

At the end of the meeting, E.O. McMichael pointed out that this document as compared to Mendocino's SOI/MSR Reports did not provide maps, did not review the proposed SOI, did not review the SOI territory as to ability to serve, did not provide SOI determinations and did not provide MSA determination as required by 56378.

**AGENDA ITEM 5—ADJOURNMENT**

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

**LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION  
MENDOCINO COUNTY**

The Planning Committee of the Local Agency Formation Commission convened a meeting on Tuesday, December 21, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. at the City of Ukiah Conference Center, Chardonnay Room, 200 School St., Ukiah, CA.

**AGENDA ITEM 1 - CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

At 10:05 p.m. Chair Shoemaker called the meeting of the Planning Committee of the Local Agency Formation Commission of Mendocino County to order in the Chardonnay Rm. of the Ukiah Conference Center. The following Commissioners were present and seated: Commissioners McCowen and Chair Shoemaker; Commissioner Madrigal was absent. Also present were Executive Officer McMichael, City of Ukiah Planning Director, Charley Stump and John Mayfield.

**AGENDA ITEM 2 - PUBLIC EXPRESSION**

There was no one in attendance from the public who indicated an interest in speaking under public expression.

**AGENDA ITEM 3 - APPROVAL/CORRECTION/ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

Upon a motion by Commissioner McCowen, seconded by Chair Shoemaker, the minutes the December 15, 2010 Planning Committee meeting were unanimously approved on a voice vote.

**AGENDA ITEM 5 - REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF SERVICE REVIEW STRUCTURE, FORMAT, CONTENTS AND DETERMINATIONS**

The Planning Committee provided a review of the November 2004 County of Sonoma Water and District Providers Municipal Service Review as prepared by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.

The review of this Report included the following comments or observations by the committee members:

- (1) Page 33 under bullet point "Asset Preservation Level of Service" the question was asked as to the meaning of item 2, "provide a beneficial impact on the quality of level of life in the community." It was thought that this comment reflected a subjective statement that could not be supported by the Report.
- (2) Page 33, second paragraph from bottom was thought to be opinion unsupported by information in the Report.
- (3) Page 38, fourth paragraph down, provided the observation as to the need for "capital improvements over the next five years." Commentary by committee members was that there was no means indicated as to how the capital improvements would be funded.
- (4) Page 38, bottom paragraph commentary was that this was a warning about insufficient capacity.
- (5) Page 40, second paragraph from top, underline this sentence as a warning about adequate reserves. "The District lacks an adequate reserve in FY 2003-2004 but provides for depreciation in its budgetary process."
- (6) Page 41, bottom paragraph, was thought to be a good statement about demand and capacity.
- (7) Page 43, last sentence, pointed out that the district lacked a Master Facility Plan or similar document (CIP) to address capacity expansion. Discussion indicated that a present day SSMP would probably force a CIP that could include facility planning.
- (8) Page 57, second paragraph, indicates need for CIP upgrades but no information about funding.
- (9) Page 57, last paragraph was thought to be an adequate statement about demand and capacity.
- (10) The overall comment by the committee was that this document was insufficiently detailed and would probably need to be twice as long to provide appropriate detail.