

Mono County Local Agency Formation Commission

PO Box 347
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
760.924.1800, fax 924.1801
commdev@mono.ca.gov

PO Box 8
Bridgeport, CA 93517
760.932.5420, fax 932.5431
www.monocounty.ca.gov

DRAFT MINUTES

May 1, 2013

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Byng Hunt & Fred Stump, Mono County; Jo Bacon, Town of Mammoth Lakes; Earl Henderson & Hank Brown, special districts; John Ross, public member. **ABSENT:** Matthew Lehman, Town of Mammoth Lakes.

STAFF PRESENT: Scott Burns, executive officer; Brent Calloway, CDD analyst; C.D. Ritter, secretary

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Earl Henderson called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. at the Town/County Conference Room, Minaret Village Mall, Mammoth Lakes.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

3. **MINUTES:** Review and approve minutes from March 20, 2013

MOTION: Approve minutes of March 20, 2013. *(Hunt/Bacon. Ayes: 6. Absent: Lehman.)*

4. **PUBLIC HEARING: 2013-14 Preliminary Budget.** LAFCO requires two public hearings, May and June. Scott Burns noted LAFCO funding from Community Services grant. Budget reduction reflects this year's status quo. Reducing a budget needs commission approval. The Finance Department supported third/third/third financial approach of LAFCO funding. Staff is working with assessor and GIS to improve map accuracy. Interaction with Community Service Areas (CSAs) on long-range planning and capital programming has occurred. Mono Supervisors have approved CSA-1 proposals. Similar LAFCO workload is anticipated. No proposals yet, seeking membership. Mention of A-87 was made. The A-87, a controversial formula-driven policy, represents administrative costs for different departments to provide services.

Grant possibilities? Burns indicated grants are rare for this sort of thing. Tapped into transportation planning, but not specifically LAFCO. A regional planning effort with Town of Mammoth Lakes is under way.

Commissioner Bacon indicated that should Casa Diablo go forward, Town recommends Ormat pay for LAFCO efforts (on draft CEQA docs). Ormat didn't specify well field or plant in earlier presentations, and pieces include Mammoth Lakes and Long Valley. Commissioner Stump thought Ormat should specify.

MOTION: Adopt 2013-14 preliminary budget. *(Hunt/Ross. Ayes: 5. Absent: Lehman.)*

5. **MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW UPDATE:** Receive status report. Brent Calloway ran into GIS data problems, couple years of subdivision will be integrated into GIS, and new staff is updating data. Update buildout numbers, incorporate into General Plan. Staff will provide MSR documents next meeting, ready to distribute to districts for comment.

6. **LAFCO HANDBOOK – FEE SCHEDULE UPDATE:** Review proposed fee schedule and consider scheduling public hearing. Old fee resolution (1986) does not truly reflect cost of processing LAFCO applications today. R13-xx updated, with base deposit for five hours of staff time. Annexation or mergers take hours. Refunding? Commissioner Bacon thought listing all identical charges looked funny. Burns noted that the longer list of all planning permits looks the same. Trouble collecting excessive costs? *Not really. The \$300 was 25 years ago. Caution in charging applicants – take on costs to get up to speed on unfamiliar applications.* Process to initiate without the \$495? *Calloway indicated adjusting LAFCO Handbook language to start working on projects. Agreed with mentioning refunds.*
7. **MUTUAL WATER COMPANY SURVEY:** Brent Calloway noted that AB 54 in 2011 was specific on requirements for mutual water companies. Ethics training, service-area maps. It's a big step to talk about private companies. Mono LAFCO followed along with map request, offered to help make map comply with state law.

A survey was sent to seven mutual water companies. Note: Environmental Health has huge list of water providers that are not mutual water companies, so Calloway chose ones titled "mutual water companies." The largest three offered friendly responses, provided information, and were glad to have a building permit tech as contact. Does LAFCO ensure compliance? *LAFCO has ability to request information from them, similar to public districts. State law could require compliance.* Commissioner Henderson noted that water companies are under the auspices of Environmental Health, whereas LAFCO just maps what they do, ensures boundaries don't overlap, and has ability to monitor. Commissioner Stump cautioned that Mono LAFCO should do only minimum with private companies.
8. **CALAFCO:** Brent Calloway attended conference last fall and recent staff workshop at Davis. He encouraged anyone interested in how large LAFCOs operate to attend. Staff workshop was much more focused on how to do things, Q&A, with emphasis on comments. Discussion on mutual water companies was held. Most LAFCOs got ~50% response and were proceeding with caution. Case law over last year was discussed. Fresno LAFCO got into trouble over annexation of islands (150 acres or less) when it broke up 400 acres into smaller, forcing cities to dissolve, lots of money, no population. Grant availabilities: state legislation authorizes LAFCO grant applications. Big cities are so different from Mono.

Breakout group for rurals? Someone collecting rural issues separate from urban? Commissioner Henderson stated LAFCO started grouping mountain counties several years ago, but no county is geographically close enough to Mono. Mono does not have much in common with big LAFCOs. Calloway noted groups broke out by titles to discuss similar issues. Next conference will be held at Tahoe. Henderson requested a reminder to make reservation.

Commissioner Brown asked whether LAFCO terms could reflect office terms. Commissioner Bacon noted the LAFCO Handbook indicates May, which doesn't coincide with terms of July [for Town] or January [for Mono County]. Set agenda item June 5.
9. **INFORMATIONAL:** None
10. **ADJOURN** at 2:45 p.m. to next meeting: June 5, 2013 (keep 2 p.m. start time due to Town budget hearings).

Prepared by C.D. Ritter, LAFCO secretary