

SHASTA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Tuesday, February 1, 2000

REGULAR MEETING

9:02 a.m.: Chairman Fust called the Regular Session of the Board of Supervisors to order on the above date with the following present:

District No. 1 - Supervisor Kehoe
District No. 2 - Supervisor Fust
District No. 3 - Supervisor Hawes
District No. 4 - Supervisor Wilson
District No. 5 - Supervisor Clarke

County Administrative Officer - Doug Latimer
County Counsel - Karen Jahr
Administrative Board Clerk - Pamela English

INVOCATION

Invocation was given by Pastor Obie Tilley, Shasta Missionary Baptist Church.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by Supervisor Kehoe.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Chairman Fust pointed out that there had been an addendum to today's agenda canceling the Afternoon Session.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - OPEN TIME

Danielle Tinman with Ogden Energy provided an update on the progress of Three Mountain Power—a proposed natural gas plant to be located in the Burney/Johnson Park area.

Chairman Fust deferred the requests to speak during Open Time submitted by Victor Ogrey and Julie Buick until the subject of their comments (Striking A Balance II) came up on the agenda for consideration.

ITEMS PULLED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR

Chairman Fust pulled from the agenda the request for approval of the minutes of the Board of Supervisors' meeting held on January 25, 2000 at the request of the Clerk of the Board. The minutes will be brought back during the next meeting for consideration.

Supervisor Kehoe pulled from the Consent Calendar County Counsel's request for approval of replacement agreements for legal services with the law firms of Gary Brickwood and Underwood & Omstead. He questioned whether this request would be at odds with the Board of Supervisors' direction to use the Request For Proposals (RFP) system for this purpose. County Counsel Karen Jahr explained that her intent was not to direct any work to these firms without the approval of the Board. However, until the RFP is concluded, the Board will need a firm for the referral of new cases.

Supervisor Kehoe indicated that he would be comfortable with the addition of a time line for the completion of the RFP. Counsel Jahr indicated that the Board could expect to receive a list of firms by April 2000, and she clarified that the request before the Board was simply a change in the names of the law firms.

CONSENT CALENDAR

By motion made, seconded (Clarke/Hawes), and unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors took the following actions, which were listed on the Consent Calendar:

Accepted the Grant Financial Audit of the District Attorney's Office participation in the California Department of Justice Spousal Abuser Prosecution Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1999. (Auditor-Controller)

Accepted the Audit Report of the Shasta County Water Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1999. (Auditor-Controller)

Approved and authorized the Chairman to sign replacement agreements for legal services with the law firms of Gary Brickwood and Underwood & Omstead. (County Counsel)

Approved and authorized the Chairman to sign a personal services agreement with New Directions Counseling Services in the amount of \$15,750 to provide mental health services to cadets at the Crystal Creek Camp for the period of February 1, 2000 through June 30, 2000. (Probation)

9:17 a.m.: The Board of Supervisors recessed and convened as the Air Pollution Control Board.

SPECIAL DISTRICTS/OTHER AGENCIES CONSENT CALENDAR

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

By motion made, seconded (Clarke/Hawes), and unanimously carried, the Air Pollution Control Board adopted APCB Resolution No. 2000-1 which authorizes the Air Quality Management District to apply for Carl Moyer Program Funds in the amount of \$100,000. (Resource Management - Air Quality Management District)

(See Air Pollution Control Board Resolution Book)

9:18 a.m.: The Air Pollution Control Board adjourned and reconvened as the Board of Supervisors.

REGULAR CALENDAR**GENERAL GOVERNMENT****AUDITOR-CONTROLLER****COUNTY CLAIMS**

By motion made, seconded (Clarke/Hawes), and unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors authorized the issuance of warrants totaling \$100,205.99 for County operating funds and special districts, as submitted by Auditor-Controller Rick Graham.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE/SUPERVISORS' REPORTS**

County Administrative Officer Doug Latimer presented an update on legislation of importance to Shasta County.

At the request of Personnel Analyst Marty Bishop and by motion made, seconded (Clarke/Hawes), and carried, the Board of Supervisors approved and authorized the Chairman to sign letters to all Legislators in opposition to Senate Bill 739 (Solis) which would make substantial changes to the local agency collective bargaining law known as the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, and Assembly Bill 1519 (Floyd) which would grant appointing authority of the Chief Probation Officer to a six-member selection committee in counties with a population of 75,000 or more. Supervisor Kehoe abstained from taking action on this matter.

The Supervisors reported on countywide issues.

9:43 a.m.: Supervisor Hawes recused himself from the following action, because of the appearance of a conflict of interest, and he left the Board Chambers.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE**RESCISSION OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1999 ACTION****AGREEMENT: CITY OF REDDING****STRIKING A BALANCE II - AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

County Administrative Officer (CAO) Doug Latimer explained that as a result of the Board of Supervisors' direction on January 11, 2000, two staff reports have been prepared for the Board's consideration and discussion. He indicated that CAO Analyst Julie Howard would present these matters on behalf of the County.

Mrs. Howard announced that the matter before the Board today was whether or not to rescind the vote of September 7, 1999 pertaining to an agreement between the County and the City of Redding on the matter of services to an unincorporated area, as well as the annexation of unincorporated islands or adjacent areas, and then to take action anew.

Mrs. Howard presented a modified agreement for the Board's consideration, specifically deleting the Wilshire Drive area and any references to an area adjacent to the City of Redding known as the Airport/East Stillwater area. She also presented the following summary of the identified alternatives and a brief statement of the effect of each alternative:

1. Rescind the vote of September 7, 1999 and then adopt the modified agreement mentioned above. The City of Redding would also have to act affirmatively on the new agreement. The Board may wish to include in its action a direction that the modified agreement be presented to the City Council with a request that they take a concurring action. The City Manager has informally indicated that there will probably be no objection on the City's part to the deletion of references to both areas.
2. Rescind the vote of September 7, 1999 and approve the agreement, as originally written. The effect would be no change in the agreement between the parties; however, this action may be prohibited by Government Code Section 1090 pertaining to "conflict of interest."
3. Rescind the vote of September 7, 1999 with no further action. The effect would be that an agreement between the parties would no longer exist.
4. Rescind the vote of September 7, 1999 and then return the matter back to staff for preparation of an agreement with further modifications, as articulated by the Board. The effect of this alternative would be that an agreement between the parties would no longer exist.

Mrs. Howard suggested that if the Board has further amendments to the agreement other than the deletion of any references to Wilshire Drive and the industrial park site, it would probably be appropriate to refer the matter back to staff for further modifications.

Victor Ogrey, Chairman of the Churn Creek Bottom Homeowners Organization, suggested that when reconsidering its action of September 7, 1999, the Board omit the sewer line extension to Churn Creek Bottom from the agreement with the City of Redding. He cited a lack of public involvement in the changes to the "Striking A Balance" agreement before action was taken by the Board. Mr. Ogrey expressed the homeowners' concern at finding that the County Service Area (CSA) that was being set up for the sewer extension had been expanded to approximately 135 acres. He also cited language included in the report/agreement brought to the Board which expressed the wish of the County and City that urbanization of Churn Creek Bottom not occur, the development in the Knighton Road/I-5 area is at the southerly entrance to the City of Redding, and the development is attractive and inviting. He also suggested that besides the possibility of a conflict of interest by one of the Board Members in participating in the approval of this agreement, the City of Redding may also have a conflict of interest in that it owns more than 50 acres of property outlined in this agreement. Mr. Ogrey expressed his belief that no one in the CSA has shown an interest in hooking up to the sewer extension, expense being one significant reason. He stated that if the agreement remains in effect, even if the sewer extension does not occur, something has then been set up in perpetuity establishing what he believed would be a commercial area.

Julie Buick, resident of the Churn Creek Bottom area, urged the Board to reconsider its vote on the issue of extending sewer service to this area. She expressed her belief that this was an ill-conceived idea which should not have been developed by the Board or LAFCo, and the report was not within the limits of the LAFCo purpose, as she understood it. She outlined her belief that LAFCo's job, as designated by the state, is to curb any urban sprawl and encroachments of city and county businesses and opportunities on prime agricultural land. It was Ms. Buick's contention that the Churn Creek Bottom area has prime agricultural soil and is located upon one of the largest aquifers within the State of California. She further outlined that LAFCo is also in the business of accepting or denying requests of annexation and should not be initiating or promoting the very thing it is in place to prevent. Ms. Buick stated that most of the residents located on the Wilshire Drive island are not in favor of this action, and any action should be initiated and voted on by the area residents. In regards to the sewer extension, she indicated that the TA Truck Stop, the proposed Flying J complex, and the residents did not request this extension, and they are not willing to pay for it. She also expressed her belief that the Flying J project is not something that should be considered because it would be a major polluter of the local environment. Her final comment was that this entire process was initiated without proper public review.

Dwight Bailey requested a copy of the map of the area that is to be included in this process prior to the Board's vote on this matter. He was having difficulties finding two other areas which appeared to be included in this report located in the Oasis Road area. Chairman Fust explained that a copy of the map of the affected areas was included in the report of staff, which County Counsel shared with Mr. Bailey. Mr. Bailey expressed his concern that he would not be in favor of any agreement which would take funds out of the school system due to the proposed annexation.

Ramona Bolling asked for clarification as to what would happen with the Stillwater project if the vote was rescinded. Chairman Fust explained that the original vote included the three islands within the City of Redding, the extension of sewer services to the Knighton Road area, and the annexation of the acreage in the Stillwater area for an industrial park and the Tarmac Road area for the sports complex. He further explained that if the vote is rescinded, all of the projects included in the agreement would cease to exist.

Supervisor Kehoe explained that after looking through Exhibits A and B-5, he could find no reference to the Oasis Road area, and he was unclear about that matter. Supervisor Clarke explained that the area Mr. Bailey was referring to was on Lake Boulevard, not Oasis Road, which Mr. Bailey confirmed.

Supervisor Clarke reported that since the original vote was taken, the Chairman's Task Force had done considerable research into the prospect of extending sewer service to the Knighton Road area. As a result, she explained that no interest in this matter was shown by anyone within the area, nor have they expressed a willingness to pay for this service. She questioned whether the Board should reconsider voting on this extension until such time as someone does in fact request the service.

Supervisor Clarke explained that as far as the tax exchange agreements that the Board and the Redding City Council originally voted on are concerned, the direction to staff after this action was that each annexation would be analyzed by County staff and departments for any impacts upon county government and its ability to continue to provide these services, which are continued even after an annexation. She further explained that the Board agreed that this format would be used for all future annexations, which it recently used in an annexation with the City of Anderson in the Ox Yoke area and exchanged both property and sales tax. She pointed out that a resolution adopted by the City of Redding on one of the islands (Lake Boulevard) does not reference sales tax at all. It does, however, refer to the County maintaining its present property tax with no increment in future growth and no transference of the existing sales tax going to the County. Not only will the County lose growth for property tax in the future, the County will also lose its existing tax base. Supervisor Clarke further questioned why the Board would choose to negotiate with the City of Anderson in one manner and not follow the same principals when negotiating tax exchange agreements with the City of Redding.

By motion made, seconded (Kehoe/Wilson), and unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors rescinded the vote of September 7, 1999 pertaining to an agreement between the County and the City of Redding on the matter of services to an unincorporated area, as well as the annexation of unincorporated islands or adjacent areas.

A motion was made by Supervisor Clarke and seconded by Supervisor Fust for the Board of Supervisors to take no further action on the recommendations contained in the "Striking A Balance" report and to direct staff to negotiate property tax exchange agreements when and if proposals are made for annexation after the proper analysis. This motion died by the following vote:

AYES:	Supervisors Fust and Clarke
NOES:	Supervisors Kehoe and Wilson
ABSENT:	Supervisor Hawes

A motion was made by Supervisor Kehoe and seconded by Supervisor Wilson for the Board of Supervisors to adopt the modified agreement presented in this report and encourage the City of Redding to take concurrent action. This motion died by the following vote:

AYES: Supervisors Kehoe and Wilson
 NONE: Supervisors Fust and Clarke
 ABSENT: Supervisor Hawes

Supervisor Clarke stated that she did not have a problem with the annexation process of the islands with concurrence of the residents living there or with the Tarmac area. She was simply asking that direction be given to County staff and departments to perform an analysis of what the impact of this proposal would be on County revenues and to bring such a report back to the Board. She explained that in certain instances where there are industrial parks, etc., the Board may find that the existing property taxes are all that are needed to be maintained. She questioned what the hesitancy or problem would be in having staff identify the impacts of annexations. Supervisor Clarke pointed out that the Board commissioned a \$10,000 study to look at exactly that so that everyone would understand the impacts of annexation. She did not understand why the Board would have a problem with taking advantage of such knowledge by directing staff to take such an action.

Supervisor Kehoe asked County Counsel what role Supervisor Hawes would play in the matter before the Board (island annexation and the offer of extension of sewer services) given its rescission of the previous action. County Counsel Karen Jahr stated that she was unaware of any fact that would give rise to the presumption of a conflict of interest on behalf of Supervisor Hawes with regard to an agreement that does not reference the Stillwater area. However, Supervisor Hawes should discuss this issue with his attorney before deciding whether or not to vote. She explained that County Counsel is not acting as his attorney, but County Counsel did, however, analyze the issue of whether or not there was a presumed conflict of interest invalidating the original agreement under Government Code Section 1090 for the Board. The conclusion of Counsel was that there was that presumption. Absent another contract's reference to the Stillwater property and assuming there is no other conflict of interest and staff is aware of no facts that would lead them to conclude that there may be, Counsel Jahr expressed her belief that the concern about Section 1090 no longer exists. After further discussion with the Board Members, she suggested that they first take action as the Redevelopment Agency before inviting Supervisor Hawes' participation so that all issues are acted upon with regard to rescission.

Supervisors Clarke and Fust requested clarification of procedures in regards to Supervisor Hawes' participation in this matter—if he were to return, could one of the motions that previously died be reconsidered. Counsel Jahr confirmed that a motion could be reconsidered.

10:19 a.m.: The Board of Supervisors recessed and reconvened as the Shasta County Redevelopment Agency.

SPECIAL DISTRICTS/OTHER AGENCIES REGULAR CALENDAR

SHASTA COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

RECISSION OF SEPTEMBER 21, 1999 ACTION **AMENDING SHASTECC REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT PLAN**

Julie Howard, Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency (RDA), recommended that the RDA take the following actions with respect to a proposal to amend the SHASTECC Redevelopment Project Plan to include the development of an industrial park:

1. Rescind the vote of September 21, 1999 which authorized staff to initiate the plan amendment process and adopted a budget resolution which provided \$50,000 for plan amendment expenditures.
2. Take action anew on the proposal and related budget change.

Mrs. Howard explained that all three participating entities (the County and the Cities of Anderson and Redding), must unanimously agree to any proposed plan amendment or budget change. In the case of the proposal at hand, she further explained that all parties have consented to the commencement of plan amendment proceedings and have adopted resolutions approving a budget change. Should the County RDA now rescind its earlier approval and then vote to adopt a different plan or budget change, the effect would be to nullify the approval of the Anderson and Redding RDAs and halt all further action on the proposed amendment.

Mrs. Howard stated that modification of an existing redevelopment project area to add or delete territory is considered a major amendment under the Redevelopment Law, and the process to amend a project is as complex and time-consuming as the process to form the original project. As evidence of the complexity of the process, she provided a time schedule and procedural guide for the adoption of an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan showing that the process has barely begun.

Mrs. Howard reported that in regards to the concerns previously expressed that the process does not allow public input, the time schedule shows that a number of public hearings are required before the three Planning Commissions, the RDA Boards, and the Board of Supervisors and City Councils. There will be mailings and legal notices for each of these hearings, and all parties are invited to submit written comments and/or appear and testify on the proposed amendment. She also cited the standard process of conducting community meetings for these types of projects.

Mrs. Howard indicated that it remains to be seen whether or not the specific findings can ultimately be made which would support the amendment of the SHASTEK Redevelopment Plan. All that has been authorized to date is the preparation of the technical analysis necessary to arrive at an informed decision at a much later date.

Mrs. Howard also presented the following summary of the identified alternatives and a brief statement of the effect of each alternative:

1. Rescind the previous action, but take no further action. Because of the requirement in the Project Formation Agreement, it is required that there be unanimous consent by all participating entities. The effect of this alternative would be to halt all further proceedings on the proposed amendment.
2. Decline to rescind the previous action and take no further action, the effect of which could expose the County to the conflict of interest issue.
3. After discussion, return the matter to staff for further analysis of the issues and associated implications. The effect of this alternative would be to place all staff activities associated with the proposed amendment on hold.

Mrs. Howard further reported that in regards to the previous authorization of the amendment process and the provision of \$50,000 to cover plan amendment expenditures, expenditures so far are estimated at approximately \$2,000. Some consideration would have to be given as to how that amount would be reimbursed in the event that the project does not move forward.

By motion made, seconded (Clarke/Kehoe), and unanimously carried, the Redevelopment Agency rescinded the vote of September 21, 1999 which authorized staff to initiate the plan amendment process and adopted a budget resolution which provided \$50,000 for plan amendment expenditures.

By further motion made, seconded (Clarke/Kehoe), and unanimously carried, the Redevelopment Agency adopted staff's recommendation, as previously adopted.

Under discussion, Supervisor Clarke explained that she has no problem with taking action on this project as the Redevelopment Agency and it was unanimously approved the last time it was considered. She pointed out that this issue is a totally different issue from tax exchange agreements and other things involved in the previously discussed matter.

10:28 a.m.: The Shasta County Redevelopment Agency adjourned and reconvened as the Board of Supervisors.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

**RESCISSION OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1999 ACTION
AGREEMENT: CITY OF REDDING
STRIKING A BALANCE II - AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

Supervisor Kehoe suggested that by taking further action on this matter at this time, the Board would be placing Supervisor Hawes in an untenable position. He further suggested that by continuing any action on this matter to another time, Supervisor Hawes would be given the time necessary to think this through and secure legal counsel before considering whether or not to participate. County Counsel Karen Jahr expressed her support of these suggestions explaining that this type of action would allow Supervisor Hawes to avoid exposure to any Fair Political Practices Commission penalties or any other adverse results. She restated her position that County Counsel only provides counsel to the Board of Supervisors as a whole, not on an individual basis.

Supervisor Clarke suggested that if the Board were to defer further action on this matter, staff be directed to analyze the proposed annexations included in the agreement. This would provide the Board with the knowledge of any potential financial impacts and ability to provide services prior to making a decision.

Supervisor Fust clarified that the action presently before the Board would be approval of the islands located in the East Cypress, Lake Boulevard, and Tarmac Road areas, minus the Wilshire Drive island.

By motion made, seconded (Clarke/Wilson), and unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to prepare the analysis, as suggested by Supervisor Clarke, for the areas outlined by Supervisor Fust, to be brought back for consideration in two weeks.

Mr. Ogrey questioned whether or not the action taken by the Board would include the sewer extension. Supervisor Clarke explained that the Board was simply directing staff to provide information on the tax exchange agreement, and the sewer extension is not part of this action.

10:38 a.m.: The Board of Supervisors recessed.

10:43 a.m.: The Board of Supervisors reconvened with all Members and staff present.

SUPPORT SERVICES - PERSONNEL DIVISION

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING:
MID MANAGEMENT BARGAINING UNIT
SALARY RESOLUTION NO. 1091
RESOLUTION NO. 2000-20**

At the recommendation of Principal Personnel Analyst Joann Davis and by motion made, seconded (Kehoe/Wilson), and unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution No. 2000-20 which approved a comprehensive Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Mid-Management Bargaining Unit (MMBU) for the period of November 1, 1999 through October 31, 2002, and adopted Salary Resolution No. 1091 which implemented various salary adjustments for all MMBU represented employees as provided for in the MOU, effective January 30, 2000.

(See Salary Resolution Book)
(See Resolution Book No. 41)

TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR-PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR

QUARTERLY REPORT OF INVESTMENTS

At the recommendation of Lori Scott, Treasurer-Tax Collector-Public Administrator, and by motion made, seconded (Hawes/Clarke), and unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors accepted the Quarterly Report of Investments for the period ending December 31, 1999.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH

**AGREEMENTS: FAMILY PLANNING, INC.,
CITY OF REDDING, HOPE CITY, INC., AND
TRI COUNTY COMMUNITY NETWORK, INC.
FOR HEALTH IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP
COMMUNITY/ NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES**

The Board of Supervisors received presentations regarding the proposed agreements for Health Improvement Partnership (HIP) Community/Neighborhood Development Activities. The Board Members highlighted the need for specificity during the evaluation process, requested and received clarification that existing law and policy would not be circumvented by giving either \$200 or goods and services to the contract agencies, questioned the length of time it would take to choose an evaluator (approximately one month), and emphasized the need for a clearly stated policy on the screening process for staff/volunteers to be used by each agency. The following individuals made these presentations and responded to the previously outlined questions from the Board: Dr. Andrew Deckert, Public Health Officer, Roxanne Williams, representing Mercy Medical Center and Chair Elect of HIP, John Truitt, Executive Director of Family Planning, Inc., Gordon Carpenter, Recreation Superintendent with the City of Redding, Cindy Dodds, Executive Director of Tri County Community Network, Inc., Christina Pease, Director of Community Development with Hope City, Inc. for the Frontline International Church, Social Services Director Dennis McFall, Patrick Moriarty, Community Development Coordinator - HIP with the Department of Public Health, Doreen Bradshaw, Community Member of HIP, and Betty Cunningham, representing the Shasta County Chemical People.

By motion made, seconded (Clarke/Kehoe), and unanimously carried, the Board of Supervisors approved and authorized the Chairman to sign agreements on behalf of the Health Improvement Partnership to implement neighborhood development activities for the period of February 1, 2000 through April 30, 2001 with the following agencies: Family Planning, Inc. for the Garden Tract Organization in the amount of \$80,000, City of Redding for the Martin Luther King Jr. Center Board of Directors in the amount of \$50,000, Hope City, Inc. for the Frontline International Church in the amount of \$30,000, and Tri County Community Network, Inc. for Intermountain Action Growth and Education in the amount of \$25,000.

SOCIAL SERVICES/PUBLIC WORKS

**PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS
BRESLAUER WAY COMPLEX
BUDGET AMENDMENT**

At the recommendation of Social Services Director Dennis McFall and after receiving clarification from Deputy Public Works Director Pat Minturn that future development to the Breslauer Way Complex would have no impact on this parking lot improvement project, the Board of Supervisors took the following action by motion made, seconded (Hawes/Kehoe), and unanimously carried: Approved an amendment to the Facilities Management budget which increases revenue and appropriations by \$55,000 for improvements to the Social Services parking lot located on Breslauer Way.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Chairman Fust announced, again, that the Afternoon Session has been postponed to a future date.

CLOSED SESSION ANNOUNCEMENT

Chairman Fust announced that the Board of Supervisors would recess to a Closed Session to confer with its Labor Negotiator, County Administrative Officer Doug Latimer, to discuss the following employee organizations, pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6: Shasta County Employees Association, Shasta County Mid-Management Association, Deputy Sheriff's Association, Sheriffs Administrative Association, Professional Peace Officers' Association, Unrepresented Employees, and United Public Employees of California.

11:34 a.m.: The Board of Supervisors recessed to Closed Session.

12:45 p.m.: The Board of Supervisors recessed from Closed Session.

12:55 p.m.: The Board of Supervisors reconvened in Open Session with Supervisors Kehoe, Fust, and Hawes, County Counsel Karen Jahr, and Administrative Board Clerk Pamela English present.

REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION ACTIONS

County Counsel Karen Jahr reported that the Board of Supervisors met in Closed Session to discuss existing labor negotiations, however, no reportable actions were taken.

12:56 p.m.: The Board of Supervisors adjourned.

Chairman

ATTEST:

CAROLYN TAYLOR
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By _____
Deputy