

CONTRA COSTA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING

November 14, 2018

Board of Supervisors Chambers  
Martinez, CA

December 12, 2018  
Agenda Item 6

1. Chair Mike McGill called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
2. Roll was called. A quorum was present of the following Commissioners:  
County Members Candace Andersen and Federal Glover (arrived at 1:35) and Alternate Diane Burgis (arrived at 1:41).  
Special District Members Mike McGill and Alternate Stan Caldwell.  
City Members Rob Schroder and Don Tatzin.  
Public Members Don Blubaugh and Alternate Charles Lewis.  
  
Present were Executive Officer Lou Ann Texeira, Legal Counsel Sharon Anderson, Special Counsel Kara Ueda, and Clerk Kate Sibley.

3. Approval of the Agenda

Upon motion of Tatzin, second by Blubaugh, Commissioners approved the agenda by a vote of 6-0.

AYES: Andersen, Blubaugh, Caldwell, McGill, Schroder, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: Glover (M), Skaredoff (M)  
ABSTAIN: none

4. Public Comments

**Debra Mason** spoke on a recent fire in the Pittsburg area and related problems with Ambrose Recreation and Park District and requested that LAFCO look into that district's practices and conduct a municipal services review on the district.

**Charles Smith** spoke on a former annexation of the El Pueblo area and asked who owns the land and whether it is served by the County or the City of Pittsburg.

5. Approval of September 12, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Upon motion of Blubaugh, second by Andersen, the September 12, 2018 meeting minutes were approved by a vote of 7-0.

AYES: Andersen, Blubaugh, Caldwell, Glover, McGill, Schroder, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: Skaredoff (M)  
ABSTAIN: none

6. Consider Request for Reconsideration: LAFCO 17-13 – Dissolution of Los Medanos Community Healthcare District (LMCHD)

The Executive Officer provided a brief update on the September 12, 2018 Commission decision to approve the County's application for dissolution of LMCHD noting that at the September 12 LAFCO meeting, the Commissioners amended one of the conditions and added two new conditions to the LAFCO resolution as reflected in the record and in the final resolution.

On October 12<sup>th</sup>, the final day of the reconsideration period, LAFCO received a request for reconsideration from the District's special legal counsel. The primary procedural concern appeared to be that the final LAFCO resolution was not made available until the week of October 8th and that LAFCO staff did not have authority to finalize the resolutions or to set the date for the protest

**DRAFT**

hearing. Additionally, the District also raised concerns regarding a potential conflict of interest on the part of a LAFCO commissioner.

In response to the first concern, staff note that the resolution amendments were all discussed during the public hearing at which the District was present; further, each change was made for the benefit of District's residents. The Commission's approval in Sept included voting on the resolutions, and noted that staff would set a protest hearing upon adoption of the resolutions.

As for the potential conflict of interest, LAFCO staff has not been provided any information that such a conflict exists or could exist.

Staff provided the following Commission options in response to the request for reconsideration: 1) disapproving and proceeding with the protest hearing as currently scheduled for November 30, 2018; 2) disapproving and directing LAFCO staff to continue the November 30, 2018 protest hearing to January 29, 2019, the maximum amount of time LAFCO can continue a protest proceeding; 3) approving the request for reconsideration if the Commission believes the request meets the statutory requirements, and then considering the reconsideration request's merits, either during the November 14 public hearing or at a different time; 4) continuing the matter to December 12, 2018, if the Commission needs more information, and simultaneously continuing the protest hearing to a date no later than January 29, 2019; or 5) ratifying or readopting the LAFCO resolution, at the same time restarting the clock with a new 30-day reconsideration period, and scheduling and renoticing the protest hearing (and thus negating the work the District has done to date in collecting signatures).

The Executive Officer then read an email from Jack Weir, President of the Contra Costa Taxpayers Association, reiterating his support of the dissolution of LMCHD.

Commissioner Schroder stated that, although he was not present at the September meeting, he has listened to the recording of the meeting and has reviewed all materials.

The Chair reiterated the purpose of the public hearing (reconsideration) and noted that LAFCO is a separate entity and not part of the County. He then opened the public hearing. He also, with concurrence of Commissioners, set the speaker time limit to two minutes, and noted that LAFCO will not allow speakers to cede their time to someone else.

**Elizabeth Calciano of Hensley Law Group, Special Counsel for LMCHD**, requested additional time to speak as the project proponent. Upon the motion of Commissioner Andersen and the agreement of all Commissioners, the Chair agreed to a 10 minute limit for this speaker, and added that the County would be provided equal time if desired.

Ms. Calciano presented five points for LAFCO's reconsideration of the dissolution:

- 1) In reviewing the five options, the District prefers Option 3, which would approve the request for reconsideration and rescind the September 12, 2018 resolutions;
- 2) The District, as a public entity, has the right to spend funds to defend itself;
- 3) Regarding Option 5, in which the Commissioners would ratify or readopt the September 12, 2018 Resolutions 17-13A and 17-13B, it is not legal under the Brown Act as such an action was not noticed on the agenda and, further, would be seen as an attempt to nullify more than 11,000 signatures already gathered in protest of this action;
- 4) LAFCO's special legal counsel has a conflict of interest that could lead to invalidation of these proceedings in a court of law, in that the longstanding LMCHD general counsel on September 17, 2018 joined the same firm as that of LAFCO's special legal counsel. As general counsel the law presumes that his firm has an intimate knowledge of the District's legal issues and thus client confidential information, and assumes that knowledge to both him and the rest of the attorneys in that firm. The District's general counsel has had numerous communications with LAFCO

since 1998 on various issues—the very same issues that form the core of the present dispute between the District and LAFCO. The District’s general counsel did not resign this position until October 18, 2018, and only after the District raised this concern with LAFCO’s special counsel law firm. The District’s special counsel has had extensive ongoing correspondence with LAFCO’s special counsel in the hope that the firm would withdraw, but it has not. Ms. Calciano urged LAFCO to discuss this issue with its special counsel.

- 5) LAFCO attorneys are saying that the record is fine; Ms. Calciano says it is not. She suggests that the courts can decide; with the current record she believes LAFCO may be providing the District with enough errors to allow the District to obtain a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) to keep the District alive while the issue is litigated. Ms. Calciano added that, even if the decision is not reversed, it should be slowed down to provide more time to really study this and the impact LAFCO’s decision will have on the District and its community.

Commissioner Tatzin asked if there was anything else, besides the allegation of LAFCO’s special legal counsel conflict of interest, that was new information that they couldn’t have heard before that constituted the basis for reconsideration. Ms. Calciano responded that her written letter of October 12, 2018 listed a number of items, pointing out that the protest hearing notice referenced the LAFCO resolution on the website, which was not posted there, and that the resolution itself was only created on October 12. She added that the District would be in favor of continuing the protest hearing to January if other options are not going to be exercised by LAFCO.

**Patt Young, LMCHD Board Member**, quoted the Centers for Disease Control to support her contention that social connectedness in the community has been shown to be associated with improved mental and physical health and that providing social support deters unhealthy activity. This is at the core of what LMCHD supports, provides, and funds. The District has collected 11,000 protest signatures to date, and that number is still growing. If LAFCO respects the voice of the District residents, it will honor their wishes and stop the dissolution.

**Itika Greene, LMCHD Interim Executive Director**, stated that the District is a community asset. The County should support the local community’s efforts, see it as a strength, and work collaboratively with it. The District wishes to continue a collaborative relationship with the County. Many of the organizations funded by and working with LMCHD are small and fly under the radar of County funders. Put the dissolution to a vote and let the people decide. The District currently has collected over 11,000 protest signatures in a very limited time. If LAFCO respects the voice of the District residents, give them more time to collect signatures and ensure a vote on the issue.

**Timothy Ewell, Assistant County Administrator, Contra Costa County**, reminded everyone that what was being considered at this hearing was a request for reconsideration. He stated that the County concurred with all of the findings made by LAFCO staff in her report, and would recommend that Commissioners adopt Option 1 (disapprove the request for reconsideration and proceed with the November 30, 2018 protest hearing). He stated that they saw no reason to extend the protest period any further; if the District has collected over 11,000 signatures they have already surpassed the number needed to drive the matter to a vote. The District has entered into several consultant contracts, using healthcare dollars to fund a political campaign. Extending the protest period simply means expending further healthcare funds.

The County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution on November 6, 2018 augmenting the Los Medanos Health Advisory Committee (LMHAC) with two more seats, making a total of seven members, five of which are local community members.

The Chair reminded speakers again that they will be allowed two minutes, and that this hearing is to consider new information only.

**Patt Young, , LMCHD Board Member**, reiterated that this entire process is extremely difficult; the system is designed to prevent LMCHD from succeeding. This disenfranchisement of community health would be just another blow to the community. The District has cut its administrative expenses, which was the only valid criticism of the studies. This pressure has a negative effect on health outcomes.

The Chair again reminded speakers that they need to speak to the matter at hand, which is the request for reconsideration, and provide new information in support of this request.

**Itika Greene, LMCHD Interim Executive Director**, when called upon, chose to not speak again.

**Barbara Hunt, St. Vincent de Paul of Contra Costa County**, stated her understanding that this hearing was about procedure and process. As an observer of the process she feels that the District and the community were not being given adequate time to analyze the situation and make their opinions known. The residents need a voice, and she asked that the process be paused in order to allow that to happen.

Chair McGill noted in response that the law governing LAFCO (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, or “CKH”), is a very prescriptive document, and LAFCO needs to follow the process as defined in the law. He stated that the hearing was getting off topic, but in asking for input from the Commissioners, the decision was made to allow speakers to say what they need to say.

**Charles Smith, resident**, protested the restricted speaking time, and showed a past County resolution congratulating LMCHD for its work in the community and signed by Supervisor Federal Glover. Is LMCHD a sacrificial lamb that is being offered up for waterfront development?

**Cassandra Cromartie**, when called on, did not come forward.

**Mary Ziegler, resident**, pointed out that LMCHD belongs to the community, and the residents of the area use it and need it. LMCHD provides a grant to the 50+ Club for services to the elderly that are stimulating and life-supporting.

Commissioner Andersen asked Ms. Ziegler if, in pointing out that her children and grandchildren “use it,” she is speaking of the Pittsburg Health Center (PHC). She replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Glover commented that the PHC is not going anywhere. All of the services it provides now will continue to be provided. The 50+ Club will still be eligible to apply for grants for its services. If people are being told that the PHC is going away, it’s not right. If people are being told that the LMCHD grant programs are going away, they are not; they will be administered by a community committee, the LMHAC.

**Janice Semanick, resident**, would like to see that LMCHD be kept within East County; her taxes pay for LMCHD. Yes, they have heard the clinic will be closed, and she felt better to know that it will not. But she does feel any dissolution should be a decision made by the voters.

**Elizabeth Calciano and Itika Greene** responded to Ms. Semanick’s comment that the public is hearing that the clinic will be closed. That is an erroneous comment.

**Carolyn Jones, Greater Faith Food Pantry**, did not speak.

**Aaronique Gordon, LMCHD staff member**, clarified that the District is not giving community members erroneous information, and stated that LAFCO does not care about the community and that what is being done is wrong.

**Barbara Lee Bryant, Greater Faith Missionary Baptist Church member**, noted out that the church runs a food pantry that is supported by LMCHD as a necessary service to community members who need food. This will be dissolved if LMCHD is dissolved.

**Jeanette Ortiz, resident**, goes to the clinic on a regular basis. If the PHC is going to stay open, where will it go if the County takes the building? Let the community vote on the dissolution; this is not a democracy.

Commissioner Andersen reiterated that the PHC is run by the County, and it's not going anywhere; LMCHD owns the building but does not run the PHC. This misimpression needs to be cleared up.

Commissioner Glover added that all documents in this process support continuing and enhancing the health services provided by the PHC and, by extension, the County if LMCHD is dissolved.

Commissioner Burgis pointed out that, if the County is the successor agency to LMCHD after dissolution, 85% of the LMCHD tax revenues will be used for the grant program to continue funding the organizations that LMCHD has been supporting.

**Regina Tucker** requested reconsideration and stated that the people have a right to vote on this.

**Deborah Polk, East County resident**, expressed her concern, and that she doesn't understand why the County wants to take over LMCHD. She would like to see the people vote on this.

**Ahmad Al Namyouiti (?), resident of Pittsburg**, wished to speak but no translator had been requested in advance, and none was available in the hearing room.

**Rubalyn Turner** chose not to speak.

**Anuson Asvakavith (?)** chose not to speak.

**Linda Departe (?)** chose not to speak.

**Gail Kellough** asked why this dissolution is happening over a building; why can't the arrangement stay the same as it has been? What is the problem?

The Chair pointed out that there is no problem with the building, and there is no problem with the services the County is providing in the PHC, which occupies that building. LAFCO is following a prescribed process, which was caused by an application for dissolution, and is going through all the legal steps required. LAFCO's approval of the dissolution was followed by a request for reconsideration, supposedly based on new information not made available at the time of LAFCO's approval of the dissolution.

Ms. Kellough then asked why this has been done without the citizens' involvement.

**Elizabeth Green** chose not to speak.

**Linda Strong** was not available to speak at the time.

**Carlos Uher** chose not to speak.

**Allen Tatomer, former LMCHD Board member**, spoke at length regarding his perspective as a former board member, indicating that he has seen the board frequently engage in unprofessional behavior. He commented on Board stipends and benefits. He felt that the grant program was designed primarily as a strategic public relations effort; that the Contra Costa Health Plan is a good example of service to low and moderate income people in the region; and that dissolution is a positive and proper step forward for a district that has become superfluous and redundant.

**Willie Mims, East County AACP and Pittsburg Black Political Association**, stated that the previous speaker provided misinformation; where is his evidence? He asked if the current board members could correct his misstatements. He asked if it is fair for Commissioners to make this decision, when two County members made the decision to move forward with the dissolution; they should not have been allowed to vote on this (when it came before the Commission). He also noted that the State Controller's Office sent a letter listing inactive districts at the end of 2016, and LMCHD was not listed there.

The Chair responded that LAFCO Commissioners are not required by law to recuse themselves when items having to do with their agencies come before the Commission.

**Debra Mason, Bay Point resident**, stated that she doesn't want to see Contra Costa County become polarized like Washington D.C.; it's possible for people to have two different opinions on either side of an issue and neither one be completely wrong. She noted that the people who are being paid to collect signatures are lying; she has witnessed them telling people they will lose their clinic and their community programs if they don't sign the petition. She suggested that LMCHD could tell the signature gatherers that it is important to give the public accurate information.

**Linda Strong, LMCHD Board member**, pointed out that board members do not receive payment for every meeting they attend.

**Dr. J. Vern Cromartie, LMCHD Board President**, clarified that board members each receive \$100 per meeting that they attend, up to a maximum of \$400 per month.

As the Chair prepared to close the public hearing, Special Counsel Kara Ueda noted out that there is still one person, Ahmad Al Namyouti, who wishes to speak if a translator can be found. The Chair thus closed the public hearing with the exception that, if a translator is found, the public hearing will be reopened for his comments.

Commissioner Tatzin asked Special Counsel Kara Ueda about Elizabeth Calciano's comments regarding Colin Coffey and the alleged conflict of interest within Best Best & Krieger (BB&K) that could invalidate LAFCO's decision.

Special Counsel Ueda noted that there are two points in Ms. Calciano's testimony that she wished to address. Regarding the allegation of an ethical conflict of interest in BB&K, she confirmed that they have had a series of correspondence with Hensley Law Group. It is true that Colin Coffey has served as legal counsel to LMCHD, and he did join the BB&K Walnut Creek office. They have been reviewing Ms. Calciano's statements in terms of assessing an appropriate response. At no point has Ms. Ueda had access to any confidential information on the District; similarly, neither Mr. Coffey nor any of his colleagues who came to BB&K has provided any confidential information to her.

Commissioner Andersen asked Ms. Ueda to explain why she feels this satisfies the ethical obligation issue brought up by Ms. Calciano.

Ms. Ueda reiterated that she has had no access to any confidential information, nor has she had any contact with Mr. Coffey. An ethical firewall was set up so that neither party can have access to either's documents, and they have complied with ethical rules. She understands that this has become a distraction to the Commission's proceedings, and stated that they are trying to address it as quickly as possible.

Commissioner Tatzin asked Ms. Ueda about Ms. Calciano's suggestion that there may be grounds for a TRO against LAFCO.

Ms. Ueda stated that everything BB&K has received has also been received by LAFCO and is in the public record. She has had no individual discussions with Ms. Calciano or anyone else at that firm regarding the possibility of a lawsuit or a TRO.

Commissioner Lewis asked Ms. Ueda about when Mr. Coffey joined BB&K. Ms. Ueda indicated sometime in September. Commission Lewis asked whether Mr. Coffey still represents the District. Ms. Ueda indicated that Mr. Coffey no longer represents the District. Commissioner Lewis asked if Ms. Ueda could help him see where the conflict is; she responded that BB&K also does not believe there is a conflict of interest, the firm has established a firewall, and they continue to evaluate the claims and cases the District has presented, and the wall between Ms. Ueda and Mr. Coffey remains.

Commissioner Tatzin asked staff about the process by which a vote can be taken by the residents. The Executive Officer explained the CKH law for written protests and the threshold that would lead to a vote by the residents of the District on this action.

Commissioner Andersen stated that she has not heard of any new information that would allow Commissioners to reconsider its September 12 decision. She suggested that she would like to move approval of Option 2 (disapprove the request for reconsideration but continue the November 30 protest hearing to January 29, 2019) out of an abundance of caution to ensure that everyone feels heard and to try to avoid future litigation on this matter.

Commissioner Tatzin seconded the motion for purpose of discussion.

Commissioner Glover pointed out that there has been no business transaction on the part of his wife that presents a conflict. He added that the LAFCO vote in September conditioned that there would be no sale of the property, and that any use of the property would be for healthcare services. He stressed that he always looks out for the best interests of the community. The rhetoric and scare tactics that he has seen are disturbing; he sees nothing new in the request for reconsideration, and he feels that there is no reason to continue this matter further. He would prefer Option 1.

Chair McGill noted that there is currently a motion and second for Option 2, and that there are still comments pending from other Commissioners as well as staff. The public hearing has also been kept open depending on finding a translator. Upon confirmation that a translator was not found, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Commissioners.

The Executive Officer noted that the protest hearing is primarily for receiving written protests. LAFCO staff conducts the hearing, and there will be no Commissioners in attendance. Testimony is not typically taken; however, the protest hearing is a public hearing. Once the protest hearing is closed, no more written protests will be accepted.

Commissioner Schroder noted that he has been on LAFCO for 16 years, and it took him about four years to figure it out; the LAFCO law is very complicated. He understands the confusion about the process, but it is a law that must be followed by Commissioners. Contra Costa LAFCO's Executive Officer is a true expert on it. He visited some of the grant recipients in the LMCHD community, and he was very impressed with what he saw. At the time of the vote on dissolution, he was absent but if he had been in attendance he would have voted to continue the matter until the end of the year to see how much more improvement could be made based on LAFCO's Healthcare Services MSR. But that decision has been made, and he saw no new information in the materials presented. He will not vote for reconsideration.

Commissioner Lewis has seen something that wasn't available in September: The County Public Records Act letter to LMCHD requesting a copy of the contract between the District and PCI Consultants for signature gathering and petition management services, not to exceed \$240,000, and additionally a draft contract between the District and Tribune Direct for printing and mailing services, not to exceed \$90,000. These are examples of administrative overhead spending that has not gone to direct healthcare services. He believes that LAFCO's approval of dissolution with the condition that the County will spend 85% of the District revenues on direct healthcare services, instead of overhead and this kind of expenditure, is the correct one.

Commissioner Glover asked that the motion for Option 2 be withdrawn in favor of moving Option 1 forward. Commissioners Andersen and Tatzin agreed to withdraw that motion.

Commissioner Blubaugh stated that he understood the passion of the audience but resented the implication that Commissioners are doing something morally wrong. Commissioners have been listening very carefully to grant recipients for months. Even though the Healthcare Services MSR suggested that the District should continue to do its work, they could not dismiss the County's application for dissolution, and they spent considerable time reviewing numerous reports going back

years. He saw nothing new in the request for reconsideration, and he noted that the residents of the District will get a chance to vote if they get enough signatures. He agreed with Option 1.

Upon motion of Glover, second by Blubaugh, Commissioners, by a 7-0 roll call vote, disapproved Los Medanos Community Healthcare District's request for reconsideration and directed staff to proceed with the protest hearing as scheduled for November 30, 2018.

AYES: Andersen, Blubaugh, Caldwell (A), Glover, McGill, Schroder, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: Skaredoff (M)  
ABSTAIN: none

7. LAFCO 17-13 - Dissolution of LMCHD - Informational Update

The Executive Officer provided an informational update on the Commission-approved dissolution of the LMCHD, covering four issues: 1) the final resolution adopted by the Commission on Sept 12<sup>th</sup> with the requested amendments; 2) information regarding the upcoming protest hearing scheduled for November 30<sup>th</sup>; 3) information regarding the District's request for reconsideration, which was covered in the previous agenda item; and 4) information regarding the District's Public Records Act (PRA) request to LAFCO.

At the September 12<sup>th</sup> LAFCO meeting, the Commission requested one amendment and two added conditions. The amendment increases the number of the County's newly formed Los Medanos Health Advisory Committee from five to seven members; and the two added conditions include one capping the amount of funding the County can spend on administrative costs, and another specifying that any proceeds from the sale, transfer, or redevelopment of PHC property be directed to healthcare related services and programs in the community. Staff also commented on the upcoming protest hearing and status of the response to the PRA request.

8. Policies & Procedures Update

Commissioners Tatzin and Blubaugh, as members of the Policies and Procedures Ad Hoc Subcommittee, presented proposed revisions relating to *Rules and Procedures, CALAFCO, Roster of Cities and Special Districts, City Annexations and Detachments, and District Annexations and Detachments*, along with a status report on the LAFCO *Agricultural & Open Space Preservation Policy (AOSPP)*. They recommended adoption by the Commissioners.

Upon motion of Andersen, second by Tatzin, Commissioners, by a unanimous 7-0 vote, approved the revisions and the status report on the AOSPP.

AYES: Andersen, Blubaugh, Caldwell (A), Glover, McGill, Schroder, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: Skaredoff (M)  
ABSTAIN: none

LAFCO staff noted a comment received from *Friends of the Creek* indicating their satisfaction with the proposed amendments to the AOSPP.

9. FY 2018-19 First Quarter Budget Report

The Executive Officer reported that total revenues are at approximately 60% of projected revenues, as a several agencies have not yet paid their LAFCO appropriations; expenditures are at 12% of projected expenses. Contributions to the OBEP and CCCERA accounts are not reflected in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter report. First quarter application activity is less than FY 2017-18 activity, with two new applications received in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of this fiscal year, compared to four applications received in the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of FY 2017-18. Further, that no budget adjustments are needed at this time, and staff will continue to keep the Commission apprised of any budget issues.

Upon motion of Andersen, second by Blubaugh, Commissioners, by a unanimous 7-0 vote, received the report.

AYES: Andersen, Blubaugh, Caldwell (A), Glover, McGill, Schroder, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: Skaredoff (M)  
ABSTAIN: none

10. 2019 LAFCO Meeting Schedule

The Executive Director presented the 2019 meeting schedule, noting that the schedule proposes one modification - to hold the April 2019 meeting on the third instead of the second Wednesday of the month to accommodate the 2019 annual CALAFCO staff workshop (April 10-12).

Upon motion of Andersen, second by Glover, Commissioners, by a unanimous 7-0 vote, approved the schedule with the proposed modification.

AYES: Andersen, Blubaugh, Caldwell (A), Glover, McGill, Schroder, Tatzin  
NOES: none  
ABSENT: Skaredoff (M)  
ABSTAIN: none

11. Correspondence from CCCERA

There were no comments on this item.

12. Commissioner Comments and Announcements

Commissioner McGill noted that he attended the CALAFCO Annual Conference along with other Contra Costa LAFCO Commissioners. He was reelected to the CALAFCO Board there, and was also elected to the Vice Chair position during the CALAFCO Board meeting. He attended a CALAFCO Legislative Committee meeting on October 26 and will attend the upcoming Board and Legislative Committee meetings in December.

13. Staff Announcements

The Executive Officer drew Commissioners' attention to CALAFCO updates, which included highlights of the 2018 Annual Conference, a letter from CALAFCO Executive Director Pamela Miller, and the 2019 CALAFCO calendar.

At 3:35 p.m., Commissioners adjourned to Closed Session to discuss employee performance evaluation.

At 3:44 p.m., Commissioners reconvened and the Chair reported that the Commissioners had discussed the performance evaluation and will discuss with the Executive Officer.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Final Minutes Approved by the Commission December 12, 2018.

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT:

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