



MEETING MINUTES
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF MONO
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Regular Meetings: The
First, Second, And
Third Tuesday of each
month

Regular Meeting

County Courthouse,
Bridgeport, CA 93517

April 12, 2011

9:00 AM Meeting Called to Order by Chairman Hazard.

Pledge of Allegiance led by Supervisor Hansen.

OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD
No One Spoke.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

Supervisor Hunt:

- Mammoth Lakes Housing BOD meeting; Larry volunteered his services to continue on. There was a discussion to change bylaws to reflect supervisor participation. If that happens, our Board will need to be involved.
- Discussion about Mammoth Lakes lawsuit; bankruptcy is still an option.

Supervisor Hansen:

- Stakeholders meeting up in Walker and RPAC for what will be discussed tonight at Special Meeting.
- Walker River Irrigation District meeting; set up committee to answer questions, they don't want anyone from California.
- LTC meeting.

Supervisor Bauer:

- Deferred due to time constraints.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Attended LTC and Mammoth Lakes Housing Meetings.

Supervisor Hazard:

- Deferred due to time constraints.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

- 1) CAO Report regarding Board Assignments (David Wilbrecht)
ACTION: Receive brief oral report by County Administrative Officer (CAO) regarding his activities.
Dave Wilbrecht:

- Deferred due to time constraints.

2) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M11-69 Action: Approve minutes, as corrected, of the Regular Meeting held March 15, 2011.

Bauer moved; Hunt seconded

Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No

Supervisor Johnston:

- On Supervisor Hazard's Board Report, second sentence, should read, "The Planning Commission determined", not "The State determined".

Closed Session: 9:03 a.m.

Break: 10:32 a.m.

Reconvene: 10:38 a.m.

Lunch: 12:10 p.m.

Reconvene: 1:04 p.m.

Break: 2:15 p.m.

Reconvene: 2:20 p.m.

Adjourn: 4:20 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

There was nothing to report out of closed session.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- 3a) Closed Session – County Counsel – CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Initiation of litigation pursuant to subdivision © of Government Code section 54956.9. Number of potential cases: one.
- 3b) Closed Session–County Counsel – CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Government Code section 54956.9. Number of potential cases: Facts and circumstances: Proposed administrative action by Local Enforcement Agency regarding landfill violations.
- 3c) Closed Session–County Counsel – CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION. Subdivision (a) of Government Code section 54956.9. Name of case: Unites States v. Walker River Irrigation District (ECR C-125).
- 3d) Closed Session–County Counsel – CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Government Code section 54956.9. Number of potential cases: one.
- 3e) Closed Session–Human Resources – CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS. Government Code Section 54957.6. Agency designated

representative(s): Dave Wilbrecht, Marshall Rudolph, Brian Muir, and Jim Arkens. Employee Organization(s): Mono County Sheriff's Officers Association (aka Deputy Sheriff's Association), Local 39—majority representative of Mono County Public Employees (MCPE) and Deputy Probation Officers Unit (DPOU), Mono County Paramedic Rescue Association (PARA), Mono County Public Safety Officers Association (PSO), and Mono County Sheriff Department's Management Association (SO Mgmt). Unrepresented employees: All.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS/EMERGING ISSUES
(PLEASE LIMIT COMMENTS TO FIVE MINUTES EACH)

Jeff Walters:

- Notice of violation from LaHontan water board received by Matt Carter; delinquent reports going back as far as 1996. He will keep Board posted and make sure LaHontan is provided with requested information.

CONSENT AGENDA

(All matters on the consent agenda are to be approved on one motion unless a board member requests separate action on a specific item.)

ELECTIONS

- 4a) Bishop Unified School District Governing Board Election Consolidation – Resolution approving the request made by Bishop Unified School District to consolidate their biennial governing board elections with the Statewide General Election in November of even-numbered years pursuant to Elections Code section 1302(b); and beginning with November 2012, permitting all of the District's regular biennial governing board elections to be consolidated with the statewide general election in November of even-numbered years pursuant to Education Code section 5342 and Elections Code section 10400.

- R11-21** **Action:** Adopt Resolution R11-21, "A Resolution of the Mono County Board of Supervisors Approving Consolidation of the Election of Governing Board Members of Bishop Unified School District with the Statewide General Election in November of each Even-Numbered Year".
Hunt moved; Hansen seconded
Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No

SHERIFF CORONER

- 5a) Sheriff's Department Boating and Waterways Grant for fiscal year 2011-2012 – Proposed contract with California Department of Boating and Waterways pertaining to grant funds for boating safety programs and law enforcement on the waterways of Mono County during fiscal year 2011-2012.

Supervisor Hazard:

- Requested Sheriff to explain funding for this grant.
- Wanted to know if RURAL COPS was used for this grant?

- Are A87 costs above the proposed amount?
- Until we know what happens with Rural COPS from state, these A87 costs are one time monies, program could be in jeopardy.

Sheriff Scholl:

- Rural COPS is not used in this grant.
- A87 costs are above amount.
- We've been looking at how to deal with budgetary issues; might not have a boating program.

M11-70 **Action:** 1. Authorize the Sheriff's Department to participate and renew the contract with the California Department of Boating and Waterways for fiscal year 2011-2012. 2. Authorize the Chairman to sign the contract. 3. Authorize Sheriff Richard C. Scholl to sign the contract and all reimbursement forms for said contract.

Hunt moved; Hansen seconded

Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No

COUNTY COUNSEL

6a) Ordinance Amending Mono County Code re: Firearm Discharge – Proposed ordinance "An Ordinance of the Mono County Board of Supervisors Amending Chapter 10.64 of the Mono County Code pertaining to the regulation of Firearm Discharge".

ORD11-02 **Action:** Adopt proposed ordinance # ORD11-02.

Hunt moved; Hansen seconded

Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No

REGULAR AGENDA

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED (INFORMATIONAL)

All items listed are available for review and are located in the Office of the Clerk of the Board

CLERK OF THE BOARD

7a) Annual Reports for Inland Aquaculture Group and Conway Ranch Foundation – 2010 annual report for the Conway Ranch Foundation and the Inland Aquaculture Group, LLC, for review by the Mono County Board of Supervisors. This was sent by Raven Angeles, IAG.

7b) Mono County Little League Thank You – Thank you note from the Mono County Little League received March 30, 2011 thanking the Board of Supervisors for their generous contribution of \$3,600.00.

The Board acknowledged receipt of the correspondence.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

8a) Child Abuse Prevention Month – Proclamation designating the Month of April 2011 as Child Abuse Prevention Month. This item has been approved for placement on the regular agenda by Supervisor Hazard.

M11-71 **Action:** Approve proclamation designating the Month of April, 2011 as Child Abuse Prevention Month.
Hansen moved; Hunt seconded
Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No

Supervisor Hunt read proclamation and presented it to Wild Iris.

Susie Bains, Wild Iris:

- Gave Board some information.

8b) Sexual Assault Awareness Month – Proclamation designating April 2011 as Sexual Assault Awareness Month. This item has been approved for placement on the regular agenda by Supervisor Hazard.

M11-72 **Action:** Approve proclamation designating April, 2011 as Sexual Assault Awareness Month.
Hunt moved; Johnston seconded
Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No

Supervisor Johnson read proclamation and presented to Wild Iris.

Susie Bains, Wild Iris (here on behalf of Lynn Rounds):

- Gave Board some information.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

9a) Request for Reimbursement to Fish & Game Fine Fund (MCFC Commissioner/Dan Lyster) – Request from the Mono County Fisheries Commission (MCFC) that the sum of \$14,261.03 be deposited into the Fish & Game Fine Fund to replace that same amount appropriated by the Board of Supervisors for power connection on Conway Ranch.

M11-73 **Action:** Transfer \$14,261.03 from the Conway Ranch Fund to the Fish & Game Fine Fund.
Bauer moved; Johnston seconded
Vote: 5 Yes; 0 No

Dan Lyster:

- Introduced item; asked fisheries commission attendees to finish presenting item.
- Explained the reason for the fund transfer. Electrical connection in Conway, a rebate with SCE that had to be taken advantage of.
- Maryanne O'Connor couldn't be here today, she'll be coming to the Fisheries Commission shortly to request some educational funding.
- Not a grant, a repayment of funds that were previously expended from contingency fund.
- Fish commission thinks money should be used on something other than

electrical connection.

Steve Marti:

- Was informed that the fine fund dollars had been reduced and put into general fund by approximately \$14,000. They are here asking that the money be reimbursed to the Fish and Game Fine Fund.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Staff report is lacking. Is this a reimbursement? Paid back through the fines?
- Is there a disagreement on how money was spent?
- He's in favor of Fishing Commission doing fish things, but not sure about bear traps.

Brian Muir:

- This is money that Board approved to be spent on the electrical connection; it was pulled from the Fish and Game fine fund. They would like it reimbursed to spend differently.
- Grazing fees go into the Conway Ranch fund. Thinks this budget is at about \$40,000; this money could be used for that.

Marshall Rudolph:

- This was originally a legal use of money; this is just a policy decision.
- The Fish and Game Fine Fund would like money transferred back to their account.

Supervisor Hazard:

- When this money was originally spent, it was an opportunity. It was originally discussed that these improvements at Conway would not come from general fund.
- The fisheries commission was not consulted on this; they would like their money back to do business as usual.
- Question now: does the board keep commitment to no general fund dollars or find money elsewhere?

Supervisor Hansen:

- This was a last minute addition to the agenda.
- He understands their position.
- Read information about allowable expenditures.

Supervisor Bauer:

- Grazing fees? What is the balance?

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

- 10a) Public Hearing for Community Development Block Grant (Mary Booher) – Public hearing to discuss and receive public input regarding potential activities to be funded with CDBG money. Upon closure of the Public Hearing the Board will provide desired direction to staff.

Action: None.

Mary Booher (Powerpoint kept in file folder for today):

- Discussed proposed changes. Instead of three different grant cycles, might be

one.

- Today we're having a public hearing; we have one more opportunity for planning/technical assistance grants.
- We are looking for staff and public input for future projects.

POWERPOINT:

- HUD National Objectives
- Targeted Income Group (TIG)
- Planning/Technical Assistance Grants (Economic Development, General Allocation) – our hope is to have applications in on the first day.

DISCUSSION:

- Income survey cost approximately \$7,500; we also got a condition survey for same price. Paid for by General Fund in CAO's budget. Used a retired individual that worked with these grants.
- The Biomass suggestion was not put on the list because she is of the belief there are better funding sources; she can present to state staff to see if it falls within recommendations.
- These grants cover 5 – 10% of administrative costs. We have three outstanding CDBG grants.
- These funds will not go away but will be significantly reduced.
- She hasn't heard of any housing/planning grant interest.
- Determining who qualifies depends on survey numbers and percentages.
- We could look at industrial area and acquiring sewer system.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SUGGESTIONS:

- Part of powerpoint, went over various possibilities.

Board Comments:

Supervisor Johnston:

- Asked how we can do something on Davidson Street?
- Asked about using 2010 figures.
- Income survey done in Chalfant – why did we use an out of county consultant for that? How much? We should be using local people for these types of projects.
- He thinks there are possibilities of working on a Biomass Utilization Project. Problem is we don't have a good study – could we use some of these funds for this?
- Large industrial park – it is not sewerred and that fact creates a problem for job creation. Is there a way that we could do a study of that to see if it's feasible to hook into Mammoth sewer system?
- Lee Vining proposals: isn't it redundant with provisioning?
- How about solar farms in old mine pits?

Supervisor Hansen:

- Asked about A87 costs.
- Is funding going to go away? That is what he heard out of Washington.

Supervisor Hunt:

- Housing opportunities?

Supervisor Hazard:

- How does the Benton/Hammil Valley area not qualify for funding?
- Solar project in Hammil Valley area? Without even going to community meetings, this would be highly opposed. There's already a plan for private solar farm out there.
- Commented about digital 395 project – probably not needed. We really need to

identify real projects.

- He feels the communities' needs are not being expressed through these potential grant projects.

Supervisor Bauer:

- Questions value of having staff time spent chasing grants that may or may not come in. It's a waste of our time.
- We should be focusing on our local needs.
- This creates a set of expectations among constituents that projects are further along than they are.

Dave Wilbrecht:

- He disagrees that we shouldn't research grants; the point is having the conversation we're having today to determine what projects are priorities, etc.
- If the Board doesn't want to move forward with applying for these grants, it will be good to know now.

Public Hearing Open: 11:53 a.m.

Public Comments:

Bob Peters:

- Could this be presented to the RPAC in Bridgeport next week?
- If there is a non-profit already in existence, could it be involved in this type of planning?

Public Hearing Closed: 11:56 a.m.

Additional Board Discussion

Supervisor Hunt:

- Supportive of further ADA planning in General Allocation area.
- Work with Mammoth Lakes Housing would be great.
- Agrees with biomass planning.

Supervisor Hansen:

- He thinks that Walker has come up with plan that they want to do regarding the community center.

Supervisor Bauer:

- If we are going to go forward, tying into small business non profit would be good.
- Interested in ADA.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Need to do something Economic Development wise that improves job base.

Supervisor Hazard:

- He supports ADA projects.
- Biomass; energy creation and potential industry creation.

Mary Booher – to summarize:

- ADA planning on General Allocation Side.
- Biomass planning on Economic Development Side.
- Small business, non-profit building?

LUNCH

OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC TO ADDRESS THE BOARD

No one spoke.

PUBLIC WORKS

- 11a) Request for Snow Removal Assistance – Yosemite National Park (Jeff Walters) – Receive a staff report regarding a request for assistance with snow removal operations at Tioga Pass in Yosemite National Park. Consider and potentially adopt a resolution authorizing Public Works to provide personnel and equipment to assist on Highway 120. Provide any desired direction to staff.

- R11-22** **Action:** Consider and potentially adopt Resolution R11-22, “A Resolution of the Mono County Board of Supervisors Authorizing the Public Works Director to Execute and Administer Cooperative Agreements and to Utilize Department of Public Works Personnel and Equipment to Assist with Snow Removal Activities Associated with the 2011 Opening of Highway 120 Within Yosemite National Park.”

Bauer moved; Hunt seconded

Vote: 5 Yes, 0 No

Jeff Walters:

- Went over handout showing past open/close dates for Tioga pass and the snowpack levels, etc.
- This year, they are looking to have Tioga cleared to the gate by the end of April.
- Discussed the plan to get the pass open.
- Looking at getting the resolution signed/approved to allow Public Works to assist in snow removal efforts.
- They intend to get started late this week, early next week.
- The Park Service’s appear to be very cooperative in coordinating this effort.

Supervisor Hansen:

- Appreciates Public Works and their willingness to assist other agencies in this effort.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

- 12a) Solid Waste Budget and Service Delivery Report (Matt Carter, Jeff Walters, Brian Muir, Dave Wilbrecht) – Presentation by Matt Carter regarding a detailed budget projection and service delivery report based on a \$68.50 per ton revenue projection as directed by the Board of Supervisors at the April 5, 2011 regular meeting.

Action: None.

Matt Carter (powerpoint, copy kept in file folder for today):

FY 2011 Balance Sheet:

- Discussed Proposed Budget showing revenues/expenses and a net contingency of approximately \$57,451.
- Explained that closing Benton and NOT laying off anyone really isn't a savings.

Summary of Operational Items.

Brian Muir (powerpoint):

Town of Mammoth Lakes Requests:

- Purchase of the parcel.
- Increase Board contribution to \$510,000.
- Steps towards a JPA.

Jeff Walters:

- They use CAL Fires as much as they can, and will continue to do so.

Brian Muir:

- He remembers that the board asked for various options to consider. That is what is before you today.
- Need a slide showing current transfer station days and then days reflected in current \$68.50 plan; also show adding holidays back in; closing Benton a day or two, etc.
- Board wants to eliminate all restoration and in addition they want to close all transfer stations two days a week; Benton landfill closed on all holidays and Benton landfill also closed for operation on Sunday.

Dave Wilbrecht:

- His understanding is that long haul issue should be discussed within a JPA.
- Idea for Town: controlling town's destiny in terms of bidding out their waste stream management.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Personal goal was to cut our costs as much as possible without passing along fees to people.
- Asked about closing Benton and how that would affect the proposed budget, etc.
- He thought task force was o.k. to close for the additional holidays.
- He doesn't understand why we're not cutting in more places.
- Could you utilize landfill staff if Benton closed two days a week?
- We need to get beyond equity issue.
- Over next year we can figure out what to do for the future; need to stop initial bleeding now.

Supervisor Bauer:

- Agrees with Supervisor Hansen that all stations should be affected by this, not just some.
- She could go to closing landfill two days a week and address the equity with the town issue.
- We make the commitment now to move forward.

Supervisor Hazard:

- What about a work release program with the inmates to pick up trash?
- He went over what he originally thought the board was approving.
- He doesn't have a problem reducing Benton Crossing Landfill one day a week, reducing staff.
- Closing all transfer stations two days a week, close Benton Crossing Landfill all

holidays, closing Benton Crossing Landfill two days a week.

Supervisor Hunt:

- No closing of the landfill.
- Can we as a Board move towards a JPA commitment with the Town which in turn will move us towards solving future problems?

Supervisor Hansen:

- Conveyed that constituents don't really understand this process.
- Until we're ready to cut everything he is not willing to vote on any of it.
- We need to cut in every single aspect. Also, dumps need to close on every single holiday.

Louis Molina:

- The issue is the number of staff available at each facility on the days they are open. Not sure the minimum requirements could be met.

Kevin (D&S Waste):

- It is a huge savings to close but need to do two days to make it worth it.
- Being open 4 or 5 days a week would work for his business.
- The County does not have to give \$9.25 to the town for their long haul station; why not have their own? The town will do what they need to do no matter what.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Additional Departments: Sheriff's Office

- 13a) Radio System Workshop & Maintenance Options (Clay Neely) –
Presentation by Clay Neely regarding radio systems and maintenance options.

Action: None.

Supervisor Bauer recused herself from this discussion due to conflict of interest.

Clay Neely (powerpoint, copy kept in file folder for today):

- Background information. This information is being presented because our current contractor wishes to retire in 5-7 years and we need to look ahead to make sure we maintain our radio systems.
- Radio Network
- Equipment added since July 2004
- Benefits of Radio System
- Strengths of our Radio System
- Weaknesses of Radio System
- Approaching Transition
- Future Options
- Contractor (pros/cons)
- In House (pros/cons)
- Hybrid (pros/cons)
- Estimated Cost of Options
- He doesn't know if now is the time for change but this is going to need to be explored if John ever retires.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Are we at a point where we could go to some sort of satellite system?
- Utilizing cell systems?
- What about digital 395?
- How often are 4 wheel drive vehicles needed? Budgets could be depleted a little with vehicle selection.

Supervisor Hazard:

- We are not going to have a one stop shop when John retires.
- This is a very technical situation.

Supervisor Hunt:

- Technology changes so rapidly that there is no telling what things will look like in five years.
- This really is something that must be addressed sooner rather than later.

Lt. Dave O'Hara:

- A satellite system would be extremely expensive and we would have to pay for air time. Additionally, there is a lag time.
- Cell carrier is also cost prohibitive and would cost us air time.
- Digital 395 will give us mobile data capabilities. We will be able to utilize this in the cars.

John Nielsen:

- He uses 4 wheel drives a lot for getting to sites.
- The different types of jobs he does may need to be separated out between different individuals.
- He offered to take Board on a tour to see what the sites look like.
- He can keep the console running in a budget crisis, but to change it and evolve with it is a different story.
- We need to end up with a system that will not break down all the time.

COUNTY COUNSEL

Additional Departments: Community Development

14a) Forest Service Planning Rule (Stacey Simon) - Overview of proposed Forest Service Planning Rule.

Action: None

Stacey Simon:

- Forest Service released a Draft Forest Service planning rule on February 14 2011. There has been a multiyear, nationwide effort to gather public input to prepare a new planning rule. (NIFMA)
- She gave some history about NIFMA and the Planning Rule.
- We are still operating today under the 1982 Planning Rule; there have been attempts at rule revisions but the Forest Service has been operating under the 1982 rule.
- Her handout in packet shows the 1982 rule and the new proposed rule. Handout only focuses on one narrow portion.
- She went over statute.

- She went over what 1982 rule required vs. proposed rule requirements.
- There's a whole new framework for these plans. A broad encompassing process. Discussed different phases.
- RCRC has circulated some comments on the rule – thinks they are helpful, they point out positive aspects: inclusion of social and economic data, consideration of other plans and policies, pre-decisional review process. Also point out negative aspects: reduction in coordination requirements in particular. Comments not due until Mid-May.
- Looking for direction to staff. Would the Board like to comment, encourage collaboration?
- BLM planning process is different; she included it as a comparison.
- Went over RCRC's comments. Positive: role of science in planning, Assessments will occur prior to the revisions, and the Pre-decisional review process. Negative: Rule lacks definition for what's practicable, been softened from 1982 rule, and they want social and economic impacts clarified, they don't want "may" used, they want wild land fire a higher priority and finally they want strong language regarding social and economic sustainability requirements.

Supervisor Bauer:

- They are not following the 1982 plan very well. Is it worth making comments?
- If we write a letter we should reference the RCRC position.

Supervisor Hunt:

- They are putting things in their favor. They want us to sit at the table but are getting final say.
- Not sure any comments would be worthwhile.
- He'd love to see every county have Collaborative Planning Teams.

Supervisor Hazard:

- Maybe we should comment but if it were our document how much would we change?
- He is comfortable having Stacey draft something for signature.
- We have continuously said we want to be allowed to be at the table, we need to comment when we have the opportunity.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Feels good relationships remain important.

Supervisor Hansen:

- Asked about definitions on coordination?

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

15a) State and Federal Redistricting (Supervisor Bauer) - Supervisor Bauer will provide information about state and federal redistricting. The Board may discuss issues pertaining to state and federal redistricting.

Action: None.

Supervisor Bauer:

- First maps come out June 1st – they have 14 day noticing period following that.
- Third drafts August 11th; expect to present final maps to Commission on August 12th and reporting to Secretary of State on August 15th.

- We will probably be put with Inyo.
- The assumption is that McKeon will no longer represent us.

Supervisor Johnston:

- Feeling about who might be our Congressman once redistricting is complete?

Supervisor Hazard:

- We're going to have to wait and see what happens when map comes out.

Andy Geisel, The Sheet:

- Will there be a change in who is our federal Congressman?

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING DIVISION

Additional Departments: IT, County Counsel

- 16a) Census and Redistricting Workshop (Nate Greenberg, John-Carl Vallejo, Scott Burns) - Workshop regarding 2010 Census and Supervisorial Redistricting Process.

Action: None.

Scott Burns:

- Introduced item. Today is a brief overview.
- Before us is an August 1st deadline.
- We're at 10.5% increase.
- Nate could provide Board with five different options.

Nate Greenberg (powerpoint presentation):

- Census 2010 – Overview and Results
- Census Process and Timeline
- 2007 – Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA)
- 2008 – Boundary & Annexation Survey (BAS)
- 2009 – Participant Statistical Areas Program (PSAP)
- January, 2010 – Census Geography Data released
- March, 2010 – Census Demographic Data released
- Organization of Census Data (Tract, Block Group and Block)
- Population by Supervisorial District – went over population changes per district. Districts 1, 2 and 5 went up, Districts 3 and 4 went down.
- Redistricting Process and Tools – GIS will play a significant role.
- In-House Process – we have a lot of tools at our disposal already.
- Citizen's Committee – web based tool. \$4500 for 12 months.

John Vallejo:

- The Equal Protection Clause limits district population differences to approximately a 10% difference between most populated and least populated district. This is based on the principle of "one person/one vote."
- Process: By statute the Board must hold at least two public hearings. First one - proposals have to be presented. Second One – meet again for a final vote.
- There are three options for the Board in obtaining proposed redistricting options: (1) in-house with public input to be heard at a Board meeting(s); (2) in-house with the Planning Commission holding meetings to gain public input prior to the Board holding a meeting, or (3) establish a Public Citizen's Committee to create

the proposed redistricting options and they would present such options at a Board meeting.

- You must to consider population but there are other discretionary factors which may justify the allowable population differences between the newly drawn districts.
- It is permissible to split a community (i.e. June Lake) between districts, but that is a policy decision ultimately decided by the Board if presented as a viable redistricting option.
- Geography is discretionary. There is nothing written in the statute requiring geographical contiguity in each district. It is legally uncertain if this is a permissible option intended by the legislature.
- He can draft a resolution to get Citizen's Committee formed, etc. August 1st is the drop dead timeline for the Committee to present redistricting options to the Board.

Supervisor Hansen:

- Population only factor? Or geography too?
- Will I have to take over part of June Lake?

Supervisor Bauer:

- Do the discretionary factors get you around the 10%?
- She's in favor of a citizen's committee. She opposed doing it amongst the Board members.
- Two from each district. 5 public meetings.

Supervisor Johnston:

- We should do In-House.
- Could do a radial perspective.

Supervisor Hazard:

- Doesn't think Board should be involved in deciding which areas end up in which districts.

FINANCE

17a) Mono County Cost Allocation Plan (Brian Muir) - Presentation by Brian Muir regarding the County's cost allocation plan (A-87).

Deferred **Action:** Deferred due to time constraints.

17b) Treasury Investment Pool (Brian Muir) - Presentation by Brian Muir, Finance Director, regarding Mono County Treasury Investment Pool.

Deferred **Action:** Deferred due to time constraints.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

18a) Federal and State Budgets (Board Members) - The Board of Supervisors may discuss the Federal budget and the California State budget and potential impacts to Mono County.

Action: None.

There was no discussion on this item.

ADJOURNMENT 4:20 p.m.

ATTEST:

DUANE "HAP" HAZARD, CHAIR

SHANNON KENDALL
SR. DEPUTY CLERK OF THE BOARD

§§§§§