

Wendy, this is what I had in mind for the ag write up. Ag is important but no more so than other resources. We will do what we can to minimize impacts but someone may decide to move forward even if impacts to ag occur. Suggest a draft along the following lines.

1. This was prepared in response to recent statements/implications about agriculture and the type of consideration it should receive in project planning and environmental documentation.
2. Your first paragraph.
3. Identify the other significant effects defined in CEQA to give reader a sense that ag is not the only one.
4. The Council of Environmental Quality in a memorandum dated August 11, 1980, illustrates how its implementing regulations for NEPA, can be used to account for the impacts of an action on agricultural land and more specifically on prime or unique agricultural lands. The memorandum goes on to urge agencies to make a particular careful effort in dealing with prime and unique farmlands.
5. As with agriculture, CEQ's implementing regulations, are to be followed to determine the effects of a proposed federal action on any resource (fish, wildlife, cultural resources, air quality, etc.).
6. It is apparent that agriculture and any other resource, potentially affected by an action, need to be treated equally and responsibly in planning efforts and in environmental documents.
7. Lay out steps we will follow, i.e., a. in alternative planning we will assess if actions impact ag or any other resources and adjust action, to extent possible, to avoid/minimize impacts; b. in the env doc., we will clearly identify consequences to ag or any other resource and suggest mitigation measures; c. If impacts to ag or any resource are unavoidable and not mitigateable, they will be defined; d. Decisions will be made as to acceptability of the preferred alternative and attendant impacts; and e. Further adjustments may be made.

Nepa/ag.d18