

CONTRA COSTA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING

November 9, 2016

Board of Supervisors Chambers  
Martinez, CA

December 14, 2016  
Agenda Item 5

1. Chair Mary Piepho called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.
2. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
3. Roll was called. A quorum was present of the following Commissioners:

County Members Federal Glover and Mary Piepho and Alternate Candace Andersen.  
Special District Members Mike McGill and Igor Skaredoff and Alternate Stanley Caldwell.  
City Members Rob Schroder and Don Tatzin.  
Public Members Don Blubaugh and Alternate Sharon Burke.

Present were Executive Officer Lou Ann Texeira, Legal Counsel Sharon Anderson, and Clerk Kate Sibley.

4. Approval of the Agenda

Upon motion of Blubaugh, second by Tatzin, Commissioners, by a vote of 7-0, adopted the agenda.

AYES: Blubaugh, Glover, McGill, Piepho, Schroder, Skaredoff, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: none  
ABSTAIN: none

5. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

6. Approval of October 12, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Upon motion of Glover, second by Tatzin, the minutes were unanimously approved by a vote of 7-0.

AYES: Blubaugh, Glover, McGill, Piepho, Schroder, Skaredoff, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: none  
ABSTAIN: none

7. LAFCO 13-08 - Northeast Antioch Reorganization: (Area 2A): Annexations to the City of Antioch and Delta Diablo and Detachment from County Service Area P-6

The Executive Officer provided brief background on this proposal to annex 116± acres to the City of Antioch and Delta Diablo and concurrently detach the same area from CSA P-6. LAFCO received objections from property owners and registered voters in the area, which triggered a protest hearing.

Staff held the protest hearing on October 31. Both landowners and registered voters in the area filed written protests. Voter protests exceeded 50%; consequently the reorganization is terminated.

Commissioner McGill asked about the timing of the City's General Plan update and potential for the City to resubmit the application, given that the area is now an island. Forrest Ebbs with the City of Antioch responded that the General Plan update is a clean-up and will be completed in the next several months, and that he is not certain at this time regarding a resubmittal. Chair Piepho noted that LAFCO took action to correct the island, however, the affected landowners and voters rejected the proposal.

**DRAFT**

Upon motion of Blubaugh, second by Glover, Commissioners unanimously, by a 7-0 vote, received staff's recommendation and directed staff to execute the Certificate of Termination.

AYES: Blubaugh, Glover, McGill, Piepho, Schroder, Skaredoff, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: none  
ABSTAIN: none

8. LAFCO 16-05 – Montreux Residential Subdivision Boundary Reorganization: Annexations to the City of Pittsburg, Contra Costa Water District (CCWD), and Delta Diablo Zone 2 (DD) and Detachment from County Service Area (CSA) P-6

The Executive Officer reported that as a result of the continuation of this item from the September LAFCO meeting, the developer, City of Pittsburg, Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFFPD) have reached agreement on the conditions as proposed.

This is a proposal submitted by the City of Pittsburg to annex 161± acres (four parcels) to the City, CCWD and DD and detach the same area from CSA P-6. Staff spoke to the factors that must be considered in the Commission's review, with emphasis on impacts to ag land and open space; housing; adequacy and availability of municipal services, notably fire services; regional transportation and growth plans (Plan Bay Area/PBA); and comments from affected agencies and other interested parties.

Of the 161± acres, 43± acres are currently dedicated as permanent open space.

Commissioner Blubaugh questioned the progress on the Community Facilities District (CFD) discussion between the City and CCCFFPD. **Joe Sbranti, City Manager, City of Pittsburg**, responded and confirmed that the CFD agreement, the first of its kind in this county, will provide \$75 per unit per year to CCCFFPD. He added that the City has a build out of 7,000 homes, and the \$75 per unit will add up.

In response to Chair Piepho's question regarding other fire amenities, Mr. Sbranti noted various fire suppression/protection features associated with the development project.

Mr. Sbranti responded to open space questions from Commissioners Tatzin and Skaredoff by deferring to the developer.

The Chair reopened the public hearing at this point.

**Louis Parsons, Discovery Builders**, confirmed the CFD agreement with CCCFFPD and outlined the details of their plans addressing fire impacts.

Mr. Parsons then explained the two parcels that will remain open space. The southern 43± acres (Parcel B) will be permanently protected by a recorded grant deed with the City that is a condition of LAFCO's approval. Another 30± acres (Parcel A) will hold a required water tank in the northern area and will be annexed into a Geological Hazard Abatement District (GHAD); while there will be a water tank and a road, the area is zoned as open space so there will be no development there. There is also a small (7± acres) area east of Kirker Pass Road that is part of the annexation and that will be impacted eventually by the Buchanan Road's bypass extension.

In response to Commissioner Skaredoff's question about the impacts on the prime agricultural land identified in the staff report, Mr. Parsons stated that the only reason there has been grazing on that land is for weed abatement, not for agricultural purposes. He does not agree that it is prime agricultural land.

Mr. Parsons responded to Commissioner Skaredoff on issues of compliance with Plan Bay Area (PBA) by stating that, noting that the pedestrian and bicycle connectivity mitigation measures are within the guidelines of the PBA.

Finally, Mr. Parsons stated his understanding and agreement to the conditions recommended in the LAFCO staff report.

**Juan Pablo Galván, Save Mount Diablo**, reiterated his organization's opposition to this project, and requested that if the Commissioners choose to go forward with the annexation, they ask that all 78± acres of open space that have been discussed today be permanently protected and codified in such a way that there is a guarantee that permanent protection will occur, through a conservation easement mechanism of some sort.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Upon motion of Tatzin, second by Blubaugh, Commissioners unanimously, by a 7-0 vote, found that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the CEQA documentation; approved the proposal to be known as Montreux Residential Subdivision Boundary Reorganization: Annexations to the City of Pittsburg, CCWD, and DD Zone 2 and corresponding Detachment from CSA P-6, with specified conditions, including that the City of Pittsburg shall enter into a community facilities agreement with the CCCFPD to fund supplemental fire protection and emergency medical services, and that the developer and City shall provide LAFCO with a certified copy of a recorded grant deed of development rights that restricts development on the 78± acres (Parcels A and B) designated as Open Space, that will remain in effect until they are permanently preserved; determined that the territory being annexed is liable for the continuation of taxes, assessments and charges; found that the subject territory is uninhabited, has 100% landowner consent; waived the protest proceeding, and directed staff to complete the proceeding.

9. LAFCO 16-08 - West County Wastewater District (WCWD) Annexation 315

The Executive Officer provided some background on this proposal for the annexation of a single parcel in the unincorporated El Sobrante area, which was continued from the October LAFCO meeting due to the Commissioners' concern that the subject property is located in an island, and that annexation of the parcel would divide the island resulting in two smaller islands. Commissioners were also concerned that WCWD had not reached out to the surrounding landowners in the island area regarding possible annexation.

Since the October meeting, the District sent letters to the four surrounding property owners; only one responded with some interest in a future annexation. Additionally, the District Board indicated that they were not at this time interested in initiating a program of island cleanup, but would discuss the matter at a future Board meeting.

Commissioner Tatzin asked what the effect would be on the subject property of conditioning approval on LAFCO receiving an application for annexation of the remaining four parcels. Staff responded that it would depend on the speed with which WCWD could submit such an application.

**E.J. Shalaby, WCWD Manager**, reported that they brought this matter to the Board of Directors, but would be unable to submit an additional application quickly enough for Mr. Ortega to move forward on his project without losing his current permits.

In response to Commissioner Blubaugh's question, Mr. Shalaby confirmed that the WCWD staff brought LAFCO's annexation request to the Board, and that they agree that if a parcel that comes forward for annexation has contiguous un-annexed parcels, the Board will look at annexation of the surrounding area.

Commissioners encouraged Mr. Shalaby to continue to work toward this, and thanked Ken Deibert for the time he spent on this issue at the October meeting.

**Michael Savannah, WCWD**, stated that he was in attendance to answer questions about this application if needed.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Upon motion by Skaredoff, second by Glover, Commissioners, by a 7-0 vote, determined that the project is exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15061(b)(3); approved the proposal to be known as West County Wastewater District Annexation No. 315, with specified conditions; determined that the territory being annexed is liable for the continuation of taxes, assessments and charges; found that the subject territory is uninhabited, has 100% landowner consent; waived the protest proceeding, and directed staff to complete the proceeding.

AYES: Blubaugh, Glover McGill, Piepho, Schroder, Skaredoff, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: none  
ABSTAIN: none

10. Agricultural & Open Space Preservation Policy (AOSPP)

Commissioner Tatzin reported that at the September LAFCO meeting Commissioners were presented with two versions of the AOSPP, which has been under discussion for the past 18 months or so. Version 1 asked the applicants to propose mitigation measures and provide an assessment of the effectiveness of that mitigation; the Commission would then determine if proposed mitigations were sufficient or whether other mitigations were required. Version 2 was an alternative where the policy contained strongly recommended mitigations; if the applicant wanted to propose alternatives to those, they could provide an analysis as to why the alternative mitigations were appropriate.

When the Commissioners discussed this in September, two issues arose: one was that Commissioners wanted a better understanding of the environmental review requirements of the two versions, also, that Commissioners seemed almost evenly split on their preferences for the two versions.

As a result, in an effort to get broader support from the Commissioners on a single version, the Committee developed Version 3, incorporating portions that people liked from Versions 1 and 2.

Version 3 allows applicants to propose mitigation measures, and in their assessments they would include comparisons of the effectiveness of their proposal against an example set of mitigations that would be provided but not required. Other updates include example mitigation for open space lands based on federal and state agencies' science-based guidelines rather than suggested ratios. The Committee also, at the Commission's request, added a provision whereby the policy would be reviewed by the Commission within one year after adoption. If the Commission chooses to adopt this version, one of the things still needed is to set the ratios outlined in Guideline 3 (simply taken from Version 2) and a few minor edits.

Commissioner Tatzin added that LAFCO Counsel would address the requested CEQA analysis.

LAFCO Counsel Sharon Anderson noted that LAFCO has broad authority to establish policies to carry out its obligations to discourage urban sprawl, preserve open space and prime ag lands, and obtain and furnish information that will contribute to the logical and reasonable development of local agencies. Obligations with regard to preservation of open space include adopting standards for evaluating the effect of the proposal on maintaining the physical and economic integrity of ag lands, which you must consider in your review. LAFCO also must guide development away from prime agricultural lands, unless doing so would not promote orderly development. LAFCO must encourage the development of vacant or non-prime agricultural lands within a local agency's jurisdiction before open spaces outside the local agency's jurisdiction are developed. When LAFCO looks at a project those are pretty big mandates to consider. What has been done in this policy is to establish a framework for following these statutory mandates. This policy does not appear to be a project under CEQA because it does not change the environment. It merely sets up a framework within LAFCO's existing statutory powers, and it is not part of a project. When specific projects come before LAFCO that is when a real CEQA review will be done regarding where the policy will apply to those specific projects.

Commissioner McGill thanked Counsel Anderson for her very helpful analysis.

The Chair thanked the Committee (Commissioners Tatzin and Burke) for the work they have done for the past many months, and opened the floor to public comment.

**Erick Stonebarger, City of Brentwood Councilmember**, applauded LAFCO for developing a policy. He noted that the Brentwood agricultural mitigation policy, established about 16 years ago, has to date collected around \$12 million, paid out approximately \$10 million, and has conserved about 1,000 acres of ag core land, with two elements: conservation/easement and enterprise (creating value with commodity agriculture).

The City is concerned about the mitigation and buffering recommendations in Version 2, and encourages Commissioners to adopt Version 1. They believe it's important to have a mitigation component.

Chair Piepho thanked Mr. Stonebarger for speaking and referenced a letter from farm families including his own. Mr. Stonebarger responded that most of the signers were in attendance and they represent about 7,500 of the 15,000 acres in the ag core.

Chair Piepho also thanked the City of Brentwood for its work on ag preservation.

In response to Commissioner Skaredoff's question about City-established buffers, Mr. Stonebarger gave a brief account of the various buffers, and added that what's important is allowing local jurisdictions' control over what they think is best for the community in different areas.

The Chair reminded all that the policy as developed by LAFCO places the responsibility of creating a buffer on the developer, not on the farmer.

**Joe Sbranti, City Manager, City of Pittsburg**, referenced the letter he sent earlier, and asked that the LAFCO policy provide that "special considerations be provided when conversions of ag lands are for public use and/or required to serve the public." There are any number of public uses that ag land may need to be used for, and there may be an unintended consequences to infrastructure that would prevent a jurisdiction from developing a project.

The Chair asked for clarification on which version Mr. Sbranti wished that insertion to be made; he indicated that he would like to see it in whichever version is adopted.

Commissioner Tatzin asked staff if there are items in the LAFCO law that would address Mr. Sbranti's concerns. The Executive Officer responded that consideration of the conversion of ag and open space land is only one of 16 different factors to be considered in reviewing an application. Further, there are provisions that apply to the strictest type of ag land, which is that covered under a Williamson Act land contract; those are Govt. Code Sects. 56856.5 and 56426.6, and they basically say that the Commission can allow for conversion of land, even under the Williamson Act contract, provided certain things are demonstrated, and one of those things is the public interest.

Mr. Sbranti expressed his appreciation for this, but added that he would still like to see as strong a statement as possible in the final policy.

**Forrest Ebbs, City of Antioch Community Development Director**, stated that the City of Antioch has not been very involved in this process. Antioch is going to be an infill city before long, so they're very supportive of whatever LAFCO develops.

**John Viano, Contra Costa Farm Bureau**, and a fourth-generation farmer in the County, applauded LAFCO's efforts and asked that there be more flexibility in the policy. He asked that LAFCO not make the last ag lands bear the burden for already-converted ag lands. There are numerous restrictions placed on farm land by local jurisdictions and state and federal agencies, most of which don't distinguish between farm land and other land. More than a 1:1 ratio is excessive. It would be best if LAFCO can take these applications case by case.

**Mark Dwelley, Brentwood Farmer**, stated that he was taken aback by the guidelines in Version 3, especially the 3:1 mitigation ratio and the 300' buffer. The average parcel size of land in the ag core is

about 20 acres. The guidelines in Version 3 would greatly devalue those parcels along the urban edge. Farming is costly, and farmers need borrowing power, of which the land is a prime component. Without the borrowing power, farming would be virtually impossible. Mr. Dwelley, along with a number of other area farmers, was involved in the development of the Brentwood program, and he encouraged Commissioners to adopt Version 1, with a 1:1 mitigation ratio and giving the local jurisdictions the power to design their own buffers. He also asked that if changes are made to the policy, farmers be given a place at the table.

The Chair asked Commissioner Tatzin if the Committee had reached out to the farmers. Commissioner Tatzin briefly gave a list of meetings and those who had been invited to participate in discussions on this policy, and reiterated that they had met with anyone who wanted to provide input. He added that Version 3 does not require a specific set of mitigations, and he apologizes if anyone has misconstrued that.

**Richard Fischer, Tassajara Valley Preservation Association**, spoke briefly about the Tassajara Parks project being proposed for an area outside the Urban Limit Line (ULL).

The Chair asked Mr. Fischer if he had any specific comments on the AOSPP (he did not), and reminded him that he is welcome to speak to his topic under public comment at any time.

**Linus Eukel, John Muir Land Trust (JMLT)**, thanked the Committee and staff for their work on the AOSPP and referred to his organization's support for Version 2 in September. While Version 3 allows for applicant-proposed mitigation, it is driven by a mitigation hierarchy and includes clear strong guidelines for open space ratios and qualified mitigation measures. If followed, JMLT supports Version 3 with a one-year review to determine its efficacy.

**Gretchen Logue** presented a handout and spoke about what people need—which is food—and what is needed to provide food for each person; her calculations indicate that there is no scenario for farmland preservation that will save enough agricultural land to feed the growing population. She stated that the AOSPP mitigation ratios are not adequate, and that the Commission needs to preserve *all* prime agricultural and open space land to ensure a healthy environment for all residents.

The Chair reminded Ms. Logue that the County's voters adopted a ULL that preserves 65% of the County's area in ag and open space; only 35% is developable and we're not near that limit yet.

**Holly Newman** is concerned with certain wording in Version 3. She believes that the words "shall" or "must," indicating strong requirements, should be used throughout, rather than "should," which implies options. Also, the first sentence of Guideline 4 should state that the following mitigation measures are *examples* of measures that can be proposed by the applicant.

**Bill Newman**, who lives in Tassajara Valley, stated that he does not want to be surrounded by "urban mess," so he would like to see the Commission keep agricultural lands consolidated and together as long as it can.

**Lesley Hunt, Friends of the Creeks**, believes that the ag policy being considered is the mirror image of the ULL, which raised the bar for urban expansion. She believes that the AOSPP deserves the same kind of consideration and protection. Friends of the Creeks prefers Version 2, but appreciates the flexibility of Version 3; the organization would not like to see a return to Version 1.

**Michael Stonebarger, Brentwood farmer and a signer of the farmers' letter**, stressed that the letter's signers represent 7,500 acres of agricultural land. They feel that the proposed mitigation of 3:1 is aggressive and unreasonable; they prefer 1:1. Additionally, a 300' buffer would reduce farm land drastically. He and his colleagues recommend following the lead of the Brentwood policy. They prefer Version 1.

**Lisa Vorderbrueggen, BIA/Bay Area**, stated that the BIA can accept Version 1 as proposed, and appreciates the modified language. They see Versions 2 and 3 would likely be subject to CEQA questions. They see that Version 1 fully recognizes the importance and significance of the local

negotiations among a jurisdiction, a landowner, and a developer. To do otherwise is to make production of housing more expensive, time-consuming, and leaves fewer places for our children and grandchildren to live. They support the adoption of Version 1.

**Joel deValcourt, Greenbelt Alliance (GA)**, stated that this policy has been in development for more than a year and has received input from nearly 100 public commenters in support of a strong policy. GA believes that Version 2 is the right direction, and urges adoption of that with the addition of mitigation measures from Version 3 (3:1 for prime ag, 2:1 for non-prime ag, and open space set by federal and state agencies). For each additional mitigation increment more land is protected in Contra Costa and more investment is made into the continued success of farming and ranching and other types of farming enterprise. Mitigating 1:1 is a net loss of agriculture and allows for continued hemorrhaging of farm land in Contra Costa, which is some of the best in the state. If there are additional CEQA concerns, GA recommends making modifications necessary to avoid CEQA analysis at the present time. Mr. deValcourt urges Commissioners to adopt Version 2.

**Juan Pablo Galván, Save Mount Diablo (SMD)**, expressed SMD's appreciation of the Committee's and the Commissioners' work on the AOSPP. They still prefer Version 2, but Version 3 is an improvement over Version 1.

Commissioner Tatzin thanked everyone for their input and stated that they tried to address concerns in Version 3, and the example mitigation is exactly that. In response to the question about the 3:1 ratio, that came from Stanislaus LAFCO. Some have 2:1 and some have 1:1. This would be the first LAFCO to base open space mitigation on federal and state science-based guidelines. Version 3 covers the range and diversity of buffers, and can certainly be changed

Chair Piepho expressed her wish to ensure that a one-year review be part of approval; this is a document that lives and breathes. She would prefer that the Commission start slowly with Version 1, knowing that as it is implemented, weaknesses and strengths will be identified for modifications as it moves forward. She is concerned about the economic impact to County voters (housing affordability) and to the agricultural community. She believes that ongoing input from all of the affected communities (environmental, agricultural, development, agencies) during the year is important.

Commissioner Glover confirmed his preference for Version 1. He believes it provides an opportunity to come back in a year and see what the impacts are at that time.

Commissioner McGill wants to go forward with something. It's important that this LAFCO develop its own policy under the charge from CKH. There is a huge housing crisis here with a shortage of homes, distant locations of homes with horrendous commutes, and high prices of homes. Thus, we're getting proposed legislation from Sacramento that may not have directly to do with LAFCO, but could result in no local review. He would like to make the AOSPP simple and orderly and able to promote more certainty within the ULL. Negotiations and EIRs can take years, which partly leads to the housing crisis.

Commissioner McGill noted his surprise that LAFCO is still getting fresh input, and is concerned that Brentwood and Oakley are not yet getting to the point of being infill cities. Communities need to get to a point that they've decided what they want to have and then stay inside that urban limit line, and he thinks LAFCO's policies need to support that. He prefers Version 1 with the edits that were provided by Bobby Glover (BIA) related to the purpose of the policy, and the addition suggested by Pittsburg City Manager Joe Sbranti ("special consideration shall be provided where conversions of prime ag lands, ag lands or open space lands for public use or benefit are required to serve the public"). He would like a one-year review as well. Commissioner Burke confirmed that the suggested language from BIA has been incorporated into Version 1. Finally, he would also like to see LAFCO do a Notice of Exemption.

Chair Piepho emphasized that in the one-year review, Versions 2 and 3 should come back to the table for consideration of beefing up Version 1 after seeing where there might be weaknesses.

Commissioner Skaredoff congratulated the Committee members for their diligence and stamina and expressed his admiration for the progress made with Version 3. He pointed out that the admired properties in Version 1 are also in Version 3. Additionally, Version 3 provides the framework that can help reduce uncertainty and increase predictability and give applicants examples from which to draw. Version 3 facilitates the process. Anything that can help to reduce the number of false starts and redos in the process would be beneficial. He feels that Version 3 is not more restrictive than Version 1, and it does not constrain applicants. He prefers Version 3.

Commissioner Schroder also thanked Commissioners Burke and Tatzin for their work. He appreciates the agricultural community's input, especially those from the Brentwood area, which this policy directly affects. He does not want to tie farmers' hands. He still supports Version 1, with a review in one year.

Commissioner Blubaugh agreed with Commissioner Skaredoff, and he thought that Version 3 was a good blend of Versions 1 and 2. He has always advocated for letting people know what's expected of them rather than leaving it open and requiring people to go back to the drawing board. If there will be a review in one year—although he believes it will be more difficult to strengthen it at that point—he will support Version 1 rather than Version 3.

Commissioner Andersen indicated her agreement with selecting Version 1. She feels that it is important to retain the ability of each local jurisdiction to work that out within their own elected council or board as to how they want to approach the mitigation. She looks forward to a review in a year when they can revisit it again.

Commissioner Caldwell expressed his preference for Version 1 as a good place to start, with a review in a year.

Commissioner Burke thought that Version 3 was a good balancing of both Versions 1 and 2, but would reiterate what the Executive Officer has pointed out often: This is only one of 16 factors to be considered when reviewing an application, so she is supportive of Version 1.

Commissioner Tatzin stated that he would be happy moving forward with *something* at this point. Version 3 was an attempt to deal with the uncertainty in Version 1. Version 1 is better than no policy. He would like Commissioners' leeway to review Pittsburg's suggestion for compliance with CKH law before just incorporating it.

Upon motion of Tatzin, second by McGill, Commissioners unanimously, by a 7-0 vote, adopted Version 1 of the Agricultural and Open Space Preservation Policy and directed the Committee to work with the Executive Officer to incorporate the changes as suggested by the Building Industry Association of the Bay Area and the City of Pittsburg, with other minor edits, and with a one-year review added; directed staff to file a Notice of Exemption pursuant to Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15378(b)(2) and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15061(b)(3); and directed staff to bring the final adopted version with changes back to the Commission's December 14 meeting.

AYES: Blubaugh, Glover, McGill, Piepho, Schroder, Skaredoff, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: none  
ABSTAIN: none

11. Proposed Amendment to LAFCO Employee Benefit Plan

The Executive Officer provided brief background on the LAFCO employee benefit plan currently in place through the County for the two LAFCO employees, and added that the County Human Resources Department had recently contacted the office with information regarding new benefits programs, including a new vision plan, which can be made available to LAFCO employees in 2017. This plan is 100% employee paid, with no cost to the employer.



Upon motion by Tatzin, second by Blubaugh, Commissioners by a 7-0 vote unanimously approved the amendment of the LAFCO Employee Benefit Plan to include the new vision plan.

AYES: Blubaugh, Glover, McGill, Piepho, Schroder, Skaredoff, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: none  
ABSTAIN: none

12. Correspondence from CCCERA

There were no comments on this item.

13. SDRMA Special Acknowledgment Awards 2015-16

Commissioners acknowledged the awards.

14. Commissioner Comments and Announcements

Chair Piepho noted Commissioner Tatzin's award for Outstanding Commissioner at the recent CALAFCO Annual Conference, Commissioner McGill's reelection to another two-year term on the CALAFCO Board of Directors, and the third-place tie won by a Contra Costa County syrah and thanked the Contra Costa winegrowers for their contribution. Commissioner McGill added that he also was elected Treasurer by the CALAFCO Board of Directors.

Commissioner McGill announced that he attended the CALAFCO Legislative Committee meeting on November 4, and will participate in the CALAFCO Board meeting in Sacramento on December 9 and the CALAFCO Legislative Committee meeting in San Diego on December 16.

Commissioner Skaredoff reported that he and Executive Officer Teixeira will be participating in the annual conference for resource conservation districts on November 18.

15. Staff Announcements

The Executive Officer drew the Commission's attention to the CALAFCO Annual Conference Summary and Senate Governance & Finance Committee Legislative Wrap-up included with the agenda packet.

She reported that she attended a stakeholders' meeting on the Urban Limit Line (ULL), and that the County will be holding three public meetings on this in the next week. She added that some time ago she had spoken at a County Board of Supervisors meeting asking that in the process of reviewing the ULL they review the islands and split parcels created by the current ULL; however, is uncertain that will be included in the County's review. The Chair asked the Executive Officer to send a letter to the Department of Conservation and Development regarding this.

The meeting adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

Final Minutes Approved by the Commission December 14, 2016.

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT:

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Officer