an operation that would store and repackage wood-related products. Would put $1.5 M into this new operation. Products would include: sawdust waste for nursery supply yards; fence posts; lattices; planter boxes; trees in planter boxes.
- Monterey Highway never had an identity except as “blood alley.” Now it will be the Atherton of the South Bay; full of boutique ag production.
- Would like Madrone to re-open onto Monterey Highway
- The greenbelt really belongs in the hillsides
- Want local uses to be allowed to stay
Background

- Victory Outreach is part of an international Pentecostal Church organization.
- Been in San Jose for 25 years. Does not consider the city church-friendly.
- Can’t find another place, have been using rented spaces.
- Need 5 acres of parking and 10,000 square feet for the church
- Has a congregation of 800-1000 people.
- Run programs: T-ball for adults, part of City league & church leagues. For children, hosts Royal Rangers and Missionettes (youth groups like Scouts); offers Sunday School.
- Within the church, lots of service programs as well; pretty expert at dealing with ex-cons.
- Have a strong economic base (25 years); our congregation includes professionals of all sorts.
- Would like to get City/Federal grants.
- Believe we have a constitutional right to worship.
- Church bought the CV property in 1999 for $1.2 M. Real estate agent told us that it was medium agricultural zoning, that we could build 10,000 square foot facility. Found out that it was “Large agricultural” zoning, and couldn’t build. For this to change, we would have to go through a legal process. Originally we had been told that it wouldn’t be difficult, and that we could have a large group assembly (LGA) on medium agricultural zoning.
- A couple of years later, we got a ‘no.’ We did a first environmental report, and still received a ‘no.’ Then we were told we had to do an EIR.
- We are discouraged from doing the EIR. Why should we spend that money when we’ll probably be denied anyway? So we set up the tent as an interim solution.
- The county is suing us.

Constraints/challenges/concerns:

- Need a home
- Biggest problem for all the folks out here (in Greenbelt) is equity.
- We want to be on the upside of capital gain. We want a financial investment.

Vision:

- Facilities for children’s and other programs
- If an LGA is not allowed here, we want to locate in the developed area, ideally next to shared parking, and next to schools and parks.
- We want to have a say on the development and formulation of the greenbelt.
- We like the idea of having an organic farm on the property, provided we can find a place in the developed area. Shared parking and sports facilities would be a good thing.
Conversation regarding the legal dispute over Victory Outreach Church being located in the Greenbelt.

- Greenbelt is exclusive agriculture zoning: 20-40 acre minimum lot size
- No churches are allowed in large scale agricultural zoning.
- 10,000 square foot structures are the maximum allowed in medium scale agricultural zoning
- The church wants 30,000 square feet of structures: sanctuary, church, space for community/social service programs
- The church abandoned its applications and rented a tent.
- County sued the church in August of 2002. Tent was not a rural scale facility.
- She believes that Victory Outreach did not exhaust their remedies because these would have been expensive and because the Church thought they would not be successful.
- Use for agricultural purposes is not realistic.
- Will not allow package sewer.
Environmental, Agricultural & Food System Interests

Agricultural Agencies ...........................................................................................................154

Interviews
Jenny Derry, Executive Director, Santa Clara County Farm Bureau .............................154
Desmond Jolly, Director, Small Farm Center .....................................................................155

Informal Discussions
Aziz Baameur, Small Farm Advisor, UC Cooperative Extension, Santa Clara County .................................................................156
Maria de la Fuente, County Director, UC Cooperative Extension, Santa Clara County and Ron Voss, UC Davis Vegetable Crop advisor and former Director, Small Farm Center ...........................................................................................................157

Local Farmers & Farmer Demand/Land Access Facilitation Organizations ..............158

Interviews
Greg Beccio, Happy Boy Farms ......................................................................................158
Phil Foster, Foster Ranch .................................................................................................159
Peter Van Dyke, Van Dyke Ranch ..................................................................................160

Informal discussions
Greg Beccio, Happy Boy Farm; Paul Hain, John Hain & Son Farms; Reggie Knox, California FarmLink .................................................................161
Reggie Knox and Steve Schwartz, California FarmLink ...................................................162
Brett Melone, Agricultural and Land-Based Training Association ..................................163

Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups ......................................................164

Interviews
Jo Ann Baumgartner, Executive Director, Wildfarm Alliance .......................................164
Erik Vink, Trust for Public Land .......................................................................................165
Don Weden, retired Santa Clara County planner ............................................................166
Tim Wirth, Trust for Public Land ....................................................................................167

Informal discussions
Tom Cronin, Committee for Green Foothills .................................................................168
Tim Frank, Sierra Club; Steve Hammond; Terry Watt, Committee for Green Foothills ..................................................................................................................169
Greenbelt Alliance Meeting, including Pat Congdon, Open Space Authority; Craig Breon, SC Valley Audubon Society; Lloyd Wagstaff, Nature Conservancy; Tom Cronin, Committee for Green Foothills; Michelle Beasley, Greenbelt Alliance; Jeremy Madsen; Melissa Hippard; Eric Carruthers, Friends of the Greenbelt ..........................................................170

Food System Groups .......................................................................................................171

Interviews
Jesse Cool, Palo Alto restaurateur ..................................................................................171
John Dickman, District Manager; Maisie Ganzler, Communications Director; Marc Zammit, Directory of Culinary Support and Development, Bon Appetit Management Company .................................................................173
Background:
- The area is not friendly to agriculture; the remaining viable agriculture in the valley has been shunted to the south.
- In the CV, the best agricultural area is east of the foothills, near the flood plain.
- Have some Farm Bureau members who want to sell.

Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:
- Agriculture is not viable when intermixed with rural residences and ranchettes.
- Specialty crops have not traditionally been grown in Santa Clara County, but they have been grown in Santa Cruz. They started on the coast when land prices got expensive.
- She was not completely supportive of the report “The Feasibility of Maintaining and Enhancing Agriculture in Santa Clara County” (October 2001, AgInnovations).
  Reasons include:
  - It required continued consultant service, and so was self-serving
  - Success depended on farmers’ markets, an invalid assumption, because SCC farmers are selling to wholesale and international markets, with farmers’ markets adjunct at best.
  - The vast majority of those involved in the report were not farmers.
  - Going in a direction not related to farmers.
  - Not reflective of reality of farming in this area

Vision:
- There is a potential for specialty crops to be successful in the area, but there is not a way to force that to happen.
- Have a huge agricultural water quality program going. The aim is to use less water, and fewer inputs; the shift is gradual.
- “Politics and education are our two main forces for change.”
- Think it would be helpful to interview farmers about where they sell their products.

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
- Mary Ellen Dick coordinates agricultural water classes regarding new State water quality control mandates for monitoring runoff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Category:</th>
<th>Interview Date: 9/22/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Derry, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Farm Bureau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>408-776-1684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jderry@sccfarmbureau.org">jderry@sccfarmbureau.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Category:
Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests
Agricultural Agencies

Person:
Desmond Jolly, Director
University of California Small Farm Center

Interview Date: 9/8/04

Contact Information:
530-752-8136
dajolly@ucdavis.edu

Background:
- For statistics on small-scale and specialty crop ag, contact the Nation Ag. Statistics Service.
- Ferry Plaza Farmers’ Market is the exception. Smartest people in farming, prime years (typically younger), highly educated, marketing savvy, hard-working; these farmers are at the pinnacle of the profession, they are the “Olympiads”. But this makes their success and profitability exceptional and not the norm.
- A lot of research is outdated and new research is needed. One of the last best studies was the Small Farm Viability Study for CA (1980), conducted by Tom Haller when he was ED of CAFF.

Vision:
- Marketing is the key!!! Land & marketing need to go hand in hand. Doing a disservice if not programmed to have marketing
- The UC Ag-Tourism database could have utility here
**Stakeholder Category:**
Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests
Agricultural Agencies

**Person:**
Aziz Baameur, Small Farm Advisor
UC Cooperative Extension, Santa Clara County

**Discussion Date:** 10/20/04

**Contact Information:**
(408) 282-3127
abaameur@ucdavis.edu

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- Hard for people in planning to see the integration of urban and rural. CSA’s (Community Supported Agriculture) are an example of this integration.
- In specialty crops, marketing is the biggest limitation. Maybe some form of cooperative might work.
- New regulations will mandate that farmers start monitoring runoff.

**Vision:**
- One of the only things that would work is a CSA. New development would be a potential market. Markets are thriving.

**Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:**
- Uesgui Farm is a big local grower; some peppers, etc.
- George Chiala, pepper grower and processor in Morgan Hill
Stakeholder Category:  
Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests  
Agricultural Agencies

People:
Maria de la Fuente, County Director  
UC Cooperative Extension, Santa Clara County  
Ron Voss, UC Davis Vegetable Crop advisor and former  
Director, Small Farm Center

Discussion Date: 8/30/04

Contact Information:  
Maria - (408) 299-2635 #3  
medelafuente@ucdavis.edu

Ron Voss - (530) 752-1249  
voss@vegmail.ucdavis.edu

Background:
• Emma Prusch Park was deeded to the City. It used to have a more extensive  
  agricultural element.  
• The City of San Jose has a vibrant community gardening program; it could have  
  possibilities for expansion.

Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:
• Concern about the history of the Olin plant in the CV and the subsequent perchlorate  
  issue  
• Are there other hazardous materials issues in the valley that could be problematic for  
  sustainable agriculture?  
• What are the soil conditions? It’s important to have detailed soils information.

Vision:
• Marketing is very critical.  
• Involve 4-H groups

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
• City of SJ – Michele Young (SJ community gardening)
Investigating the idea of purchasing land in Coyote Valley:

- Would like to rent CV land if feasible.
- Spoke to Chris Marchese. Marchese’s well operates at 40 horsepower, and should produce 700-800, but puts out 80.
- Ross Satake, near Marchese, says that his well is shot.
- It will be expensive to fix the pump on a broken well. The water table has dropped, and the wells have collapsed or caved in.
- Most greenbelt parcels have failed wells.
- The hay must be being sprayed; there is little weed in it. This means you can’t convert to organic in a year; it would take three years.
- The land is tight; there is active demand for agricultural land in the CV area.

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:

- Steve Weith, land broker
- Ag Commissioner’s office: you need the APN of parcels in order to inquire whether any pesticide permits have been pulled in the past 3 years.
- George Chiala, a major pepper grower and processor based in Morgan Hill; a percentage of his product is organic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Category:</th>
<th>Interview Date: 10/12/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental, Agricultural, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food System Interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Farmers &amp; Farmer Demand/Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Facilitation Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person:</th>
<th>Contact Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil Foster</td>
<td>P.O Box 249, San Juan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Ranch</td>
<td>Bautista, CA 95045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(831)623-2806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pfoster@pinnacle organic.com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background:**
- Certified Organic for 12 years
- 246.9 acres certified Organic

**Current farming/ranching business:**
- Certified crops: apples, beets, broccoli, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, celery, cherries, corn (fresh), cucumbers, fennel, garlic, lettuces, melons, mixed vegetables, onions, parsnip, peas (fresh), peppers, potatoes, shallots, spinach, squash (summer), squash (winter), strawberries, tomatoes (fresh market), walnuts
- Core crops are shallots, onions, peppers
- Sales: wholesale via distributor/broker, local wholesale, farmers’ market. Sells to Veritable Vegetable, Whole Foods. Does San Jose and Sunnyvale markets.
- Gross per acre: $8-20 K per acre.
- Net per acre, for organic, is generally 10% - 20% of gross. For him this means a net of $800-$4000 per acre. These margins are even more possible in smaller acreages, and when marketing locally and regionally. Smaller farms should go for more direct sales.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- Fuel issue is going to become a bigger issue

**Vision:**
- To have success with organics, you have to want, and believe in, it.
- If you do sales yourself, focus on crops with higher margins.
- Need support in the first few years. Organic farming mentoring. Organic farmers are willing to do a fair amount of mentoring, though there is a limit because they want to maintain a competitive edge.
- Apprenticeship programs are good.
- Many of his workers want to own their own farms
Background:
- Certified Organic for 16 years

Current farming/ranching business:
- 121.65 acres certified Organic
- Certified organic crops: apricots, cherries, fallow, persimmons
- Sales: wholesale via distributor/broker, wholesale including export sales, local wholesale, CSA (community supported agriculture).

Constraints/challenges/concerns:
- Worker compensation is too expensive. Rates go up very quickly.
- Fuel prices have doubled
- Labor is more expensive here – they have to pay more to keep workers in the area
- Other costs: utilities, regulations, property tax (which also continues to rise).
- It is getting hard to turn a profit
- Everything is working against the farmer. It is brutal.
- It’s not pretty for farmers in California. It’s cheaper to operate elsewhere.
- Forget about farming in Santa Clara or San Benito. They restrict what you want to do. There are zoning restrictions on agricultural land.
**Stakeholder Category:**
Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests
Local Farmers & Farmer Demand/Land Access Facilitation Organizations

**People:**
Greg Beccio, Happy Boy Farm; Paul Hain, John Hain & Son Farms; Reggie Knox, California FarmLink

**Site Tour Date:** 10/20/04

**Contact Information:**
(831)252-5669

**Background:**
Paul’s farm is an 80 acre organic farm located in Tres Pinos; crops include walnuts and tomatoes; also pastured poultry. (See page 66 for interview with Greg; and page 70 for background about FarmLink.)

Greg, Paul, and Reggie, toured the Greenbelt to get a sense of the place and to find out more about the potential for farming there.

**Constraints/challenges/concerns:**
- Are farm trails a liability issue? Who will maintain them? SCC Parks & Recreation?
- What are the allowable uses?

**Vision:**
- Opportunity for wild-farm mixed habitat
- Bike/non-vehicular paths along the creeks
- The mushroom compost – perhaps mixed with clay – could potentially be made into a high-value finished compost product; question about whether it could be allowed for organic production would depend on initial inputs.
- All riparian features emphasized, enhanced, and attractive; plants that work well to host beneficial insects and wildlife for farms
- Maximize opportunities for on-farm businesses
- Like the idea of at least one center: distribution, technical, educational center.
- Seasonal crops: hay bales and pumpkins, Christmas trees—need marketing
- Nurseries and animals (goats, chickens) are good ideas
- Pastured poultry can use the new mobile slaughter-house technology
- Idea: educational programming for at-risk groups, etc.
- Horses: stables, riding school
- Linked nutrition education: schools, county health, farm tours.
- Following up, Paul Hain says there are opportunities for others to do pastured poultry, and that he might be interested in partnering with this sort of operation.

**Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:**
- Bob Bugg, UC SAREP soils and entomology expert
California FarmLink was founded in 1998 as a non-profit organization to build family farming and conserve farmland in California by linking aspiring and retiring farmers; and promoting techniques and disseminating information that facilitate intergenerational farm transitions.

**Vision:**

Both FarmLink and ALBA (see following page) have given considerable input over the course of several discussions to register their interest in helping to facilitate connections between the farmers with whom they are working and Greenbelt property owners interested in leasing or possibly selling farmland. These organizations are most interested in specific steps, such as a meeting between property owners and aspiring farmers to explore lease and possibly purchase options.

General input regarding the overall planning includes: maximizing contiguity of ag parcels; prioritization of locating farming areas on the best soil/water conditions; and providing sufficient buffering, preferably multi-purpose for habit value, wind-break, noise/dust buffering, and aesthetics.
ALBA's mission is to advance economic viability, social equity and ecological land management among limited resource and aspiring farmers. ALBA carries out its mission through training, demonstration, technical and marketing assistance, and access to land, at its two bi-lingual education centers in Salinas and Watsonville. In carrying out its mission, ALBA aims to contribute to a more just and sustainable food system.

Serving a primarily Latino audience, ALBA’s work is grounded by the belief that in order for limited-resource and aspiring farmers to gain a foothold within California's highly competitive agricultural sector, they must have access to information, capital, and land. ALBA strives to provide an incubator environment of reduced-risk farming and business opportunities.

ALBA’s mission is carried out by two distinct centers: the Rural Development Center (RDC) located about ten miles south of Salinas; and the Farmer Training and Research Center (FTRC) at the Triple M Ranch, located just south of Watsonville. These programs offer resources, technical assistance, education, training, and information access to families and individuals who aspire to become independent farmers or improve their existing farming operations.

**Person:**
Brett Melone, Director
Agriculture and Land-Based Training Association (ALBA)

**Stakeholder Category:**
Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests
Local Farmers & Farmer Demand/Land Access Facilitation Organizations

**Discussion:** ongoing

**Contact Information:**
(831) 758-1469
brett@albafarmers.org
Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:
- Buffer issues between housing and agricultural uses
- Need to manage for invasive species
- Who is going to monitor the easement?

Vision:
- Trails through farms that connect with wild lands
- Farmers motivated individually to do on-farm conservation
- WFA might be very interested to work together on habitat conservation/creation on a larger, multi-farm scale.
- There is a developing concept for a “Wild-farm easement”, which could provide yet another tool for Greenbelt development.
- Flood mitigation could tie in with new runoff monitoring requirements.
- Need a new entity to manage marketing and easements and provide technical support to farmers. There could also be a marketing angle of for a “wild-farm easement” that could include interpretive signage, etc.

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
- Randy Gray, USDA NRCS
- Local NRCS
- Sustainable Conservation, a NGO that helps to streamline paperwork. Their model might be useful.
- Packard Foundation.
Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:
- At the rural-urban edge, can’t go back to traditional agriculture that has larger parcels and lots of infrastructure
- Need a different model of agriculture: hybridize food systems and land preservation approaches and come up with some new ideas

Vision:
- Food Belt is a good idea
- Pursue marketing links with schools, institutions, food service, consumer-direct, etc.

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
- Models:
  - King County, Washington
  - Peconic Land Trust, Suffolk County, New York (Long Island)
**Stakeholder Category:** Environmental, Agricultural and Food System Interests
Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups

**Person:**
Don Weden, retired Santa Clara County planner

**Contact Information:**
(650) 968-7162
weden@ix.netcom.com

**Interview Date:** 9/22/04

**Background:**
- The most important element in managing projects is managing expectations.
- Expectations are part of existing conditions
- SCC Water District – Measure B has some funds earmarked for trails.

**Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:**
- Toolkit is limited (e.g. rezoning)
- What is a greenbelt? Who will pay? Who will benefit?
- Clustered houses: who will be eligible?
- How much open space dedicated?
- Who would own dedicated open space?
- Zoning is required to be consistent with the general plan.
- If there were a culinary academy, restaurants, would they be feasible on septic?
  Guaranteed to use only local produce?
- Trail system: Where? Whose land? Who will pay?
- How will the greenbelt be implemented? Acquisition, regulation.
- Wildlife corridor for what critters? Mountain lion corridors? Was under impression this would be cross-valley at Tulare Hill
- Failed septic—what about those people who haven’t yet applied?
- What is a realistic build-out scenario?
- Drainage and impermeability issues

**Vision:**
- Buy it out-right, sell it back with an easement.
- Long-term working agriculture as a significant component.
- Greenbelt needs to have successful symbiotic relationship with the urban area
- Recreational use should be passive
- Greenbelt should be included in EIR
- There needs to be a rationale for public investment
- Fund it or forget it.

**Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:**
- Boulder, CO greenbelt as an example.
- Marc Klemencic, with SCC Valley Water District 408-265-2607 #2084
  mklemencic@valleywater.org
### Stakeholder Category:
- Environmental, Agricultural and Food System Interests
- Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups

### Person:
- Tim Wirth, Bay Area Program Director
- Trust for Public Land

### Discussions: ongoing

### Contact Information:
- (415) 495-5660 #346
- tim.wirth@tpl.org

### Vision:
- TPL has been following the Coyote Valley planning for years.
- Is quite interested in partnering in an easement and/or acquisition program; is very good at finding matching funds.
- Would require at least 50% local funding to get matching funds.
- Might be willing to play an interim role, as a managing entity, at least in terms of managing escrow accounts and facilitating deals.
### Stakeholder Category:
Environmental, Agricultural and Food System Interests  
Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups

### Person:
Tom Cronin  
Committee for Green Foothills

### Discussion Date:
9/28/04

### Contact Information:
tom.cronin@hp.com

**Vision:**
- Wants to keep environmental coalition moving forward together.

**Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:**
- Conservation Council, with focus on SCC
- Brian Schmitt (staff at Green Foothills assigned to CV): has met with some of the farmers, has background information, and would know of the different models.
- Farm Bureau of San Mateo County is working with Stanford Masters students to do a marketing report for local agriculture.
**Stakeholder Category:**
Environmental, Agricultural and Food System Interests
Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups

**People:**
Tim Frank, Sierra Club;
Steve Hammond, Wallace, Roberts, and Todd, LLC
Terry Watt, CVSP Task Force

**Discussion Date:** 9/1/04

**Contact Information:**
SHammond@sf.WRTdesign.com
(415) 575-4722
TerryWatt@worldnet.att.net
(415) 563-0543

**Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:**
- High speed rail issue: what will the impact be if and when high speed rail comes through the valley?

**Vision:**
- May be an opportunity for intensive agriculture to contribute to workforce goals of Coyote Valley as a whole.
- Celebrate place and land as part of the plan.
- Perhaps a public garden and the lake get equal play, which might be less expensive.
Stakeholder Category:
Environmental, Agricultural and Food System Interests
Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups

People: Greenbelt Alliance Meeting including:
Jeremy Madsen, Michelle Beasley, Greenbelt Alliance; Pat Congdon, Open Space Authority; Craig Breon; Lloyd Wagstaff; Tom Cronin, Committee for Green Foothills; Melissa Hippard, Sierra Club

Meeting Date: 10/27/04

Contact Information:
Greenbelt Alliance
www.greenbelt.org
(415) 543.6771

Constraints/Challenges/Concerns:
- City doesn’t want to change regulations
- How will the City and County work together?
- What about preservation priorities? Prime natural areas, hillsides.
- Laguna Seca: wetlands would be compromised by playing fields.

Vision:
- In the Greenbelt, Coyote Creek has the highest resource value.
- Large area permanently protected
- There needs to be an entity to promote the Greenbelt plan: design and zoning guidelines, regulatory components
- Regulatory cooperation needed between the City and County
- Co-location of health centers and farmers markets, such as is being looked at/implemented elsewhere.
- Maximize opportunities for agricultural enterprise.
- Need for easements and financing.
- Keep the plan comprehensive and connected to the CV Specific Plan.
- Need development of specifics, strategies, costs, and the involvement of necessary agencies.
- Retain or enhance wetlands.
- The wildlife corridor needs to be buffered from small animal husbandry and equestrian facilities, as well as from residences.
- Also emphasize North-South connectivity.
Background:

I used to keep market gardens in East Palo Alto, wherever we could grow food. That land does not exist any longer. I have taken a piece of Stanford open space and put in 12 beds where Seeds of Change is working with me on a cooking community garden. Drew Harlow, former manager of the Stanford farm, is also working with me. We will grow delicious heirloom veggies and fruit; get the neighborhood, schools, and whoever else involved and participating. I am in the process of building a wonderful outdoor kitchen where we can pick and cook....real connection.

Current businesses:

- JZCool – Casual Deli Café, where I do a lot of catering
- Cool Café (museum café) – at the Cantor Arts Center
- Flea Street – “Struggling white table cloth restaurant that is renovated and wonderful, but hit hard in Silicon Valley’s economic downfall.”
- Use as much locally produced farm products as possible. “All produce is local and seasonal, except when we can’t get things like lemons, onions, garlic. Otherwise the menus in all three [restaurants] have always been seasonal and local.”
- Not sure if she could use more local produce. “I support the people at America Fresh and use Greenleaf who offers organics. So, I try to make sure and not spread too thin in order to be loyal and supportive of these suppliers’ efforts.”
- Regarding featured/named use, in SCC restaurants, of locally produced farm products: “I don’t do that as much as I should. I use it all, but my menu would be ridiculously wordy if I mentioned every farm. Rather...I make a blanket statement right on top of the menu about our support and honor of those who grow our food.”
- Regarding support for locally produced farm products in SCC restaurants, in terms of restaurants participating in events/campaigns that support local agriculture: “Not a lot. I am not sure. I am not as connected as I used to be. But, I know there are more restaurants and chefs aware that gourmet food is locally produced.”

Constraints/challenges/concerns:

- “How often, when speaking publicly, I use the phrase "they took paradise and put up a parking lot". I live in farmland. From the beginning, nearly 30 years ago now, it has been very difficult for me to get farm fresh local for my restaurants. It is ludicrous. I have struggled far more than any restaurant in Berkeley, or SF to get product...and, yet, I live in the Valley of Heart's Delight.
• I support what you are doing and hope that you succeed. Of course, farming or agriculture has to be viable for those working the land. With the value of the land as it is, that choice, for the landowner is not easy.
• Opportunity for broadening demand for use of locally produced farm products in SCC, relates to changed/changing economics of the area. “Many of us were hit very hard. Bigger places might do it. America Fresh tried . . . I couldn’t even invest though I buy first from [that] company. I had no investment money for this, what a disappointment for me.”
• Demand for locally produced foods from other sectors (such as schools and food service): “It is changing. Palo Alto is a disaster. I gave up. . . I think it will turn around, but not sure when and how.”

Vision/Opportunities:
• This is a wonderful endeavor.
• Would be willing to feature Coyote Valley agriculture if this was part of an effort to preserve agriculture.
• “Stanford is doing some cool things. There is a man . . . who is doing remarkable things on the Stanford campus.”
• “I think you should go to Google and other big companies. Start CSA programs and drop off boxes of local food there. That is real volume and real support. I have always wanted to get involved in that kind of a program, but it is beyond my realm of time constraints. I do have an office manager and would love to help with this. I think it would work… I think the time is right and it would be more time and cost effective. It would also get the food into the hands of home cooks.”
• “They could come and cook with me to learn how to use the stuff!”

Suggested Contacts/Follow-up:
• Leaders among SCC restaurateurs in supporting local farms: Village Pub and Greenleaf Produce Company probably knows of others.
• Brian Gardiner, America Fresh
• Nadim, Stanford
**Stakeholder Category:**
Environmental, Agricultural, and Food System Interests

Food System Groups

**People:** John Dickman, District Manager; Maisie Ganzler, Communications Director; Marc Zammit, Director of Culinary Support and Development, Bon Appetit Management Company
(See Attachment Appendix for company brochures.)

**Interview Date:** 10/5/04, 11/8/04

**Contact Information:**
(650) 854-2145

**Background:**
- Parent company (Compass) is very impressed with Bon Appetit’s initiatives
- Growth has been considerable
- We are stakeholders in our local economy

**Vision:**
- Need to bring flavor back to our plate—go seasonal, go regional, preserve farmers
- Use purchasing power to support community.
- Help with distribution.
- Buying locally and participating in local economy can offer very important PR opportunities to the company
- Looking for a setting for ag-tainment for employees, etc.

**Emailed statement from Maisie Ganzler, 12/13/04**
“Bon Appétit Management Company is a $300 million restaurant company with 200 cafés nationwide and over 40 in the Bay Area. Our dream is to be the premier on-site restaurant company known for its culinary expertise and commitment to socially responsible practices. We are a culture drive to create food that is alive with flavor and nutrition, prepared by hand with authentic ingredients. We do this in a socially responsible manner for the well being of our guests, communities and the environment.

“We see the Coyote Valley Greenbelt as possibly playing a key role in our ability to purchase local, sustainable food in the South Bay. To aid in the planning process for this area, we would be willing to provide information about the types, quantities, qualities, and price points of local products we are actively seeking and participate in a market advisory committee for greenbelt farmers. We would also be happy to offer advice on the development of on-farm programs (ag-tainment, team-building cooking classes, company harvest days, etc) that our company might utilize.

“We have great hopes for the agricultural potential of this area and look forward to being one of its largest customers.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Caldon</td>
<td>SC Valley Water District</td>
<td>Yves Zutti- San Jose Public Works/Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Carruthers</td>
<td>CVSP Task Force Team Member</td>
<td>Daryl Boyd, Principle Planner, lead CV environmental analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Congdon</td>
<td>SCC Open Space Authority, General Manager</td>
<td>Get letter from Farmlink and from Rural Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Dando</td>
<td>City of San Jose, Vice-Mayor</td>
<td>Contact Land Trust Alliance for possible models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Felice</td>
<td>Morgan Hill School District, Director of Food Services</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife, CA Fish and Game (Dave Johnston), biologist Gail Rankin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Johnston</td>
<td>CA Dept of Fish &amp; Game, Biologist</td>
<td>Pat Congdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Shoe</td>
<td>SC County Planning, Principal Planner</td>
<td>King's County Farm Day - possible model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedd Faraone</td>
<td>Alliance for Smart Planning</td>
<td>Bonnie Tognazini, Deputy Superintendent over Business Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don &amp; Joyce</td>
<td>Mirassou</td>
<td>Ken Schreiber at the County; Darryl Boyd at the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Perusina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Burch- Redwood Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Snively</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet Johnson</td>
<td>Coyote Garden Center</td>
<td>SCC Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Marchese</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research the ag-business Natural Selection as a prototype operation, and get photos of their headquarters building, which is apparently beautiful and well-sited in an agricultural area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governmental Jurisdictions & Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra Caldon</td>
<td>SC Valley Water District</td>
<td>Yves Zutti- San Jose Public Works/Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Carruthers</td>
<td>CVSP Task Force Team Member</td>
<td>Daryl Boyd, Principle Planner, lead CV environmental analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Congdon</td>
<td>SCC Open Space Authority, General Manager</td>
<td>Get letter from Farmlink and from Rural Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Dando</td>
<td>City of San Jose, Vice-Mayor</td>
<td>Contact Land Trust Alliance for possible models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Felice</td>
<td>Morgan Hill School District, Director of Food Services</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife, CA Fish and Game (Dave Johnston), biologist Gail Rankin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Johnston</td>
<td>CA Dept of Fish &amp; Game, Biologist</td>
<td>Pat Congdon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Shoe</td>
<td>SC County Planning, Principal Planner</td>
<td>King's County Farm Day - possible model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tedd Faraone</td>
<td>Alliance for Smart Planning</td>
<td>Bonnie Tognazini, Deputy Superintendent over Business Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don &amp; Joyce</td>
<td>Mirassou</td>
<td>Ken Schreiber at the County; Darryl Boyd at the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Perusina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Burch- Redwood Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Snively</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet Johnson</td>
<td>Coyote Garden Center</td>
<td>SCC Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Marchese</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research the ag-business Natural Selection as a prototype operation, and get photos of their headquarters building, which is apparently beautiful and well-sited in an agricultural area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Owners & Farmers**

**A. Property Owners Not or No Longer Farming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tedd Faraone</td>
<td>Alliance for Smart Planning</td>
<td>Ron Nunn- installed and maintains ‘orchard’ buffers (from Doug Dahlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don &amp; Joyce</td>
<td>Mirassou</td>
<td>Soil map of the County from the Resource Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Perusina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson Reservoir- aqueduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Property Owners Still Farming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>violet Johnson</td>
<td>Coyote Garden Center</td>
<td>Grass Valley Studios on Dougherty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Marchese</td>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to see photo of high-end nurseries, such as Western Hills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Agricultural Businesses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Wright</td>
<td>Monterey Mushrooms</td>
<td>Research the ag-business Natural Selection as a prototype operation, and get photos of their headquarters building, which is apparently beautiful and well-sited in an agricultural area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Suggested Contacts / Follow-up

### Environmental, Agricultural & Food System Interests

#### A. Agricultural Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aziz Baameur</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Ext. SCC, Small Farm Advisor</td>
<td>Uesgui- big local grower of peppers, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria de la Fuente</td>
<td>UC Cooperative Ext. SCC, Director</td>
<td>City of SJ – Michele Young (SJ community gardening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny Derry</td>
<td>SCC Farm Bureau, Executive Director</td>
<td>Mary Ellen Dick- coordinator of agricultural water classes regarding new State water quality control mandates for monitoring runoff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Local Farmers & Farmer Demand/Land Access Facilitation Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Beccio</td>
<td>Happy Boy Farms</td>
<td>Steve Weith- land broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hain</td>
<td>John Hain &amp; Sons Farms</td>
<td>Bob Bugg, UC SAREP soils and entomology expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Chiala- major pepper grower, processor based in Morgan Hill; a percentage of his product is organic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Environmental and Open Space Advocacy Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Baumgartner</td>
<td>Wildfarm Alliance, Executive Director</td>
<td>Randy Gray, USDA NRCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Cronin</td>
<td>Committee for Green Foothills</td>
<td>Conservation Council, with focus on SCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Vink</td>
<td>Trust for Public Land</td>
<td>Models: Peconic Land Trust, Suffolk County, New York (Long Island); King County, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Weden</td>
<td>SCC Planning (retired)</td>
<td>Boulder, CO Greenbelt as an example. Marc Klemencic- SCC Valley Water District 408-265-2607 #2084 <a href="mailto:mklemencic@valleywater.org">mklemencic@valleywater.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D. Food Systems Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People</th>
<th>Business / Affiliation</th>
<th>Suggested Contacts / Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Cool</td>
<td>Chef/Owner, Village Pub, Manresa - Leaders among SCC restaurateurs in supporting local farms: Greenleaf Produce Co. probably knows of others.</td>
<td>Brian Gardiner- America Fresh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. South Coyote Valley Greenbelt Agricultural Park

A Potential Land Use Concept

At the same time that SAGE was retained by the City of San Jose to produce the Coyote Valley Greenbelt Research Report, SAGE was leading an Urban Edge Agricultural Parks Feasibility Study. This Study, taking place in two phases over two years (2004 - 2005), is funded by the USDA Risk Management Agency (RMA) Community Outreach and Assistance Partnership Program.

There is an overlap in the purpose of the Greenbelt Research and the purpose of the Agricultural Parks Feasibility Study. Therefore, it was decided to include in this Research Report, a potential land use concept for a Coyote Valley Greenbelt Agricultural Park.

The Urban Edge Agricultural Parks Feasibility Study, Final Report Phase I, is available at www.sagecenter.org. A synopsis of the Executive Summary of this Report is included below in order to establish the background and rationale for the AgParks concept as it might apply to the Greenbelt. The potential land use concept for a Coyote Valley Greenbelt Agricultural Park follows this synopsis.

Urban Edge Agricultural Parks Feasibility Study
Final Report Phase I - Synopsis of the Executive Summary

Overview of AgPark Concept
California’s producers of specialty crops, particularly those with limited resources, face the twin challenges of access to affordable land and profitability. At the same time, residents in urban areas such as the San Francisco Bay Area seek to contain sprawl, improve diet and health, and preserve treasured natural landscapes. As these rural and urban problems interact, they may yield some innovative solutions.

The AgriCultural Connection Project25 fosters the shared values of sense of place, culture, and health as means to promote the convergent interests of specialty crop producers seeking a viable living and diverse urban consumers seeking a healthy life. The Project is developing strategies that link solutions to the market- and land-access needs of many producers, with solutions to the diet-related health problems and sprawl-containment needs of metropolitan regions.

The creation of Urban Edge Agricultural Parks is one such potential strategy. Agricultural Parks are a new idea, but the concept draws from various existing models. Such Parks are envisioned as entities that would facilitate secured land tenancy by multiple small producers and that would also provide fresh food and an educational, environmental, and aesthetic amenity for nearby communities. The naming of the concept as a “park” is intended to suggest the continued open space preservation, while at

25 This Project covers a number of related SAGE program areas.
the same time invoking the traditional model of a business park, with multiple tenancies operating under a common ownership structure.

**Phase I Study Goal**

This Phase I Feasibility Study explores the challenges and opportunities of developing Urban Edge Agricultural Parks on two different sites with varying conditions of ownership, agricultural potential, and relationships to urbanized development. The Phase I Feasibility Study’s goal is to demonstrate how such Parks will achieve the objectives of land access for limited-resource specialty crop producers while concurrently creating economic, social, and environmental value at the urban edge through activation of the land in productive uses.

**Study Methodology and Findings**

The study methodology included the following: background research into the historical context for collective farming; research of management and development models; exploration of funding resources; identification of producer’s and access needs; identification and screening of potential sites; and preliminary program planning for two selected sites. These sites were Martial Cottle Park located in San Jose and under the jurisdiction of the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department; and Ardenwood Historic Farm located in Fremont and under the jurisdiction of the East Bay Regional Park District.

**Conclusions and Recommendations for Next Steps**

The research and analysis for this Phase I report outlines the following key opportunities and challenges:

**Opportunities:**

- Land owned by public agencies offers the most near-term opportunities, and public agencies have been most immediately responsive to the AgPark concept. Additional potential sites owned by farmland trusts and preserves, or in private ownership, bear further investigation.
- Many of the opportunity sites emerged from planning processes for public/open spaces. In some cases, non-traditional spaces are being re-evaluated for agricultural potential: rights-of-way, firebreaks, combined agriculture/recreation areas, and for other purposes.
- In response to increased urban sprawl, growing support for non-urban buffers and agricultural preservation in the Bay Area has included mandates for agriculture/green space in some development projects.
- In keeping with trends toward innovative small-scale agriculture and niche marketing, the AgPark model is of interest to those seeking to develop effective collaborative agricultural enterprise and sub-leasing programs.
- Urban edge locations are particularly valued by emerging local-food systems connections.
Challenges:
- The high value of urban edge land in the Bay Area can make costs prohibitive to agriculture.
- Development pressures and local politics create a climate with a low prioritization of agricultural land use.
- Water and resource allotment is a challenge in the Bay Area as with everywhere in California.

Next Steps
Recommendations for next steps in Phase II included the following: organization of focus groups to test needs of potential AgPark producers (and link them with circumstances of specific potential AgPark sites); production of economic analysis of small-scale farming at the urban edge; development of more detailed program, management, and operations plans for the two sites studied to date; and production of new preliminary feasibility studies for additional sites as determined by interest and funding availability. [End of Executive Summary Synopsis.]

South Coyote Valley Greenbelt Agricultural Park - A Potential Land Use Concept

South Coyote Valley is located in the south San Francisco Bay Area between the Cities of San Jose and Morgan Hill. The South Coyote Valley Greenbelt encompasses approximately 3,600 acres of unincorporated land in the southern part of the Valley. Santa Clara County, and the Cities of San Jose and Morgan Hill designated the Greenbelt in their General Plans to serve as a permanent non-urban buffer between the two cities. Potential uses allowed in the Greenbelt include agriculture, recreation, and rural residential development.

San Jose is currently developing a Specific Plan for the northern half of the Valley to accommodate a development program of 50,000 jobs and 25,000 new residents. The Greenbelt is included in the Specific Plan process so that strategies can be formulated to secure it as a permanent greenbelt.

An Urban Edge Agricultural Park that emphasizes small-scale agriculture providing fresh food as well as educational and recreational services to a nearby urban community has great potential as an element in the Greenbelt. In this report, the Coyote Valley Greenbelt Agricultural Park is conceptualized in a general way on two different hypothetical sites, to demonstrate its potential and possibilities in this urban edge setting. It has not been reviewed by the CVSP Task Force, and is therefore not an integral part of the specific plan document. Once the Specific Plan is completed, it is likely that there will be an opportunity for interested stakeholders to assess the AgParks concept for one or more specific sites within the Greenbelt.
Context

Regional Location
Coyote Valley is located in Santa Clara County at the southern tip of the urbanized portion of the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. It is also at the southern edge of the economic region known as Silicon Valley. Located approximately 13 miles south of downtown San José and 7 miles north of downtown Morgan Hill, Coyote Valley is connected to the region by Highway 101, which forms the area’s eastern boundary, and by Monterey Highway and Santa Teresa Boulevard, which extend through the Valley.

Character of the Coyote Valley Today
Coyote Valley is roughly 6 miles long and 2 miles wide. It runs northwest by southeast and is defined by the foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains to the west and the foothills of the Diablo Range to the east. Tulare Hill, Coyote Peak, and the hills of the Laguna Seca formation enclose the north end of the Valley, creating a clear physical break between the urban fabric of San José and rural Coyote Valley. The 7,000-acre planning area generally occupies the flat valley floor formed by these foothills. Coyote Creek and its tributary, Fisher Creek, are the key natural features on the Valley floor, with the riparian vegetation along Coyote Creek providing a pleasing contrast to the grasslands that make up most of the Valley.

Coyote Valley is currently predominantly rural in character, despite its proximity to Silicon Valley and San Jose, the region’s largest city. The Valley currently consists primarily of open space and agricultural lands, with scattered rural residential and agriculture-related development, particularly in the southern half of the Valley. Other existing uses in the Valley include IBM’s Santa Teresa campus, the PG&E electrical substation, the new Metcalf Energy Center, the Riverside Golf Course, the County’s 800+-acre Coyote Creek Parkway, and a handful of commercial and industrial uses along Monterey Highway, including the unincorporated town of Coyote, with its bar, post office, lumber yard, Grange Hall, and bait shops.

Planned Development
San José is currently developing a Specific Plan for the northern half of the Valley to accommodate a development program of the 50,000 jobs and 25,000 residents. Within the next two decades, as the Specific Plan is implemented, the northern half of the Valley will become a vibrant urban place. It will have a mixed-use, high-density urban core designed around a new 60-acre lake and surrounded by transit-oriented neighborhoods. Trail systems and greenways will provide recreational and environmental connectivity to regional parklands to the east and west and to the Greenbelt to the south.

Coyote Valley Greenbelt: Vision and Challenges
In 2000, the City, County, and other stakeholders developed Greenbelt Planning Principles with the following Coyote Valley Greenbelt Vision statement to guide the establishment of the Greenbelt as the northern part of the Valley was developed. The Vision Statement describes the Valley as:
The Coyote Valley Greenbelt should be a unique, rural place of countywide importance, providing permanent separation between the urban areas of the North County and the South County. It should be a special place that:

- Clearly delineates a permanent, non-urban buffer between the urban areas of North County and South County
- Supports and celebrates small scale agriculture and Santa Clara County’s agricultural heritage
- Provides recreational opportunities for residents throughout the county
- Contributes to the quality of life of nearby urban neighborhoods.
- Protects, enhances, and teaches the ecological values of its riparian areas
- Provides safe, convenient recreational linkages to and between the trails and open space lands of the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Diablo Range, as well as to the urban areas to its north and south
- Provides a positive, memorable experience for those who visit or pass through it
- Maintains its rural character
- Can be a source of pride for current and future residents of Santa Clara County
- Is enhanced by the natural appearance of its adjacent foothills

Existing conditions show a reality quite different from this vision. The Greenbelt encompasses almost 400 parcels of land with an average size of less than 10 acres. Agriculture is the predominant land use in terms of acreage, but most fields are fallow and dozens of commercial greenhouses are empty or derelict. Rural residential, the second largest land use, is trending toward new construction of large rural ranchette homes, although there are still many modest older houses, especially on the 1 to 5 acre parcels along streets where subdivisions started before the 1984 Greenbelt designation. Mixed into the landscape are several large light industrial uses including a lumberyard and a prefabricated concrete business, and several large commercial agricultural enterprises including a sod farm and mushroom farm. The overall character is far from most conceptions of a greenbelt. Skeptics state that increased traffic and pollution from the pending development will make the concept of a Greenbelt even more far-fetched.

One major challenge to the implementation of the Greenbelt vision is a financial one. The experience of greenbelt property owners, many of whom are current or retired farmers, is that agriculture is no longer viable. They cite lack of profitability, labor, small parcel size, urban adjacencies, and over-regulation as key problems. Many of these stakeholders are primarily interested in the financial outcome. Some believe that their land values should be similar to values in the northern part of the valley. Others are counting on their land as their retirement plan.

However, there is another set of stakeholders, including environmental and open space groups, aspiring farmers, and local food enthusiasts, who believe that small-scale specialty crop agriculture could be a feasible land use in the Greenbelt. One concept is for a food belt, envisioned as a multi-functional interweaving of agricultural, environmental, recreational, and residential land uses that would complement the mixed-use theme of the planned development. The agricultural element could encompass
multiple specialty crop and small animal operations that emphasize on-farm sales and education as well as direct sales to local consumers and institutions. The food belt concept is generating interest, and also many questions about feasibility in term of economics, demand from new farmers, proximity to a dense urban area, and adjacency of executive homes and farms. In many respects, the Agricultural Parks concept is a microcosm of the food belt concept.

Almost all stakeholders agree that key to the success of the Greenbelt is a holistic plan that links market opportunities (both real estate and agricultural enterprise) with strategic public investment.

**AgPark Concept- General Considerations**

**Site selection**
No particular site has been selected for an agricultural park in the Coyote Valley Greenbelt. The program elements in the following section illustrate a hypothetical mix of AgPark activities as well as potential planning solutions to the particular complexities typical of the Greenbelt. These complexities include working around existing residences and other existing land uses, the incorporation of existing roadways, and linkages to existing parklands.

Soil quality and composition will determine the varied value and viability of agricultural land in the greenbelt. Particularly for organic and intensive agriculture, previous use (or disuse) by conventional farms and greenhouses indicates the possibility of very different necessary input by new farmers. It is suggested that guaranteed long-term access to the land would allow farmers the security to transition to organic and intensive agricultural practices.

The relatively high water table in Coyote Valley allows for easy access via wells. Most parcels have existing wells although many of these need retrofitting. The expectation is that there will be sufficient water for the urban area and for expanded agricultural uses.

**Existing Land Uses**
Current land use/state of development is one of the larger issues facing the Coyote Valley planning process. In order to be feasible, the AgParks concept needs to demonstrate the flexibility of encompassing two or three undeveloped parcels of land or of falling over a larger number of smaller plots, interspersed with already developed sites.

**Connections to Adjacent Park Land**
On both the eastern and western edges of the Coyote Valley Agricultural Greenbelt are regional parklands that can be accessed via sites along the edge. Connections with these should be a primary consideration in the site planning of an agricultural park.

**Land Rehabilitation**
An agricultural suitability analysis of the lots would determine much of a park’s site plan. Much of the Greenbelt is underutilized and some lots are currently in industrial use.
Fallow land, neglected orchards, abandoned greenhouses and other land not currently in agricultural use may need extensive site mitigation before being put into agricultural production. It may be best to use the least suitable lots for non-agricultural program elements.

**Circulation**

The report does not propose extensive recreational trails or park space. Rather, it proposes establishing a combined recreational trail and farm service network. The historic intensity of agricultural uses limits existing “natural” areas, while the adjacent regional parklands, such as the Coyote Creek Parkway, offer extensive recreational trail networks. Therefore, this study recommends creating linkages to regional parklands, rather than developing additional amenities on-site. Furthermore, the existing road network would most likely bisect an agricultural park in the Coyote Valley Greenbelt. For safety and circulation reasons, this report recommends keeping recreational trail users and farmers off main thoroughfare roads by providing a separate circulation network. Existing and new hedgerows and buffer strips between plots are opportunities for additional multi-use recreational trails.

**Economic Viability and Funding**

Finally, in this initial phase, the challenging issue of current land values is not addressed. Subsidies, land trusts, and incentives to keep the land in agricultural production will probably be a necessary component of the Greenbelt strategic plan, regardless of whether or not it becomes an AgPark.

**Management**

The project obviously could not develop a management plan or draft a pro forma for a Coyote Valley Greenbelt AgPark without studying a specific site. However, the Greenbelt Research to date and antecedent research both point to the need for a dedicated entity to help pro-actively develop, oversee, and market the agricultural element of the Greenbelt, in order to help ensure its success. This will be particularly necessary in so far as a more comprehensive Food Belt concept is implemented.

**AgPark Concept- Potential Program Elements**

The overall AgPark concept is envisioned as encompassing about a hundred to several hundred acres. To accommodate this range, the following potential elements are also described in a range of scales.

**Agricultural Operations**

- Farm Plots: could include multiple small lots (~3-7.5 ac), medium lots (~8-15 ac), and large lots (~16-40 ac). The small lots could best accommodate intensive row-cropping of specialty vegetables, herbs, and flowers; and small nursery businesses. The medium lots could accommodate more mixed cropping systems, small fruits such as can berries, and also small-scale animal and dairy operations. The larger lots could
accommodate orchards (including existing orchards) and tree farms in addition to the other uses.

- **Greenhouse:** existing greenhouses could be incorporated into the AgPark, operated by a single producer and/or used as a shared propagation facility and/or for crop research. There is potential to heat the greenhouse from local compost byproduct.

- **Animal Husbandry:** There is an opportunity to establish small-scale commercial animal husbandry operations, such as pastured poultry. In bio-intensive farms, animal operations are often rotated with other cropping systems for fertility and disease and weed control. A 4-H or other institutional research facility is proposed. This could include barns and corrals, but there is no grazing land per se. An appropriately scaled recreational equestrian center could also be incorporated.

- **Farm Equipment Storage:** an acre or less could be dedicated to shared farm equipment storage and a shared machine shop.

- **Farm Service Routes:** such circulation through and/or around the AgPark could potentially be combined with or created parallel to mixed-use recreational trails.

### Educational Facilities

Educational programming is a core element of the AgPark operation, in terms of public relations, income diversification, and basic philosophy to cultivate public access. There are numerous examples of educational farms to draw from, both those for which education is the primary activity and those which offer educational programming as an adjunct to a farming business. A sampling of the kinds of activities offered include the following:

#### Passive or minimally staffed:

- Interpretive signage
- Demonstration gardens
- Petting zoo
- Equipment and artifact museum

#### Staffed

- Field days for schools, public, and private groups
- Summer camps for children
- ‘Week at the farm’ programs for school groups
- Customized ‘ag-tainment’ activities for private groups and businesses
- On-farm research projects conducted in conjunction with an educational institution

### Recreational Facilities

- **Trails:** recreational trails would be a major feature of the AgPark. Obviously, these would need to be well managed for purposes of liability and maintenance, requiring at the least, creation of appropriate buffers and establishment of interpretive signage.

- **Horseback riding:** this has been identified as an important desired use. Riding trails through the Greenbelt would provide a connection between riding trails in the Coyote Creek Parkway and in regional parks to the west, and thus significantly expand the
overall equestrian capacity of the south county. An equestrian facility could be part of a diversified AgPark operation in terms of both income and sustainable management, provided it did not fall into the large group assembly restriction.

**Commercial/Concessions and Public Access**

- **Market/Produce stand:** such an onsite facility would be important for attracting on-farm business. Ideally it would have a certified kitchen for preparing value-added products and possibly for serving some of these products on-site in a ‘market café’. Such a facility could be developed in conjunction with the packing and shipping infrastructure needed for the AgPark products.
- **Historic house, if there was one, or a new facility could incorporate a small bed and breakfast operation and/or restaurant.**
- **Outdoor Event Space, Lawn, Gazebo:** Associated with market stand, bed and breakfast operation or visitor center; available for private events.
- **Entry Feature/Main Entry Road:** for the purposes of identity and visibility, it would be desirable to develop a notable entry to the park, with landscape features and signage.
- **Parking:** there would need to be sufficient public parking to support the proposed uses. Potentially, this parking area could be paved with permeable materials.

**Housing**

Ideally, there would be on-site housing for the families farming the AgPark. This need could be accommodated by siting the AgPark over properties that either already have houses or have permits for homesites. In addition, current regulations allow for many current homesites to build one or more extra ‘granny’ units. Any new homesites constructed could be relatively modest and designed and sited as part of the overall AgPark plan.

**Conclusions**

The Coyote Valley Greenbelt as a whole has enormous potential to provide an active urban buffer, with a mix of viable economic uses such as agriculture and visitor-serving and recreation activities, while at the same time providing resource protection and a visual and physical amenity to more urban development to the north and south. Local municipalities have a vested interest in developing and implementing a feasible plan to realize the Greenbelt vision. San Jose wants to help create a vibrant Greenbelt as an integral part of the Coyote Valley Specific Plan. Santa Clara County wants to set a positive precedent for Greenbelts and Urban Growth Boundaries elsewhere in the County.

A Coyote Valley Agricultural Park is a concept that in many ways epitomizes the Greenbelt vision of supporting small scale agriculture, providing recreational linkages to surrounding regional park areas, and contributing to the quality of life of nearby urban neighborhoods.
# Appendix E. General Resources

The following list includes key organizations involved in various aspects of small scale farm viability and farmland preservation in California.

## Organizations

### Research and Farmer Education Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Small Farm Center</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sfc.ucdavis.edu">www.sfc.ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Serves as a clearinghouse for questions from farmers, marketers, farm advisors, trade associations, government officials and agencies, and the academic community. Organizes and coordinates statewide conferences and workshops; publishes manuals and other publications about small scale farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sarep.ucdavis.edu">www.sarep.ucdavis.edu</a></td>
<td>Provides leadership and support for scientific research and education in agricultural and food systems that are economically viable, conserve natural resources and biodiversity, and enhance the quality of life in the state's communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension, Santa Clara County Office</td>
<td><a href="http://cesantaclara.ucdavis.edu/">http://cesantaclara.ucdavis.edu/</a></td>
<td>Statewide, UCCE works toward the development and protection of the state’s land, resources and people. Includes more than 400 campus-based specialists and county-based farm, home, and youth advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Center for Agroecology &amp; Sustainable Food Systems</td>
<td><a href="http://zzyx.ucsc.edu/casfs/index.html">http://zzyx.ucsc.edu/casfs/index.html</a></td>
<td>A research, education, and public service program dedicated to increasing ecological sustainability and social justice in the food and agriculture system. On the UCSC campus, the Center operates the 2-acre Alan Chadwick Garden and the 25-acre Farm. Both sites are managed using organic production methods and serve as research, teaching, and training facilities for students, staff, and faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sare.org">www.sare.org</a></td>
<td>Serves farmers, ranchers, researchers, and consumers. Provides grants and information to Improve Profitability, Stewardship and Quality of Life.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organic and Small Farm Marketing Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Certified Organic Farmers (CCOF)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ccof.org">www.ccof.org</a></td>
<td>Offers a premier national and international organic certification program for growers, processors, handlers, and retailers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Organics</td>
<td><a href="http://www.marinorganic.org">www.marinorganic.org</a></td>
<td>A cooperative association of Marin County organic producers dedicated to improving farming practices, promoting the ethical, creative, and patient enterprise of sustainable agriculture, and encouraging a preference for locally produced food. Provides certification and workshops for farmers and education programs for retailers about organic foods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgTourism Workgroup</td>
<td><a href="http://groups.ucanr.org/Ag_Tour/">http://groups.ucanr.org/Ag_Tour/</a></td>
<td>Facilitates research and extension education activities that add to the rural and agricultural sectors through the development of agri-and nature-tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFA California Organic Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/is/fveqo/organic.htm">http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/is/fveqo/organic.htm</a></td>
<td>Certifies California farmers as organic. Protects producers, handlers, processors, retailers and consumers of organic food sold in California by assuring that foods labeled as organic are, in fact, organic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFA Certified Farmers’ Market Program</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cdfa.ca.gov/is/fveqc/cfmprogram.htm">www.cdfa.ca.gov/is/fveqc/cfmprogram.htm</a></td>
<td>Certifies California farmers and farmers’ markets to sell direct to consumers. Verifies that each farmer is selling products that they themselves have grown or produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Harvest</td>
<td></td>
<td>LocalHarvest maintains a definitive and reliable &quot;living&quot; public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
http://www.localharvest.org/  nationwide directory of small farms, farmers markets, and other local food sources. Our search engine, built entirely over Open Source software components, helps people find local sources of sustainably grown food, and encourages them to establish direct contact with family farms in their local area.

**Small Farm Advocacy and Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Alliance with Family Farmers</td>
<td>A nonprofit that is building a movement of rural and urban people to foster family-scale agriculture that cares for the land, sustains local economies and promotes social justice. Program areas include Biological Farming, Community Food Systems and Economic Options, and Risk Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis <a href="http://www.caff.org">www.caff.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Farming Association</td>
<td>Hosts conferences and workshops on various sustainable agriculture topics. The main activity is organizing the annual Ecological Farming Conference, now in its 25th year. Held at Asilomar every January, this conference attracts over 1,000 farmers, researchers, educators, and marketers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville <a href="http://www.eco-farm.org">www.eco-farm.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Farm Succession and Farmer Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California FarmLink</td>
<td>A non-profit organization that builds family farming and conserves farmland in California by linking aspiring and retiring farmers, and by promoting techniques and disseminating information that facilitate intergenerational farm transitions. Resources include workshops, case studies, and linkage services between retiring and aspiring farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol, Davis <a href="http://www.farmlink.org">www.farmlink.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Land-Based Training Program</td>
<td>A non-profit organization that promotes economically viable agricultural production that concurrently protects the environment through sustainable methods. Two programs, the Rural Development Center (RDC) and the Farmer Training and Research Center (FTRC), offer resources, technical assistance, education, training, and information access to families and individuals who aspire to become independent farmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas <a href="http://www.albafarmers.org">www.albafarmers.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Valley Center</td>
<td>A non-profit organization working to make the Great Central Valley a better place to live. GVC's staff provides extensive resources, technical assistance, and information in areas such as Leadership Development, Agriculture, Resources, Economic Development, Technology, and Youth Leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto <a href="http://www.greatvalley.org">www.greatvalley.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Farm Alliance</td>
<td>Promotes a healthy, viable agriculture that helps protect and restore wild Nature. Resources include: briefing papers, biodiversity articles, and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville <a href="http://www.wildfarmalliance.org">www.wildfarmalliance.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land Trusts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marin Ag. Land Trust (MALT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.malt.org">www.malt.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood Ag. Land Trust (BALT)</td>
<td>(925) 516-5405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.openspacetrust.org">www.openspacetrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Valley Conservancy</td>
<td><a href="http://easement.addr.com/tvc/index.html">http://easement.addr.com/tvc/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sonoma-county.org/opensp">www.sonoma-county.org/opensp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capay Valley Vision</td>
<td><a href="http://www.capayvalleyvision.org">www.capayvalleyvision.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano Land Trust</td>
<td><a href="http://www.solanolandtrust.org">www.solanolandtrust.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Publications:** A sampling of publications of utility and relevance to the Coyote Valley Greenbelt

*Agritourism and Nature in California: A How-To Manual for Farmers and Ranchers*
University of California, Division and Agriculture and Natural Resources, 2002

*Building Better Rural Places: Federal Programs for Sustainable Agriculture, Forestry, Entrepreneurship, Conservation, and Community Development*[^26]
A publication of USDA in collaboration with The Michael Fields Agricultural Institute and the National Center for Appropriate Technology, 2004

*2004-2005 California Agricultural Directory*
California Farm Bureau Federation, 2004

*California Agriculture: Dimensions and Issues*
UC Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, 2003

*Farmland Protection Action Guide*
Institute for Local Self-Government, 2002

*The Feasibility of Maintaining & Enhancing Agriculture in Santa Clara County*
AgInnovations Network, October 2001

*Feasibility Study for Urban Edge Agricultural Parks*
Produced by Sustainable Agriculture Education 2004
Urban Edge Agricultural Parks are envisioned as entities that would facilitate secured land tenancy by multiple small farmers, and provide fresh food and an aesthetic, educational, and environmental amenity for nearby communities. The Study investigated organizational models, funding sources, farmer demand, and potential projects in the Bay Area. It also produced preliminary concepts for three specific sites, two owned by regional parks districts and a third being planned as an urban-rural buffer. Partners for those sites have similar goals of continuing agriculture, incorporating recreation and education, and creating linkages with surrounding urban communities.

*Hedgerows for California Agriculture: A Resource Guide*
Community Alliance with Family Farmers, 2004

*2005 Trends in Agricultural Land and Lease Values*
California Chapter of the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, 2005

*Working Landscape Plan*

[^26]: This publication includes USDA funding resources for sustainable agriculture and farmland conservation, but other sources exist as well. The Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems Funders, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Wellness Foundation, and the Cal Endowment are some of the major funders in this field.