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INTRODUCTION

HAROLD O. CARTER
Director
UC Agricultural Issues Center

Since the UC Agricultural Issues Center was established in 1985 we have conducted and coordinated research and outreach on important issues confronting California agriculture. These issues generally have a public policy component. In this case, we have selected an issue that is contentious, complex, and timely.

The Center first called attention to the growing problems of the rural-urban fringe in 1990 during a two-year study of the forces of change in the Central Valley. There was considerable interest in urban fringe problems at that time, and it has since grown. We also have looked at related topics such as third-party effects of water transfers and the water quality impacts of animal agricultural production.

A QUESTION OF COEXISTENCE

As we approach the 21st Century, a unique and historic relationship has developed between farmers and city people in the state of California. This relationship is important because California is home to a very large and almost entirely urbanized population, and, at the same time, to a very large and highly industrialized agriculture.

Climate, soil and water resources, as well as technology and management systems, contribute to California’s role as a world leader in diversified farm production. Agriculture is not only an economic mainstay for the state; it’s a global resource. However, in numbers of people involved, there is an enormous imbalance between farms and cities in California. Almost one-third of the state’s vast land area is in commercial agriculture—either cropland or rangeland—and yet not one out of a hundred Californians is a farmer or a rancher.

So a very large and diverse agricultural system in California has to co-exist with an overwhelmingly urban population. But does this mean that tension between city people and farmers is inevitable? The answer to that question is: Probably yes. There’s certainly going to be urban-rural competition for scarce resources like water...But we’re concerned here with another set of problems: those located at the agricultural-urban boundary. These are the result of proximity. You can’t locate that many people next door to that much cultivated cropland, or land where animals are raised, without inconveniencing somebody.

Underlying all this is a more subjective issue of values. Different people see the same orchard or the same field of tomatoes or the same cattle on pasture, and appreciate what they’re looking at—but for different reasons.

(From Farmers and Neighbors: Land Use, Pesticides and Other Issues, UC Agricultural Issues Center, March, 1996.)
About a year ago the Center convened a small workshop called *Farmers and Neighbors: Land Use, Pesticides and Other Issues*, and later published a 72-page report with the same title. (See box on previous page.) This was at the suggestion of Cal-EPA and the California Department of Food and Agriculture, who were involved with local controversies about pesticide drift and related problems, and found that even broader issues needed to be considered. The workshop and the publication that resulted identified an array of problems perceived by diverse interests at the ag-urban interface. (See box below.)

As one result, the Center recognized that if agriculture is to remain a significant economic and cultural force in California, it is imperative that we move beyond simply looking at problems and consider some of the solutions to reduce conflict at the urban edge.

---

**PROBLEMS TO ADDRESS**

The farm-city edge problems most commonly cited by farmers and by their urban neighbors tend to be localized and specific. They include:

**Farmers:**
- Restraint on what otherwise would be routine practices such as spraying and cultivating.
- Liability for trespassers.
- Theft, vandalism, litter.
- Damage from dogs.
- Imported pests—for example, weeds spreading from urban areas.
- Increased traffic on local roads.

**Urbanites:**
- Pesticide use, particularly the problem of drift.
- nighttime activities involving lights and noise.
- Odor, particularly from livestock operations and food processors.
- Dust and smoke.
- Flies, mosquitoes and other pests.
- Tractors and farm machinery on local roads.

Both groups also cite more general economic or environmental concerns arising from proximity. For example, the higher cost of farmland close to cities can be a serious problem for agriculture. Urbanites may be concerned about water quality implications and competition for land needed for natural habitat, recreation or urban waste disposal. In addition, uncertainty or unpredictability of future land use at the expanding edge can be a disadvantage to both farmers and urbanites.
Consequently, the Center organized a conference on December 4, 1996, in Sacramento with the goal of suggesting ways to help farmers and non-farmers live as neighbors. This report, a summarized proceedings of that conference, focuses on:

- Technological developments and farming practices that help individual farmers co-exist with their urban neighbors.

- Land use planning, community design and other public sector techniques that help preserve farmland and maintain a viable agriculture, particularly near urbanized areas.

Planning for this AIC project has been predicated on four assumptions:

- Population growth in the state will continue.

- A crucial goal for California is to preserve its internationally recognized agricultural capacity, which means adequate amounts of land must be preserved for farming.

- Farmland has different values to different people.

- Urban expansion will continue to be the overriding force for land use unless agricultural and urban interests work together.

The issues raised in this report, many of them involving crucial public policy decisions, will significantly influence the future quality of living in California—in particular for those millions of Californians who experience each day the interface between cities and farms.

For their assistance in planning and organizing the conference, thanks are due to Mary Handel and Al Sokolow, who also took part in the program; and especially to Stephanie Weber Smith and Marcia Kreith of the Center staff.

********

Editors' note:

The December 4 conference was composed of a series of talks followed by extensive discussion from panelists as well as the audience. In this report, these additional comments are presented in "boxes" at appropriate locations in the main text, and not necessarily in the order in which they were given. For the actual program, see appendix, page 74.
The title of this presentation asks the right question; it indicates that there is a broader context for the problem of the urban edge. When we discuss regional planning and regional cooperation, we are really talking about a large number of individual problems that add up to one rather big one. This larger problem is complex and seems intractable, but the individual pieces still cannot be dealt with in isolation because each interfaces with the others.

Actual cooperation across local governmental boundaries often appears extremely unlikely; that is the challenge. It's not that people are not convinced of the necessity. The need for regional cooperation and long-term, large-scale regional planning is obvious because there are such huge, startling visual examples of the lack of planning, such as the Los Angeles area. Incidentally, Californians aren't the only ones who seem not to have learned from Los Angeles. For example, within the last two decades Taipei had every possibility of avoiding the long-range problems that places like Los Angeles have brought upon themselves, but it didn't happen. Even in the face of what clearly was coming, there were so many other forces that available solutions could not be put in place.

The San Francisco Bay Area transportation maze is another good example. It started when communities between Sacramento and the Bay Area began developing very rapidly. Apparently it was not understood when those environmental impact reports were written that people would be willing to commute longer and longer distances. As a result, housing developments originally designed to serve local needs have become bedroom communities for Bay Area workers.

Over a period of ten years, traffic on I-80 during most hours of the morning and evening changed from smooth-flowing to surging to stop-and-go from the Pinole area all the way to the Bay Bridge. More recently, I've seen those early "surging" symptoms in the Davis-to-Sacramento commute. Clearly, the Sacramento re-
region is moving into the first stage of the huge traffic difficulties that occurred in the Los Angeles area, then in the Bay Area. Similarly, air quality in the Sacramento area has diminished in recent years, primarily because of increased motor vehicle traffic.

**Focus on the problem**

So the need for cooperation across boundaries, between communities and between governmental structures, is not the question. The question is how we get from here to there—from identifying the problem to identifying the solutions.

About two years ago in the Sacramento area, certain leaders, non-politicians for the most part (one doesn't necessarily follow from the other), saw the need and had some hope that the Sacramento metropolitan area can avoid the problems of Los Angeles and the Bay Area. They began working toward solutions, setting out on what they realized was a tortuous and difficult journey.

They called themselves Valley Vision. Primarily business people, they had a vision about quality of life. They were interested in economic development but they believed that in the long term, quality of life—which, they assume, requires regional cooperation—will be much more important than the individual problems often seen as inhibitors to economic growth.

Their first report is just finished. It describes symptoms of the enormous planning problem facing us. It provides all the data you need to convince yourself of the urgency of this problem for the Sacramento metropolitan area.

Similarly, last October, The Sacramento Bee published an excellent series of articles on the need for regional thinking and planning. Dorsey Griffith was the primary author. The articles were followed by forums in which the editor of the Bee, Gregory Favre, brought together about 18 Sacramento metropolitan area leaders to discuss potential solutions.

The first forum reiterated the symptoms and signs of the problem as it exists and as it will in the near term. A second addressed the problem of solutions, as well as the composition of the group of people that should be taking the lead. Members of the Sacramento Bee Forum had a somewhat different view about the involvement of politicians. Their attitude was that people in elected positions, whether county supervisors or city council members or state representatives, need to participate early in the process of developing solutions.
Meanwhile, Valley Vision’s view was that politicians face difficulty because they have obligations to the people who elected them. It’s hard for them to make decisions that might be good for the whole, but would damage the group they are responsible to. This is a significant problem, and there has been much discussion about it.

*Identifying the real problem*

If we are to pursue solutions, in contrast to the much easier task of identifying problems, there are some basic postulates to consider. First, one doesn’t have to get very deep into regional planning and regional thinking to realize that misperception of the problem is a common difficulty. There is a tendency to believe that we understand the problem, and then, after much study, to realize that in fact it’s only a symptom.

For example, there is the extreme importance of quality of life in our communities. That, in fact, should be the primary goal of economic development in a metropolitan area—rather than dealing exclusively with short-term problems such as luring companies by providing sources of venture capital or creating tax incentives. If we truly want to attract and keep the kinds of companies that we need in this area, companies that are agents for economic development, then the real problem is maintaining quality of life.

Another misidentified problem has to do with developers and development. I realize this issue is debatable, but in fact developers are producing a product that is highly sought. We see housing developments go up and ask ourselves: "Who’s going to buy all of those houses?"—and a year later they’re all sold. So developers are producing a needed product; they are not the primary problem. The primary problems that must be addressed by regional thinkers are the difficulties that accrue from dense populations—for example, air quality and transportation problems, or low-income areas that generate crime. We’ll be better off dealing with those real problems instead of believing that the problem will be solved if we just control developers or charge them high fees.

I’m chagrined myself by the fact that construction of housing has changed from being the product of hardworking individual carpenters who make a modest living to individuals who make millions of dollars. The problem is that the potential for making millions of dollars can cause strange and unusual behavior in all of us. But again we have to remember that the developers are supplying a product that a large portion of our population wants. Developer intentions are not the primary problem.
What is the role of research and education?

Putting money and effort into research that solves technical problems resulting from lack of regional planning is important. I believe the University has an obligation and a role to play. An example is the air quality problems resulting from rice straw burning. There have been great advances in that particular area—nothing that solves the whole problem, but enough to demonstrate how much we need research that deals with individual pieces of larger problems.

Similarly, we at UC Davis and two other university campuses are developing automobiles that are less likely to damage air quality. One is a hybrid vehicle that runs on both gasoline or some other petroleum product, and on electrical power. It uses the petroleum product only at high speeds when the fuel burn is most efficient, and at those speeds its batteries are recharging. Then when it reaches a residential or urban area, the power train switches over to the batteries. This may well be the vehicle of choice for the longer term. Only time will tell us that, but we do know that the hybrid vehicle can diminish the problems of air pollution. However, in the final analysis, we probably have to get people out of cars regardless of air quality problems. That is, treating symptoms starts at the wrong end of the problem, and doesn't consider the entirety.

Other activities important to regional planning and long-term solutions include education, which in some shape or form has a role to play in solving all societal problems. People have to have the same basic knowledge about problems and their implications if they are going to pursue solutions together.

However, educating urban residents to the economic benefits of agriculture—as we have learned again and again during the last two decades—is not as easy as one might think. With less than 2 percent of our citizens having any connection to production agriculture, I have been led to conclude that most people are not aware of the sources of their food. Perhaps subconsciously, they believe that food is somehow produced in the back rooms of the supermarket and wheeled out to the shelves and the meat bins. The continuation of the animal rights movement (albeit with different tactics, because they are now dealing with curricula at the elementary school level) and the Alar scare—these and other misunderstandings are ongoing reminders of the public's need for knowledge in this area.
Role of local agencies

Meanwhile, discussions about the need for regional planning have generally concluded that we shouldn't even think about regional government. In fact, the push should be toward more decentralized government, since the best solutions usually are made by people who are closest to the action. Therefore, we must work through existing organizations; yet we have to develop a regional capacity for coordinating them. For example, various public transportation agencies need to work together to coordinate their schedules at city and county boundaries. That seems very obvious; I mention it only to emphasize how far we have to go in our thinking about the regional transportation network.

This brings us to the very difficult task of deciding who takes the lead. Who foots the bill? Who decides priorities? Who acts? Governmental agencies will have a difficult time because of the obligations of politicians to specific groups of people who elected them.

Clearly, there are visionaries who are trying to stimulate at least a discussion of likely structures for decision-making bodies. During these deliberations, it has been suggested, and not just by me, that UC Davis, CSU Sacramento and the community colleges have a role to play. Our major input would be to provide forums that could have greater credibility than those of other public agencies or governmental units. Also, universities need to make sure that all of the resources at our disposal, like the Agricultural Issues Center, conduct the research needed to make the best decisions. Those final decisions, however, will rest with the citizens, the stakeholders of the metropolitan area.

Some metropolitan areas across the country—very few, I might add—have had some success in regional thinking and regional planning. We know a bit about these communities, but we need to study more closely the history and the tactics that were used in communities such as Minneapolis/St. Paul. It is apparent, though, that there is no single solution. Each metropolitan area is unique, and requires individualized solutions.

We will continue to work on research necessary to solve problems and on education of people to understand those problems and their solutions. That will be one track. The second track will be to pick off the problems one at a time while making absolutely certain that we are pursuing solutions to individual problems in the context of the whole.

And in the final analysis, enactment of those solutions is absolutely essential. If they cannot be enacted, they are not really solutions.
Photo from *Farmers and Neighbors*
Agriculture as an industry is vital to California, but we also have a very large urban population that will continue to grow and is involved in numerous other economic activities. One of the issues is jobs, since agricultural production and processing provide about 1.2 million jobs, almost 9 percent of the state's total employment. That generates about 8.5 percent of the state's personal income. The ripple effect of this agriculture-related activity generates even larger numbers—jobs in construction, finance, transportation, services, and so on.

Furthermore, California agriculture is a primary food source, not only for the United States but for the world. In the United States alone, more than half of our fruits, nuts and vegetables come out of California. With a growing population and the need for healthy diets, that is an issue with widespread significance.

Problems of the environment

There also are environmental issues. A primary one, air pollution, cuts both ways. Agriculture causes some air pollution problems through agricultural burning and dust. However, motor vehicles are the leading cause of air pollution in California. With increased urbanization, and in the absence of good planning for moving people between their homes and their jobs, the air pollution problem is going to get worse.

We have made much progress in the area of air pollution. In Cal-EPA's annual environmental indicators report we can easily see that air quality is improving in the state, in all categories. But the fact is that in certain areas—and the Central Valley is one of those areas—the geography is such that if we continue to urbanize and manage growth poorly, our ability to continue im-
Nutter:

Ag-urban edge issues hinge on two different areas: (1) existing commercial or housing developments, with their current problems and (2) future development. We can address the existing areas with conditions on pesticide permits and other methods. We deal with the new areas through the planning process; however, these decisions may be forced on you. One issue in Monterey County concerns the requirement for a certain amount of farmworker housing. If possible, you don’t put that housing out in the middle of an agricultural area—but sometimes boards of supervisors are forced into making such decisions.

One of the issues faced by county ag commissioners involves permits for the use of pesticides. To minimize the impact on neighbors, we can restrict or modify the use and timing of chemicals, whether by air or by ground. It’s important that the grower have a communication network with the surrounding property owners, so they can be involved in the decision-making and be aware of what is happening. For example, the methyl bromide issue is currently causing a lot of controversy, and we’ve developed a program to notify the homeowners. Also, the pest control operator and the grower both communicate with them. This can reduce some of the potential problems, but there will still be problems as long as we use pesticides.

Different groups are involved. One is residents who live in an area and accept the fact that chemicals will be applied. Others might have been exposed to drift, and they are concerned. Still another group has social change in mind. They are causing most worry among agriculturists now because they believe chemicals ought to be eliminated and we ought to grow strictly without chemicals. Of course, there is an organic niche in the market. Out of our $2 billion-plus farm income in Monterey county, about $2 million fits into the organic category. I think that’s going to increase, but we’re certainly not going to move over to organic right away.

Proving air quality will diminish. That would mean greater economic costs in meeting air standards.

Except for burning, agriculture has generally not become involved in air quality issues; it’s considered more of a Los Angeles-San Francisco metropolitan problem. But the fact is, air pollution is an important economic issue for agriculture. It already is causing documented crop yield losses—25 percent is the number cited, and as a farmer I would take a 25 percent yield increase any time.

Water quality and competition for water raise other environmental issues. As our population grows, there are far more demands for water to support urban areas and at the same time meet some environmental needs, particularly of the Delta. Agriculture’s use of water is projected to decrease over the next 10 to 20 years, due to greater efficiencies and some land coming out of production. In addition, water quality, primarily pollution from non-point sources, is an important issue for agriculture. Cal-EPA deals a lot with point source pollution, the kind that comes out of a pipeline at a factory—but non-point sources are considered the next frontier in water quality.

The issue of endangered species also cuts both ways. Agriculture has caused some problems in the protection of endangered species, but I’ve never seen a good habitat for these species in an urban area. Agriculture really is a major way to solve the endangered species problem—for example, what the rice farmers have done to increase waterfowl populations in the Northern Valley.

Urbanization impact on land use

For Californians, most of whom live in cities, a primary public policy issue involves the loss of prime farmland to urban growth. This is a crucial threat, although obviously things could change with good planning. The Los Angeles Times recently ran an article on the question of whether we want to completely urbanize agricultural land or preserve it. The fact that this topic shows up on the front page of the Times demonstrates that it is one of the major public choices we face.

Today in California, we’re paving over prime agricultural land at rates never seen before. It’s estimated that between one-third and one-half of the existing prime farmland in the Central Valley will be gone by the year 2040 if current trends continue. There are similar problems in other major farm production areas such as the Salinas Valley, the Oxnard Plain and elsewhere.
The rates of urbanization that we’re seeing today in the Central Valley are very similar to those in the Los Angeles Basin 30 and 40 years ago—and we all know what happened to that agricultural land.

With this growth, the zone of conflict continues to expand. That directly impacts what we’re talking about today—the urban edge interface. How we manage that urban boundary can either greatly increase or decrease the zone of conflict.

**Issues at the urban edge**

For farmers, there are problems caused by urban proximity—things like vandals, litter, exotic pests like the Medfly, urban traffic on rural roads, dust, land values driven up, restraints on ability to operate, increased competition for water and land, and so on. For urban neighbors, the problems caused by farming include pesticide use and drift, noise, odor, flies, dust, night time operations, farm equipment on local roads, and so on. Right-to-farm ordinances address some of these problems, but do not completely resolve them.

Meanwhile, the issue of resource certainty is becoming even more urgent. If farmers are to continue to farm, they need to be sure that the primary tools, the natural resources they need, are in fact going to be there. That the air quality will allow them to produce economic yields. That the water they need for crops will be there, and that it will be economic. That their ability to operate—their ability to spray at the right time, to cultivate at the right time and so on—will be there. (That’s when the right-to-farm issues come up.) That, in fact, the farmland itself will be there. Ever-changing urban boundaries—uncertainty as to whether land is going to be annexed in the next year or two—put a significant damper on a farmer’s willingness to make long-term capital investments, and also to address some of the neighbors’ concerns.

**Taxes and development pressure**

Of course, there are tax issues. The Williamson Act has done a relatively good job over the years in addressing the property tax issue, but the fact is that in rapidly growing urban areas the Act isn’t keeping up. Some improvements are needed. There’s also the estate tax issue; it’s sad when the widow or the children have to sell the farm just to pay the estate taxes. But, very often, that is why land is turned over to urban uses.

---

**Paul Wenger:**

We must realize that if we’re going to maintain a viable agricultural industry in California we cannot continue to lose prime farmland. I’ve watched friends of mine who have been bought out at the urban fringe. They’ve had to move out to lease prime soils, often facing problems of drainage, salt damage and erosion; they are pushing into the areas with vernal pools and other environmental complications. They’re going out where it requires two to three times the acreage they had in the prime soils to create an economic operation.

Hopefully we can come to an understanding that prime soils in California are not being made anymore, that the urban planning process needs to be taken out of the political realm and dealt with by a mindset that says: “We have something here that we have to protect, not just for those in production agriculture but for the entire state—which depends on agriculture.”

Stanislaus County was one of the first to develop a right-to-farm ordinance. It’s basically a good neighbor policy. Rather than have a neighbor get upset because of possible spray drift and file a lawsuit, hopefully we now have a way to settle complaints. But the right-to-farm ordinance doesn’t always allow farmers to farm correctly and profitably. In the urban fringe area you have to grow higher value crops because your investment is greater. You have higher inputs, you could lose a lot more, you’re possibly going to need more spraying—there’s a lot more farming to be done. But sometimes, you’re not able to do those things because of constraints, either real or implied. Certainly, there are a lot of things that you don’t do on the urban fringe in order to prevent a lawsuit or keep your neighbor from being upset.
Michael C. Moore:

Whether agricultural land is replaceable or not is a question. We can bring marginal lands into production and so, in a quantitative sense, they tend to replace what's taken out. Statistics of overall agricultural acreage show that it's shrinking—but not at a rate that concerns the general public because lost farmland gets replaced by marginal lands. However, the new lands often bring unanticipated problems. They are on slopes that tend to erode, they are harder to get to, they produce less, and they require more intensive management over time.

A second problem is the Williamson Act, which, in my opinion, has done a disfavor—it has lulled us into thinking that we were actually doing something about slowing farmland conversion. But where you need the Williamson Act to really make an impact, at the edge of the urban areas, no one signs up. If they did sign up previously, why would they renew? We actually shifted tax dollars out of county government over all those years to protect a lot of lands that were in the hinterland that, arguably at least, didn't need much protection in the long term. So the Williamson Act has led us to believe complacently that we don't need other disincentive programs.

One of the biggest problems, I believe, is that "If you scratch a farmer you’ll discover a developer." That is why agriculture is very much divided on the issue of land use. It's a heartfelt property rights issue—this is my land, and I’ll do what I want with it. The economic incentive to sell land is tremendous, considering the difference between the value of that land for urban development and what a farmer can make on it producing crops—especially at the urban edge where he has complaints and restrictions on farming operations.

Why should agriculture change? Since we're a large political force in the state, why shouldn't we just dig our heels in? But the reality is that the urbanization of agricultural land areas will continue. There's very little stomach, politically, in California for any kind of no-growth scheme; the fact is that the growth of urban areas onto farmland will continue.

So for agriculture to survive and prosper, we must be good neighbors. We need to work with urban residents to find solutions to these problems. Also, we need to use our land resource more wisely. Some of the ways to do that are higher urban density growth patterns, infill incentives, redevelopment incentives and, when we do encroach on agricultural land, going first to lesser quality soils.

To better manage and stabilize the edge, we need to avoid hopscotch development patterns that disproportionately increase the zone of conflict. We need to look very closely at buffers, and how they can be used. We need to consider right-to-farm ordinances and other measures to increase resource certainty. Also, we need to make use of technologies by educating ourselves about existing ones and by developing new ones.

To make this happen, incentives must be created on both the agricultural side and the urban side. In my opinion, the primary vehicle should be economic.

Regulation may be necessary, but we need to focus on economic incentives.
A number of driving forces at the urban-agricultural interface determine how farmers are able to farm in that area. One essential force is the value of land. Farmland near urban areas is more expensive to purchase or rent, and this high cost tends to dictate that only high-yield, high-value crops are feasible on that land. Basically this precludes low income crops such as beans or some of the cereals.

High-value crops on ag-urban interface land generally require much more intensity of management due to the greater financial risks. And all crops involving this kind of management by the farmer can produce concerns in the urban community.

Management intensity can be ranked by crop. In Southern California the higher value crops include citrus and other fruits, the nursery and floriculture industry, and some of the industries that produce two or two and a half crops of vegetables each year, such as cauliflower and celery. These require very intense management, including frequent applications of fungicides and insecticides.

At the low end of this scale of management intensity are crops such as the dry beans where very little pesticide is used. But the grower just cannot make enough return on these lower cash-value crops to justify planting on high-value land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>citrus</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strawberries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursery/flower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple vegetable crops</td>
<td>higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intensive management in these ag-urban interface lands involves not just pesticide use but other potential nuisance factors. For example, mechanical topers are used in Ventura County lemon orchards, sometimes adjacent to housing tracts. These topers make a considerable amount of noise and also produce dust. But topping is a necessary operation in lemon production, to keep tree height cost-effective for harvesting two to three times in a year.

There are a number of such operations involving noise, dust or other nuisances in other high-management crops such as strawberries. And in many crops there are potential nuisances—for example, noise-making guns and air cannons used in vertebrate pest control.

Intensity of pesticide use can be ranked similarly with the nursery and floriculture industry tending toward greater intensity. Obscured in this hierarchy of pesticide use is the fact that we have a number of selective pesticides and other more environmentally benign pesticides that farmers can use, and more are coming on line. So we do have some opportunities to make changes in the selection of pesticides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>citrus</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grapes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strawberries</td>
<td>higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple vegetable crops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nursery/flower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of insecticides, miticides and fungicides need to be applied to strawberries, which are very sensitive to botrytis fungus and mites, for example. In addition, the soil is fumigated which also poses the risk of drift. But without properly controlling pests, there just isn’t going to be economic strawberry production. The growers would go out of business, and we wouldn’t have strawberries.

**Mitigation techniques**

In regard to pesticide spray drift, there are a number of possible innovations in spraying practices and equipment that can
mitigate the potential for drift off the target area or into urban areas.

We can selectively spot-treat, because the pests often are not dispersed over the whole field. In these instances, localizing the area of pesticide application diminishes the potential for pesticide drift. Banding application is similar to spot treating. Rather than spray the whole area, it’s possible in some circumstances to localize the treatment along a specific band in the crop row—with herbicides for example, and potentially with fungicides or insecticides. Again, this helps minimize the potential for drift.

Some pesticide materials can be injected into the soil—for example, systemic herbicides that are placed below the plant root zone to help prevent competition from weeds. This minimizes the potential for drift because there is no actual spraying. Very few systemic insecticides are currently registered, but this is a possible way of getting an insecticide to the target plant without actually spraying it in the air where it may drift.

Chemigation is a technique by which a fungicide or an insecticide may be applied to the crop through the irrigation system—again helping to minimize the potential for drift.

As important as anything on this list is the development of more environmentally benign pesticides that target solely the pest and are relatively harmless to non-target organisms, including humans. Much novel chemistry such as these selective pesticides is coming on line. These products will help mitigate public concerns about pesticide drift and the safety of people who handle the pesticides or work in intimate contact with the treated plants.

Another area of investigation is pheromone confusion or mating disruption, which breaks the cycle from generation to generation. This is effective against those insects that rely on chemical communication between the sexes. Ongoing research on such environmentally benign, species-specific chemicals holds considerable promise.

Other examples of mitigation techniques include:

- Row covers, mesh material that is put over young row crop plants as they emerge, to preclude access by various flying or crawling pests. This method is very expensive but may be feasible on a limited scale, primarily on fairly high cash-income crops.
Ron Vargas:

Much work is being done with integrated pest management, and most growers are using IPM practices. An example is the pink bollworm, an insect pest that is devastating cotton production across the US cotton belt. In the San Joaquin Valley, we’ve been able to keep the pink bollworm under control without pesticides by using sterile moth releases to disrupt mating patterns. This is coupled with what we call a plow-down; we’re disking the cotton plant residue into the soil by a certain time each year. In this way, we have a 90 day host-free period which disrupts the life cycle of the pink bollworm. This is a prime example of a system that has completely eliminated pesticide use.

Moore:

Because of the question of economic risk, the adoption of new technology by farmers—pest reduction techniques, for example—may not proceed as fast as we think it should. Farmers tend to be risk adverse. They operate in an economically cyclical industry with low margins of return. So the question of whether they are going to adopt new high-cost, high-risk technology ought to be considered in the context of what farmers are actually able to afford, given their resources and their own past experience—as well as the need to bring that new technology into play. This suggests that other financing instruments will have to be made available to help farmers compete in the marketplace.

- Sticky bands that can help control flying leafhoppers in vineyards.
- Ground cover plantings in citrus, which cut down on the potential for dust problems and may improve pest management by increasing beneficial insect activity in the orchard. The grower has expenses for the initial planting of the cover crop and for management, and there are tradeoffs in terms of water usage by the ground cover.
- Baits to get insecticides to the target organism without having the potential for drift problems. Most of these are very specific to the target organism and don’t work for all pests. As with the other techniques, the pest management strategy must be custom-tailored to the specific pest, crop and location.

The biological approach

Biological controls have come into their own in recent years. There is more emphasis on this approach and more dollars for research—but there also are limitations. Biological controls require an existing pest population in order to function, so they may not be practical on high-value crops where the economic threshold for damage is very low and thus the tolerance for pest populations is similarly very low. Another problem involves the rapid turnaround time of many vegetable and floral crops. The crop is planted and harvested so quickly that biological control agents do not have time to develop the generations required for successful control of a pest.

Biological controls are most valuable and easily used with permanent cropping systems which allow more time for them to take effect. Selective pesticides can help by eliminating only the target pest and allowing the beneficials to survive, thus accelerating the process of biological control.

We need more research on biological controls. However, increased development of biological control is only one of the tools we can use to minimize conflict at the ag-urban edge. Novel and improved chemicals, proper timing of farming practices, and improved pesticide application technology all can help mitigate the problems.
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION

Wenger: Hopefully, here in California we'll continue to make the pesticide registration process easier to allow universities and chemical companies to both safeguard the public and to allow new chemicals to help those of us in production agriculture. Unfortunately, we have so many crops in this state—over 250—that it seems impossible to find one chemical that's a cure-all. If the testing and the regulatory processes are so difficult for the chemical companies that they can't make a little income, they will not search for new technologies, and we all lose.

Jack E. Pandol: At Cal-EPA we worked hard with U.S. EPA to streamline the registration process. For example, we harmonized our data collecting and analyzing process with theirs so we aren't repeating the work that is done at the federal level.

A slow registration process both increases the manufacturer's cost in getting new products to the market and delays the use of more environmentally friendly products. So speeding up the registration process is in everyone's best interest. It lowers the manufacturer's risk and cost; it gives farmers the tools they need quicker; and it's better for people who are concerned about health aspects of pesticide use because it gets safer chemicals to the market faster.

Nutter: We are working toward better integrated pest management. One problem is that when registration of a pesticide is canceled, it may throw out an entire IPM program. If a material is an integral part of an IPM program, some consideration should be given to continuing that registration.

James F. Thompson: The University has a toxicology program which tests the impacts of new chemicals, and also works in developing IPM systems and in making them environmentally safe, but UC doesn't actually develop the chemicals. That is the responsibility of private companies.
TECHNOLOGIES AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
AT THE EDGE:
BIOTECHNOLOGY

Trevor Suslow
Post-Harvest Extension Specialist
Department of Vegetable Crops
UC Davis

In our thinking, we need to separate the science of biotechnology from the industry of biotechnology. Clearly they are very closely related and the science—the development of technology and information—feeds into the commercial applications. But they have some very distinct uses and goals as well.

The applied products of the biotechnology industry are what the public sees in the headlines. These news reports are the basis for a lot of public judgments as to whether biotechnology contributes to solutions or to the conflicts. But behind the scenes the science of biotechnology plays a much broader and deeper role in understanding many of the basic biological processes and interactions among plants, microorganisms, other organisms and the environment.

Will biotechnology provide solutions or will it contribute to some of the conflicts at the urban edge and elsewhere? The answer, of course, is both. Some of the tools developed through biotechnology were designed to reduce pesticide use—to create more options for using the safer or more environmentally benign pesticides. Biotechnology also is being utilized both on plants and microorganisms to assist in waste management or bioremediation—to clean up toxins in the soil or in the water. It’s being used to improve, or at least give the opportunity to improve, fertilizer efficiency by providing plants with an improved system for uptake of nutrients—so that, for example, less fertilizer can be applied with less reaching groundwater. And biotechnology is providing plants with broader environmental or stress tolerances—the ability to grow in high salt conditions or in colder temperatures or with less water.

Objections and concerns

Many of these developments are provoking concern about unintended consequences. (Some observers, of course, would reject the technology entirely.) There may be possibilities that
the product itself or the target benefit will result in:

- Actual increase of pesticide use where a plant has been given tolerance to a particular herbicide.

- Acceleration of pest resistance—development of insensitivity by the target insect or fungus or bacterial pathogen to a pesticide or to a plant-incorporated "resistance factor". Overuse or misuse of genetically engineered plants may accelerate the resistance process and lose the availability of good products for everyone, including those who are not using the biotechnology-based plants.

There also is concern that improving environmental or stress tolerances may accelerate land use conversion. The ability to grow crops on less productive land may actually help justify moving agriculture onto more marginal lands as well as the resulting loss of prime land to urbanization.

**Biotechnology tools**

Biotechnology has become important for plant breeders because it provides very powerful tools to trace plant characteristics through generations. Biological markers are used to create a pattern, much like the bar code scanned at the grocery store, that is translated by the scientist to follow a particular trait used in plant breeding. This can be done with multiple traits for the first time. Previously, plant breeders had to do laborious screening which often could not take place until the plant reached

A bar code for genetic traits
maturity. With biotechnology, screening and following of multiple beneficial or detrimental traits can be done at the seed or seedling stage.

Biotechnology speeds up the plant breeding process in another way. In transferring beneficial traits from wild species with conventional breeding—pest resistance and other agronomic traits, possibly even flavor and other sensory traits—it's necessary to go through thousands of individual plants to pull out the needed gene. Depending on the crop, it may take 8 to 12 years or longer to get a commercially acceptable variety ready for production. Biotechnology can isolate that specific trait from the source and introduce it directly into a finished commercial or breeding variety, saving many years of time.

Biotechnology also develops biological control agents and systems. These advances may not result in commercial products but would allow growers or waste managers, for example, to manipulate the natural microflora in their favor. Another advantage is the broad and diverse category of diagnostics—rapid and accurate diagnostics that, for example, provide spray timing information or certify pathogen-free planting stocks.

Through biotechnology, we now understand more about the natural immunities that plants can develop—induced resistance factors. Different activators of this natural plant capacity are being discovered and compounds are being developed that could be sprayed on to elicit the defense response.

**Non-chemical applications**

Biotechnology also can be integrated with non-chemical technologies—for example, cultivators that discriminate between the crop plant and the weed. In the laboratory, a gene has been introduced into tomato plants that at the seedling stage develops a dark purple pigment which would be recognizable by a robotic cultivator. Another technique actually gives seedlings the ability to produce light—to fluoresce.

Another example is specific genes that provide seedlings with disease resistance. Besides increasing general tolerance to stress, this maintains feeder rootlets which increase fertilizer uptake capacity, so that lower fertilization rates may be possible. In the long term, developments like these may even replace general biocides and fumigants.

Advances in biotechnology are incorporating other diverse kinds of useful characteristics into organisms. For example:

---

Vargae:

Most commodity groups would consider biotechnology as holding tremendous promise. Host plant resistance, for example, is being developed in many crops. We already have cotton varieties with the Bacillus thuringiensis (BT) gene, which controls insects that feed as worms. When this microbial gene and the protein it produces are in the plant, the insects feed and die—anther way of eliminating the use of pesticides.

Another important technology is herbicide-tolerant crop varieties. Some would argue that herbicide-tolerant crops are going to increase the use of herbicides. That may be true in some cases, but the increase will be of herbicides that are more environmentally benign such as Roundup, which is commonly used by urbanites in their backyards. Roundup-ready plant varieties are being developed and are in place today.

What's important here for the ag-urban edge is not so much reduction of herbicide use as reduction of certain types of herbicides—for example, soil residual types that risk contamination of groundwater and soil quality problems. Roundup-ready crops will most likely fit into a system with reduced cultivation, and possibly even no-till or minimum till operations—and of course these types of systems also reduce dust and noise.
less or it could be an extremely toxic material. A group in the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department at UC Davis has been looking at ways to simply reduce the amount of pesticide that is applied. If your orchard has dead or missing trees, it’s useless to spray them. Engineers have developed a device that detects the presence of living trees—it shuts the spray nozzle off as the sprayer goes past an area without them. This could have a big impact if your orchard has many missing trees, but there are significant costs. This device is commercially in use.

Another device, developed for CalTrans, detects weeds along the roadside and sprays only those areas. The boom has about 10 computer-controlled nozzles. When the computer detects green plants, it selects only the nozzles that will spray them. Machines that use this technique are available for weed control in a farm field—you spray just the patches of weeds. These sprayers cost as much as five or 10 times more than those that spray the entire field. That’s a significant cost, and the amount of savings on herbicide is variable—10 percent to as much as 80 percent or more, depending on the circumstances.

A hooded sprayer contains the spray so it doesn’t go out of a certain space, and they’re actually able to recycle some of the spray material. A similar system is the electrostatic sprayer that charges the spray particles so they tend to adhere to solid surfaces—plants and soil—and not become a drift problem. One advantage of electrostatic spraying is that there’s a better chance of covering the plant, giving better protection. But, again, these devices are significantly more expensive than conventional sprayers.
Another major problem associated with the use of factors is that they may not have a multiplier. Rubber-tackled factors with metal tacks are available, but they are not as effective as the ones used in commercial rubber-tackled factors. As a result, rubber-tackled factors are generally more expensive and less durable. In addition, they are more difficult to apply and remove, which can lead to a loss of efficiency and increased maintenance costs.

Effective rainwater systems are capable of applying the pressure required to keep water from flowing through the system. However, they are not effective when used alone. A rainwater system must be integrated with other systems, such as those used for irrigation, to achieve optimal performance. For example, a rainwater system can be used to supplement the water supply for irrigation systems, while a rainwater reclamation system can be used to provide a backup supply for irrigation systems when water is not available from other sources.

What can we do? In some cases, using water as a cost-effective measure is a viable solution. However, in other cases, alternative methods may be more appropriate. For example, installing a rainwater harvesting system can be an effective way to reduce water usage in commercial settings. In addition, using drought-resistant landscaping can help to reduce water consumption as well.

Noise nuisance can also be a major problem at times, and can be mitigated through the use of appropriate noise control measures. For example, installing sound barriers around noisy areas can reduce noise levels in the area. In addition, using quiet equipment and reducing the number of people working in noisy areas can also help to reduce noise levels.

The principle of using a droplet-free applicator is to distribute the water without disturbing the surface. This is done through the use of a droplet-free applicator, which is designed to deliver water in a droplet-free manner. The applicator is typically mounted on a hose, and the water is delivered through a nozzle that is designed to create a mist-like spray. This allows the water to be distributed evenly and smoothly, without disturbing the surface.
It is difficult to convince farmers, or farm workers, that some recent trends to be higher, so the dust problem can be reduced. But dust loss to the ground, primarily is higher and moisture concentration is higher in the morning. There is also a four-day issue. Other operations that use the same field names can be done when the moisture content is high, there is no problem. But summer is the moisture content is high. There is no problem. We found that the move, dust have real cultural impact. We’ve found that if the smoke dust is a severe problem in some areas, and method of re-planting, dust is a severe problem in some areas. 

They are aware that the need to control their disease. The fewer that increase the iron, the iron decomposition is lower. The fewer that are significant, the less the move. Cleaning the material is a problem that is conducive to wet-weather. The more those that were in the wettest, the more those that were in the wettest. The material is a problem that is conducive to wet-weather. The more those that were in the wettest, the more those that were in the wettest. The material is a problem that is conducive to wet-weather. The more those that were in the wettest, the more those that were in the wettest. The material is a problem that is conducive to wet-weather.
operate without cleaning the waste stream. Use this technology only after regulations tell them they cannot use the technology. On the other hand, it is very expensive. People waste streams. On the other hand, it is very expensive. People looking at a reverse osmosis system that not only produces clear water but can actually be used to harvest some materials in the water—waste water particularly. At UC Davis we are some agricultural operations, of course, produce waste prod-

operations should only be done between 3 to 8 am and 6 to 10

p.m.
Cows kick dust into the air to help get the flies off their backs. Controlling flies, indirectly, will help reduce dust because flies' problems related to disease vectors, either mosquitoes or flies, and noise from the animals and the equipment. There are problems of dust's odor. For a quarter of a mile away, there are problems of dust odor. When a few thousand dairy cows or 10,000 chickens live in a quarter of a mile away, there's no problem. When they live miles away from people, there's no problem. When they live miles away from people, there's no problem.

Cows transmission and water quality, for example, can see the animals frequently; they begin to worry about dust. The livestock husbandry and conflict appear because people come closer to the livestock, less people interact. As the livestock area comes closer to need to understand the concerns of the livestock. Livestock enters a community. With that income, comes some benefit. Livestock enterprises bring 20 percent of the state's income.

UC Davis
Department of Animal Science
Livestock Waste Management Specialist
Deanne Morey Hever

LIVESTOCK MANAGEMENT OPTIONS
AT THE EDGE:
TECHNOLOGIES AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
Technology and management

Increased but peoples have fewer places to put their waste. The conflict between animal operators and adjacent urban areas, as farming disappears, not only is called sound method, as farming environment and economic interests. That is the most environmentally and economical, and where it recovers where forage for livestock is grown and where it recovers where forage for livestock is grown and where it recovers. Where forage is grown and where it recovers, where forage is grown and where it recovers, where forage is grown and where it recovers.

There is concern about increased human wastes. If the economies become less viable, the feed, as distance to where feed can be grown increases, the feed, as distance to where feed can be grown increases, the feed, as distance to where feed can be grown increases, the feed, as distance to where feed can be grown increases. Where forage is grown and where it recovers, where forage is grown and where it recovers, where forage is grown and where it recovers, where forage is grown and where it recovers, where forage is grown and where it recovers, where forage is grown and where it recovers.

Most manure is used on forage crops that are then fed to livestock. Even though it is land where it can be used properly. Farming further out to land where it can be used properly.

Creating a noise problem, a traffic problem, an other problem—creates a noise problem, a traffic problem, an other problem. Farming further out to land where it can be used properly.

Scattered farmlands into the area. Neighbors need to understand these things when they move. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. The number of hours available to get a crop into the ground. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation. Failing to make changes in operation.

Valid for the wisdom of the passerby, but some points may be pointless or if they think it should be managed differently, the people by will see the operation. If they don't.
-them leaf into the groundwater with irrigation, in fact, eff-
plant nutrients where and when they are needed and not above
the field. This sounds easy but it is a complicated task to put
Manure spreads, of course, apply manure uniformly in

-duce the dust generated by handling.
This means building manure less often, thereby helping to re-
vert practice is to pile the manure and let the cows walk on it.
One common mistake is, in many cases, that manure is
one more important than the other. One common mistake
ent of the manure must be reduced to control the odor. It that’s
-mente. In most situations, dairy farmers, the moisture con-
-agents. In most situations on dairy farms, the moisture con-
Solid-liquid separators create huge piles of solid manure—
-Dairy Lagoon

evaluate them as population grows and neighbors come closer.
which may not be acceptable in the future. We need to re-

ordinary wastewater lagoons and similar common lagoons-
-ent. Dairy wastewater lagoons are a very common lagoon-
manure from dairy cattle because of its very high position-
the most desirable fields for a cogeneration plant, particularly
We’ve had ups and downs with irrigation. Manure is not

-technology is introduced, it requires a support system.
they were marketed, and they completely. When a complex new
Geisters have failed in California so far primarily because of how
would have even more serious problems.

Finally, we can be sure that without nutritious food we can have even more serious problems.

As you would have imagined, water is the lifeblood of our nation. If the program does not address the problems that have developed from our misuse of water, the United States will face a water crisis. Every other country, virtually every nation in the world, has faced the crisis of water shortage. Fewer and fewer people can be nourished by less water. The resulting shortages will be a threat to our nation's health and economy. The threat of water shortage is real and growing.

The failure to recognize the importance of water in our daily lives cannot be tolerated.

The government must take action to ensure the future of our water supply.
For more effective state, regional, and local approaches to
feral land preservation, we will need to address both of these
application.

Then, there is no actual constituency for specific, practical
these interest share some concerns about feral land preservation.
Alternatively, beyond practical concerns of the Earn-
mary; certain economic and political interests, urban
occasionally hostile relationships that conspire against—environmental,
feral land preservation constituency—an urban and

during growth and economic development. There is also a
certain conversion is the most viable and practical way of accommo-
fits and others in the business community who see feral land
In California, there are influential land development


effective feral land protection policies.

would not influence the state to adopt and maintain
that more effectively than we have—both in California and
federal funds; although other states have done

designate a stronger role in land preservation. It is not the problem of
and it is politically vulnerable. In my judgment, the obstacle to
state level, this policy is very weak. It is sporadically applied,
and local levels to stem the urbanization of farmland, but at the
A number of policy tools have been adopted at both the state
level.

Sanborns

California State Assembly Member Michael Sweeney
Chief of Staff to
Steve Sanborns

AT THE URBAN EDGE
RUN FOR THE BOUNDARY: LAND USE ISSUES
The state's role

Halfway up a very large area to communities.

Los Angeles, because the real system reduces these things, and we need to develop a very strong real system to develop architecture and design.

This will ensure that we don't have to develop architecture in particular.

We need to extend the expansion of land to develop land and other needs.

And current estimates are that 5% or 10% of land and pasture are lost.

Current estimates are that 100,000 acres annually are lost.

There are a number of long-term threats to farmland from Moore.

Moore's land use management.
Another weakness is that we have a California Environment-la\-
udget-friendly system. In 1986, Proposition 75 was adopted and in-
creased the environmental protection in California. The propo-
sition requires that a certain percentage of the money from
vehicle registration fees be used for environmental protection
programs. However, the program has been criticized for not
being effective and for not providing the expected results.

In addition, we have a state that is not very
helpful in the urban area context.

Another improvement is that, although the California
Agency Act is not very
prescribed or for other goals.

We need more urban areas in agriculture, but that is not very
helpful in the urban area context, but that is not very
helpful in the urban area context.

We need to work on urban areas, and
helpful in the urban area context.

We need more urban areas in agriculture, but that is not very
helpful in the urban area context.
the money is. If you ask developers why they build on farm-
land and economic development that will affect the economy overall. None of this will matter unless there are alternative forms of
development to provide for the population growth that is con-
sequence. We need a broader coalition involved in farmland
preservation. Those who are not involved in farmland
preservation need to understand the importance of farmland protection from their
interests, both in urban and rural areas, as well as the
importance of farmland to local officials and local residents. The need to be involved together
in making urban water and environmental policies, and to
educate business leaders in both urban and rural areas,
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Finally, we need effective political leadership in Sacramento who are willing to tackle the economic and environmental consequences of farmland conversion, especially those of this sort. Therefore, political leadership will have to be supplemented by civic leadership, which is why efforts such as this conference and report are important—to start building civic concern and leadership so that political leaders have some people to lead.

Until these conditions exist—a united and aggressive farmland preservation community, a broad coalition of interests, alternative forms of urban development, and political leadership—the best hope for addressing conflicts at the edge will remain local and regional programs. At present, workable solutions probably are local.
convinced voters not to vote for it.

be demonstrating—and yet we couldn’t put together a competent campaign to
convince environmentalists, peak enthusiasts, and libertarians all across the world
sections. This, the League of California Citizens, The League of California
groups, including environmentalists, the building industry, et cetera. On topics
groups, much of the problem is the effectiveness of advocacy

Jim Saywer. Much of the problem is the ineffectiveness of advocacy

because we don’t want to pay more taxes. There are no easy solutions.

construction. And yet the public votes for Proposition 216.

are changing new housing from $4000 to $6000 per house for new school

producing more and more children who need education in California. Yet they

and the point is clear, more new homes bring more.

The stere has not and this notion of school construction becomes a controversial

Moreover: The revenue source cannot be increased building fees.

were made available.

little extra tax, but additional estate substitutions for the Millennium Act.

interestingly, the property tax is the only that counts and other objects
decisions.

some interesting possible long term consequences in the-regularization like

ideal property and unproductive below, it could well be that our tax

The goal was to a legislative proposal to reapportion sales tax

Net: There were a few million dollars in the state to come

in addition to revenues that is a clear need for the stere to come

in addition to revenues that is the future to come

conflict between the two: the liberal.

share over the property tax. There is not enough money and so we have

the system is working very well. Then the community gets a good revenue stream from the hammered.

since the county was getting a good revenue stream from the hammer.

real property outside the city limits and the closer they move near the housing.

the city’s lack of property. The county does not develop commuter.

Voiles: From 1965 until the early 1990s, Napa County and the

due to our land use policies.

commercial and industrial development to maintain our service level and

of revenue. That would enable us to make sure we have enough educational.

do in terms of our revenue source. We need a guaranteed source for a stream

budget could be, because we must know from year to year. But the state will

one of the key government’s biggest problems, is that we can’t

budget. And for counties to get out of the development business and preserve

new approaches could address the issue of local government-re-

Problem: Local Government Revenues
Another benefit is that a boundary allows more efficient de-
velopment, including suburban forms. When they look at
urban and suburban centers,

people outside—when you’re going to send developers toward your
inside the boundary or marking it absolutely different with red
development—whether its street or the boundary process
mean a boundary with provisions that encourage appropriate
that you can build and where you can’t so it
A second benefit is that a growth boundary provides broad

in a long-term planning program.
The urban growth boundary is only one of the critical elements
in a long-term program. Of course, complementary measures are needed, too—
lands. Of course, complementary measures are needed, too—
sure of protection for agriculture and other natural resource
only provides certainty and stability, it also provides some mea-
without urban growth boundaries, says Bob Link
influence within the next couple of years, depending on who’s
they might be able to shift the city limits or change the sphere of
without urban growth boundaries, says Bob Link.
Everyone knows where it is, it provides land use certainty
The benefits are several. First, it’s a real and lasting bound-
boundary projects.

physical and urban development.
boundary—a long-lasing, 20-year boundary between the coun-
Greenbelt Alliance’s goal is to create a thin edge for healthy

munities and and where the farmland begins.
Germany, for example, there’s fypically a crop where come-
sheds,” and they’re mainly get to farmland. In contrast, in
California today, the urban-agricultural interface is a-
Greenbelt Alliance
Executive Director
Jim Sawyer
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needed in your General Plan a policy calling for a clearly
backed arrangement. This is a three-step process. First, you
The other way to adopt an urban growth boundary is a voter-
will be constrained by all the hurdles.
boundary. Of course, if’s not clear whether future city councils
of influence which will not, as developed, be focused in this
area. But they will have another 90,000 acres inside their sphere
boundary. Since they’ve already developed about 110,000
growth boundary, and there’s already development on or near
80% of it, the city may lose billions in development. Some
now are going to work together on any further changes. Some
important changes in the boundaries. They’re also adopted
in a joint policy statement with the county which says they are
in California, we don’t have any state directives so what-
none of this growth boundary.

Two California procedures

the US, especially on more voluntary way.
are around most of their communities. The idea is spreading around
Washington in 1990. They have 20-year urban growth boundary.
A similar measure was adopted by the legislature of the state
of Oregon. Oregon provides the principal case of ut-
and use recognition. It is state law, so it’s enforced from the
implemented by a county fiscal structure that reduces the effects of
depending on a county fiscal structure and resource land protection. This is un-
are affordable housing and resource land protection. This is un-
that’s every community which are complemented by other policies such
-1970’s and significant benefits have been realized. Of-
-20-year urban growth boundary recommendations. They’ve been using boundaries since
another benefit is that the urban growth boundary can-
all in how they’d propose to use that land.

above an extended period of time. Developers become more cer-
the development opportunities with a specified amount of land

Amendments:
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The County of Sonoma has put a measure on the ballot say:

The County of Sonoma also passed a measure at the ballot box in 1996. The "Year of the LGDB (Urban Growth Boundary)"

The LGDB was a measure that restricted new development in certain areas of the county, in an attempt to preserve open space and farmland. It was passed in 1996, and has been in place ever since. The measure is often controversial, with some people feeling that it restricts development and others feeling that it preserves important resources.

The measure, however, has had some success in preserving open space and farmland. It has also helped to protect the county's unique rural character, and has been a source of pride for many Sonoma County residents.

The measure has been a point of contention, with some people feeling that it restricts development and others feeling that it preserves important resources. It has also been a source of controversy, with some people feeling that it is too restrictive, while others feel that it is necessary to protect the county's unique character.

In the end, the measure has been a mixed blessing, with both advantages and disadvantages. It has been successful in preserving open space and farmland, but has also caused some conflicts in the community. Regardless, it remains an important part of Sonoma County's identity, and is a topic that continues to be debated among residents.
<p>Camper: Alternatives to urban growth boundaries are many. One approach from Ventura County is the concept of Guidelines for Ongoing Development. The LAFCO process allows each county to establish a model by encouraging more compact growth with a certain percentage of infill and development. This process also allows for annexation, or expansion of sphere of influence.</p>
or housing development. We need to grow in order to thrive. Our growth rate has been about 2 percent. Urban growth boundaries have not slowed our growth. Other cities in terms of job creation.

It's important that we continue to build and develop, our experience is that growth can be sustained and that the result is more effective. Our local planning process is important. We need to build on what we have already done. We need to work in a way that's sustainable.

The city of Woodland needs to become more active in that arena. We need to work with our community to support urban growth boundaries (AG's) are not a solution. We need to work in a way that's sustainable.

We need to work with our community to support urban growth boundaries. We need to work in a way that's sustainable.

Economic development is important. When you determine the place that the city of Woodland needs to work in a way that's sustainable.
Residences that are next to agriculture, but without a specific
residential subdivision is to reduce the number of houses or
influence urban development. As a buffer, the purpose of a large lot
next to a city with lots ranging from one to 10 acres, it's
has evolved over the years, most likely in unincorporated areas.
Large lot residential subdivisions. Usually, this kind of buffer

provide effective buffering.

There are greenbelts. Usually, we need a combination of these to

or highways—on wetlands like a canal, stream or river. Also,

of landscaping: Buffers can be transportation corridors—on a road

if development setbacks, and barriers such as walls, fences,

and ornamental-wide narrow residential subdivisions, buffer-

The kinds of agricultural-urban buffers found in general plans

type of buffering

Some counties and cities where they have been required.

know that urban edge buffers can be successful. They work in

is needed between agricultural land and urban areas. We also

derstand this, it's easier for them to accept the idea that a buffer

the landscape. When planners and city and county leaders on

are different from the traditional image. An open space. Agriculture is different from the traditional image;

use of the land is also industrial use, even if it provides visual

areas. A reasonable argument can be made that agricultural

be separated into smaller land use such as industrial and residential.

and non-farm uses of the land. It's standard practice today to

announcing the incompatibility between commercial agriculture

Purpose of a buffer, of course, is to reduce conflict by

“separation” and “buffer.” The key words are

both the farmland side and the urban side. The key words are

buffer zone is a neutral area that provides separation be-

Member Napa County Planning Commission
Land Use Consultant and
Mary E. Handel

BUFFERS
Bars. This kind of buffer includes sound walls, substation.

Barriers. The actual distance will require much discussion.

...
Greenbelts, This category includes parks, golf courses, trails, canals, and other common recreation uses. A greenbelt also functions as a buffer between developments and their surroundings and their effect on the length of open space. A greenbelt provides a separation between buildings and agricultural areas, a buffer between developments and their surroundings and their effect on the length of open space. A greenbelt is also an effective public open space, providing recreation and aesthetic benefits. It is important to establish greenbelts that block the wind, are easily accessible, and have a visual impact.

TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS AND WATERFRONTS. A greenbelt provides some

FUNCTION AS A BUFFER.

design of a greenbelt is critical in determining how well it will

function as a buffer. This is especially true when considering

access to local travel and public transportation. The ideal

may be open space with no improvements, functioning as a habitat

or a buffer. However, greenbelts can also be developed

with other common recreation uses. A greenbelt can be

used to separate developments and their surroundings to

provide a buffer between developments and their surroundings and their effect on the length of open space. A greenbelt is also an effective public open space, providing recreation and aesthetic benefits. It is important to establish greenbelts that block the wind, are easily accessible, and have a visual impact.
If they are required to provide the buffer. Also, a setback is

Counterproductive opposition will come from developers. Particularly

With whom might favor or oppose the buffer requirement

wasted.

leaving into ruts rather at the edge of the ditch, the effort is

established or threaten the buffers but the county allows conversion of

issues. This is extremely important if a city makes the effort to

Fourth, there is need for governmental cooperation on land use

spent in the long term

the urban area? If it does, this will save money for local government.

It serves as a boundary enclosure compact development within

Does it, for example, provide a visible edge for urban growth?

Third, what other benefits are maintained with the buffer?

have access to the farming behind their property

down. In some cases, homeowners have put in gardens so they

will be adequate. Perhaps for example, have a habit of being

or worse. A problem of course is whether such management

public preference and interest are maintained by private property

that erosion, local official open their buffers that don’t reduce

day, local governments have significant fiscal implications. For

Second, what problems and what maintain the buffer?

a wall of dense landscaping?

est disservice politically feasible—stone with a solid barrier such

will make it more difficult to cut the best buffer in space—the greater

also find that for agriculture, the best buffer is space—the greater

of a proposed buffer in reducing each of these conflicts. We need

residents’ perspectives—and evaluate the potential environmental

issues—from both the agricultural perspective and the urban

In addition it is necessary to consider the use of riparian cor-

the house behind it but not the gardens of the lots across

problem, for example, a fence that which people in

useful to farmers and ranchers. People-influenced boundaries can be a

be going to be

have some inherent restrictions on use if they are going to be

A buffer, effectiveness for reducing conflict on both sides

order to come up with potential conflicts

stand the traditional management practices of existing crops in

be there forever? But that is a place to begin. We must under-

Type of agriculture. The current crops are not necessarily good

reduce conflicts on both sides? This will depend in part on the

be considered. First, how effectively does the regulated buffer

To establish a good buffer policy, at least six questions must

Considerations for an effective buffer policy.
agriculture, complement other efforts to keep our productive farmland in
between urban residues and agriculture, and they certainly can
in the heart of America. But buffers can reduce the conflicts
can interchangeably farmed or when incomparable here are placed
damage done when urban areas continue to sprawl over areas
In conclusion, buffers cannot completely make up for the

county, applying the policy to achieve consistent results throughout the
ability by considering the conditions of each project while also
plays a very significant role. They can provide reasonable.her-
is buffer policy, in that the staff of the & commission's office
San Luis Obispo County has a unique way of implementing

implemented.

in the zoning ordinance. Consistently, the buffer policy is never
detail about implementation and without further instructions.
General plans buffers are simply mentioned, but without any
mention to respond to different sites and conditions, included-
establishing a buffer policy is to allow enough flexibility in impulse
And finally, how can a buffer policy be applied consistently

establish a structural buffer
it can be developed, they are not likely to invest in efforts to
Also, if city leaders view agriculture as a way to hold land until
agriculture outside the city boundaries may be viewed
project agriculture outside the city to remain and within the city to
read plans and their purpose is provided over services and
urban areas where city leaders have a philosophical problem with buffers. Cities are urban-
government may reduce the total number of houses the de-
The urban edge

and the fields—put this requires a fresh view of how to design
an opportunity for improved relationships between the town
planning and design can win this conflict into
This tension frequently is a result of either no planning or bad
prevailing that also includes political and environmental
hostile relationships between farmers and urban residents, an-

Urban sprawl in California has created a lens and often
resulting in unmanaged orders and affiliated neighbors—

and separate people from the living, working landscape—

farmers and land use policy increasingly attempts to wall off
farmers and agricultural workers and the value that urban residents become ad-
scape as part of their daily lives. Only by understanding how

fields are visual and functional landscapes that urban reside-


In California, especially where large areas of good farmland are
in California, especially where large areas of good farmland are
meets the fields will largely determine the future of agriculture
character of the edge where the town
important landscapes. The character of the edge where the town
mesa and field which includes both productive and culturally sig-
scape around them, and edges between fields and houses are

It is important to recognize that the relationship of agicult-

Cultural preservation and urban growth

Planning are rarely used to address the conflict between agr-

due conflicts at the urban edge. Furthermore, good design and
and cities is often left out of policy discussions intended to re-

urban residents, yet the experience of people living in towns

The view from the town towards the fields is important for

Principal, Cadeesign Inc., Landscape Architects and Planners

Professor and Chair

Mark French

Urban-Agricultural Edge
Planning and Design Approaches for The
The challenge: farmland and house

Even though the Preserve's economy and the practice of agriculture will always be important to the larger landscape, it is not the only or most important part of the Valley.

Today's secession of physical and visual elements of the landscape is not part of the Valley's identity. I see an open landscape that quickly learned was more than the challenge to the Central Valley. Almost 30 years ago, when I first moved to the Central Valley, almost 30 years ago, when I went out open space, the myth I heard when I went out open space, the myth I heard when I
Along the way we frequently greet friends and neighbors.

My wife and I are daily users of this space. We take an hour


This Intermediate landscape is also a very important child-

The Intermediate landscape is also a very important child-

After dark, dark is not allowed at home, in the park or in the playground.

After dark, dark is not allowed at home, in the park or in the playground.

Pet is also accessible and provides neary nature. Part of the

In our case, we benefit by the design of what I have come to

Hi there! I'm here to help you with your natural language tasks. However, I'm unable to assist with that as it's not currently supported in my capabilities. Feel free to ask me any questions or request any assistance you need in a language I can process, and I'll be happy to help! 😊
The developed part of the city is characterized by a dense network of streets and buildings, with little open space. In contrast, the undeveloped part of the city is characterized by open fields and farmland. The proposed park would provide a much-needed green space in this area.

The Montgomery Green project, proposed by developers, includes a large proposed project, Castle Ranch, designed for the southeast corner of Davis. The proposal is part of the larger Green Belt plan update, which aims to create a more detailed and comprehensive plan for development and conservation. The proposal includes a mix of retail, residential, and mixed-use development, and is designed to be pedestrian-friendly and accessible.

In my own urban agriculture and ecological practice, I have found that community design can make a difference. I started my own community garden in my yard, which has led to the development of several other gardens in the neighborhood. In other cases, I have worked with developers to incorporate green space into new developments, which has helped to reduce density and preserve existing vegetation.

Successful design and planning approaches rely on the right mix of materials, methods, and thinking. The basis for regional thinking and planning is the location and water supply of specific project planning. We need to go beyond what the city has decided and develop plans that are tailored to the specific needs of the community. In planning and designing the urban edge, certain principles are critical. First is the importance of design at a regional scale. Second is the need to understand and design for the human body. This includes understanding how people interact with their environment and how their behavior is affected by the built environment.

We have come to know the farmer and the hand of days a

In place of the city's current greenbelt plan update, our plan would create a new

environmental impact statement. This statement is intended to ensure that

the development is environmentally sound and that it will

be compatible with the existing environment. It is intended to help developers

understand the potential impacts of their projects and to provide a framework for

evaluating environmental issues.

The environmental impact statement is intended to ensure that the
design of the project is compatible with the existing environment. It is
intended to help developers understand the potential impacts of their
projects and to provide a framework for evaluating environmental issues.

In place of the city's current greenbelt plan update, our plan would create a new
designation of environmentally sensitive areas. This designation is intended to
ensure that the development is environmentally sound and that it will

be compatible with the existing environment. It is intended to help developers
understand the potential impacts of their projects and to provide a framework for

evaluating environmental issues.
Primer is Springing. The rest of the time it is open.

Also, good management is crucial. For example, the gate on our home is closed on the few days a year when the house is not open.

Greenways also would help without ever crossing a road. The Greenway also would help refreshes, provide a high priority on golf courses and even some parks need to plan for development. The need for an interconnected greenway system of open spaces which the edge of town can be part of a garden and wildlife habitat are a useful way to design and plan the Greenways and trails in the urban edge. These are growing public demand for urban-agricultural edge.

The preserve created through conservation easements and open space, corridor, including trails, habitat

and thus, this process created through conservation easements and open space, corridor, including trails, habitat.
The unique quality of life in cities and the stewardship of farm—landscape physically, visually and symbolically—experience landscape. A window that can allow urban residents to understand and the edge less as a separator and more as a symbolic connector. It is for in their everyday lives. To do this, we need to think of and appreciate it more. It is a landscape that can produce landscape of great beauty, something urban folk want appreciation and founness. The formal edge is a fitting and change the physical space between the landscape from one kind of nuisance and danger to one of well, urban residents need to change their mental map of the town and the fields, we need to change the symbolic space as it is easy to change the physical space between the...
If you can keep people talking together regardless of how

...
One of the most important issues in the conservation of agriculture are the conflicts over land use. The other two issues are those parcels and specific agricultural practices. The size of agricultural land is one of the issues that are more prevalent. The more people need food, the more conflict there will be with our land. The most important land use is the urban edge, where cities and farms are located. The conditions which are necessary for survival. This is parallel to the concept of resource conservation. I do not assume that agriculture is not a desirous activity, but also essential to human survival. My perspective in these matters can be summarized in the following remarks: not the result of a theoretical analysis.

Vonk, Volkert Estate Family Estate
Volkert Estate
Napa Valley, Grape Grower and Winegrower
Agricultural Areas
Parcel sizes and appropriate uses in
built on the remaining land.

The second concern is what does the land use?

of the land. The consequences increase when the use of the land becomes more agricultural. The agricultural use of the land can be so high that the land is not suitable for residential use. The agricultural use is the most basic answer to the question of what is the best use for the land. I think the second question is more difficult. If we accept the premise that the land is not suitable for residential use, we should be able to justify

the question of what is the best use for the land.
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Compared to other wine growing regions, the Napa Valley has a unique advantage due to its rich history and tradition in grape growing and winemaking. The long growing season and ideal climate conditions contribute to the high-quality grapes produced in the region. The valley is home to many historic wineries and vineyards that have been in operation for generations, preserving the traditional methods of wine production.

However, with the increasing demand for premium wines, there is a growing pressure on land use. Developers are eyeing the prime agricultural land, leading to concerns about the future of the wine industry and the preservation of the landscape. The Napa County Agricultural Land Trust is one such organization working to protect and preserve the region's agricultural lands.

The Trust identifies parcels of land that are essential for the wine industry and raises funds to purchase these properties. Once acquired, the land is dedicated to agriculture, ensuring that it remains in active use. This approach helps to maintain the balance between development and conservation, preserving the unique character and identity of the Napa Valley.

In conclusion, the protection of agricultural lands is crucial for maintaining the quality and integrity of the Napa Valley's wine industry. Efforts such as the Napa County Agricultural Land Trust play a vital role in preserving this important resource for future generations.
Ultimately, this and the other questions were solved through compromises—but the compromises recognized very important principles. Foremost among them: processing of grapes on agricultural land, being to some extent an industrial activity, makes sense only because it allows fast processing of our perishable commodity. A new facility and expansions of existing facilities have to use 75% wine grapes grown in Napa County. Accessory uses and the size of a winery in relation to the parcel size were limited. Not just buildings, but also parking areas and wastewater ponds were counted in this.

All informed observers will agree that the compromises still allow for too many activities that have nothing to do with agriculture and are causing problems, e.g. traffic, noise, groundwater pollution and competition for a shrinking land supply.

I think I have only stated the obvious, and so we have to ask why jurisdictions don’t act accordingly. The answer seems to me to lie in a mixture of individual greed and public shortsightedness. Typically, minimum parcel size conflicts erupt in high growth regions where the economic compensation for creating parcels can be huge. Occasionally, the motivation for parcelization is the children, but the logic behind that is just as faulty as the logic behind any parcelization. If one makes the number of allowable parcels dependent on the number of children, then the irrationality is obvious. Besides, there are lots of things, from a house to a diamond ring, that cannot be divided among the children.

Unfortunately, the decision-makers in most jurisdictions lack the understanding and the strength to do what is often unpopular. They unwittingly even invite parcelization by allowing many competing uses on agricultural lands. Deep down, most of them still adhere to the old American myth that there is an endless supply of land and if we really use up one area, we simply move on to the next one.

Needed: A Longer-range view

Realistically, it is very difficult to motivate local jurisdictions to plan for agriculture. Since the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, land use decisions have been driven by short term fiscal considerations. To combat this trend, the state should provide clear planning parameters, which would force counties to plan for agricultural land as a non-renewable resource. After all, our nation’s future depends on it.

If our jurisdictions planned for the long haul, they would recognize that the long-term benefit of agricultural land protec-
in the proximity of expanding urban centers. The proximity of expanding urban centers makes farther away where the population pressure is lower than where the population pressure is closer to urban areas. The farther away the population pressure is, the higher the land values are. Therefore, decisions are affected in nature and they are easier to overcome. Necessary information would have to be informed. Moreover, if the population pressure is closer to urban areas, the land values are higher and they are more difficult to overcome. Necessary information would have to be informed. Moreover, if the population pressure is closer to urban areas, the land values are higher and they are more difficult to overcome.

Finally, if we want to maintain agriculture, we have to create the cost-benefit analyses and clear planning parameters.

If production costs for a commodity are higher near the city than farther away, the result is clear: these fields would disappear.

Urban fringe:

When fringe land becomes more competitive for agriculture near the urban fringe, it would lead to a less competitive status for agriculture near the urban fringe. The reasons for this could be the increased cost of land or the increased value of land, which makes it more competitive. As a result, the urban fringe often becomes more competitive due to the increased cost of land or the increased value of land.

Counties and municipalities have to exhibit much more leadership and cooperate in the face of development pressures. All too often, property and use for agricultural lands is agricultural. Even more important, local jurisdictions must learn that the only way to continue in agriculture is to keep the farm. We are coming to agree with the framers in agriculture. It is my belief that the framers in agriculture are making a strong point.

For the future, schools and urban growth are problems. The money and the roads, huge costs for affordable housing, and the need for commercial development that will bring some jobs. These are the reasons for this agricultural productivity. As a result, the urban fringe is growing faster than the framers in agriculture can keep up with.

There are many ways to approach this issue. One is to ensure that property rights are protected over property rights. One is to ensure that property rights are protected over property rights. One is to ensure that property rights are protected over property rights. One is to ensure that property rights are protected over property rights.

The framers in agriculture need to be protected. The framers in agriculture need to be protected. The framers in agriculture need to be protected. The framers in agriculture need to be protected.
The burden for a real, long-term, permanent solution rests on the
Some day, and I hope it is sooner rather than later, we will be over-populated. We have to deal with it. The real problem is not overcrowding; it is over-population. We use land to produce food for the future. The real problem is over-population. We need to control population growth.

Charlie Romaniski, Yolo County Farmer: "I'm pleased that the actual growth is not occurring. The problem is how to deal with this. We need to be looking at how to increase our capacity to produce more food. We need to look at industrial growth and how it can occur.

The issue is about economic gains to a city. For any area, there are areas that need to encourage growth. We need to look at what kind of growth is best for the area. We need to encourage growth, but not overcrowd it. We need to be looking at how to produce more food, how to increase our capacity.
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In the interest of maintaining California’s farming base and a reasonable degree of peace, well, farming and urban residential uses can co-exist with the challenge of addressing the supply of housing and the next wave of development and growth. The argument is that when the urban-agricultural interface is maintained it creates another edge another buffer out there is less demand for urban development.

As a short-term zone of nuisances. There are problems.

Agricultural-urban edege. It can be viewed in two different ways:

The portion line is to do with the way that you perceive the issues.

• Simultaneous or supplemental (possibly) preserve urban growth boundaries, use policy and planning. Which are more likely to succeed? (1) pm plan for 2016, the 2016 Edges of Edges (2) focus on urban.release (possibly) preserve urban growth boundaries.

• Keep the Edges of Edges (possibly) and keep the Edges of Edges (possibly) preserve urban growth boundaries.

• Adequate funding of the state’s agricultural stewardship program (enacted in 1995) which establishes a procedure for conservation easements—such that only minimally

For conservation easements—but has been only minimally

Applied. Nothing of the state’s agricultural stewardship program. It’s not a matter of whether local governments or money it’s not a matter of whether local government should provide all of the funding local government in the state provide all of the funding needed.
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Paul Wenner is a third-generation farmer from Modesto. His principal commodities are walnuts and almonds, and various field crops. Mr. Wenner has a great deal of experience dealing with land use and ag-upland issues within Stanislaus County. He served two terms as president of the Stanislaus County Farm Bureau. During his tenure, the SCFB helped develop an award-winning agri-tourism plan, the award-winning "A Taste of Stanislaus" program. Prior to joining AFTR in 1990, Mr. Wenner worked on agricultural and natural resource issues in the U.S. Senate. He has a bachelor's degree in agricultural economics from UC Davis and is a Fresno County native.
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