MINUTES OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
WORKSHOP SESSION OF AUGUST 18, 2010

WORKSHOP SESSION **9:00 A.M.** **AUGUST 18, 2010**

PRESENT:

COMMISSIONERS:
Paul Biane
Jim Bagley
Robert Colven, Alternate
Kimberly Cox
James V. Curatalo, Vice-Chairman
Neil Derry, Alternate
Brad Mitzelfelt, Chairman
Robert Smith, Alternate
Diane Williams, Alternate

STAFF:
Kathleen Rollings-McDonald, Executive Officer
Clark Alsop, Legal Counsel
Samuel Martinez, Senior LAFCO Analyst
Michael Tuerpe, LAFCO Analyst
Anna Raef, Recording Secretary

ABSENT:

COMMISSIONERS: **Larry McCallon**

WORKSHOP SESSION – CALL TO ORDER – 9:12 A.M.

Vice Chairman James Curatalo calls the workshop session of the Local Agency Formation Commission to order and leads the flag salute.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATED TO WORK PLAN AND COMMISSION GOALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

Executive Officer Kathleen Rollings-McDonald presents the staff report, a complete copy of which is on file in the LAFCO office and is made a part of the record by its reference here.

MISSION STATEMENT: Ms. McDonald states that both Orange and Riverside LAFCOs have established mission statements. San Bernardino LAFCO has historically been of the opinion that the legislative findings and declarations contained in Government Code Section 56001 and the purposes of the Commission in Section 56301 have been the mission statement of the Commission. She asks if the Commission wishes to create a mission statement.

Commissioner Biane asks what is the latest language added to Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg. She says that in 2000 when Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg was updated, Section 56001 was updated and clarified as an outgrowth of the Commission for the Twenty-First Century discussion. Commissioner Biane asks about language regarding housing opportunities for all persons (environmental justice) and says he does not remember that being included in our discussions. Legal Counsel Clark Alsop says that was added later. Commissioner Biane says Orange and Riverside do not address that issue. Mr. Alsop says that the original statement was that LAFCO is supposed to discourage urban sprawl. Statements regarding providing housing for low-income people were added later.

Vice-Chairman Curatalo states a mission statement should be short and concise. He would prefer that the preamble be personal from the members of LAFCO, indicating that the members are dedicated to serving the citizens of San Bernardino County. Ms. McDonald states Orange's

statement is along those lines and it was their goal to make their mission statement unique to them. It would be San Bernardino LAFCO's undertaking to make the mission statement unique with emphasis on sustainability, and clear and defined boundaries.

Commissioner Bagley says he prefers that option which includes the legislative direction indicating there is a misconception that LAFCO is devising its own game plan. He is very sympathetic about people feeling burdened about LAFCO's intrusion into their life. He believes it is important to incorporate clarification of that misunderstanding into the mission statement.

Ms. McDonald says LAFCOs in the future will be faced with an issue titled "infrastructure disadvantaged community." She emphasizes that LAFCO law requires that Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg be utilized, while making it representative of the unique circumstances in each respective county. She says the official title of the statute is "Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000."

(It is noted that Chairman Mitzelfelt and commission Cox arrive at 9:18 a.m.)

Vice-Chairman Curatalo turns over leadership of the workshop to Chairman Mitzelfelt.

Commissioner Williams asks if the year "2000" could be removed because she believes it could be limiting. Ms. McDonald states a reference to the statute should include the entire title. Ms. Williams believes the statute should be embodied in the statement in order to indicate that the local LAFCOs may personalize its policies and procedures, but must not exceed the authority of the statute. She says Orange LAFCO's is well-written. Ms. McDonald asks if the Commission wishes to model from Orange LAFCO's and add a sentence outlining the directive from Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg that it is to be implemented through the unique circumstances of the local county.

Commissioner Cox says Orange LAFCO's statement discusses facilitating constructive changes in governmental structure through special studies, programs, and actions that resolve intergovernmental issues. She says that appears as though LAFCOs are seeking out actions, when in fact applications for projects are required to come before this body. She thinks it gives a misconception that LAFCO is "watchdogging" the issues. Mr. Alsop points out that Orange LAFCO does more special studies than other LAFCOs.

Chairman Mitzelfelt says the Commission must review all the laws it is required to follow and include them. Ms. McDonald says Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg is the principal act for LAFCO jurisdiction; however, the principal acts for all special districts must also be considered, including the applicable Revenue and Taxation Code sections and CEQA. Ms. McDonald refers to Riverside's mission statement and points out that the first sentence in Riverside's says it will implement the legislative directives and policies embodied in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 in a manner most appropriate to provide an orderly growth pattern that reconciles the varied needs of Riverside County. She says that statement makes it unique to the circumstance of that county. She points out that San Bernardino LAFCO is in no way comparable to Orange County, as San Bernardino County's issues are much different. She says it is important to state that the Commission is implementing the provisions of the act under the unique circumstances of San Bernardino County. Commissioner Williams asks if that statement would embody all the laws. Ms. McDonald says it would.

Chairman Mitzelfelt says there is consensus that San Bernardino LAFCO needs a mission statement. He says Riverside's seems to be closer but language regarding laws and statutes must

be added. Ms. McDonald states she will write a few examples and bring them back to the Commission for discussion at the November hearing. She will include language which embodies the legislative policy and directives, procedures which must be followed, as well as the types of agencies which must be addressed, i.e., county service areas, community service districts, cemetery districts, etc.

2010-2011 WORK PLAN: Ms. McDonald says staff's work plan for the upcoming year is to finish the mountain and south desert service reviews noting that some agencies have not as yet provided any information. She says most important for Commissioners and staff is the educational component providing good in-depth understanding. She explains that, as the county is so large and diverse, the service reviews provide an opportunity to see and understand a broader perspective. Her personal goal is to make sure that those are completed.

Ms. McDonald says staff will ask the Commission to revisit the service review implementation structure. Currently there are five regions: West Valley, East Valley, Mountains, North Desert and South Desert. She does not believe the division between east and west valley is appropriate. She notes that the west valley was not done in the way that service reviews are currently done.

She says that seven proposals were anticipated for the year. Of those seven, two have been submitted and the City of Barstow island is expected to be submitted in October. Of the four remaining, one is mandated, the CSA 120 sphere of influence establishment. She says staff has been working with Special Districts and County staff on that proposal; however, it has not yet been received. The other three may or may not come to fruition; one of which relates to the City of Rialto's major annexation into Lytle Creek. That project was not included on the timeline; however, it will be a complex proposal as it relates to service delivery and sustainability. She says that, while state law allows the Commission to initiate proposals for change as an outgrowth of its service reviews, there are limitations to the types of actions which are consolidation, merger, subsidiary district status and formation of districts. State law does not allow the Commission to initiate proposals for annexations or detachments. The Commission utilized this authority when it initiated the Parker Dam Park and Recreation District because there was no board of directors or staff in existence.

Chairman Mitzelfelt opens the discussion on the five regions. Ms. McDonald says the divisions were based on state water contractors, because waters cannot be comingled. The west valley region included those agencies within the boundaries of the Inland Empire Utilities Agency. She does not believe that is a good division. She thinks the valley should be considered as a whole, as it is a unique region on its own and there are valley-wide agencies with valley-wide issues that must be addressed.

Commissioner Curatalo questions the Commission's ability to be more proactive in studying the elements of government, to which Mr. Alsop states that the Commission always has the ability to do special studies separate from the service reviews. He states the only one that has been done by this Commission was in the 1970's when the Mojave Water Agency was studied. Ms. McDonald states that another study was attempted for the Apple Valley water districts; however, they simply refused to participate. Good financial information was obtained from that attempted study. She points out that the cost of any special study is borne solely by the Commission.

Chairman Mitzelfelt asks if the Commission has any objection to combining east and west valley. The Commission expresses no objection. Chairman Mitzelfelt asks if there are any objections to the four regions. There is none.

Chairman Mitzelfelt says he believes it would be beneficial for Commissioners to become more involved in going out to visit the districts during the service review process. He suggests a Commissioner attend meetings with agencies and staff in order to solicit concerns and comments from the districts. Commissioner Smith agrees. Ms. McDonald says the process involves putting together a draft report and reviewing the findings with the agencies. In some areas this process is more well-received than others. In the case of Baker CSD, for example, the general manager has no desire for LAFCO to participate in the district's operation. Ms. McDonald says staff would be happy to change the process to include participation by the Commission; however, the Commission will need to amend the budget to cover the increased stipend and travel costs. Commissioner Cox agrees that Commission participation would be advantageous.

Ms. McDonald explains that for many years the question of what it actually costs the County to serve pockets of unincorporated territory has been unanswered other than through a comparison of the Plan for Service documents. She says the Commission could ask staff to work with the County to determine what the costs are by region. This would help in evaluating any annexation proposal. This would be an example of a special study to be done in collaboration with the County. She comments that some communities are underserved and others may be serving other areas of the county.

Commissioner Mitzelfelt says he thinks communities organize these efforts based on revenues available and their particular service needs. He believes Trona will be coming back to LAFCO in the future with an application for formation of a CSD. He believes the Commission should continue to be reactive rather than proactive.

Commissioner Cox comments that many of the service issues will be addressed in the CSA service reviews. Ms. McDonald says that does not provide the whole picture, as the reviews do not include law enforcement, road costs and other things, unless those services are part of another agency. Annexations, however, do include those areas of review. Chairman Mitzelfelt asks if it is feasible to look at the County as a whole for law enforcement, for example. Ms. McDonald states that service reviews do not include CSA 70 as a whole, the County Flood Control District, or the County itself. She explains that part of the sustainable community strategy will entail some degree of that type of review. She says the Commission does have a relationship with SCAG; however SCAG did not understand the level of jurisdictional options for services. Regional workshops with SCAG and LAFCOs included discussion of limitations in service delivery.

Chairman Mitzelfelt says service reviews are somewhat proactive and some Commission participation would be helpful. It is not, however, a good time to get any more proactive than that. Ms. McDonald comments that there will be costs if the Commission becomes more active in service reviews; i.e., stipends, mileage, etc. She says she will provide the Commission with a list of the remaining service reviews. She believes inclusion of one Commissioner at each meeting with agency staff would be doable. More than one Commissioner may be too costly. Commissioner Curatalo asks if there is a mechanism for cost recovery for service reviews. She says staff has applied for SB90 funds; however, the requests have always been denied because LAFCO is a state-mandated agency that has the ability to charge for all levels of service. She notes that special districts are eligible for reimbursement. No LAFCO has ever been able to obtain reimbursement from the State of California.

Ms. McDonald explains that all agencies providing service are to be reviewed, whether or not the agency is under LAFCO's purview. For example, information is included on private water

companies, over which LAFCO has no authority. LAFCO has no jurisdiction over improvement zones within county service areas; however, those are also included in service reviews. School districts and community college districts are not included, but LAFCO can look at them in the context of a service review. She says review of school districts can be added to the service review process for unincorporated areas and issues can be identified but LAFCO has no jurisdiction. Information can be included regarding how the school district affects the community and what facilities are jointly used, open to the public, etc. This would provide a broader understanding, especially for the desert and mountain communities. As an example, she explains that Rim of the World Park and Recreation District's boundaries are coterminous with the Rim of the World Unified School District boundaries, so there is a natural relationship. She notes that the Park District's major funding activity is before-and-after school care in the schools within the District.

Chairman Mitzelfelt asks that school districts be included in future service reviews. It was the consensus of the Commission that future service reviews will include basic information on the boundaries of the school districts, not including community college districts.

Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for questions or comment from the public. There are none.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATED TO EVALUATION AND RECRUITMENT PROCESS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICER – APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Ms. McDonald presents the staff report, a complete copy of which is on file in the LAFCO office and is made a part of the record by its reference here. She reports that the Transition Committee has been working with her and the Commission's human resources consultant, Alcock & McFadden, to develop an updated job profile, as well as a performance evaluation and interview guide. She says the intent has been that recruitment will open probably in March with the position to be filled toward the end of the fiscal year. She says this is an outgrowth of the need for establishing goals for evaluation because the process is integrated with the review and appraisal of the Executive Officer, not only for the recruitment, but for the future. She says the Transition Committee is comprised of Commissioners Biane, Curatalo and Mitzelfelt, which relates to the current Chair, Vice-Chair and most current past Chair. Commissioner Curatalo says he was very pleased that every concern he had was thoroughly covered by the consultant and staff. He believes the performance appraisal is very comprehensive. Ms. McDonald states that at each Commissioner's place is an update from Ms. Alcock, which was an outgrowth of a meeting with the Transition Committee and includes questions on the interview guide that were important for the review process. She says Ms. Alcock has indicated that the process will be participatory with the Transition Committee and that the she will receive all applications, conduct phone interviews and the full range of applicants will be presented to the Committee with recommendations for interviewing the top applicants by the Commission as a whole.

Ms. McDonald explains that the job profile specifies the skill sets and educational background required which translate into the appraisal process. She notes that the Transition Committee, for the first year, will have a great deal of interaction with the new Executive Officer. She believes the proposed process will be very good.

Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for questions or comments from the Commission. There are none.

Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for questions or comments from the public. There are none.

Commissioner Curatalo moves approval of the staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner

Biane. Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for opposition to the motion. There being no opposition, the motion passes with the following vote: Ayes: Bagley, Biane, Cox, Curatalo, Mitzelfelt, Williams. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: McCallon (Commissioner Williams voting in his stead).

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION RELATED TO COMMISSION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Ms. Rollings-McDonald presents the staff report, a complete copy of which is on file in the LAFCO office and is made a part of the record by its reference here. She reports that the Commission's Policies and Procedures Manual was first adopted in 1978 and it has never had a comprehensive review but there have been amendments and additions. She notes that the staff report is divided into the six sections.

Ms. McDonald asks for direction from the Commission on areas it wishes to review. A full review will be scheduled for the November hearing. The Commission will be provided with a copy of the manual with the changes indicated. Commissioner Biane asks for a copy showing strikeouts and revisions.

SECTION 1 – GENERAL INFORMATION: Ms. McDonald states that this section must be updated to change the language to indicate the Commission's new hearing scheduled.

SECTION 2 – STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS: Ms. McDonald states this is the section which outlines the Commission's review authorities, including factors to be considered. The update must include the environmental justice issue and other changes. This section provides a general understanding of what LAFCO can and cannot do.

SECTION 3 – COMMISSION RULES OF ORDER: Ms. McDonald states the Rules of Order have been amended over the years. The most recent amendment was to the order of business. She states that the structure of the agenda is somewhat confusing because public hearings are held on continued items first, followed by public hearings on new items. Ms. McDonald states that the staff is proposing to revise the Rules of Order to place public hearings (continued or otherwise) first, provide for information items which will allow for more flexibility for preparation of the agenda. Chairman Mitzelfelt asks if there is any objection to this recommendation. There is none.

SECTION 4 – COMMISSION POLICIES: Ms. McDonald states that from staff's perspective, Policy 1 talks about the purpose of the Commission, which is simply a recitation of the law, and Policy 2 is also a recitation of law regarding powers of the Commission. She says that Item C – Plan for Service – is a policy and is the first policy declaration. She says staff proposes to revise these policies to remove the items that are not a policy declaration because the Commission is obligated to do this. Other items need to be removed completely.

She refers to Item I – Conducting Authority, and says a policy declaration needs to be corrected because the responsibility for conducting protest proceedings has been delegated to the Executive Officer.

She asks if the Commission wishes to revisit its incorporation policies or out-of-agency service contract policies. She says incorporation guidelines, as set forth by the State Office of Planning and Research with supplemental incorporation policies, have been adopted by the Commission as it guidelines along with seven other policies. She says the mandates for incorporation in state law are very minimal; only 500 registered voters and a fiscal analysis that shows the territory is sustainable

are required. Commissioner Curatalo questions the issues surrounding the Bloomington incorporation. She says the issues surrounding Bloomington were related to sustainability and financing. Commission policy requires a minimum population of 10,000; however, if the community is capable of sustaining itself, that policy can be overridden. She says she is not aware of a policy directive that would assist a community like Bloomington that does not have the revenue to sustain incorporation. She explains that the process requires a new city to establish cost of service because the city is obligated to take over law enforcement and traffic control, and develop a general plan within two years of incorporation. So, when developing the cost of service, the County establishes what the cost was for those services for the prior year and the law establishes a formula to transfer to the new city a share of property tax. She says that in many instances, the share given by San Bernardino County is the lowest in the state because the cost of service computation is finite. She notes that in Riverside County, when the cities of Wildomar and Menifee were incorporated, the County provided 12 percent of the general property tax levy. For newly incorporated San Bernardino County cities, the share was about four percent. She says that potential to increase that share can be discussed; however, it is a negotiation that must take place with the County. Commissioner Cox asks if there is any interest by the Board of Supervisors to revisit the level of property tax revenues provided to newly incorporated cities. Ms. McDonald states that five of the last seven cities incorporated sued the County over the determination of cost of service, and all won.

Commissioner Curatalo asks how a reasonable reserve is defined. Ms. McDonald says it is always defined as 10% for the General Fund minimally, and in fact, the Commission has required the same for its accounts. She says this was a decision of the Commission and she believes it is reasonable.

Ms. McDonald asks if there are questions of the Commission regarding the out-of-agency service contracts policies. Chairman Mitzelfelt asks if cities charge additional fees for out-of-agency service contracts. Ms. McDonald says that most charge a premium rate for service outside their boundaries because those properties do not pay property tax to the city. She notes that there is a great variation from city to city, with the highest being the City of Rialto, which charges three times in-city rates for service outside its boundaries and three times connection fees. Commissioner Derry comments that he believes the City of Redlands has similar additional fees. Ms. McDonald explains that the City of Redlands has, by municipal code, defined what is called “sums equivalent to” which relates to its development impact fees. The city has two kinds of development contracts, in-fill and development. In-fill contracts do not require “sums equivalent to,” and any tract-type development is required to pay the equivalent of the development impact fee. She notes that any out-of-agency service contract, except for connection to an existing home, comes to the Commission for it review and approval. The Commission has the ability to deny the contract; however, the practices of the cities can be discussed during the city’s service review. In the case of the City of Redlands, the extension of water and sewer is within its sphere. This should be discussed during the City of Redlands’ service review.

Ms. McDonald notes that the Commission has delegated the approval process for out-of-agency contracts for connection to an existing home to the Executive Officer, but the Commission approves any development-related contracts.

Commissioner Biane asks for a listing in a single place of the Executive Officer’s authority, as delegated by the Commission.

(It is noted that Commissioner Williams leaves at 10:45 a.m.)

Ms. McDonald refers to Policy 29 relating to island annexations. She says staff wishes to receive direction as to how the Commission wishes to present that information at the November hearing, as the Commission has directed that this policy needs to be revisited. Ms. McDonald states that the staff position is that the definition of "entire island" requires review and policy language. She asks if the Commission wishes a list of all islands in the County which meet the 52 percent surrounded criteria. When this criteria was discussed, LAFCO staff supported 66 percent surrounded and identified islands that met that criteria. Commissioner Derry asks what other counties are doing on substantially surrounded and request staff to survey other counties and provide other counties' criteria. Discussion will also be held in November regarding whether or not the Commission wishes to continue requiring cities to annex islands as a condition of approval for development-related proposals.

Senior LAFCO Analyst Sam Martinez says LAFCO staff will provide maps of the 52 percent islands and 66 percent islands. Chairman Mitzelfelt asks for a summary of statutory guidelines as to what is "surrounded." Ms. McDonald says that, just as the Commission has defined what it considers to be "substantially surrounded" there should also be a policy declaration of what is the entire island within the context of the existing statute. Legal Counsel Alsop states that, for example, for a 300-acre island of which 75 acres is substantially surrounded, the question is if the 75 acres is the entire island or if the 300 acres is the entire island. Ms. McDonald says if the smaller area is not to be considered a substantially surrounded island that must be stated. The policy declaration will be this Commission's perspective on the definition of "entire island."

Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for comments or questions from the public.

Susan Hulse, San Bernardino, asks if the public comment portion of the hearing will change. Ms. McDonald says agenda items will not change as far as public comment is concerned. She says discussion items and public hearings will be separated, but the presentation will be staff's presentation, followed by the applicant's presentation, and public comment.

With regard to islands, at the November hearing, Ms. Hulse would like the Commission to consider allowing interaction between the public and the Commission during the public comment portion of the hearing. Ms. McDonald asks her to submit her concerns in writing and those concerns will be included with the staff report. Ms. Hulse agrees to do so.

Steven Cade, Colton, comments on Policy 29 and says he believes the legislators' intent for entire islands is that larger islands cannot be annexed without a vote. He does not believe islands can be subdivided. Ms. McDonald says that will be discussed in November. She explains that there used to be a restriction that if the territory was part of a larger island of 100 acres or more, it could not be annexed. There was a change in statute that removed that limitation. She says the legislation and court decisions were based on the prior language of the law.

Donna Johnson, Colton, asks if she will have the same opportunity to speak if she does not submit her concerns in writing. Ms. McDonald assures her that she will.

Gerald Johnson, Colton, says dividing a parcel into parts is done to prevent the residents from having the opportunity to vote. He says the city was to provide services and has not done so in Colton. He says that, as time has passed, the City is unable to meet its own needs. He says the citizens were wise to oppose annexation and the fact that the citizens did not have a vote is what he found disturbing.

Ms. McDonald refers to Policies 32 and 33 related to mandated service reviews. She says that, while the Commission has taken a function-by-function approach, it is within each of the individual communities. She believes that section needs to be updated to include that the plan for services should include at least five years of revenue projections, and that establishment of a sphere of influence for a new district must be done within one year.

Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for further questions, comments of direction from the Commission for staff. There are none.

SECTION 5 – SPECIAL DISTRICTS: Ms. McDonald states that Special District representation on the Commission is optional and specific policies and procedures are required relating to the seating of those commissioners. She notes that San Bernardino was one of the first commissions to seat Special Districts representatives in 1976. In doing so, the Commission has responsibility to review the functions and services actively performed by the special districts of the County under each of their principal acts, and those districts must request Commission approval to expand or change that range of service. She says recently what appeared to be an innocuous change for activation or divestiture of services and functions identified those actions as a change of organization. As a change of organization under LAFCO law, these proposals now require a property tax transfer process, issuance of a certificate of filing, protest process and issuance of a certificate of completion. Commission policies do not include those requirements; therefore an update of this section will be need to reflect changes in the law.

SECTION 6 – FORMS: Ms. McDonald states the law requires that forms be adopted. She says that the application documents need to be updated to include a statement regarding acknowledgement of the indemnification policy. She refers to San Diego LAFCO's forms that would be helpful. Also, staff will be providing a campaign contribution and expenditures disclosure forms, which an applicant would provide. She explains that campaign contributions are fairly easy information to obtain; however, recent changes in FPPC law require that anyone who expends more than $1,000 in support or opposition to a LAFCO proposal must declare and file those with the FPPC through the Registrar of Voters. The second form would help applicants understand their obligation to provide that information. Mr. Alsop states this law was as a result of the Orange County Sheriff's union lobbying against an annexation to the City of Anaheim. The union was successful in obtaining the protest but the union was not identified as financially supporting the protest.

Commissioner Bagley asks how to put more teeth in the indemnification process. Ms. McDonald states that addition of a paragraph on all application forms explaining those obligations will do that. If a committee is formed to spearhead the application process and spends more than $1,000 or if a group spends more than $1,000 campaigning in opposition to a proposal, both of those scenarios would trigger the process. Commissioner Cox states that in recent history there was a lobbying effort through the umbrella of a contract with legal counsel. She asks if this law covers that example. Mr. Alsop says that is different because counsel represented the district. Ms. McDonald states that in that case the District hired the law firm and the law firm hired the lobbying group. Mr. Alsop says the FPPC is considering what kinds of regulations to implement for LAFCOs.

Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for further comment or questions by the Commission or the public. There is none.

NOMINATION OF COMMISSIONER MITZELFELT FOR CALAFCO SOUTHERN REGION SUPERVISORIAL MEMBER AND COMMISSIONER CURATALO AS ALTERNATE CALAFCO SOUTHERN REGION SPECIAL DISTRICT MEMBER – APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Ms. McDonald presents the staff report, a complete copy of which is on file in the LAFCO office and is made a part of the record by its reference here. Ms. McDonald states that at each Commissioner's place are the official nomination forms for Commissioner Mitzelfelt to serve as the southern region's County Supervisor on CALAFCO, and for Commissioner Curatalo to serve as the secondary nominee representing Special Districts. She explains that the importance of having both a primary and secondary nominee is that, in the event one of the other regions does not have a full slate, there would be an at-large nomination.

Commissioner Biane moves approval of the staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Cox. Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for opposition to the motion. There being no opposition, the motion passes with the following vote: Ayes: Bagley, Biane, Cox, Curatalo, Mitzelfelt. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: McCallon.

Ms. McDonald notes the election will take place at the annual conference in Palm Springs. She states that the notice regarding the annual conference was mailed out and that the budget includes funding for four Commissioners and one staff person to attend.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Cox states that last month staff was directed to submit award applications. LAFCO Analyst Michael Tuerpe says they are due the middle of September and staff will prepare draft applications in the coming weeks. The nominees will be Ms. McDonald, former Commissioner Pearson and the Adelanto Service Review.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Mitzelfelt calls for comments from the public. There are none.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION, THE WORKSHOP SESSION IS ADJOURNED AT 11:28 A.M.

ATTEST:

ANNA RAEF, Recording Secretary

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

BRAD MITZELFELT, Chairman