9:06 a.m. Meeting Called to Order at the Mariposa County Government Center

Pledge of Allegiance

Introductions

Public Presentations: For Non-Timed Agenda Items including Attention, Information, and Consent Agenda, and for Items Not on the Agenda – none.

Board Information

Supervisor Fritz advised that she attended the service clubs and organizations dinner sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce on Thursday. She advised that she, Supervisor Pickard and Rich Inman/County Administrative Officer, judged the 4-H presentations on Saturday.

Supervisor Stetson advised that the El Portal Town Planning Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet this evening at 7:00 p.m. and everyone is invited to attend. On Friday, there will be a Boosters Club meeting in Midpines at the Community Hall at 7:00 p.m.

Supervisor Bibby advised that she attended the stakeholders meeting on the recreational sports complex/field of dreams on Thursday, and they were able to view some proposed layouts of the facility. She advised that there is another meeting and it will be advertised in the paper, and the public is encouraged to attend and participate in this process. She noted that the Hornitos Enchilada Dinner was a success. She advised of Storytelling event scheduled for this weekend.

Supervisor Turpin thanked the Public Works Director for attending the District II meeting in Coulterville and addressing solid waste issues, and he noted that the staff did an excellent job.

Supervisor Fritz mentioned that Rick Peresan, Technical Services Director, gave a presentation on the County’s website and the community calendar at the service clubs and organizations dinner; and she thanked him for that.

Supervisor Pickard noted that Wednesday is the Day at the Capital for the California Invasive Weed Coalition event; and he commented on the budget status for this program and advised that there is a request to reauthorize the funding for SB 1740 – “Noxious Weed” bill. He also noted that the 4-H Presentation Day was good.

Approval of Minutes 2-1-05, Regular Meeting
BOARD ACTION: (M)Turpin, (S)Stetson, the minutes were approved/Ayes: Unanimous.

Approval of Minutes 2-8-05, Regular Meeting
BOARD ACTION: (M)Fritz, (S)Stetson, the minutes were approved/Ayes: Unanimous.

Approval of Minutes 2-15-05, Regular Meeting
BOARD ACTION: (M)Bibby, (S)Turpin, the minutes were approved with a clarification provided relative to the Human Services item on Proposition 63/Ayes: Unanimous.
Approval of Consent Agenda (See End of Minutes)

**BOARD ACTION:** Supervisor Bibby pulled items 2 and 3. Supervisor Turpin pulled item 1. (M) Bibby, (S) Stetson, the balance of the items was approved/Ayes: Unanimous.

Consent Agenda item 1 – Supervisor Turpin asked that Public Works provide a status report on the landfill operations, especially the status of the rental of the scraper. Rich Inman, County Administrative Officer, will follow-up with Public Works on this request and ask for a status report on March 15th. (M) Turpin, (S) Stetson, item 1 was approved/Ayes: Unanimous.

Consent Agenda item 2 – Supervisor Bibby initiated discussion relative to the recommendation for payment of the claim; she asked for clarification of the six months versus 180-days to respond to a claim; and as to whether there is a possibility that this would be covered by a homeowners’ policy; and as to whether the County has proof that the work was done, and in what amount. Rich Inman, County Administrative Officer, and Tom Guarino, County Counsel, responded to the questions; and Rich advised that he could bring the matter back on March 22nd. Supervisor Bibby stated she would like to see the photographs of the damage, and she would like to know whether others suffered damages in this incident. The matter was continued to be brought back with additional information.

Consent Agenda item 3 – Supervisor Bibby initiated discussion relative to the request and the previous agreement with IBM. Rick Peresan, Technical Services, Director, provided information on his attempts to resolve this matter. Supervisor Bibby suggested that a letter be sent to IBM from the Board relative to their previous agreement on this matter. Chairman Pickard asked that the Technical Services Director draft a letter to IBM for review by the County Administrative Officer for the Chair’s signature explaining the County’s dissatisfaction in this matter. (M) Bibby, (S) Stetson, item 3 was approved, with the direction given for the letter to be sent to IBM/Ayes: Unanimous.

Blaine Shultz, Fire Chief,

Authorize the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to Sign Amendment Number One to the Agreement with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) for Dispatch of the Mercy Ambulance and County Fire in an Amount Not to Exceed $200,057 through June 30, 2006

**BOARD ACTION:** Discussion was held with Blaine Shultz, and he explained the “not-to-exceed” amount and the future increases in the contract due to increases in the personnel costs for CDF. He also advised of preliminary work on reviewing options for providing dispatch services with the other involved agencies. Discussion was held. Supervisor Bibby asked that the Board be provided with the actual expenditures at the end of each year. It was clarified that the additional cost for this contract for the remainder of this fiscal year is $19,821; however, due to other savings in the Fire budget, $14,000 was transferred during the mid-year budget actions. Jim Allen, Sheriff, commented on what would be involved for the County to take over dispatch services and the time that would be needed for recruiting for staff and training, etc. (M) Bibby, (S) Fritz, Res. 05-81 was adopted approving the contract amendment/Ayes: Unanimous.

CLOSED SESSION: Conference with County Labor Negotiator: Name of Employee Organization: SEIU Local 250, Health Care Workers Union; Name of County Designated Representative: Jeff Green (County Administrative Officer)

**BOARD ACTION:** Rich Inman, County Administrative Officer, advised that this closed session is not necessary.

CLOSED SESSION: Conference with Legal Counsel Relative to Anticipated Litigation/Initiating of Litigation for a Case Pursuant to Subdivision (c) of Government Code Section 54956.9 (Continued from 3-1-05) (County Counsel)

**BOARD ACTION:** Tom Guarino, County Counsel, asked that this closed session be rescheduled for March 15th.

10:09 a.m. CLOSED SESSION: Conference with County Labor Negotiator: Name of Employee Organization: SEIU Local 535; Name of County Designated Representative: Rich Inman (County Administrative Officer)
BOARD ACTION: (M)Bibby, (S)Stetson, the closed session was held, with Sandi Laird/Administration-Administrative Analyst, to be present/Ayes: Unanimous. Chairman Pickard announced that the Board would recess for lunch following the closed session and would reconvene at 2:00 p.m.

10:26 a.m. – Recess and Lunch, with the closed session continued to 1:30 p.m.

1:31 p.m. The Board reconvened in continued closed session.

2:02 p.m. Recess

2:17 p.m. Chairman Pickard announced that direction was given to staff as a result of the closed session.

Kris Schenk, Planning Director; Public Workshop to Review and Approve the February 2005 General Plan Update and to Initiate the Recirculation Process for the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

BOARD ACTION: Kris Schenk, Planning Director; Sarah Williams, Deputy Planning Director; and Andy Hauge, Parsons, were present for the workshop. Kris advised that the revised (February 2005 version) of the General Plan Update, the map and town planning area maps are available. He also advised that the Update, with changes made during this workshop, is what will be part of the recirculation of the EIR process. Chairman Pickard commented on the workshop process, and he advised that public input would be accepted during the workshop.

Chairman Pickard referred to the cover page of the Plan, and he suggested that the former Board members and Planning Commissioners that worked on the Plan be acknowledged; and the Board concurred with this change.

The following Chapters of the Plan were reviewed:

Chapter 1 – The Mariposa County Setting; Chapter 2 – Issues Important to Mariposa County Citizens; Chapter 3 – Guiding Principles of the Board of Supervisors; and Chapter 4 – General Plan Administration:

Supervisor Turpin referred to Chapter 1, Section 1.10.02, Planning Roles and Responsibilities in Mariposa County; and he asked about using the description from the Ordinance for item F. Agricultural Advisory Committee, to reflect its function, as well as adding the reference to cancellation of Williamson Act contracts.

Supervisor Turpin referred to Chapter 3, Section 3.2, Guiding Principles, and he suggested that the bullet read “Plan for and Ensure the Delivery of Infrastructure” versus “Provide for...”; and the Board concurred with the change. The same change was made in section 3.2.13.

Supervisor Turpin referred to Section 3.2.13, Plan for and Ensure the Delivery of Infrastructure; and he stated he feels that it needs to be clear that the developer and not the County is responsible for providing services such as potable water, sewage disposal and fire safe road access to newly created parcels of land. Discussion was held, and it was noted that it may not always be the developer that is responsible and that there could be other ways that the services are provided. Don Starchman stated he does not understand why this is in the document, and he does not feel that it is necessary. He feels that approval of the Health Department should be sufficient. Further discussion was held. Ken Melton stated he does not find the referenced sentence in the previous document, and he feels it should be deleted. He feels it calls for the improvements to be made at the time the new parcel is created, and not when it is known where the residence will be built on the parcel. He stated he feels that this language is throughout the document. He questioned if the County wants to require wells to be drilled at the time of the subdivision versus the current process. The Board concurred with changing the sentence to read “The
General Plan requires potable water, sewage disposal and fire safe road access to be delivered or available to the property consistent with State and County regulations for each newly created parcel of land...” Further discussion was held on this issue later in the workshop – see page six of the minutes.

Chairman Pickard called for additional comments from the public on these chapters, and none was received.

Chapter 5 – Land Use:
Chairman Pickard asked for clarification of the Board’s previous direction relative to retaining the title of the Fish Camp Town Specific Plan, like was done for the Wawona Town Specific Plan in the document. Discussion was held. The Board concurred with retaining the title of the Fish Camp Town Specific Plan throughout the document.

Supervisor Bibby referred to section 5.2.02, Summary of Major Findings, and she noted that L. Legally Existing Uses of Land, does not read correctly. Kris Schenk advised that some wording is missing, and the Board concurred with adding “and the regulations have later changed.”

Supervisor Bibby initiated discussion relative to Implementation Measure 5-1a(2) concerning land development regulations respecting the diversity of the rural lifestyles balancing the right to use one’s property with a neighbor’s enjoyment of nearby property.

Supervisor Bibby referred to the map for the General Plan Land Use Classifications and the list of parcels proposed to be placed in the Rural Economic Classification, and whether the required findings could be made. Discussion was held. Supervisor Bibby asked about including language for non-conforming businesses. Sarah Williams clarified that the zoning issues would still need to be dealt with for some of the businesses. The Board concurred with not making any changes at this time, pending public input at the hearing phase.

Supervisor Bibby referred to section 5.3.05, Natural Resource Land Use Classification, C. Zoning Consistency, and she asked about leaving the zoning designations in the Plan.

Supervisor Bibby referred to section 5.3.04, Agriculture/Working Landscape Land Use Classification, G. Criteria for Lands Proposed to be Removed from the Agriculture/Working Landscape Land Use Classification, and she referenced the statement that no Agriculture Preserve is eligible for exit from its contract during the 20-year life of the General Plan. She stated she saw another statement in the Plan that may be in conflict with this. The Board concurred with adding language to clarify that this is the case, unless a notice of non-renewal has been previously filed for the parcel.

Supervisor Bibby referred to section 5.3.05, Natural Resource Land Use Classification, E(1) Individual Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems, and she asked if there needs to be proof that a person is connected to a sewer system. Discussion was held. No change was made. Supervisor Bibby asked about no special requirements for lands proposed for timber management for section E(2) Criteria for New Lands to be Included. Discussion was held. The Board concurred with stating “To comply with requirements of the State.”

Tom Guarino, County Counsel, referred to the issue relative to the list of parcels proposed to be placed in the Rural Economic Classification, and he advised that if the Board determines to add more parcels to this classification at some point after this Plan is re-circulated with the EIR, it could cause another recirculation. Discussion was held relative to the list of parcels/businesses that is proposed to be included at this time.
Supervisor Turpin referred to section 5.3.03, Rural Land Use Classification, F(1) Separation Between the Location of the Rural Economic Land Use Classification, and he suggested that “should” be used in place of “must.”

3:52 p.m. Recess

4:25 p.m. Supervisor Stetson referred to section 5.3.02, Residential Land Use Classification, F(6) Animal Husbandry, and he questioned the verbiage. The Board concurred with deleting the last sentence.

Supervisor Stetson referred to section 5.3.05, Natural Resource Land Use Classification, B. Extent of Uses, and he suggested that “and harvesting” be deleted as he feels it is redundant to timber management. No change was made.

Supervisor Turpin referred to section 5.2.02, Summary of Major Findings, G. Public Facilities, and he asked about addressing Williamson Act Contract land. Andy Hauge advised that this would be addressed in Title 17 of the County Code. Supervisor Turpin referred to section J. Ready to Build Land, and he suggested that this section reflect “all” isolated areas for requiring access to sewer and water services; and he asked for clarification of what point the services are required – at the time of recordation of the parcel map, building permit stage, or at the time of sale of the parcel. Discussion was held. Tom Guarino clarified the definition of “services.” Sarah Williams explained the current process and advised that the proposal language does not change the system. The Board concurred with adding “all” and “access” to the parcel.

Chairman Pickard called for public input on this Chapter.

Cathie Pierce-Ragghianti, representing Mariposa County Farm Bureau, referred to the Land Use Classifications map and the size of the proposed boundary for the Catheys Valley Town Planning Area. She asked, if, and when this boundary could be changed, and she stated she feels it needs to have further discussion. She advised that the California Farm Bureau Federation also questions the size which is approximately 37,000 acres, and she presented a letter from the Federation concerning this matter. She expressed concern with the amount of agricultural land that is included in the boundary. Discussion was held.

Ken Melton referred to section 5.2.03, General Plan Implementation, Goal 5-2: Create land use density and development patterns to manage growth in patterns avoiding sprawl, and the Implementation Measure. He suggested that there is an inconsistency with using “encourage” in the Policy and “shall” in the Implementation Measure. No change was made. Ken referred to Policy 5-3a relative to requiring new subdivisions and lands created for commercial and industrial purposes to have direct access to maintained roads. He asked how mandatory maintenance would be implemented on someone else’s property. Discussion was held. He stated he feels there should be a meeting with the Public Works Director relative to the use of “capacity” in this document, and he questioned its definition. Ken referred to Policy 5-9a relative to allowing one house per five acres, and he noted that the State law allows for two. Andy Hauge clarified that if the language was changed to read that two single-family dwellings were allowed per five acres, it would result in allowing the two dwellings plus two “granny flats,” for a total of four dwellings. He referred to the population density and noted that we have an average density of two people per five-acre parcel.

Ken Melton referred to section 5.3.02, Residential Land Use Classification, E. New Subdivisions, relative to basic infrastructure. He stated he feels this should be brought into compliance with the intent of everything else. He referred to E(1) Road Capacity and Access, and noted that the term “capacity” is used again. He referred to E(2) Hillside and Ridge Top Design, and he asked what portion of the parcel with a slope in excess of 15% would be required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Kris Schenk advised that this language is general; however, language in Title 17 will be more specific. Ken also referred to the visual impact objective, and he noted that a large percentage of
the land in the County is scenic and open space. He suggested that “view shed” be removed from this document.

Supervisor Bibby commented on erosion and fire concerns with ridge top and hillside development; and she noted that development needs to be looked at from a safety standpoint and not just relative to view shed issues. She also noted that there could be problems in obtaining water on ridge tops.

Mark Harris commented on his experiences with drilling wells and being able to find good water throughout the County. Supervisor Bibby noted that there is a cost to pump water up hill. Mark commented on the existing process versus drilling a well before the location of the housing site is known.

Ken Melton stated he was only addressing the visual issue, and he stated his question is how staff will address this issue in making decisions. Ken referred to E(3) Individual Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems, and his previous request that the Health Department be consulted to determine if there is any reason that “off-site” could not be considered. Sarah Williams advised that this section refers to new subdivisions and not existing parcels. She also advised of the Health Department requirements for on-site systems.

Discussion was held relative to the language in E(2) Hillside and Ridge Top Design and the slope issue; and E. New Subdivisions, and the basic infrastructure issue. Ken Melton stated he feels that “infrastructure” means something that is in place at the time the map is recorded. Tom Guarino advised that the language is simply a standard that says you have to have an approved area per section E(3) Individual Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems. No change was made.

Ken Melton referred to section E(4) Potable Water Supply, relative to options for providing proof of a potable water supply. Discussion was held. No change was made. Ken stated he agrees with the requirement to record a disclosure statement relative to the water supplies for residential lands, as he feels people should be informed and not regulated. He referred to E(5) Wildland Fire Hazard and Emergency Services, and asked if “regulations” should be used instead of “requirements” and he asked if “State agency” should be used in place of specific agencies. Ken referred to F(5) Parcel Size, and he suggested that “County Code” replace “Planning Commission.” He referred to F(7) Multiple Dwelling Units on Property, and he asked whether “irregardless” is a correct word.

Ken Melton referred to section 5.3.03, Rural Economic Land Use Classification, B(1) Rural Economic/Commercial Subclassification, and he questioned the language relative to supporting arts and culture activities. He referred to section B(3) Rural Economic/Recreation Subclassification, and stated he feels that the mandate of employee housing was changed in the Housing Element to encourage on-site employee housing and he feels that the rest of the document should be consistent. Discussion was held. Tom Guarino noted that the housing issue needs to be a part of the environmental review, so this policy would be consistent with addressing that issue.

Chairman Pickard noted that written comments would be accepted on the draft Plan.

Ken Melton referred to section 5.4.01, Relation to the Agriculture Element, and he stated he questions whether the Land Use Element focuses on what locations in the County should be the primary lands for agricultural uses. He referred to section 5.4.03, Relationship to Implementation Tools, [B] Design Review and County Character, and the reference to the “scenic landscapes.”

Kris Casto referred to section 5.2.03, General Plan Implementation, Implementation Measure 5-1a(2), and she suggested that the following language be used: “Land development regulations should respect the diversity of rural lifestyles allowing the right to use one’s property complimentary with a neighbor’s enjoyment of nearby property.” She stated she feels this measure could be regulated in such a way that it is complimentary. Andy Hauge stated he feels this is a good suggestion for change. Tom
Guarino noted that complimentary is in the context of the uses that are allowed and not what a neighbor feels is complimentary. The Board concurred with the change.

Kris Casto referred to the Land Use Classifications map and the property along Highway 49 North, between Mount Bullion and Bear Valley. She noted that one side of the highway is Natural Resources, and the other side is Residential, leaving two different types of uses along the highway. She stated she would like to see the scenic view protected, and suggested that consideration be given to changing the Residential use to 40-acre minimum versus the 5-acre minimum parcel size. Discussion was held. Kris advised that she will meet with Supervisor Bibby on this issue.

Don Starchman referred to the issue of “capacity,” and he requested that the Board be careful about this. He feels that if this is not properly defined, it could shut down development in the County. He questioned whether any county road has the capacity for build-out, and what the definition is. He stated he wants to make sure that something does not happen that we do not want to have happen. He also noted that we need to be flexible so that the Planning Commission can accept mitigation measures. He stated this is also an issue in the Circulation Element.

Kris Schenk referred to section 5.3.05, Natural Resource Land Use Classification, E(1) Individual Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems, and he suggested that the language from section 5.3.02 Residential Land Use Classification, E(3) Individual Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems, be used in this section. The Board concurred with the change and with being consistent with using this language throughout the document.

Chapter 6 – Economic Development; and Chapter 7 – Arts and Culture:
Supervisor Stetson referred to section 6.3, Economic Development Implementation, Implementation Measure 6-1b(1), and he stated he feels the wording should be changed to reflect that the plan “should” contain provisions for destination resorts and hotel facility development versus “shall.” The Board concurred with the change. He referred to section 6.2.05, Enhancing the County’s Economic Sectors, A. Expansion of the Visitor-Serving Economy, and he suggested that “remote” be deleted for encouraging the development of destination resorts and hotel facilities in appropriate portions of the County. The Board concurred with this change.

Chairman Pickard called for public input on these Chapters, and none was received.

Chapter 8 – Housing:
This Chapter was previously adopted by the Board.

Chapter 9 – Circulation, Infrastructure, and Services:
Supervisor Turpin referred to Implementation Measure 9-1d(1), and he asked about “required” mitigation for projects if the traffic generated by the proposed project exceeds the capacity of the road systems. Discussion was held, and no change was made. Supervisor Turpin referred to Implementation Measure 9-1e(1), and stated he feels the bullet should read as “all “new” non-County maintained roads shall be…” The Board concurred with this change.

Chairman Pickard called for public input on this Chapter.

Ken Melton referred to Policy 9-1e relative to adopting comprehensive standards for all County roadways, and he asked if this applies to all county roads or to all roads in the County. Andy Hauge advised that this applies to the roads that the County has jurisdiction over. Ken asked where the roads with offers of dedication fit into this. There was no change.
Chapter 10 – Agriculture:

Supervisor Turpin referred to section 10.2.02 Summary of Major Findings, A. Preserving Agricultural Lands, and he noted that the correct name is “Natural Resource Conservation Service” versus Department of Conservation. Supervisor Pickard suggested that the Resource Conservation District be added. The Board concurred with correcting the name of the Conservation Service.

Input from the public was provided by the following:

Kris Casto advised that, as a result of the agri-tourism sessions, she is speaking as a voice of the group. She thanked the board for adding the agri-tourism to the Plan, and she suggested that agri-nature tourism be added. She stated she believes that some of the land uses that are currently allowed are inflexible, and they would like to see an expansion of ancillary uses. For example, if you have an apple orchard, it would be nice to be able to sell a book of apple recipes. She also suggested that there be benchmarks, such as allowing a certain number of events with a limited number of people so that they could experience the apple farm. And, if you want to have a day in the country, you would also want to be able to serve food. Sarah Williams referred to the Home Enterprise and noted that these uses are allowed in the Agricultural zones. Kris stated she feels the definitions are very narrow and should be broadened, and she asked about the deletion of pomegranates from the specialty crops list. Kris clarified that the addition of agri-nature tourism would address activities like bird and butterfly watching.

Discussion was held. Andy Hauge advised of the text in the Plan, but noted that it does not specify “nature.” Tom Guarino suggested that agri-tourism could be defined as including “nature” and he noted it might need the Farm Bureau’s review. He also suggested that it could be included in Chapter 13, Regional Tourism, as something that people do. Supervisor Stetson suggested that a bullet be added to section B. Working Landscape Stewardship, to indicate the benefit of agri-nature tourism. Further discussion was held. The Board concurred with including this in Chapter 13 as suggested.

Ken Melton referred to section 10.2.02, Summary of Major Findings, D. Maintaining the Rural Character of the County, and he asked whether the County could deny issuing a Certificate of Compliance to a legally created smaller parcel under Williamson Act contract. Sarah Williams advised that in the past, restrictions have been placed on processing applications for property under Williamson Act contract. Ken asked about adding “Highway 140” to the reference for the “Highway 49” corridor for residential subdivision activity.

Chapter 11 – Conservation and Open Space:

Supervisor Pickard referred to section 11.3, General Plan Implementation, Policy 11-1b and its Implementation Measure, and he suggested that “private” be added to reflect public and private agencies. The Board concurred with the change.

Input from the public was provided by the following:

Ken Melton referred to Implementation Measure 11-1a(2), and he asked how subdivision design standards would be developed for placement of structures on ridgelines and open hillsides.

Chapter 12 – Local Recreation:

There was no discussion or public input on this Chapter.
Chapter 13 – Regional Tourism:
Supervisor Pickard noted that agri-nature tourism was added.

Supervisor Stetson referred to section 13.4.01, Land Use, and suggested that “remote” be removed to be consistent with the change made in section 6.2.05 earlier this date. The Board concurred with the change.

Chairman Pickard called for input from the public and none was provided.

Chapter 14 – Historic and Cultural Resources; and Chapter 15 – Noise:
There was no discussion or public input on these Chapters.

Chapter 16 – Safety:
Input from the public was provided by the following:

Ken Melton referred to section 16.2.02, Summary of Major Findings, A. Fire Hazard, relative to the references to the ISO ratings. He stated he feels these references should be deleted. Discussion was held. Tom Guarino advised that this section is a summary of findings and realities of how things occur, and it does not endorse what CDF does. Ken asked where the requirements are for CDF to be able to request two points of access into a subdivision. Following discussion, the Board concurred with deleting the last sentence of this section.

(M)Stetson, (S)Fritz, Res. 05-82 was adopted directing staff to take this draft version of the Plan, with the changes made during the workshop, and re-circulate it with the EIR; and further authorizing minor wording clarifications and technical changes that staff needs to make, while maintaining the intent of the Board. Supervisor Stetson asked about working on the Rural Economic Subclassification and being able to add another parcel if one is found. Staff advised that as long as the parcel meets the criteria, consideration could be given to adding it. Ayes: Unanimous.

CONSENT AGENDA:

CA-1 Action to Continue Emergency Findings for the Interim Operation of the Mariposa County Landfill by County Staff is Necessary to Continue an Essential Public Service Until the Bidding Process is Completed (Public Works Director); Res. 05-79, and direction was given to staff

CA-2 Adopt a Resolution Authorizing Payment in the Amount of $11,513 for Claim No. C04-12 (County Administrative Officer); Direction was given to staff to bring back more information

CA-3 Authorize the Technical Services Director to Dispose of the Old AS400 as E-Waste (Technical Services Director); Res. 05-80, and direction was given to staff

CA-4 Approve Budget Action Transferring Funds with the Sheriff’s Budget from Maintenance of Equipment to Equipment $300 to $1,000 for the Purchase of Six Metal Signs to be Posted on Lake McClure ($1497) (Sheriff); Res. 05-77
CA-5  Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to Sign Organic Program Agreement No. 05-0024 for FY 2005/2006 with California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) (Agricultural Commissioner); Res. 05-78

7:14 p.m.  Adjournment in memory of John L. Clark, Richard A. "Dick" Penrose, and Nate Kwalwasser.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

MARGIE WILLIAMS  
Clerk of the Board