

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

Carre Brown, Chair

County Board of Supervisors

Tony Orth, Vice Chair

Brooktrails Township CSD

Gerald Ward, Treasurer

Public Member

Gerardo Gonzalez

Willits City Council

John Huff

Mendocino Coast Recreation
and Park District

Scott Ignacio

Point Arena City Council

John McCowen

County Board of Supervisors

Jenifer Bazzani, Alternate

Ukiah Valley Fire District

Will Lee, Alternate

Fort Bragg City Council

Richard Weinkle, Alternate

Public Member

John Haschak, Alternate

County Board of Supervisors

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

Approved by Commission on August 3, 2020

MINUTES

Local Agency Formation Commission of Mendocino County

Regular Meeting of Monday, June 1, 2020

Meeting held via Zoom due to COVID-19 Pandemic Emergency Conditions

1. **CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL** (Video Time 2:51)

Chair Brown called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Regular Commissioners Present: Carre Brown, Tony Orth, Gerald Ward (at 9:12 a.m.), Gerardo Gonzalez, Scott Ignacio, and John McCowen

Regular Commissioners Absent: None

Alternate Commissioners Present: Richard Weinkle (seated for Commissioner Ward until 9:12 a.m.)

Alternate Commissioners Absent: Jenifer Bazzani, Will Lee, John Haschak

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

2. **PUBLIC EXPRESSION** (Video Time 6:02)

No one from the public indicated interest in public expression.

3. **CONSENT CALENDAR** (Video Time 6:45)

Commissioner Orth noted that Alternate Commissioner Weinkle will be the voting member during Commissioner Ward's absence.

3a) Approval of the April 6, 2020 Regular Meeting Summary

Commissioner Ignacio noted a correction to the poll vote tally at the bottom of page 5 of the agenda packet: correct results were 6 to 3.

3b) Approval of the May 4, 2020 Regular Meeting Summary

3c) Approval of the May 4, 2020 Claims & Financial Report

<u>May 2020 Claims totaling</u>	<u>\$ 10,462.70</u>
Hinman & Associates Consulting	\$ 9,088.00
P. Scott Browne	\$ 600.00
Newspapers	\$ 190.70
Ukiah Valley Conference Center	\$ 434.00
Commissioner Stipends	\$ 150.00

Following a motion by Commissioner Ignacio and a second by Commissioner McCowen, the Consent Calendar was approved with noted changes by roll call vote.

Ayes: (7) Orth, McCowen, Gonzalez, Huff, Weinkle, Ignacio, Brown

4. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEM** (Video Time 9:48)

5a) Final Budget and Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2020-21

Chair Brown gave a review of the Public Hearing process and confirmed with EO Hinman that item was properly noticed.

EO Hinman reported that Commissioner Ward had joined the meeting (at 9:12 a.m.), then presented the Staff Report.

The Proposed Budget and Work Plan for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-21 was approved by the Commission on May 4, 2020. The funding formula for LAFCo's budget is established in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act. Mendocino LAFCo is funded primarily by the County, Cities, and Independent Special Districts, each paying one-third of the adopted budget. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 56381, the Proposed and Final Budgets have been circulated to all member agencies including the County, Cities and Independent Special Districts. No comments have been received throughout the budget proceedings for FY 2020-21.

In recognition of the uncertain economic future due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Final Budget includes multiple limits to expenses despite significant increases in membership fees and insurance premiums, and reflects a very small increase from last fiscal year (\$1,402). The 2020-21 Final Budget:

- Excludes participation in the annual CALAFCO Conference and out of County travel for Commissioners and Staff;
- Approves an increase to the Legal Services Agreement to provide for an average of four hours per month of legal support and accommodates a rate increase;
- Limits necessary increases in member agencies' apportionments to 10% and advises member agencies of the potential necessity to incrementally increase apportionment rates in future fiscal years in order for the Commission to achieve its expanding state mandated responsibilities, consistent with Government Code Section 56381; and
- Utilizes reserves to fund the difference between apportionments and expenditures.

Commissioner Ward expressed concern about voting on the Final Budget before having the discussion about Legal Counsel Support (Agenda Item 6a). Commissioner McCowen suggested moving forward, and if the discussion prompted a need for change, the Commission could revisit the Public Hearing item. Commissioner Ward, concurred.

Following a motion by Commissioner Orth and a second by Commissioner Huff, Resolution No. 19-20-04 was adopted, and the Final Budget and Work Plan for FY 2020-21 were approved unanimously by roll call vote.

Ayes: (7) Orth, McCowen, Gonzalez, Huff, Ward, Ignacio, Brown

5. **WORKSHOP ITEMS** (Video Time 18:52)

5a) Mendocino City Community Services District MSR/SOI Update

Chair Brown announced the item and called for staff presentation. EO Hinman introduced the Workshop for the Mendocino City Community Services District (MCCSD) Draft Municipal Service Review (MSR) and Sphere of Influence (SOI) Update. EO Hinman noted that the Workshop was a continuation from the May Commission meeting, that additional public comments had been received since the agenda packet was released and were provided to the Commissioners and District and also posted on the LAFCo website, and that members of the public were in attendance to provide comments via teleconference. EO Hinman also thanked the attorney for MCCSD, Jim Jackson, for participating in the Workshop on behalf of the District.

Analyst Feiler presented revisions made to the MCCSD Draft MSR/SOI Update since the May Commission meeting, four questions outlined in the staff report, and public comments received (Video Time 20:59).

Chair Brown thanked LAFCo Counsel Scott Browne for attending the meeting and called on each Commissioner in turn for comments and questions (Video Time 27:10).

Commissioner Gonzalez inquired about the response to question #2 on page 28 of the packet regarding whether the District has actually provided groundwater replenishment as part of groundwater management services. Staff responded that it does not appear that the District has provided groundwater replenishment service to date and the question can be further investigated. Counsel Browne clarified that if the service has not actually been provided by the agency then the question is whether it is a new or different function or class of service requiring LAFCo approval.

Commissioner Huff had no questions and noted that the questions raised by the public were well researched by staff.

Commissioner Ignacio confirmed interest in clarification regarding the question raised by Commissioner Gonzalez.

Commissioner McCowen requested confirmation regarding answers to the four questions on page 28 of the packet as follows: question 1 - yes, question 2 - no, question 3 - yes, and question 4 - yes. Counsel Browne clarified that the technical answer to question 2 is no, but question 2 should be restated to focus on whether or not the District needs LAFCo approval to provide groundwater replenishment. Discussion ensued regarding the District does have the statutory authority to provide groundwater replenishment service but if the District has not already exercised that power then it requires LAFCo approval to activate a latent power. Commissioner McCowen inquired as to whether the District supports including Road 500D in the Area of Interest (AOI) Designation as it could lead to an expansion of their service area. Staff responded that Road 500D was included in the AOI Designation based on staff review to identify an opportunity for increased coordination and was not requested by the District.

Chair Brown directed the question to the attorney for MCCSD, Jim Jackson, and EO Hinman noted that no action would be taken related to the workshop item. Mr. Jackson confirmed that the District has statutory authority to provide groundwater replenishment under the Water Code but has never exercised that authority largely due to the lack of a water source to provide water service or replenish water and agreed it was a latent power. Mr. Jackson also explained that the Road 500D area is not contiguous with the District boundary and that when Mr. Powers contacted the District years ago regarding wastewater service the District polled the property owners on North Lansing Street regarding wastewater service and there was very little interest in annexation to the District other than Mr. Powers and the District likely does not currently have active interest in the area. Commissioner McCowen noted that for the future public hearing, it would be helpful to know whether the District supports inclusion of the areas of interest, and Mr. Jackson confirmed that he would request that the District Board Chair add this to the next District Board of Directors meeting agenda for discussion.

Commissioner Orth confirmed interest in clarification regarding the question raised by Commissioner McCowen related to whether the District supports including these areas of interest and noted that the staff report is very thorough and thanked staff for answering the questions from the first workshop.

Commissioner Ward requested clarification regarding the information source for the four questions on page 28 of the packet, and staff explained that questions 1 and 2 were addressed by staff in coordination with Counsel and questions 3 and 4 were based on information provided by the District. Commissioner Ward inquired about the issue raised by Mr. Gomes in the May workshop related to the December 4, 2019 and January 9, 2020 District Board of Directors meetings in which the District Board voted not to pursue the formation of a water replenishment district for a year. Attorney for the MCCSD, Jim Jackson, responded that the event described by Mr. Gomes did not occur and explained that the District Board did not make a decision not to pursue water replenishment for one year. Commissioner Ward had no further questions and noted that staff did an excellent job on the report.

Chair Brown invited members of the public to provide comments (Video Time 40:02). Public comments were received from Barbara Reed, Steven Gomes, Paul Clark, and Ed Powers.

Ms. Reed indicated that she provided recent comments in a letter to staff and asked if the Commission had any questions. There were no questions from the Commission.

Mr. Gomes noted that he had difficulty hearing Commission discussion related to question 2 and inquired as to whether the conclusion was that the District has complied with Water Code Section 10702 and is authorized by law to provide water service which is a prerequisite to provide any groundwater management under Water Code Sections 10700-10717. Analyst Feiler provided a summary of the answer to question 1 from the staff report and confirmed that water and groundwater management are powers the District is able to exercise as recognized by LAFCo in 2005 per SB 135.

Mr. Gomes responded that it has not been determined then that the District is providing water services as defined by Water Code Section 515, which is selling and metering water for delivery, in order to be a water replenishment district as authorized, and Mr. Gomes noted that this is a contentious issue and he prefers not to have further litigation on the subject. Mr. Gomes commented that he hoped LAFCo could make a final determination as to whether existing wells that were in place prior to MCCSD formation should be governed by a sewer district that has more powers to control private wells than the State Department of Water Resources. Mr. Gomes explained that overlying water rights are not sufficiently accounted for in the District's groundwater management ordinances, which are applied uniformly throughout the District although a 2008 Kennedy and Jenks study concluded that underlying groundwater in the area is isolated into five separate zones that are disconnected from each other.

Ms. Reed commented that the powers of a water replenishment district are to provide water and the District does not provide water. Ms. Reed explained that the District is just metering private wells, which was not done by the State or County before 1987, and she noted that the District should be providing water in order to use water replenishment district powers.

Mr. Clark requested documentation showing that property owners voted to join MCCSD for water services and asked if the Commission had any questions.

Analyst Feiler recognized that Mr. Gomes had raised important and complicated issues that cannot necessarily be resolved within the scope of the MSR but staff will try to address them where possible in the study. Analyst Feiler also responded to comments by Ms. Reed and Mr. Clark noting that there is a distinction between groundwater management and groundwater replenishment activities and in 1985 District voters approved adding water service to MCCSD. Attorney for MCCSD, Jim Jackson, confirmed the responses provided by staff.

Mr. Powers commented that he is in a Public Records Act request process with State Parks to obtain information regarding using the 4-inch pressure line from Russian Gulch State Park (RGSP) that runs through the Road 500D area to the District, he inquired about whether RGSP is within the District boundary and if not how they are provided District wastewater service, and explained that the level of interest of property owners on Road 500D to connect to the District's wastewater system has likely changed since the District polled interest years ago as there are more homes now and he noted that he has not spoken with property owners on Lansing Street but connecting that area might require a separate lift station. Mr. Powers further explained the primary question is whether or not the 4-inch pressure line from RGSP could be utilized and possibly turned over to the District, at least between Road 500D to the Heeser Street lift station.

Commissioner Orth noted that an infrastructure study is a costly and necessary item to address the wastewater service questions which could be developed over the next five year period and once the actual cost per connection is determined it can have a big impact on those who support or do not support an annexation.

Mr. Powers commented that the costs of putting in the lift station could partly be offset by the revenue generated by the services provided to 500D, and possibly Lansing Street, and he noted that it is a difficult position to take that homes on Road 500D with septic systems that have failed and some presently in failure and with an existing 4-inch line running in front of all the homes should not be connected to a wastewater system that has excess capacity.

Chair Brown called on each Commissioner in turn for further comments and questions (Video Time 56:26).

Commissioner Ignacio had no comment or questions.

Commissioner McCowen requested to ask a question of Mr. Gomes, Ms. Reed, and Mr. Clark related to their combined letter provided for the May workshop. Mr. Gomes commented that he provided minutes of the District Board meeting of December 4, 2019 when the District Board intended not to pursue the water plans with a quorum of three Board members, then the Board appointed a fourth Director and at the last in-person Board meeting before the shelter-in-place order on January 9, 2020 the Board voted 2 to 2 not to pursue the water plans, which if the Board had passed the intent to further the water plans then the public could have submitted 250 protests and the Board would not have been able to consider the water plans for a year. Mr. Gomes continued explaining that then one Director that voted no on the water plans resigned and the District Board voted down appointing Jim Sullivan to the vacant Director seat, then the County Board of Supervisors appointed Jim Sullivan as the fourth Director, and then the District Board with three votes proceeded with the water plans at recent public hearings. Commissioner McCowen asked Mr. Gomes what specific action he believed LAFCo should take in regards to the issues he raised. Mr. Gomes responded that he believes that the District Board is out of compliance with transparency to the public related to the recent public hearings and noted that the District does not have bylaws to govern Board voting. Commissioner McCowen asked Mr. Gomes if at the January 9, 2020 District Board meeting the Board voted 2 to 2 not to pursue the water plans and Mr. Gomes so confirmed.

Commissioners Weinkle and Orth had no comment or questions.

Commissioner Ward noted that he previously raised the question regarding the December 4th and January 9th meetings and confirmed interest in receiving clarification regarding conflicting information provided by Mr. Gomes and the attorney for MCCSD. Commissioner Ward requested that staff address Mr. Gomes questions without going too far out of scope, work with Mr. Powers regarding annexation to address failing septic systems, and also inquired about next steps for the August meeting.

Commissioner Gonzalez agreed with Commissioners Orth and Ward regarding Mr. Powers and providing a roadmap to assist property owners in exploring whether there is a vehicle to move forward.

Commissioner Huff agreed with Commissioner Ward regarding assisting the property owners on Road 500D, noted that addressing areas with failing septic systems is within the LAFCo wheelhouse, and explained that Road 500D has cliffside homes and septic system failures could result in unsafe discharge to the ocean and so making progress on this issue is in the interest of public health and safety.

Commissioner McCowen requested legal advice regarding the public comment that the District decided not to pursue a certain course of action with a 2 to 2 vote on January 9th. Commissioner McCowen stated that the motion in front of the District Board at that time would have failed on a 2 to 2 vote and therefore the District in effect took no action unless there was a corresponding motion later subject to a quorum that resulted in a different vote. Counsel Browne responded that without knowing the District bylaws he cannot absolutely confirm, but that normally a 2 to 2 vote is no action, unless for example it is an appeal in which case the no action has the effect of affirming the action on the previous decision. Commissioner McCowen also inquired as to whether the District has bylaws and do they need them or do they proceed pursuant to statute. District attorney for MCCSD, Jim Jackson, responded that he was unaware of the complaint regarding the District bylaws and he would look into this further and he also confirmed that the December and January meetings were essentially deadlocked because of a lack of three affirmative votes in any direction which is why there were later votes on the groundwater management program and it was ultimately re-adopted.

Chair Brown reminded the Commissioners that LAFCo can make recommendations within the MSR and SOI Update Determinations and noted that the issue has been raised by staff that all funds have been expended for this study and the public hearing process will result in further expenses. Analyst Feiler noted that a written public comment had been received from Colin Morrow of the Carter Momsen PC Law Firm representing Mr. Gomes and read the comment into the record. Analyst Feiler explained potential additional costs related to addressing public comments as directed by the Commission and preparing for the public hearing process.

Commissioner McCowen noted the importance of minimizing costs, agreed with Commissioner Orth's comment and explained that we should proceed with identifying areas of interest based on affirmative interest by the District as opposed to advocacy by the public or interest of staff, requested information from the District regarding interest and capacity to serve areas outside their boundary including Road 500D and inquired as to whether excess wastewater capacity is needed for customers within the District boundary, commented that the proposed sphere for an agency should reflect what the agency has identified it can serve except that LAFCo can reduce the sphere if determined appropriate or expand the sphere associated with a contiguous Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community that has been identified, and confirmed that the record is now clear regarding the actions of the District Board of Directors related to adoption of the groundwater management ordinances and does not require further research unless someone provides documented evidence to the contrary.

Commissioner Orth commented that the five years between the MSR allows time for an agency to work on planning related to unmet needs identified in the community and explore feasibility and identify next steps as budget allows and the Area of Interest Policy supports that process.

Commissioner Ward requested resolution on the new or different function or class of water service issue raised. Commissioner McCowen responded it was clarified that the District has latent powers that would require LAFCo approval to activate.

Commissioner McCowen agreed with Commissioner Orth that identifying an area of interest allows an affected entity to be apprised of and comment on potential land use changes and explained his understanding that this situation involves fully developed areas with no further development potential that probably would not be approved at the current density based on the site constraints and the District should decide whether it is identified as an area of interest.

Commissioner Huff agreed with Commissioner McCowen and noted that Sections 1.3 and 1.4 of the study clearly outlines the scope of the MSR and SOI Update which have been well addressed by staff and commented that additional issues raised by the public related to the conduct of District Board meetings would be more appropriately resolved by another avenue such as the Grand Jury and activating latent powers for water service and annexing areas should be actions proposed by the District.

Chair Brown requested staff response and Analyst Feiler affirmed the refined scope of further staff activities related to public comments received and EO Hinman clarified that there is budget remaining in the current Work Plan line item to cover further expenses and the intent was to keep the Commission apprised of actual costs exceeding estimated costs for the study.

Commissioner McCowen suggested providing specific staff direction to move forward with the public hearing with the only further action needed to verify with the District their position on the proposed areas of interest. Commissioners Ward, Orth, Gonzalez, Huff, Ignacio, and Chair Brown agreed to the staff direction as stated by Commissioner McCowen.

Chair Brown noted potential cancellation of the July Commission meeting as proposed in the following agenda item and requested that staff inform interested members of the public regarding the public hearing tentatively scheduled for the August Commission meeting.

6. MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION (Video Time 1:27:07)

6a) Legal Counsel Services Report

EO Hinman presented the item, noting that at the May 4, 2020 meeting the Commission requested a report on the Legal Service agreement with Attorney, Mr. Scott Browne, who has been representing and providing counsel to Mendocino LAFCo since August 4, 2014. The 2020-21 Final Budget includes an increase in rates and billable hours for legal services due to increased support provided in the latter half of the 2019-20 fiscal year and increasingly complex issues anticipated into the foreseeable future. The discussions which prompted the request centered around increased rates and billable hours, special projects, and applicant generated legal support.

Staff recommendations include amending the Legal Services contract with LAFCo to clarify reimbursement for application driven services, updating the LAFCo Fee Schedule as needed, and review of the Standard Fee Agreement for consistency and clarity.

Commissioners, Gonzalez, Huff, Orth and Ignacio supported Staff's recommendations

Commissioner McCowen confirmed with staff that unused monthly hours roll over for future use within a fiscal year. Commissioner McCowen also asked for clarification on LAFCo policy regarding costs (i.e. legal fees, environmental studies) for entities wishing to expand an SOI. EO Hinman stated that she would review the policies again but that typically much of the work on an SOI/MSR is done up front before a point of the discussion is reached where an agency would request a boundary change. A designation of a Special Project could be a way to recoup some of the legal fees spent in preparation. Following EO Hinman's answer, he stated that he supports Staff's recommendations.

Commissioner Ward asked for clarification regarding applications and special projects. EO Hinman explained the term/designation of "Special Project" applies to projects where there is no applicant but need for additional attorney review. The designation provides a vehicle for billing for extra time spent by staff and Legal Counsel. Pursuant to the LAFCo Fee Schedule, attorney fees related to applications are billed to the applicant.

Commissioner Ward requested copies of the Weger detachment billing and asked if Mr. Brown's attendance at the Weger Detachment hearing was billed to the application. EO Hinman answered that those fees were absorbed into LAFCo's contracted hours with Mr. Brown; other time spent on the detachment application was billed to the applicant.

Commissioner Ward asked if the City of Ukiah Detachment application was a "Special Project?" EO Hinman responded that as an application, legal support fees will be billed to the City and it did not require the Commission to designate it a special project. Furthermore, the proposed amendments to Legal Counsel's contract will help further clarify billings. Commissioner Ward expressed his preference of discussing rate changes for contractors at a time other than during a budget approval process.

Upon Commissioner Ward's question regarding whether Legal Counsel would be attending all future LAFCo meetings, Commissioners Brown and Gonzalez stated that legal counsel should be present if Staff deems it necessary. Commissioner McCowen suggested that the Commission be strategic about deciding when he should attend.

Following the discussion, Commissioner McCowen motioned to direct staff prepare an amendment to the Legal Services agreement to increase the contract hours, clarify project billing for legal services with consideration given to non-special projects and SOI/MSRs, update the Fee schedule, and review all policies for consistency and clarity. Commissioner Ignacio seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Ayes: (7) Orth, McCowen, Gonzalez, Huff, Ward, Ignacio, Brown

Following the vote, Chair Brown thanked Mr. Brown for participating and advised that he would not be required for the rest of the meeting.

6b) Cancellation of July 6, 2020 Regular Meeting of the Commission (Video Time 1:45:21)

EO Hinman reported that due to COVID-19, staff spent a considerable amount of time revising operations, adding an unforeseen burden to the budget, which resulted in balance of \$605 remaining through the end of Fiscal Year 2019-20. As a cost savings measure, staff recommended canceling the July 6 meeting. EO Hinman ensured that Work Plan and application processing will continue to progress as well as the continuation of necessary office operations. Each Commissioner expressed support of Staff's recommendation and Chair Brown directed staff to notify all parties interested in the MCCSD MSR/SOI Update of the cancellation.

Following a motion by Commissioner Ignacio and a second by Commissioner McCowen, cancelation of the July 6 Regular Meeting of the Commission was unanimously approved by roll call vote.

Ayes: (7) Orth, McCowen, Gonzalez, Huff, Ward, Ignacio, Brown

8. INFORMATION/ REPORT ITEMS (Video Time: 1:50:11)

8a) Work Plan, Current, and Future Proposals

EO Hinman presented and update:

Current Proposals

1. Weger/MCHDC Detachment: Staff is finalizing mapping requirements for submission to the State Board of Equalization.
2. Moores Annexation to Irish Beach Water District (IBWD): Staff has received the deposit and has corresponded with the applicant and IBWD regarding next steps. Following a conference call with IBWD, the application will not be moving forward at this time.
3. City of Ukiah Detachment Application: Staff has requested a new application due to elapsed time as well as let the City know of the need to process the application concurrently with the UVSD's MSR/SOI update.

Work Plan:

- The Administrative Draft is in progress for the Ukiah Valley Sanitation District and the Covelo Community Services District.
- County Service Area No. 3 MSR/SOI has been put on hold due to the pandemic.
- The public hearing for the Mendocino City Community Services District will be scheduled for August 3rd.

8b) Correspondence None

8c) Executive Officer's Report (Video Time: 1:54:36)

The Ukiah Valley Conference Center remains closed to the public including the LAFCo office. Staff continues to work remotely although visits regularly to collect mail and review files.

8d) Committee Reports (Executive Committee/Policies & Procedures) None

8e) Commissioners Reports, Comments or Questions

- Commissioner Orth noted that MCOG will meet today at 1:30 and will host a presentation on the Fire Evacuation Planning Grant.
- Commissioner Ward apologized for his tardiness and asked if there were any changes to the May Meeting Summary and/or Financial Report. Commissioner Ignacio provided an update. Commissioner Ward expressed his approval of the claims and suggested changes to the Minutes on page 11.
- Commissioner Gonzalez thanked staff for doing a great job considering the challenges presented by COVID-19. Commissioner Ignacio thanked the Chair for her leadership. Commissioners McCowen and Orth echoed their colleagues' sentiments.

8f) CALAFCO Business and Legislation Report

CALAFCO continues preparations for the conference and holds weekly calls for EOs, Analysts, and Clerks. LAFCo staff participate for items of interest.

ADJOURNMENT (Video Time: 2:01:20)

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 3, 2020 at 9:00 a.m. The location is to be determined based on guidelines recommended by the Mendocino County Public Health Officer and Executive Orders regarding the COVID-19 pandemic.

Live web streaming and recordings of Commission meetings are now available via the County of Mendocino's YouTube Channel. Links to recordings and approved minutes are also available on the LAFCo website.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E6cQSak21aY&list=PLraKTU7AyZLQXUgRLLzYuAU9eq1qMFheb&index=6&t=0s>