

MENDOCINO

Local Agency Formation Commission

Ukiah Valley Conference Center | 200 South School Street | Ukiah, California 95482
Telephone: (707) 463-4470 | E-mail: eo@mendolafco.org | Web: http://mendolafco.org

COMMISSIONERS

Tony Orth, Chair
Brooktrails Township CSD

Scott Ignacio, Vice Chair
Point Arena City Council

Gerald Ward, Treasurer
Public Member

Matthew Froneberger
Special District Member

Glenn McGourty
County Board of Supervisors

Maureen Mulheren
County Board of Supervisors

Mari Rodin
City Member

Vacant
Ukiah Valley Fire District

Gerardo Gonzalez, Alternate
Willits City Council

John Haschak, Alternate
County Board of Supervisors

Richard Weinkle, Alternate
Public Member

STAFF

Executive Officer
Uma Hinman

Analyst
Larkyn Feiler

Commission Clerk
Kristen Meadows

Counsel
Scott Browne

REGULAR MEETINGS

First Monday of each month
at 9:00 AM in the
Mendocino County
Board of Supervisors
Chambers
501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah

Approved by Commission on December 19, 2022

MINUTES

Mendocino Local Agency Formation Commission

Regular Meeting (Hybrid) of Monday, November 7, 2022

County Board of Supervisors Chambers 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah, California

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL (Video Time 4:21)

Chair Orth called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

Regular Commissioners Present: Tony Orth, Scott Ignacio, Gerald Ward, Matthew Froneberger, Glenn McGourty, Maureen Mulheren, and Mari Rodin

Regular Commissioners Absent: None

Alternate Commissioners Present: Gerardo Gonzalez

Alternate Commissioners Absent: John Haschak, Richard Weinkle

Staff Present: Uma Hinman, Executive Officer; Larkyn Feiler, Analyst; Kristen Meadows, Clerk; Marsha Burch, Legal Counsel

2. AB 361 REMOTE TELECONFERENCING ACTION (Video Time 6:54)

Treasurer Ward asked for clarification on the upcoming legislation requirement for a quorum of Commissioners to be present in-person at hybrid public meetings. EO Hinman confirmed this requirement and noted that the new legislation goes into effect in March.

The Commission adopted Resolution No. 2022-23-04 making further findings related to holding Commission meetings via a hybrid model pursuant to the provisions of Government Code Section 54953(e).

Motion by Commissioner McGourty to adopt Resolution No. 2022-23-04.

Second by Commissioner Mulheren.

Approved by roll call vote: unanimous.

Ayes: (7) Ignacio, Rodin, McGourty, Mulheren, Ward, Orth, Froneberger

3. PUBLIC EXPRESSION None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR (Video Time 9:24)

4a) September 12, 2022 Regular Meeting Summary

4b) Ratify the September 2022 Claims & Financial Report

September 2022 Claims totaling:	\$17,243.51
Hinman & Associates Consulting	15,531.25
P. Scott Browne	900.00
Cash	136.64
Comcast	93.67
Streamline	50.00
Ukiah Valley Conference Center	531.95

4c) October 2022 Claims & Financial Report

October 2022 Claims totaling:	\$13,775.48
Hinman & Associates Consulting	11,389.22
P. Scott Browne	900.00
Mulheren Reimbursement	799.30
Comcast	93.67
Phone.com	0.24
Streamline	50.00
Ukiah Valley Conference Center	543.05

Commissioner Rodin expressed appreciation for the meeting summary and quality work of Clerk Meadows.

Motion by Commissioner Rodin to approve the Consent Calendar.

Second by Commissioner Mulheren.

Approved by roll call vote: unanimous.

Ayes: (7) Ward, Froneberger, Mulheren, McGourty, Rodin, Ignacio, Orth

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS None

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS (Video Time 11:00)

6a) Joint Public Workshop for the City of Ukiah and Ukiah Valley Sanitation District Draft Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Updates

EO Hinman introduced the item regarding a joint public workshop on the Draft Municipal Service Review (MSR) and Sphere of Influence (SOI) Update studies for the City of Ukiah (City) and the Ukiah Valley Sanitation District (UVSD or District). EO Hinman explained that this is the second of two workshops; the first was held in September and focused on the MSRs and this workshop focuses more on the SOI Update studies for the agencies.

Analyst Feiler provided a [staff presentation](#) on the item. (Video Time 12:36 – 19:23)

Analyst Feiler clarified that no formal action would be taken on the Draft MSR/SOI Updates at this meeting, and a public hearing would be scheduled for formal consideration by the Commission of the Final MSR/SOI Updates.

Analyst Feiler also gave special thanks to the following local agency staff and representatives for assistance in preparing the draft documents.

City of Ukiah

Sage Sangiacomo, City Manager

Craig Schlatter, Community Development Director

Jesse Davis, Chief Planning Manager

Ukiah Valley Sanitation District

Wing-See Fox, Interim General Manager

Ernie Wipf, Board Chair & Ad Hoc Committee Member

Mark DeMeulenaere, Contractor

Following are summary Commission discussion points for this item for ease of review:

- The Slide Deck for the staff presentation was requested to be added to the LAFCo website.
- Feedback was requested from UVSD staff regarding the coterminous sphere recommendation for UVSD.
- The UVSD Interim General Manager responded that the District, City, and LAFCo staff have been working together on this item and in addition an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of two City Councilmembers, two District Board members, and agency staff have been working together on the Interim Services Agreement, which is a milestone agreement, and where many of the recommendations are coming from and dependent upon. A key component is that with City annexations there will not be detachment of any UVSD sewer customers, either in the overlap area or future out-of-agency service agreement connections, which allows the District to remain financially whole. The District and City are cooperating on this and future plans for consolidation once certain thresholds are met.
- Clarification was requested on the anticipated timeframe for the thresholds to be met and transition to occur.
- The UVSD Interim General Manager responded that it is dependent on the City's annexation schedule and noted that both agencies continue to work together related to the 70% thresholds of voters and land area, since the land threshold may be difficult to achieve and could potentially lead to special legislation.

- The City Community Development Director responded that it is difficult to know with any level of certainty, but upon completion of the MSR/SOI Update studies the City plans to submit one to three annexation applications that are currently in a pre-application status with LAFCo, and the thresholds could be met in one to two years depending on application processing timeframes.
- Clarification was requested on the order of operations and why the MSR/SOI is occurring before the annexations.
- The City Community Development Director responded that the City General Plan Update and MSR/SOI Update normally occurs first and this has been requested by the Commission to lay the foundation for significant City annexation applications.
- Clarification was requested on what happens if the annexations are not approved.
- The City Community Development Director responded that City Council gave City staff clear direction in 2020 to proceed with the proposed City sphere boundary that is now memorialized in the City's 2040 General Plan and therefore City staff will continue to implement the Council's direction until such time as the direction changes.
- Clarification was requested on the hard lines in the proposed City SOI, whether is it related to parcels rather than geographic landforms, and what is customary for SOI mapping.
- LAFCo staff responded that the proposed City SOI boundary is based on the historic boundaries of adjacent wastewater and water service providers and topographical constraints including hillsides and water features.
- A suggestion was made to take this legacy opportunity to create a sensible sphere instead of relying on historic approaches; this seems like the time to make a change that works better with the actual landscape and follows logical areas that are buildable and have services in order to avoid abrupt jurisdictional changes from City to County across the street. Of note, there is a peculiar looking area west of the City that appears based on parcels.
- LAFCo staff responded that the area west of the City is based on specific parcels for a future annexation proposal and is related to land acquired by the City for open space preservation and a clustered development.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that there are a number of factors that influence and inform the SOI boundary, such as geopolitical boundaries, proposed annexations, topography, zoning, and noted that the City's General Plan Planning Area, which effectively follows the Ukiah Valley Area Plan boundary, is also a component.
- A comment was made that a more progressive thought is to manage based on watershed and topography, looking at the influence of hydrology on landforms and how it affects the landscape and uses, but instead we are looking at square lines which does not seem to make sense anymore.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that the SOI boundary is a component of what the City's boundary may be in the future; the proposed SOI identifies the City's intentions for annexation and ultimately makes a more consolidated and effective political geography in relation to water and wastewater services. Of note, the Western Hills open space preservation and the headwaters of Gibson Creek encompass unique opportunities presented, and APNs 156-240-09 and 11 should be added to the SOI and were excluded due to a small mapping error.
- A comment was made that on page 92 the City's General Plan Land Use Diagram shows critical uses such as ag lands and public uses and on page 101 shows the Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUC) which are elements included in the SOI. Areas of Interest can also be designated for future consideration of other areas.
- Clarification was requested on whether the MSR/SOI Updates will bind the Commission on the annexations and future consolidation.
- LAFCo staff responded that the SOI establishes the probable boundary of an agency, and any proposed change of organization would come before the Commission for approval.
- Clarification was requested about how the tax share process ties into this and realistically whether this sphere decision will come to fruition in the near-term.
- LAFCo staff responded that a tax share agreement is required prior to Commission consideration of any change of organization, approval of an SOI indicates that the Commission would consider an annexation proposal by the agency, an agency's SOI can be revised in the future, and MSR/SOI studies are commonly reviewed on a five to ten-year cycle with a twenty-year SOI planning horizon. Further, the reason for the jagged looking sphere is to follow parcel boundaries since annexations occur on a parcel basis and are not intended to include partial parcels.
- The City Community Development Director echoed LAFCo staff in confirming that there will be another opportunity for the Commission to consider whether the proposed City SOI is effective in five to ten years and the City's General Plan Update, which is aligning with the SOI Update process, is also a living and breathing document, not static, and needs to be re-evaluated regularly to ensure that it remains appropriate. Further, the area between the City's proposed SOI and General Plan Planning Area is currently proposed as an Area of Interest.

- A comment was made that everyone has been working for years to further refine the City's ridgetop to ridgetop SOI which has led to the proposed sphere based on modern planning efforts.
- A comment was made that typically a City grows to encompass urban and municipal uses and an exception would be made for the City to include agricultural and open space due to inclusion of an Ag Element in the City's General Plan and commitment to ag land and open space protection.
- LAFCo staff elaborated that the Ag Preservation analysis portion of the City's study is on page 166 of the packet and confirmed that normally agricultural and open space areas are not included in a city sphere in order to prevent premature conversion to urban uses; however, the City will be one of a few cities in California with an Agriculture Element, which emphasizes the City's long-term vision for and dedication to agricultural preservation and stewardship, and the City is creating policies and a land uses designation that mirrors those established by the County and therefore the City will provide the same if not greater ag protection as a result. Therefore, the City's proposed SOI is recommended to include ag and open space lands.
- Clarification was requested on why the City's SOI Update has not occurred sooner.
- The City Manager responded that currently there is unprecedented collaboration between the agencies involved, which historically has been focused on protecting territory, and the milestone agreement for interim services and the current effort to reduce the City's SOI and add an Area of Interest has progressed this far because the agencies are now focusing on how to work together to best serve our community. Further, the current interagency collaboration and planning is long overdue and setting the stage to guide short and long-term opportunities for improving the delivery of municipal services in the valley.
- Appreciation was given for the interagency collaboration and convergence of the Ukiah Valley Area Plan, City 2040 General Plan and EIR, and SOI Update which is hugely beneficial.
- Clarification was requested on the long-term and short-term effects of the tax share agreement between the City and County related to the proposed City SOI and annexations.
- The City Manager responded that the County and all four Cities are involved in creating a Master Tax Share Agreement.
- A comment was made to confirm that the County Tax Share Ad Hoc Committee process includes consideration of the proposed SOI and annexation areas and financial impacts to each agency. Further, when specific applications come before the Commission, the Master Tax Share Agreement will provide a template for reviewing revenues, costs, and reduction of liabilities on the County for each proposal.
- Appreciation was given for the Master Tax Share Agreement process and all the studies being prepared to help move the process forward for the benefit of our communities.
- The City Manager elaborated that in addition to the Master Tax Share Agreement, individual LAFCo applications will include a Plan for Services addressing financial implications of the proposal. Further, these current efforts involving tax sharing and SOI planning will have a net positive effect for the areas adjacent to the other three cities in the County and help better manage urbanizing effects based on lessons learned in the Ukiah Valley.
- Clarification was requested on how the City General Plan is addressing changes in State law effecting development that can occur in City limits, such as how commercial can now include mixed-use residential.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that this issue is central to the General Plan, especially related to SB 9 and accessory dwelling units, and the City is looking toward infill as a primary component for addressing the myriad of State laws involving housing, water, and municipal waste. Further, the City already recognizes and provides allowance for multi-family in commercial, the City is already capable of meeting the State law allowing affordable housing in vacant underutilized commercial properties, and the density allowance in commercial zoned areas is aligned with medium or high-density zoning for residential uses. Overall, the City's infill development very much reflects State law and our intent to develop housing and other mixed-use developments, all of which flowed directly into the City's MSR/SOI Update study.
- The City Community Development Director elaborated that there is a tremendous amount of State law coming down to local planning authorities and the City's intent is to retain as much local control as possible, adhere to the longstanding vision of Ukiah Valley as a whole community which can be accomplished through consistency of design and infrastructure connectivity planning, and protect the greenspaces that make the valley unique.
- Appreciation was given for the thorough and yet concise information in each MSR section and the determinations specific to areas of improvement for City services in view of proposed annexations.
- Table 2.3 should be corrected to reflect 2018-2021 as the term for Councilmember Rodin.

- Add a reference to the City-County mutual aid agreement for law enforcement on page 52 of the packet under Section 2.3.3.2.
- Add a definition for “all-risk” related to fire services on page 52 of the packet under Section 2.3.3.3.
- Clarification was requested on the location of the Gardens Gate development south of the City limits and the proposed provision of services.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that the Bella Vista project was originally approved roughly ten years ago, is located within the City’s proposed SOI, and service provision will be reviewed when the County Planning Commission considers the proposed modification to a tentative map. Further, this project is located just south of Gobalet Lane and south of the City limits and is currently within the Willow County Water District boundary.
- Clarification was requested on the lack of information on groundwater in the City’s MSR since there is the Ukiah Valley Basin Groundwater Sustainability Agency, a heavy reliance on groundwater in the valley, a potential need for a Watershed Element in the City’s General Plan to protect headlands such as Doolin Creek, and the potential for future State limitations on land use and development in critical groundwater recharge habitat areas.
- Clarification was given that originally the City’s SOI was ridgetop to ridgetop representing the watershed and has been criticized as being too extensive and needing a higher level of planning, which the proposed SOI represents.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that the City’s MSR on page 3-117 under Section 3.14.1.3 provides information on the Groundwater Sustainability Plan. Further, the MSR consolidates information from various recently completed studies, such as the Ukiah Urban Water Management Plan.
- Clarification was requested about whether there are any residential areas currently served by water districts that are not within the City’s proposed SOI boundary.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that he is not aware of such a situation. There are portions of the Willow County Water District beyond the City’s General Plan Planning Area and SOI; however, these areas are primarily agricultural in nature and have limited to no customers. Further, City staff was careful in developing the proposed SOI boundary to ensure that no water district customers were excluded.
- Clarification was requested on the buildout figures for the City’s future annexations.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that the buildout figures are related to the General Plan not the SOI.
- The City Community Development Director elaborated that the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) maximum buildout projections are unlikely to actually occur but are included for CEQA evaluation purposes.
- A comment was made that the City’s population projections seem low.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that the population projections were based on existing trends and conditions to evaluate what percentage would be appropriate for population increase within the City limits, and the trend is that there are fewer families getting larger and less net migration occurring resulting in a fairly stagnant City population for a number of years and an estimated growth of 1%. Further, more growth would occur upon annexation.
- Clarification was requested on the City’s growth constraint or limiting factor being tied to available Equivalent Sewer Service Units (ESSUs) as opposed to water since the City has very underutilized water rights.
- The City Chief Planning Manager responded that there is a combination of limiting factors to growth, such as the cost of construction, available land, and interest rates, and one of the tools for addressing needed housing is accessory dwelling units and infill development which would have limited impact to ESSUs.
- The City Manager elaborated that there is sufficient ESSU capacity to serve projected growth at this time.
- The UVSD Interim General Manager echoed the City Manager’s comment regarding sufficient ESSU capacity.
- The City Chief Planning Manager elaborated that the City-owned property adjacent to the treatment plant will allow for future service expansion when appropriate.
- Clarification was requested on whether recycled water effects capacity at the wastewater treatment plant.
- The City Manager responded that recycled water improves discharge at the plant but does not impact capacity; however, improvements to the collection system to limit water intrusion into the system is improving capacity.
- Clarification was requested whether any determinations from the City’s 2014 MSR warranted discussion.
- LAFCo staff responded that there was nothing of significance to note.
- Clarification was requested on how much of the MSR information originated from LAFCo and City staff.
- LAFCo staff responded that study development was a heavily collaborative effort between the agencies and LAFCo with considerable iterations of review and revision, and a significant amount of information came from the City’s 2040 General Plan and environmental review documents, and other existing studies of the agencies.

- Clarification was requested on the level of public controversy related to the City's General Plan.
- The City Manager responded that City staff have completed an extensive community engagement and diligent planning process over the last couple of years that has informed and advised the General Plan document, and it is not anticipated that there will be controversy related to the City's MSR/SOI Update.
- The City Community Development Director elaborated that it has been a concerted effort by the City, District, and LAFCo staff over the last couple years to move towards open communication and effective collaboration resulting in a community driven MSR/SOI document.
- Clarification was requested from the District on their perspective of the process and outcomes.
- The UVSD Board Chair commented that the Interim Service Agreement will help make for a smooth transition and the remaining kinks will be worked out in moving forward, such as the triggers for when the District becomes a subsidiary of the City, and ultimately the creation of the District to serve areas outside the City limits may not have been the most effective approach in retrospect and has led to duplications in staffing.
- Clarification was requested on how long it will take before the District is consolidated or becomes a subsidiary.
- The UVSD Board Chair responded that it depends on development, and the current arrangement will remain in effect until 70% of the District customers are within the City limits.
- The City Manager elaborated that the agreement allows for enhanced efficiencies in the short-term and the long-term when the consolidation threshold is reached, and immediately releases the log jam building over the last four decades to allow forward movement for the community and property owners.
- Appreciation was given for this plan which lays out a logical development process.
- The UVSD Interim General Manager commented that the cooperation between the City, District, and LAFCo on this arrangement runs deep and everyone is working under a unique set of circumstances and rules and making compromises for the greater good. For example, the landmark agreement between the City and District allows for the City to proceed with annexation plans and the District can be assured of financial viability and ability to meet coverage, covenants, and pay its debt service and service costs. Further, there are exceptions being made by LAFCo in extending support for this excellent cooperation, such as normally with consolidation plans the dissolving agency would have a reduced sphere recommendation, however, in this case the prospect of the District moving from a sphere that matched the City to a reduced sphere that removed the overlap area was too big of a step at this time and therefore a coterminous sphere recommendation was provided as a good compromise.
- A comment was made that while multi-headed bureaucracies are not ideal and can be wasteful, sometimes it is important to have more than one group in control because different groups have different interests and needs, and provided that this encouraging level of cooperation continues between the agencies, this is a beneficial approach for moving forward instead of sideways and building bridges instead of silos.
- A comment was made for public transparency that there is a surcharge on the tipping rate so that anyone who uses the Ukiah transfer station is supporting the closure of the Ukiah landfill (page 135 of 281).
- A comment was made that there is a disconnect between the beginning net position on the finances table and balance sheet.
- On page 95, add a clarification statement for the benefit of the reader that the proposed annexations are pending the tax share agreement and LAFCo approval to be clear that certain steps in the process still need to be addressed.
- Appreciation was given to LAFCo and agency staff for a job well done in preparing the MSR/SOI studies.
- Clarification was requested regarding the City's Electric Utility and PG&E services currently provided in the proposed annexation areas, and at what point in the process does PG&E become part of the conversation.
- The City Manager responded that areas proposed for annexation that are currently receiving PG&E services would not prevent a LAFCo application, but it would be addressed in the Plan for Services and there does have to be a negotiation between the City Electric Utility and PG&E to change the electric service provider, which may or may not happen at the time of annexation. Further, it is in the best interest of customers to be served by the City Electric Utility because there is no revenue allocated to Shareholders and therefore City electricity rates are about 30% cheaper than PG&E. Further, even if PG&E does not provide consensus for service change, it does not prevent the City from building out its infrastructure to provide services to those customers, but it is in the best interest of everyone to reach those types of agreement and the City will be seeking them in the future.

The Chair welcomed public comments on the Draft City and District MSR/SOI Updates. No comments were received.

Chair Orth directed staff to schedule a public hearing to consider adoption of the final City and UVSD MSR/SOI Update studies at the next Commission meeting.

EO Hinman noted that the discussion focused a lot on the City and gave special thanks to the UVSD Interim General Manager and Board Chair for all their assistance in developing the UVSD study. EO Hinman also noted that the teamwork on this effort involved the City, District, and LAFCo staff and appreciated the hard work and relationship building involved in bringing this item forward without controversy and with the high level of coordination.

The Chair called a 5-minute break at 10:46 a.m. (Video Time: 1:48:48)

The Chair called the meeting back to order at 10:55 a.m. (Video Time: 1:58:10) The same Commissioners were present.

7. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

7a) Proposed Rescheduling of December Regular Meeting (Video Time: 1:58:10)

EO Hinman presented a proposal to reschedule the December 5 regular meeting to December 12 to allow time for the Ukiah City Council to consider its 2040 General Plan Update and EIR, which is the CEQA component that LAFCo will rely upon for the Ukiah SOI Update. Additionally, to plan for the potentiality of a delay in the Ukiah City Council process, staff requested the Commission discuss availability for a potential special meeting the last week of the December.

Commissioner Ignacio requested clarification regarding the need to schedule the hearings for December rather than January. EO Hinman responded the intent is to complete the public hearings with the current boards and Commission who have been working through these studies all year and including the two previously held workshops. Most boards and the Commission will be changing seats at the beginning of January and five Commissioner terms are up at the end of December.

Commissioner Mulheren recommended setting the December date and finding alternative locations for the meeting if the Board Chambers are not available.

Motion by Commissioner Ignacio to reschedule the December meeting to December 19, 2022, and also give staff leeway to make the necessary adjustments for alternative locations and alternative dates, as necessary.

Second by Commissioner Mulheren.

Approved by roll call vote: unanimous.

Ayes: (7) Ward, Mulheren, Ignacio, Froneberger, Rodin, McGourty, Orth

7b) New Brown Act Rules for Remote Meetings (AB 2449) (Video Time: 2:08:45)

EO Hinman presented an informational report on a new law AB 2449 that will take effect March 1, 2023 regarding virtual meetings for local agencies. With Governor Newsom's termination of the declaration of emergency that takes effect February 28, 2023, the new law will allow for continued virtual meetings under specific circumstances and limitations. The law requires a quorum of the commission to be present in-person and limits the number of meetings attended virtually by any one commissioner to two in a calendar year (for commissions that meet monthly). Requests by commissioners to attend remotely must be made to the full commission beforehand and reasons must meet the criteria for either "just cause" or "emergency circumstances."

Chair Orth suggested an Executive Committee meeting to discuss how to implement the new law.

Commissioner Ward asked for clarification regarding the three missed meetings language of the bill. Counsel Burch responded that there are a number of open questions regarding the consequences of missed meetings. Counsel will work with staff to develop a plan for implementing the new requirements for discussion with the Executive Committee. Any policy addressing the new meeting requirements should be in place before March 1, 2023.

8. INFORMATION AND REPORT ITEMS

8a) Work Plan, Current and Future Proposals (Video Time: 2:16:20)

EO Hinman presented the staff report, noting that a written summary of the Work Plan and current proposals is located on pages 277 – 281 of the Agenda Packet. In summary, all applications are incomplete at this time, pending, among other things, tax share agreements.

Staff anticipates a proposal from the City of Ukiah and the Ukiah Valley Sanitation District for an Out-of-Agency Service Agreement in the coming months.

There has also been correspondence with the Anderson Valley Community Services District regarding an application to annex its Sphere of Influence for fire services; an application is anticipated in the next couple of months.

8b) Correspondence None

8c) CALAFCO Business and Legislation Report (Video Time: 2:18:34)

Senate Bill 938 was signed and passed by the Governor revising protest thresholds for LAFCo-initiated applications. Staff will present on this further in the first quarter of 2023.

Commissioner Mulheren attended the CALAFCO Conference in October and provided a summary of her take-aways.

Chair Orth suggested sending each newly elected official in the County a link to their agency's MSR/SOI study and an introduction to LAFCo.

Commissioner Rodin recommended that a LAFCo 101 session be provided to the new Commission in early 2023, emphasizing the roles and responsibilities of commissioners.

Chair Orth agreed, noting the importance of educating new commissioners that LAFCo commissioners act for the benefit of all the citizens within Mendocino County and not just for their representing agency.

Commissioner Ignacio noted that we held a LAFCo 101 training workshop last year that was open to everyone.

Commissioner Ward suggested that Commissioners attend district board and city council meetings when they can to stay informed on local issues and concerns.

8d) Executive Officer's Report (Video Time: 2:26:32)

EO Hinman reported the following:

- The Fiscal Year 2021-22 financial report and backup documentation has been provided to our CPA for preparation of the annual audit.
- The special district election ballot deadline is Friday, November 11, for the regular special district seat for the term 2023-2026; candidates are Candace Horsley and Francois Christen. As the only nominee for the alternate special district seat, Francois Christen (Anderson Valley CSD), is automatically appointed the Alternate Member.
- We received one application for the new Public Member term, Commissioner Ward; consideration of appointment will be on the next agenda.
- Kristen Meadows, who has served as our LAFCo Clerk, has accepted a career advancement and her last day will be November 14.
- An Executive Committee meeting will be scheduled following the next regular meeting of the Commission. Chair Orth suggested scheduling a Policies & Procedures Committee meeting in January.

8e) Committee Reports (Executive Committee, Policies & Procedures, Work Plan Ad Hoc) None

8f) Commissioners Reports, Comments or Questions None

ADJOURNMENT (Video Time: 2:31:45)

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m. The next regular meeting of the Commission will be held on Monday, December 19, 2022 at 9:00 a.m. The meeting will be conducted in a hybrid format to accommodate both in-person and remote participation. The in-person meeting will be held in the County Board of Supervisors Chambers at 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah.

Live web streaming and recordings of Commission meetings are available via the County of Mendocino's YouTube Channel. [November 7, 2022, YouTube meeting recording](#). Links to recordings and approved minutes are also available on the [LAFCo website](#).