

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

Approved November 6, 2023

COMMISSIONERS

Maureen Mulheren, Chair
County Member

Gerald Ward, Vice-Chair/Treasurer
Public Member

Gerardo Gonzalez
City Member

Katharine Cole
Special District Member

Candace Horsley
Special District Member

Glenn McGourty
County Member

Mari Rodin
City Member

Francois Christen, Alternate
Special District Member

Douglas Crane, Alternate
City Member

John Haschak, Alternate
County Member

Richard Weinkle, Alternate
Public Member

STAFF

Executive Officer
Uma Hinman

Clerk/Analyst
Larkyn Feiler

Counsel
Marsha Burch

REGULAR MEETINGS

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

MEETING MINUTES

Mendocino Local Agency Formation Commission

Regular Meeting (Hybrid) of Monday, September 11, 2023

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

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL (Video Time 4:30)

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

Regular Commissioners Present: Maureen Mulheren, Gerald Ward, Gerardo Gonzalez, Glenn McGourty, Mari Rodin (remotely), Candace Horsley, and Francois Christen (immediately seated)

Regular Commissioners Absent: Katharine Cole

Alternate Commissioners Present: Richard Weinkle and Douglas Crane

Alternate Commissioners Absent: John Haschak

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

2. PUBLIC EXPRESSION (Video Time 5:55)

None

3. OTHER BUSINESS

None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR (Video Time 8: 47)

4a) August 7, 2023 Regular Meeting Summary

4b) August 2023 Claims & Financial Report

August 2023 Claims totaling:	\$ 26,288.07
Hinman & Associates Consulting	22,800.07
P. Scott Browne	900.00
Streamline	63.00
CALAFCO	1,950.00
Ukiah Valley Conference Center	575.00

Commissioner Ward inquired about a recent phone bill for \$199, which was not listed in the expenses. EO Hinman responded that the charge is accounted for under the Hinman & Associates invoice and covers the annual office phone bill, which is paid by corporate credit card and expensed.

Commissioner Ward also inquired about \$370 in overhead billed to process the applications associated with the City of Ukiah and Fort Bragg. EO Hinman described that all services are billed per the service fees that were adopted in 2022 and that the overhead portion will offset organizational expenses. In response Commissioner Ward requested that the difference in overhead be shown as income.

Commissioner Ward inquired if the Money Market account with WestAmerica Bank had better rates available for saving accounts. EO Hinman responded that the idea could be explored.

Commissioner Ward asked about the hours being billed by Marsha Burch for legal services and requested a detailed breakdown of hours. EO Hinman confirmed the request and noted that no bill had been received from Ms. Burch as of yet; the last bill for legal services was from Scott Browne.

Commissioner Ward inquired about the Commission's decision to have hourly billing rather than a monthly average with the new legal services contract. EO Hinman responded that the comparison of charges and hours over the past two years appeared to average out and that ultimately the intent was for cost savings.

Commissioner Horsley asked for confirmation of whether legal services would be charged as a flat fee or hourly per month. EO Hinman confirmed that they would be charged hourly.

Motion: Approve the consent calendar.		
Motion Maker: Gonzalez	Motion Second: McGourty	Outcome: Passed unanimously
Roll Call Vote: Ayes: (7) Ward, Gonzalez, McGourty, Rodin, Horsley, Christen, Mulheren		

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

None

6. WORKSHOP ITEMS

None

7. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

7a) City of Ukiah Annexation of City-Owned Properties A (LAFCo File No. A-2021-01a) and Finding of Exemption Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Video Time 14:54)

The Commission considered approval of the City of Ukiah Annexation of City-Owned Properties A, involving APNs: 156-240-02, 156-240-13, 003-330-68, 003-330-69, 003-330-70, 184-080-36, 184-080-37, 184-090-01, 184-090-07, 184-100-04, 184-080-40, 184-100-05, 184-090-06, 184-150-01, 184-140-13.

EO Hinman noted that Craig Schlatter and Jesse Davis from the City of Ukiah were present at the meeting to answer questions related to the item.

Analyst Feiler provided a staff presentation on the item. (Video Time 16:05 - 25:22)

Commissioner Horsley asked the City staff about the electric services provided to the properties (PG&E); if there was any agricultural land within the City prior to the proposed annexation; for further clarification on Area 2 of the proposal and where that land came from previously; why the of Norgard Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC) needs to be further investigated; and if the school agencies would still be receiving property tax on the properties.

Analyst Feiler responded that she believed PG&E would still be serving the properties. The only agriculture land is in Area 4 and it was used for agriculture purposes prior to the proposed annexation. Analyst Feiler referred to City staff to clarify background information related to Area 2. She stated that the Norgard DUC needs to be further analyzed as part of state requirements. Lastly, Analyst Feiler explained that local schools are exempt from changes to property taxes in general, although City-owned property in City limits is exempt from all taxation.

Commissioner McGourty inquired about Area 4 and if it would be an island post annexation. Analyst Feiler responded that Area 4 and Area 5 are both adjacent to the City's wastewater treatment plant which are all considered noncontiguous areas under LAFCo law which allows for incorporated areas that are not connected to the City limits that are owned by the City and used for municipal purposes to exist.

Commissioner McGourty inquired about the conclusion made that suggests voting members of the DUC would not support annexation. Analyst Feiler responded that the conclusion is a broad generalization given that residential areas that are historically unincorporated prefer to remain unincorporated. Analyst Feiler further explained that this is why the DUC needs further analysis because no outreach has been conducted.

Commissioner McGourty inquired about the conclusion made that the Norgard/Airport South DUC would not benefit from annexation because of potential adverse economic impacts. Analyst Feiler responded that further analysis needs to be done related to the Norgard/Airport South DUC because only broad generalizations can be made for that particular area as part of the research for the annexation proposal.

Commissioner McGourty inquired about the road maintenance provided by the City and if it would affect the DUC area. Chair Mulheren responded that that type of inquiry would be better answered by City staff. Commissioner McGourty responded that as a District Supervisor adjacent to the DUC he believes urban uses should be contained within the City limits. Commissioner McGourty inquired about the City of Ukiah plans for Area 4.

Commissioner Ward noted that he would prefer to hear the City respond first before asking any questions.

Commissioner Gonzalez inquired about the timeline related to acquiring the DUC area. Chair Mulheren responded that the tax share agreement plays a role in this question which the City will hopefully address.

Jesse Davis, Chief Planning Manager for the City of Ukiah, noted that if the annexation is approved it will be the first annexation for the City since 1986.

Mr. Davis first addressed the PG&E service inquiry and stated that not all the properties currently have service from PG&E but those that do would continue service post annexation and that there would be no changes in services provided. Mr. Davis then addressed the agricultural inquiry and stated that there are no agricultural exclusive lands within the City limits but there are certain uses that allow small scale ag uses. He detailed that the Agricultural Combining District allows the City to preserve the continued use of those ag uses; further Area 4 is served by treated wastewater which is a direct benefit to the property and supports the recycled water system. The intention is to land bank Area 4 so it can be maintained for ag uses and maintained as a buffer from incompatible uses. Mr. Davis explained that Area 2, which was acquired by the City in 2013, contains the headwaters to Gibson Creek. The area contains natural resource protection enhancement projects as implemented by the City and the City intends to use this area to further preserve it and ensure future development doesn't hinder the progress made on repairing it to protect water resources. Mr. Davis noted that it makes the most sense for the City to maintain the islands as no other agency has the means to annex this area.

Mr. Davis confirmed Commissioner Horsley's inquiry that the land includes the old hatchery.

Commissioner McGourty commented that maintaining groundwater management and watersheds is important and it is very forward thinking to recognize and maintain it.

Mr. Davis discussed the Norgard/Airport South DUC (which is not part of the current annexation proposal) and noted that DUCs are identified in a number of documents and that the Nordgard/Airport South DUC was previously identified as a DUC in the City's Housing Element, but its boundary stopped at Highway 101 because it was determined by census blocks. The City identified and mapped five DUCs within the Ukiah Valley that are intended for annexation. Mr. Davis noted that time is needed to best understand how services will be provided to these areas as funding sources need to be identified and there are pre-zoning considerations to be made. The Norgard/Airport South area was considered a DUC was because of previous zoning designations made to the area by Mendocino County; Mr. Davis detailed the area west of the highway was zoned for industrial uses despite there being no industrial uses present and the area east is

zoned for agricultural uses despite being used primarily for residential uses. Mr. Davis noted that if the Norgard area is considered for annexation in the future, great considerations would need to be made to update the zoning given its proximity to the airport. Mr. Davis noted the potential future maintenance and improvements of Norgard Lane. He also noted the federal grant opportunities available for connecting DUCs, and explained that the City will conduct a thorough analysis in order to best provide services to the DUC areas post-annexation.

Commissioner McGourty inquired about groundwater contamination under Norgard Lane. Mr. Davis responded that there are many issues associated with that area including flooding, stormwater management, as previously mentioned the erroneous zoning, noise from the airport, etc., all of which contribute to the area being a DUC. Mr. Davis explained that based on geographic reasoning (i.e., the location of the area), it makes sense for the City to prioritize annexing it in the future. Mr. Davis further explained that a tax share agreement with the County would need to be in place to fully consider the options.

Commissioner Ward inquired about the existing housing on Norgard Lane. Mr. Davis responded by confirming that there are existing residents who would be annexed into the City and their input and feedback are critical to best understand how to provide services to the area. Mr. Davis emphasized that approximately 50% of the residents in the DUC are primary residents, or owner-occupied, and thus their feedback is vital; outreach would need to be offered in multiple languages and ample time is necessary.

Commissioner Ward asked for clarification on the parcels owned by residents on Norgard Lane and if they were a part of the current proposal for annexation; Mr. Davis confirmed that they were not up for consideration with the current proposal because only City-owned parcels were proposed for annexation.

Commissioner Ward inquired about the pocket of land in the middle of Area 2 which would become an island. Mr. Davis responded that as part of the proposal the City was requesting that an exception be made to allow for the creation of an island. Mr. Davis went on to explain that the parcels making up the island are privately-owned and used for residential purposes, and given that the proposed annexation consists of solely City-owned properties, it did not make sense for the City to annex the residential area at this time. Mr. Davis confirmed that this type of boundary is legal and that if in the future those residents in the island want to apply for annexation that would be welcome as the land is located within the City's SOI.

Commissioner Ward asked if the owners of the privately-owned parcels in Area 2 have been contacted and Mr. Davis responded they had not.

Commissioner Ward asked if it was the City's intent to annex the island in the future. Mr. Davis responded that it is the City's intent but only if the private landowners are willing.

Commissioner Horsley commented that the City purchased the surrounding land from the island property owner.

Commissioner Ward asked for clarification on the school district receiving \$21,743 less in property taxes. Mr. Davis responded that when these City-owned parcels are incorporated, they will no longer be subject to any property taxes. Chair Mulheren confirmed that County/City-owned properties and school district-owned properties are not subject to property taxes. Commissioner Ward asked if the school district was aware of this. Chair Mulheren confirmed that because the Board of Supervisors had already approved the funds, the County had reached out to all jurisdictions that would be affected by the change.

Commissioner Ward asked for clarification on the 'zero-sum' tax implication. Mr. Davis responded that to facilitate any annexation within California a tax share agreement must be negotiated; however, because the properties in the proposal consisted only of government-owned land, the City and County worked together to create a 'zero-tax share agreement' recognizing that there would be no new revenues, and thus no new taxes to share. Mr. Davis expressed that the agreement was approved by the City of Ukiah City Council and the County Board of Supervisors.

Commissioner Ward asked if the annexation would reduce the City's tax liability; Mr. Davis confirmed that it would reduce the City's tax burden by approximately \$62,966, as projected in 2021.

Commissioner Ward asked if the County would ultimately be affected by the reduction in taxes; Mr. Davis confirmed yes. Chair Mulheren commented that approximately 10 agencies would be subject to a reduction in property tax revenue because of the annexation. Mr. Davis reiterated that, with respect to the proposed annexation, careful consideration was taken to only include City-owned properties so as not to significantly affect the taxes of private lands, and that one of the priorities of the City is to achieve jurisdictional authority of the areas for streamlined processes in the future (i.e., applying for grants).

Commissioner Gonzalez inquired about the timeline related to acquiring the DUC area that is not part of the current proposal. Mr. Davis responded that while not currently under pre-application, upon completion of a master tax share agreement, the area would ideally be considered within the next five years.

Commissioner Ward asked who owned the land in Area 4 being used for vineyards, which has lease income; Mr. Davis responded that the City has owned the property since 2007, is leased to a vineyard management company, and was originally purchased for land banking purposes.

Commissioner Ward asked LAFCo staff how much the application for the annexation cost. EO Hinman responded that the City had deposited \$7,500 for the application. Commissioner Ward asked who paid for the mapping; EO Hinman responded that the City of Ukiah paid for and provided the mapping.

EO Hinman mentioned that in regard to the Norgard DUC annexation; a correction memo was provided the previous week clarifying the timing of the annexation of those properties and is part of the revised resolution of application.

Commissioner Rodin commented that she appreciated the work that went into the application and believes it will pave the way for future applications.

No public comments were provided on the item.

Motion: (1) Find the City of Ukiah Annexation of City-owned Properties A is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the Class 20 Exemption pursuant to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (14 CCR) § 15320, and approve the Notice of Exemption for filing; and (2) Adopt LAFCo Resolution 2023- 24-01, conditionally approving the City of Ukiah Annexation of City-owned Properties A (File No. A-2021-01a) for APNs: 156-240-02, 156-240-13, 003-330-68, 003-330-69, 003-330-70, 184-080-36, 184-080-37, 184-090-01, 184- 090-07, 184-100-04, 184-080-40, 184-100-05, 184-090-06, 184-150-01, 184-140-13.		
Motion Maker: Rodin	Motion Second: Gonzalez	Outcome: Passed unanimously
Roll Call Vote: Ayes: (7) Rodin, Gonzalez, McGourty, Ward, Horsley, Christen, Mulheren		

7b) City of Ukiah Annexation of City-Owned Properties B (LAFCo File No. A-2021-01b) and Finding of Exemption Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Video Time 1:01:45)

The Commission considered approval of the City of Ukiah Annexation of City-Owned Properties B, involving APN 178-130-01.

Analyst Feiler provided a staff presentation on the item. (Video Time 1:02:20 - 1:05:07)

Chair Mulheren clarified that the tax implications of the proposal had been considered, which was also confirmed by Analyst Feiler.

Commissioner McGourty asked how the project can be exempt from CEQA if it includes the landfill that is currently being closed. Analyst Feiler responded that the landfill has already been closed so from a CEQA perspective there are no proposed changes in the use of the site as it relates to the annexation.

Chair Mulheren asked for the City of Ukiah staff to give an update on the closure of the landfill. Mr. Davis stated that there are no proposed changes to the maintenance and monitoring of the landfill, only a change to the jurisdictional

authority is proposed. Commissioner McGourty asked if the area included the Ukiah Gun Club; Mr. Davis responded that it does not include the gun club or the adjacent property to the south.

Commissioner McGourty asked if it was typical for cities to have islands of incorporated lands. Analyst Feiler responded that there is a provision in LAFCo law that allows for this, and the Cities of Ukiah, Fort Bragg, and Willits have all utilized the provision. Analyst Feiler further clarified the provision is intended for city-owned properties used for municipal purposes. Mr. Davis then commented that the City views the areas as serving a public benefit.

Commissioner Ward inquired about the monitoring of the landfill and what could potentially happen in 10 years if there is no CEQA analysis now. Mr. Davis responded that the City is still responsible for the property as the property owner.

Legal Counsel Marsh Burch commented about the inquiries related to the landfill and CEQA, and clarified that the project (annexation) is proposing a jurisdictional authority change, and the decision related to the proposal will not have an environmental impact. Commissioner Gonzalez commented that the City wanting jurisdictional authority to help improve the grant application process is a good idea.

Commissioner Christen asked if conditionally approving the project meant that there are more steps in the process. Analyst Feiler explained that the conditions associated with the approval defined the scope and boundaries of the annexation proposal; there are no other conditions that would need to be satisfied.

No public comments were provided on the item.

Motion: (1) Find the City of Ukiah Annexation of City-owned Properties B is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the Class 20 Exemption pursuant to Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (14 CCR) § 15320, and approve the Notice of Exemption for filing; and (2) Adopt LAFCo Resolution 2023-24-02, conditionally approving the City of Ukiah Annexation of City-owned Properties B (File No. A-2021-01b) for APN 178-130-01.		
Motion Maker: McGourty	Motion Second: Gonzalez	Outcome: Passed unanimously
Roll Call Vote: Ayes: (7) McGourty, Gonzalez, Horsley, Rodin, Ward, Christen, Mulheren		

The Commission took a 10-minute recess (Video Time 1:15:58).

7c) Annual Work Plan Implementation and Schedule (Video Time 1:24:30)

EO Hinman provided a brief summary of the work plan, describing the schedule for annual MSR/SOI updates, which are intended to occur every 5 years and are focused on municipal services (water, sewer, fire and police).

EO Hinman explained that between 2012 and 2016, the first round of studies for the water and wastewater districts were conducted that produced abbreviated reports. Given drought conditions and other factors, a more robust approach to the reports is more appropriate for this round. There are 7 special districts that will be analyzed and 10 mutual water companies that will be included. EO Hinman presented the approach to implementation of the work plan. Public workshops and hearings are expected to begin in the beginning of the next calendar year.

Commissioner Ward inquired about the work plan contingencies and if there was a specific dollar amount in the budget. EO Hinman responded that the contingency is currently approximately \$30,000, which rolled over from last year and is intended to cover any changes to the work plan scope. Commissioner Ward asked if EO Hinman expected that the contingency would need to be used for this work plan; EO Hinman responded that she did not think so, and explained that the only foreseeable reason to use it would be related to necessary CEQA analyses. EO Hinman confirmed that the contingency amount rolls over into the next fiscal year if not used. Commissioner Ward asked when the last MSR reports were completed, and specifically Irish Beach which had issues. EO Hinman responded that the last round was in 2014-2016 and MSR determinations are revisited for each report as needed.

Commissioner Rodin inquired about how the process for retrieving information from the districts is going. EO Hinman explained that the RFIs are still being developed, but outreach has begun to two of the districts who have not been responsive to date. Depending on the responsiveness of the districts, this can cause significant delays in the overall process.

Commissioner Horsley inquired about how staff manages the workflow. EO Hinman responded that applications take precedence because they have regulatory timelines attached to them, which has caused delays in the past to the work plan. EO Hinman further described that more staff has been brought on to focus specifically on the work plan.

Commissioner Gonzalez asked about the requirement to analyze mutual water companies, which are not under the jurisdiction of LAFCo, and if there is any sort of state funding to cover the work related to them. EO Hinman responded that there is no funding mechanism to cover this work. EO Hinman noted that this message could be delivered to the CALAFCO legislative committee.

Commissioner Ward inquired about the applications that have been in process for the last three years and how they are being prioritized. EO Hinman responded that the applications have been deemed incomplete due to outstanding information needs and tax share agreements.

7d) Commissioner Terms, Recruitments and Elections (Video Time 1:39:20)

EO Hinman provided an informational update regarding the terms and recruitment of the alternate public member for 2024-27. EO Hinman stated that the alternate County term is up at the end of the year and will be appointed by the County Board of Supervisors in January. The current alternate public member is Commissioner Weinkle and his term is up at the end of 2023. The vacancy will be announced in September and applications will be taken through October. The Commission may hold interviews during the regular November meeting with appointment made in December.

7e) CALAFCO Business and Selection of Voting Delegates (Video Time 1:40:30)

EO Hinman reminded the Commission that the CALAFCO Annual Conference will be held in Monterey October 18-20; Commissioners Cole, Gonzalez and Weinkle are currently registered to attend, but Commissioner Weinkle can no longer attend, so there is an extra registration available. EO Hinman mentioned that the nomination period is still open for the Board of Directors for CALAFCO until September 18; the Northern Region is accepting nominations for both a county and a special district member. EO Hinman informed the Commission that Bill Connolly from Butte County LAFCo is the incumbent and has been nominated for the county position; Nevada LAFCo announced they will be nominating Commissioner Rikkie Heck who is a special district member from Nevada Irrigation District.

EO Hinman initiated the selection of a commissioner or staff member attending the conference to act as a voting delegate and an alternate; the deadline to submit the names of the delegates is September 18. Staff recommended the Chair invite motions for the voting and alternate delegates.

Motion: Nominate Commissioner Gonzalez as the voting delegate.		
Motion Maker: Ward	Motion Second: Horsley	Outcome: Passed unanimously
Roll Call Vote: Ayes: (7) Ward, Horsley, McGourty, Rodin, Gonzalez, Christen, Mulheren		

EO Hinman advised that an alternate be nominated as well to ensure voting coverage. Commissioner Gonzalez recommended EO Hinman as the alternate delate given that Commissioner Cole was absent.

Motion: Nominate EO Hinman as the alternate voting delegate.		
Motion Maker: Gonzalez	Motion Second: Ward	Outcome: Passed unanimously
Roll Call Vote: Ayes: (7) McGourty, Rodin, Ward, Gonzalez, Horsley, Christen, Mulheren		

8. INFORMATION AND REPORT ITEMS

8a) Work Plan, Current and Future Proposals (Video Time 1:45:05)

EO Hinman provided an update, noting that all applications on file are pending the completion of tax share agreements; tax share negotiations occur between the County Assessor, Auditor, the County Executive Officer, and Board of Supervisors. For the Anderson Valley CSD application to annex their SOI, a tax rate analysis has been provided to LAFCo and staff is working with County staff and the application to better understand the analysis and next steps.

Commissioner Ward asked if the City of Fort Bragg application was for annexation of the property located off Highway 20; EO Hinman confirmed that it was and that is it a pre-application request at this time for what will be another City-owned property annexation.

8b) Correspondence (Video Time 1:46:50)

None

8c) CALAFCO Business and Legislation Report (Video Time 1:46:55)

EO Hinman stated that AB 399, which staff will be sending a letter of opposition to, was passed by the Senate late last week and has moved to the Assembly Local Government Committee for a committee hearing. EO Hinman noted that the urgency clause had been dropped from the bill but that it still proposes to override a portion of the CKH process as it relates to water agencies and voting rights. Commissioner Rodin then suggested that per an email she sent to EO Hinman, she recommends the Commission add an informational agenda item related to the case in San Diego that led to the legislation.

8d) Executive Officer's Report (Video Time 1:48:55)

EO Hinman informed the Commission that per the last MUNIS report there were three agencies that had not paid their apportionments for fiscal year 2022-23; staff worked with the Auditors office to contact the delinquent agencies and confirms that all have now been paid. EO Hinman reported that staff has received recent public inquiring about receiving services from the City of Fort Bragg, which they are working through with City staff. Additionally, staff researched a request from the Palo Verde Fire Company (a volunteer fire department located in southeastern Humboldt County) related to receiving recognition similar to Whale Gulch Fire Company, which is a bi-County response agency; EO Hinman referred them to the Fire Chief's Association for further input in the process. In response to Commissioner Ward's inquiry EO Hinman explained they are interested in finding formal recognition that will allow them to seek additional funding to support their services. Chair Mulheren then commented that Senator McGuire received funding for fire trucks for smaller fire districts. EO Hinman confirmed that the process to determine eligibility for Prop 172 funding is determined by the Fire Chief's Association and the County.

8e) Committee Reports (Executive Committee, Policies & Procedures) (Video Time 1:51:25)

None

8f) Commissioners Reports, Comments or Questions (Video Time 1:51:30)

Commissioner Ward inquired about planning a future Policy and Procedures Committee meeting. EO Hinman suggested that a meeting be scheduled for October. Commissioner Horsley commented that she recently read the Policies and Procedures Manual and found a couple items that appear to need updating, she will direct those items to EO Hinman for review.

ADJOURNMENT (Video Time 1:52:30)

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

The next regular meeting of the Commission is scheduled on Monday, **October 2, 2023** 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 [September 11, 2023 YouTube meeting recording](#). Links to recordings and approved minutes are also available on the [LAFCo website](#).