



LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Dave Braun, Executive Officer

200 W. 4th Street, Suite 3100, Madera, CA 93637
www.maderacounty.com/government/madera-laftco
(559) 675-7821

MEETING MINUTES

Madera County Government Center
Board of Supervisors' Chamber
200 West 4th Street, 1st Floor
Madera, California 93637

LAFCO Meeting
Wednesday, February 22, 2023
11:00 A.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Waseem Ahmed called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

Roll Call

Roll call given by LAFCO Clerk Joann Zuniga.

Commissioners Present: Waseem Ahmed, City Member (Chowchilla)
Laura Young, Public Member At-Large
Jose Rodriguez, City Member (Madera)
Robert Macaulay, County Member
Mark Stamas, Alternate Public Member At-Large

Commissioners Absent: Robert Poythress, County Member

Others Present: Dave Braun, Executive Officer
Joann Zuniga, LAFCO Clerk
Laurie Avedisian-Favini, Attorney at Law, LAFCO Legal Counsel
Wally Nishimoto, Business Systems Analyst, Tech Assistance

Pledge of Allegiance

Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chair Waseem Ahmed.

Presentation by Legal Counsel regarding teleconferencing

Legal Counsel Laurie Avedisian-Favini gave an overview on remote teleconferencing rules; stated there were three options available:

Option 1 - the Brown Act allowed attendance at a meeting by telephone if the meeting location was on the agenda and if the meeting was open to the public.

Option 2 - State Assembly Bill 361 (AB 361) allowed remote meeting attendance if the Commission adopted a resolution declaring a State of Emergency and in-person attendance at a meeting might cause imminent health risks; stated the entire Commission could meet remotely under Option 2 and a quorum was not required to be present at the meeting location; stated the State of Emergency in California was set to expire at the end of February 2023 and AB 361 would no longer be an option to use.

Option 3 - State Assembly Bill 2449 (AB 2449 – new legislation) allowed remote meeting attendance under two circumstances when there was no State of Emergency: (1) "Just Cause," which included child care, caregiver need, contagious illness, need related to mental or physical disability, or travel while on official business of a state or local agency; or (2) "Emergency Circumstance," which included a physical or family medical emergency that would prevent in-person attendance at a meeting; stated the executive director, legal counsel, or LAFCO clerk would need to be notified as soon as possible whenever attendance at a meeting would be remotely and if the Just Cause circumstance was applicable; stated notification could be at the beginning of a meeting if needed; stated Commissioners could remotely attend two meetings per year.

Ms. Avedisian-Favini stated AB 2449 went into effect at the beginning of January 2023 and would remain in effect until January 1, 2026; stated under the new rule at least a quorum of the Commission must attend a meeting in a single, physical location within the boundaries of the jurisdiction and that less than a quorum could attend remotely; stated before Commission took any action at a meeting, the remote member would need to disclose whether or not an individual or individuals 18 years of age or older were present in the room with the Commissioner and disclose the general nature of the Commissioner's relationship with the individual(s).

Laurie Avedisian-Favini stated there were additional requirements under AB 2449 regarding remote attendance at a meeting that were more restrictive than AB 361.

Laurie Avedisian-Favini stated there was a resolution on the agenda to allow remote meeting participation by teleconferencing within the requirements of Assembly Bill 361; stated the Commission would need to proceed to adopt that resolution as there was one Commissioner attending the meeting remotely; stated it would be the last AB 361 resolution to be on the agenda.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated he understood that under AB 361 a resolution would need to be on the agenda and adopted by the Commission, but that AB 2449 did not; asked when attending a meeting remotely, would either the Just Cause or Emergency Circumstance need to be on the agenda and would the remote meeting location need to be disclosed.

Laurie Avedisian-Favini stated AB 361 required a resolution be adopted by the Commission; stated AB 2449 was a State law exception that allowed individual members to participate remotely if less than a quorum; if the Just Cause justification were to be used, Commission approval would not be required for a member to participate remotely, however, if using Emergency Circumstance justification the member would need Commission approval to attend the meeting remotely.

Commissioner Rodriguez asked if the new law, AB 2449, required a member attending the meeting remotely to disclose the remote location. Laurie Avedisian-Favini stated the Commissioner's remote meeting attendance location would not need to be open to the public or location disclosed, but the member would need to disclose if anyone else is present at the remote location. Under AB 2449 at the remote location the video of the meeting would need to be on the entire time of the meeting.

Adoption of a Resolution of the Madera Local Agency Formation Commission proclaiming the continuing need to meet by teleconference pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e).

Commissioner Rodriguez moved to approve the resolution, seconded by Commissioner Young; motion passed by a vote of 4 to 0, with 1 member absent.

Vote: Yes - Rodriguez, Young, Ahmed, Macaulay
 No - None
 Absent - Poythress
 Abstain - None

The Commission passed Resolution No. 2023-01 approving remote meeting participation by teleconferencing during a declared State of Emergency in accordance with Government Code Section 54953(e) (Assembly Bill 361).

2. SELECTION OF CHAIR AND CHAIR PRO TEM

Dave Braun stated at the first meeting in the new year the Commission selected a new Chair and Chair Pro Tem. The newly selected Chair typically was the prior year Chair Pro Tem. A new Chair Pro Tem was selected on a rotating basis (i.e., City rep, County rep, Public Member at Large, City rep, etc.). Dave Braun stated this year because Chair Pro Tem Poythress was not present at the meeting and unavailable to assume the Chair position, it was recommended Commissioner Ahmed continue as Chair for the February meeting.

Commissioner Jose Rodriguez recommended that the matter of selecting the Chair and Chair Pro Tem for the 2023 calendar year be moved to the end of the agenda; and further that Chair Waseem Ahmed continue in that position for the February meeting due to the absence of Chair Pro Tem Robert Poythress. Chair Ahmed asked the Commission if there was

consensus to move the matter to the end of the agenda. The Commission unanimously approved the change to the agenda.

3. CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

Presentation to LAFCO Commissioner Tom Wheeler for his years of service on the LAFCO Commission

Former Commissioner and Board of Supervisor Tom Wheeler was unable to attend the meeting, therefore the matter was postponed.

4. COMMISSIONER'S OATH OF OFFICE

Robert Macaulay, LAFCO's newest Commissioner and newly elected Board of Supervisor representing District 5, took the Oath of Office.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Chair Waseem Ahmed called for public comment. There was none. The Chair closed the public comment period.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2022.

Commissioner Rodriguez moved to approve the December 14, 2022, meeting minutes, seconded by Commissioner Young; motion passed by a vote of 4 to 0, with 1 member absent.

Vote: Yes - Rodriguez, Young, Ahmed, Macaulay
 No - None
 Absent - Poythress
 Abstain - None

The Consent Calendar was approved. The December 14, 2022, meeting minutes were approved and filed as presented.

7. NEW MATTERS

**Triangle T Water District Annexation and Sphere of Influence Expansion
(File No. 2022-03)**

Staff Presentation

Dave Braun gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Triangle T Water District application for annexation and Sphere of Influence (SOI) amendment; stated the SOI amendment proposed to add approximately 11,293 acres of property; stated the Triangle T Water District was located in the northwest corner of Madera County on the east side of the San Joaquin River between the Avenue 10 and Avenue 21 alignments; stated there were 7 property owners representing 24 parcels totaling 3,062+/- acres within the SOI expansion area; stated all 7 property owners had consented to the annexation, which involved 6 different areas near or adjacent to the Triangle T Water District, and all 6 areas were included in the SOI expansion; stated all but one of the 6 areas had more than one parcel; stated the Water Code allowed California water districts to annex property that was not contiguous to its boundary as long as it was within two miles.

Dave Braun stated the Sphere of Influence expansion included other areas not proposed to be annexed but were in the SOI of other water districts such as the Chowchilla Water District, Madera Irrigation District, Clayton Water District; stated if the Commission approved the Sphere of Influence expansion of the Triangle T Water District, it would remove those areas from the other districts' Spheres of Influence at the same time.

Dave Braun stated the Triangle T Water District was formed in 2017 with the purpose to (1) facilitate contracting with other water districts for supplemental surface water; (2) facilitate projects under Proposition 1 and Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA); (3) obtain surplus water from neighboring sources for irrigation and groundwater recharge; and (4) coordinate and monitor use of shallow and deep wells to minimize subsidence impacts from groundwater pumping.

Dave Braun stated the area was one of the worst in Madera County for land subsidence; stated Triangle T Water District was addressing those issues by (1) constructing 1.5 miles of pipeline from the Poso Canal into the District to provide surface water to the District for recharge purposes, and that was done through a Mitigation Agreement with Central California Irrigation District and San Luis Canal Company to address land subsidence; (2) constructing 5 reservoirs within the District to accommodate surface water for recharge; (3) landowners within the District were working on a master plan to address subsidence issues within the District; and (4) working on 4 large scale projects with the County of Madera to address groundwater sustainability within the Chowchilla Subbasin and attempting to obtain grants for those projects.

Dave Braun stated Triangle T Water District was a Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) under SGMA and had prepared a groundwater sustainability plan; stated approval of the annexation for the south end of the district would extend that area into the Madera Subbasin and would then be in both the Chowchilla and Madera Subbasins.

Dave Braun stated when the Triangle T Water District Formation application was received in 2017, staff attempted to reach an agreement between property owners to consolidate the Triangle T Water District and Clayton Water District; stated the property owners/farmers within the two water districts had different goals and farming practices, and an agreement was never reached between the two districts to join as one.

Dave Braun stated the Commission approved the creation of the Triangle T Water District but removed the Cross Creek property from that application; stated the Triangle T Water District would have surrounded the Clayton Water District if the Cross Creek property had been included in the annexation and would have limited the ability of the Clayton Water District to expand, which at that time was the 1200-acre Clayton Ranch.

Dave Braun showed a map depicting the area of the Triangle T Water District Formation, which consisted of the Triangle T Ranch, the Vlot property, and the Cross Creek property; stated in 2019 the Clayton Water District annexed 9,457 acres to the north of the Clayton Ranch, which included properties in both Madera and Merced Counties; showed a map depicting the Clayton Water District; stated Triangle T Water District consisted of 14,687 acres, the Clayton Water District consisted of 10,657 acres; stated both water districts were capable of providing the same services.

Dave Braun showed on a map four areas (Areas B, C, E, F) that met the standards for annexation; stated there were two areas on the map (Areas A and D) that were not in compliance with LAFCO policies for annexation; stated Areas A and D were in the Sphere of Influence of the Clayton Water District, in the path of development of the Clayton Water District, and created islands and peninsulas; stated parcels interspersed one next to another in different districts did not represent the most efficient way to provide services; stated the policy that if an annexation was proposed, it must show it was the best service provider of that property; stated in the case of Areas A and D, the Clayton Water District was unable to provide services, and Triangle T Water District was the preferred provider.

Dave Braun stated there were good reasons why property owners in Areas A and D wanted to be annexed; stated they had substantial land holdings within the Triangle T Water District and preferred to have all their property in the same district; stated Triangle T Water District was a Groundwater Sustainability Agency and more proactive in dealing with subsidence issues in the area; stated Clayton Water District was still in the white area regulated by Madera County; stated a finding of LAFCO was the logical formation and determination of local agency boundaries in promoting orderly development; stated the determination of orderly development could not be made for Areas A and D.

Dave Braun recommended approval of the expansion of the Sphere of Influence as proposed with the exception of the proposed expansion into Areas A and D within the Clayton Water District Sphere of Influence; recommended approval of annexation of Areas B, C, D, and F into the Triangle T Water District; recommended the proposal to annex Areas A and D not be approved; stated the solution would be the consolidation of the two water districts—Clayton

Water District with Triangle T Water District; further recommended that if the Commission was inclined to approve the annexation of Areas A and D, it should be accompanied by an action leading toward consolidation of the two districts.

Commissioner Jose Rodriguez asked what authority the Commission had to approve the annexation of the island and peninsula properties since it would go against LAFCO policy. Dave Braun stated the policy discouraged the creation of island and peninsula properties but would not prohibit it.

Commissioner Laura Young asked had there been a consolidation request. Dave Braun replied no, but when the district was formed in 2017 Triangle T Water District had been encouraged to consolidate; stated at the present time there was not enough interest on both sides--Clayton Water District and Triangle T Water District--to do so. Commissioner Young asked Dave Braun if he thought that might change. Dave Braun stated it could; stated there were ever changing water issues in California with SGMA; stated the Clayton Water District was in the white area under the authority of Madera County, which recently put in place fines regarding water conservation; such action could lead to a change of thought regarding consolidation.

Commissioner Jose Rodriguez stated the proposed annexation would place the Triangle T Water District in both the Madera and Chowchilla Subbasins and asked how it would be administered. Dave Braun stated it required the district to submit plans to both subbasins.

Public Comments

Chair Ahmed opened the meeting to public comments.

Jessica Johnson, attorney with Baker Manock and Jensen and general counsel to Clayton Water District, stated Clayton Water District submitted a letter on January 13, 2023, commenting on the Triangle T Water District application; stated Clayton Water District opposed that portion of Triangle T Water District's application to annex lands into Triangle T Water District that were within Clayton Water District's Sphere of Influence (SOI) boundary because those portions would create irregular boundaries, islands, and peninsulas contrary to Cortese-Knox Hertzberg law and LAFCO Commission policies; stated it looked like disconnected hopscotching and disorderly organization contrary to LAFCO law.

Jessica Johnson supported staff recommendation not to include Areas A and D in the annexation; stated it would create a patchwork of properties interspersed between the two water districts; stated as in 2017 when consolidation was first suggested, Clayton Water District continued to disagree with staff that the two districts should be consolidated; stated they have significant differences in farming practices and different governing styles; stated it was not in the best interest of Clayton Water District to consolidate at this time or in the foreseeable future; noted that Clayton Water District was now primarily in Merced County and the Merced LAFCO would be the governing agency for decisions regarding consolidation.

Jessica Johnson stated Clayton Water District generally had no issue with Triangle T Water District expanding its boundary or the work it was doing to reduce subsidence in the Red Top area; reiterated support for staff recommendation not to include Areas A and D; did not recommend action to consolidate the two districts; stated better option would be to work on agreements between the two districts to provide out-of-district services to Areas A and D that may need services rather than make a patchwork of Clayton Water District's Sphere of Influence; stated Clayton Water District was willing to work with its neighbors on such an agreement and had already worked with Triangle T Water District on a water rights application.

Sarah Woolf, general manager of the Triangle T Water District, stated the District was in agreement that it did not want the patchwork of properties; stated in 2017 the Cross Creek property was originally intended to be part of the Triangle T Water District but at that time Area D was not owned by Hancock; stated Areas A and D were unique in that they were located along an existing pipeline plumbed and ready to deliver surface water to those properties; stated there was infrastructure in place because the original intention of the Triangle T Water District was to have Areas A and D included in the District.

Sarah Woolf stated Area D was a property that could receive services available to them if they were annexed into the District; stated Area A was a separate, noncontiguous area that was intended to have recharge facilities to help mitigate the pumping that was occurring; stated Triangle T Water District currently operated like a conjunctive use district; stated surface water was purchased for the district to ensure that deep ground water was used as little as possible.

Sarah Woolf stated they received two significant grants with Madera County and Chowchilla Water District as part of the SGMA process to put in recharge facilities; stated Triangle T Water District's policy was to only annex lands they could provide services to at this time.

Larkin Harman, president of Clayton Water District, stated goals and farming practices were different than the Triangle T Water District; stated landowners in the Clayton Water District were multi-generational family farms; stated there were properties located on the shallow aquifer adjacent to the San Joaquin River and received water from the river; stated they were not as focused on subsidence as the Triangle T Water District; stated they were not pumping from the deep aquifer or contributing to it; stated they were focused on the shallow aquifers and recharging their aquifers; stated they have worked with Madera County and have gotten a Proposition 68 grant to help do recharge projects in their District and to construct a pipeline from the San Joaquin River bypass to District properties.

Michael York, current board member of the Triangle T Water District and manager of the Vlot Family Farms in the Red Top area, stated Dirk Vlot had spent time and effort to ensure the land was properly being maintained and ground subsidence issues treated as a top priority; stated his values align with Dirk Vlot and the Triangle T Water District that groundwater

sustainability was an important factor in the future of water sustainability; stated one of main goals was to farm in a way that combatted the rapid subsidence issue; stated Vlot Family Farms had been able to do so because of the Triangle T Water District's involvement in multiple programs dealing with subsidence issues; stated since 2017 the Vlot Family Farms had been participating in water purchases, water recharge drilling of shallow wells, and managing groundwater and surface water to help with subsidence issues.

Michael York stated Dirk Vlot planned to develop a permanent recharge facility to take water from the East Side Bypass during flood water excess and use it for groundwater recharge; stated this facility would help support the district's goals of recharging the groundwater aquifers and mitigating subsidence; stated this facility would also support properties currently within District boundaries.

Michael York stated it was extremely important that the remaining property be annexed into the Triangle T Water District, which had been the only water district in the area actively managing groundwater use at a sustainable level; stated the Triangle T Water District currently had a mitigation agreement with the Central California Irrigation District and the San Luis Canal Company to reduce lower aquifer pumping, thereby, continuing to reduce subsidence impacts in that area; stated that had proven to be beneficial in showing a reduction of subsidence at the Sack Dam; stated by annexing the remaining Vlot property and adopting rules and regulations to reduce lower aquifer pumping, they could also continue to reduce the impacts of subsidence in the surrounding area.

Michael York stated the Vlot Family Farms preference was annexation into the Triangle T Water District, which had shown to be proactive in farming sustainability; stated the Triangle T Water District was the best option for the Vlot Family Farms as they were already participating in multiple water sustainability programs, whereas other water districts in the area had not started any programs to his knowledge; stated the remaining Vlot Family Farms would adhere to all future agreements to assist in combatting subsidence by having one less property in the area relying on lower aquifer pumping; stated by annexing in the remaining Vlot property they could expand their footprint on mitigating subsidence in the Red Top area.

Brad Samuelson, manager of the Triangle T Water District Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA), stated land owners in Madera County GSA and Chowchilla Subbasin defeated a Proposition 218 election to fund programs in this area; stated there was uncertainty among farmers if the entire subbasin would be placed on probation by the Department of Water Resources; stated Areas A and D were currently not in the Triangle T Water District, however, the land owners were accustomed to the rules and regulations of the District in terms of managing their water portfolio as one unit; stated if Areas A and D were not annexed, both areas would have to be treated as completely different properties in terms of their water balances; stated land owners would have to ensure compliance with the Chowchilla Subbasin groundwater allocation program, which was a totally different way to manage groundwater, and they would be buying significant amount of surface water at a high price and then conjunctively use shallow pumping groundwater to meet their water portfolio;

stated if these two Areas (A and D) were not in the Triangle T Water District, they would essentially only be able to farm half of the property.

Jeannie Habben, Deputy Director of Water and Natural Resources for Madera County, stated for Chowchilla Subbasin projects the County did not receive Proposition 218 funding as there was a successful protest of Proposition 218; stated there was a group formed of growers, and funding was being collected for domestic well mitigation; stated there was money some place, but no MOU (memorandum of understanding), no letter of intent, or anything received by the County as to what and when they would do anything with that funding; stated the County of Madera received a grant for 1.5 million dollars for the Chowchilla Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) to write the plan for that area and install 7 monitoring wells; stated there was a Proposition 68 planning grant that was received for 500,000 dollars to conduct a domestic well inventory in the Chowchilla Subbasin and install additional monitoring wells; stated the County received Proposition 68 implementation funding for 4.2 million dollars, and this grant included three turnouts from the East Side Bypass for on-farm recharge in the Triangle T Water District, Clayton Water District, and other white areas; stated the County received a total of 7.6 million dollars of grant funds for the Triangle T Water District and Madera County GSA as a subgrantee.

Commissioner Macaulay asked Ms. Habben if Clayton Water District was participating in the contribution of funds to the domestic well mitigation. Ms. Habben stated she was not aware of their participation. Commissioner Macaulay asked about Clayton Water District groundwater subsidence issues and if well levels had stayed the same over the last several years. Ms. Habben stated the Red Top area was a hot spot.

Larkin Harman, Clayton Water District, responded to Commissioner Macaulay's question stating in 2017 Clayton Water District signed an MOU (memorandum of understanding) with the County of Madera to implement all GSP requirements; stated they were double covered because almost all domestic wells were owner-operated and the irrigated lands programs covered domestic wells; stated by law they had to cover their own domestic wells and supply any water in their area; stated regarding groundwater levels in their area, for about 50 years the Bureau of Reclamation had been checking their wells along the San Joaquin River in both Madera and Merced Counties; stated they had a long history of well levels not fluctuating much due to the proximity to the San Joaquin River; stated east of the bypass everything was a deep well; stated current groundwater levels on the Clayton Farms property were about 40-45 feet; stated Clayton Farms offered three wells that the County monitored as part of the County GSA, and each year in Spring and Fall a company was hired to check well levels and turn in results to County.

Commissioner Macaulay asked Ms. Harman what had been implemented since 2017 with respect to the MOU and GSA commitment. Ms. Harman replied implementation of the MOU and GSP plan that the County proposed within the Clayton Water District boundaries included measures to install monitoring wells, lands kept fallow for water balance, and not overplanting.

Brad Samuelson, manager of the Triangle T Water District Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA), clarified the Chowchilla Subbasin Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP).

Darcy Vlot Cross, Cross Creek Farm, stated they were part of the subsidence area, and they chose to be proactive in joining with Triangle T Water District along with other farmers in the area to put in a pipeline so they could receive surface water and would not have to pump from their deep wells; stated they had been on this program since 2017; reiterated that they wanted to be a part of the Triangle T Water District that was proactively addressing subsidence in the area.

Chair Waseem Ahmed closed the public hearing.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Jose Rodriguez stated if the requested annexation of the island/peninsula properties were to be approved, it would go against the principles of LAFCO and asked staff how would the Commission justify approval. Dave Braun advised the Commission to take action toward consolidation of the Triangle T Water District and Clayton Water District; stated the Commission had the authority to initiate an application to consolidate; cited Section 56375; stated Commission could not force consolidation as the property owners could protest.

Commissioner Laura Young asked if there had been a consolidation request. Dave Braun replied there had not been interest from the water districts; stated he had encouraged consolidation since 2017. Commissioner Laura Young asked if that might that change. Dave Braun stated it was possible, the issues with water in the State of California SGMA (Groundwater Sustainability Agency) were ever changing and Clayton Water District was within the white area in Madera County.

Commissioner Jose Rodriguez asked how it would work for Triangle T Water District to be in the two subbasins in Madera County. Dave Braun stated it would require the water districts to submit plans to both subbasins. Commissioner Jose Rodriguez stated the end goal was how to substantiate the amount of water use and how to recharge and conserve; stated they could submit plans to the subbasins; stated Triangle T Water District was taking proactive approach to meeting the goals mandated by the State of California.

Dave Braun stated both water districts were California Water Districts and could provide the same service; stated under SGMA the two water districts were different in that Triangle T Water District was a Groundwater Sustainability Agency and Clayton was under the authority of Madera County.

Chair Waseem Ahmed asked if other surrounding water districts (except the Clayton Water District) objected to this annexation. Dave Braun stated there was no objection; stated the

Sphere of Influence (SOI) expansion of the Triangle T Water District would reduce the SOI of the Chowchilla Water District and Madera Irrigation District.

Commissioner Robert Macaulay referenced comment made by Brad Samuelson (manager of Triangle T Water District GSA) that islands already existed; cited Areas A and D and that the property owners wanted to be part of the Triangle T Water District; stated LAFCO policies discouraged, not prohibited islands and peninsulas from being created. Dave Braun stated Policy 2.94 did not prohibit the Commission from taking action to approve Areas A and D as part of the annexation. Commissioner Robert Macaulay clarified that the Commission would not be violating policy if it approved the annexation of Areas A and D.

Discussion ensued amongst the Commission and staff regarding the consolidation of the Triangle T Water District and the Clayton Water District.

Commission Action

Commissioner Macaulay moved to approve the Triangle T Water District Sphere of Influence Expansion and Annexation 2022-03 including Areas A and D; Commissioner Rodriguez seconded the motion and asked to add the condition to consolidate both districts into one water district. Commissioner Macaulay amended his motion to include the condition that if within the next five years an application to consolidate the Triangle T Water District and Clayton Water District had not been filed with LAFCO, the Commission would conduct a hearing to initiate an application for consolidation of the two water districts.

Vote: Yes - Macaulay, Rodriguez, Young, Ahmed
 No - None
 Absent - Poythress
 Abstain - None

The motion passed 4 to 0, within 1 member absent.

8. COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

Commissioner Rodriguez congratulated newly elected County Supervisor Macaulay and welcomed him to the Commission. Commissioner Macaulay stated he met Chair Ahmed in October 2019 at the CALAFCO 2019 Annual Conference in Sacramento when he was seated next to him; stated it was nice to be with other elected and appointed members.

9. EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORTS

Dave Braun welcomed newly elected County Supervisor Robert Macaulay to the Commission; stated Commissioner Macaulay was experienced and had been the chief of staff for now-retired County Supervisor and Commissioner Tom Wheeler.

2. CONTINUED - SELECTION OF CHAIR AND CHAIR PRO TEM

Commissioner Jose Rodriguez moved to nominate Commissioner Poythress as Chair and Commissioner Laura Young as Chair Pro Tem for the 2023 year; a second to the motion was made by Commissioner Robert Macaulay; motion passed by a vote of 4 to 0, with 1 absent.

Vote: Yes - Rodriguez, Macaulay, Ahmed, Young
 No - None
 Absent - Poythress
 Abstain - None

The motion passed 4 to 0, within 1 member absent.

At the next meeting of the Commission, the newly appointed Chair and Chair Pro Tem would be assuming their respective role.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ahmed adjourned the meeting at 12:55 p.m.

Submitted by:



LAFCO Executive Officer David E. Braun

Approval Date: 6/7/23