

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

October 14, 2021

Commission Members

P John Hess, District I
P Everardo Chavez, District II
A Batsulwin Brown, District III
P Christina Price, District IV
P Maile Field, District V

Staff Members

P Mary Darby, Director
P Eric Porter, Associate Planner
P Sateur Ham, Assistant Planner
P Nicole Johnson, Deputy City Counsel
P Kerrian Marriott, Office Assistant III

REGULAR MEETING

9:01 A.M. CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance lead by Comm. Price

9:02 A.M. ACTION ON MINUTES

Comm. Hess Motioned to approve minutes from the September 23rd, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting, Seconded by Comm. Field.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

9:02 A.M. CITIZEN’S INPUT – NONE

9:05 A.M. Public Hearing to consider the Adoption of Assembly Bill 361 Findings Authorizing Teleconference Meetings during a State of Emergency.

Nicole Johnson Deputy City Counsel stated that the past general order that waived certain parts of the Brown Act as it pertained to teleconferencing ended on January 30, 2021. The legislator had adopted AB361 wherein

bodies subject to the Brown Act could make findings related to emergencies which would determine what actions were necessary to affect the safety and protect health of themselves and the public. The commissions finding would define how attendance to the meetings proceeded going forward i.e. three commissioners in chambers as two commissioners would teleconference in for the entirety of 30 days until a new finding was made. Board has given authorization for Commissioners to make their own recommendations.

Comm. Hess asked if it was a case of simply adopting language of the presented resolution rather than making more specific findings.

Nicole Johnson responded that the commission could make more specific findings addressing specific elements of an emergency. However, the resolution could be adopted as written.

Comm. Field inquired if the resolution was a continuation of current protocol of making teleconferencing optional and wearing mask.

Nicole Johnson responded that it was not exactly the same method, under the governors order which did not provide substitute rules, the rules as it related to teleconferencing were waived. The new resolution provides substitute rules which the Commission would be adopting. The AB361 rules govern a broader range not just the Commissioners teleconferencing option but public access, digital access and what was to be done if there was failure for digital media. Ms. Johnson stated that AB361 did not allow flexibility whereas the governor's order did. The Commissioners could not decide to teleconference in one week and be present the next. Their findings would stand for 30 days until new findings were made.

Comm. Chavez asked if findings were made that three commissioners would be present and two would teleconference could a forth commissioner be present. Is three the minimum Commissioners needed in chambers?

Nicole Johnson stated that if the commissioners determined that the risk was greater when more than three commissioners were in the room to social distance appropriately, to increase that number after the finding would be to place the commissioners and the public at risk, it would be violating the findings for social distancing so they would stay in that numbered split.

Comm. Chavez asked if there would also be a limit on the number of participants (Public) who could be in attendance at the hearings.

Nicole Johnson stated that the commissioners could address that concern however, it was not a part of the AB361 analysis. This was an assurance

that the commissioners could not be in violation of the Brown Act, whereas the Brown Act did not apply to the participants.

Comm. Hess asked if the commission could determine for their own safety that two commissioners could stay home and teleconference in but could potentially have a full chamber with participants.

Nicole Johnson stated that she understood why it would seem conflicted but in relation to the Brown Act requirement and the findings that needed to be made now was regarding the commissioners attendance so the Brown Act was not being violated. The commission could then make a decision regarding the attendance of the public.

Comm. Hess asked that for the commissioners should they decide to stay home would the same action be taken, would their location need to be noticed and made available to the public.

Nicole Johnson responded that it did not. The Rule that AB361 follows would allow the commissioners to not follow the old rule. However, the findings would have to be made to do so. The commission could also determine that three members should be in the room or it could be determined that it would be safer to have everyone remote in. It was left to the commission to make the findings.

Comm. Hess stated that he had read the resolution and it seemed adequate and voiced that he had no concerns with attending the meetings in person.

Comm. Field stated that she agreed and thanked County Counsel for the presentation and clarification.

9:34 A.M. Public Comment – NONE

Comm. Field Motioned to Move, Seconded by Comm. Hess to adopt resolution 361 authorizing continued teleconference meetings of the County of Lake Planning Commission during the Existing State of Emergency.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

9:21 A.M. Public Hearing to consider approving Major Use Permit (UP 20-12). Applicant/Owner: Charles Collins / High Caliber Farms. Proposed Project: the applicant is requesting three (3) A-Type 3 medium outdoor cultivation licenses and one (1) A-Type 13 'Self-Distribution' license for commercial cannabis cultivation and distribution. Location: 12194 White Rock Canyon Road, Upper Lake, CA. (Eric Porter)

Eric Porter Associate Planner gave a PowerPoint presentation which reviewed the Project Details, Zoning of Site and Surroundings, Lot Cultivation area, Water Analysis, Project Analysis, Major Use findings needed which included one, two, three, four, five and six. A review of Article 27 findings and a note to disregard the last portion of findings.

9:30 A.M. Public Comment –

Robert Geary the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer of Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake stated that he was not there to oppose the project, a consultation between the tribe and the applicant had occurred. He was there for the actual verbiage of the environmental review for cultural resources. During the consultation with the applicant following AB52 they addressed the tribe concerns with the project and found no impacts to cultural resources. A cultural sensitivity training was completed with the project personnel. Mr. Geary stated that the tribe would like to see mitigated measures, which would include the tribe be a part of the process if any inadvertent discoveries were made and that the project be halted and the tribe notified. Actual verbiage, should any human remains which are found in conjunction with the project lands, culturally affiliated with the tribe should be treated within the Habematolel tribe treatment protocol, any cultural resources should be treated by the Habematolel tribe protocol, should any archeological cultural materials be discovered during the site development all activity should be halted and the affiliated tribe be notified and a qualified archeologist be retained working in conjunction with a member of the Habematolel tribe to evaluate and make necessary mitigated measures subject to the approval of the Community Development Director.

Comm. Hess stated that he saw in the Staff Report a referenced agreement between the applicant and the tribe. Comm. Hess stated that the Commissioners could not impose such an agreement but could encourage it.

Robert Geary stated that his tribe had spoken with the applicant and reached an agreement. Mr. Geary stated that it was down to the Conditions of Approval for this and other projects going forward, that they would like the verbiage to be included.

Comm. Field Thanked Mr. Geary stating that she had reviewed his letter and concluded that a part of the Conditions of Approval CUL one and two, which referred to cultural sensitivity training and the tribes involvement were included.

Craig Mountain consultant on project thanked the Commissioners and stated that he was happy to work with the tribe.

Charles Collins applicant stated that he was a long term resident of Upper Lake and was available for questions.

9:40 A.M. Public Comment Closed

Eric Porter stated that there was a conflict of interest between the cultural conditions the Staff Report and in the Conditions of Approval, the Staff Report was the most current, verbiage in the Conditions of Approval were unenforceable by the county so it needed to reflect what was written in the Staff Report.

Comm. Field stated that she would like to know what the differences were in the verbiage.

Eric Porter stated that the Conditions of Approval referred to the Upper Lake Habematolel Tribe, while the conditions in the Staff Report did not and were more generic per County Counsel advice for Cultural Resources. Mr. Porter recommendation was to replace what was in the Conditions of Approval with what was written in the Staff Report.

Nicole Johnson stated that from her understanding the issue was in reference to sections one, two and five of the Habematolel Tribe protocol within the conditions. A permit application was not the place to enforce other laws or other agencies protocols. If the Commissioners found that it was appropriate based on the evidence then, they may list specific tribe's within the conditions and that a particular named tribe may be contacted in the event that cultural resources are found. The objection here was another set of rules/protocols being incorporated within the County's permit and the County could not enforce them.

Comm. Price asked if a specific tribe could be identified.

Nicole Johnson stated that it was possible, however the two conditions that were provided for the application included language similar to what would be provided for Cultural Resource mitigation, staff should be asked to clarify what kind of impacts the verbiage was intended to mitigate. The objection here was the tribal protocols, which the tribe can enforce if entered in an agreement with the applicant. However, if included here we are not only enforcing the protocols but a third party agreement which the commission could not do.

9:45 A.M. Public Comment Reopened

Robert Geary Stated that individual tribes had different ways to deal with Cultural Resources, his tribe had a protocol which dictated what needed to

be done when it came to preserving Cultural Resources. Mr. Geary stated that he understood that it needed to be an agreement with the applicant. States that he believes it is important to address the tribe which is directly involved.

Comm. Field stated that the document stated culturally affiliated tribe which meant his tribe.

Robert Geary stated that the verbiage as written did not include the Tribe in the evaluations and recommendation process if Cultural resources were discovered.

Comm. Hess asked if the agreement between the tribe and the applicant allowed tribal collaboration.

Robert Geary stated that the tribe would be willing to exclude the verbiage that included the tribe's protocol but would like the Conditions of Approval to state the specific tribe and to ensure that Habematolel was included as part of the process for evaluations and recommendations.

Comm. Hess stated that this was common regarding other tribes and their requests. Comm. Hess stated that the Commission could not instruct the applicant to reach a specific agreement with the tribe.

Robert Geary referenced the Conditions of Approval that stated cultural affiliated tribe, it did not state that they were able to make recommendations and be included in the evaluation along with the archeologist on the site.

Nicole Johnson stated that in the past staff had included language that required the applicant to not only include a consultation with an archeologist but also with a specific named tribe when resources had been discovered and it was an option, the commissioners could also replace cultural affiliates with a specific named tribe in the language if the evidence provided supported that decision.

Comm. Field stated that she agreed with County Counsel and the item should be sent back to staff to make the necessary changes.

Eric Porter read new wording into the record as a Condition of Approval. Condition of Approval 1 - should any archeological, paleontological or cultural resource be discovered during site development then all activity should be halted in the vicinity of the find and the Upper Lake Habematolel Pomo Tribe shall be notified and a qualified archeologist is retained and shall coordinate with the Upper Lake Habematolel Tribe to evaluate the finds and recommend mitigation procedures if necessary, subject to the approval of the Community Development Director. Should any human

remains be encountered they shall be treated in accordance with public resources code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code 7050.5.

Craig Mountain thanked the Commissioners, Staff and Mr. Geary. Mr. Mountain stated that they understood what was at stake and they were ready to help in any way.

9:52 A.M. Public Comment Closed

Comm. Hess stated that he was comfortable with the revised language presented by staff.

Comm. Field stated that she was happy with the amendment but had other concerns. Comm. Field asked about the property management plan stating that it was sloppy with tons of grammatical errors and asked if there was an updated plan.

Eric Porter responded stating that he would allow the applicant to respond to Comm. Field's inquiry.

Nicole Johnson clarified stating that the verbiage was not being changed to exclude conditions two; But the verbiage was changing condition one while maintaining or keeping condition two?

Comm. Field responded stating that condition two was being kept.

Craig Mountain stated that the property management plan was antiquated and that he had provided staff with an updated version.

Comm. Field stated that she felt inadequately prepared to move forward.

Comm. Price asked Comm. Field what her main concerns were besides grammatical with regards to the project.

Comm. Field stated she had other concerns, the Cannabis Control Committee submitting a lengthy adverse comments letter which included improvements to the Initial Study.

Eric Porter stated that he did not recall receiving a revision to the Property Management Plan. Mr. Porter stated that the hearing could be continued to a date certain, giving him time to research if a newer version of the plan was on hand.

Comm. Field stated that she would not feel that she would be doing her job if an updated Property Management Plan was not reviewed.

Comm. Hess asked Mr. Porter if once the questions from the cannabis board were received were they responded to by updating or amending the Staff Report.

Eric Porter stated that he did not, as sometimes the feedback did not correspond with the timeline of the hearing. Mr. Porter also stated that it was also not uncommon to receive feedback after a hearing had concluded. Stating that in the past he would respond and address letters sent by the Cannabis organizations only to receive another lengthy document with different concerns. Mr. Porter stated that he had spoken to Kevin Ponce Supervisor for Cal Cannabis who has stated that Lake County had the best Initial Studies reviewed. Mr. Porter stated that the lengthy adverse letter from Cal Cannabis was standard.

Comm. Hess stated that he had read through letters from Cal Cannabis as well and the way he understood the letter it was not stating that the project was flawed or inadequate but that the report could be strengthened which could potentially be an endless cycle.

Eric Porter stated his agreement with Comm. Hess.

Comm. Field stated that the letter she was referring to was received on August 13th and asked if staff had the opportunity to address the concerns presented as she felt they were relevant.

Eric Porter stated that he had not addressed the concerns Com. Field asked about.

Craig Mountain asked if the Property Management Plan that the commissioners had was the one posted on the agenda? If so, it was a preliminary plan stating that he was sure Mr. Porter had a more updated version.

Comm. Hess stated he was ready to make a motion.

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Initial Study (IS 20-12) applied for by High Caliber Cannabis on property located at 12194 White Rock Canyon Road, Upper Lake, and further described as APN: 022-010-01 will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a mitigated negative declaration shall be approved with the findings listed in the staff report dated October 14, 2021 and as amended here today.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Use Permit (UP 20-12) applied for by High Caliber Cannabis on property located at 12194 White Rock Canyon Road, Upper Lake, and further described as APN: 022-010-01 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Major Use Permit be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated October 14, 2021 and as amended here today.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

10:02 A.M. Public Hearing to consider a Five Year Extension for a MAJOR USE PERMIT (UP 11-09). Applicant: LaMonica Signs. Proposed Project: A five year extension for an existing billboard. Location: 255 Soda Bay Road, Lakeport, CA. (Eric Porter)

Eric Porter gave a PowerPoint presentation on proposed billboard permit extension. A review of the Project Details, Zoning of Site and Surrounding Area, Aerial Photo, the lack of need for a Water Analysis, Project Analysis and the Basis for the Extension.

10:04 A.M. Public Comment – None

Comm. Field asked for clarification on what Scenic combining meant.

Eric Porter Spoke on what scenic combining meant, stating its effects on the height of buildings, restrictions that can be done in a zone. Restrictions on greenhouses, restrictions to height on accessory buildings etc.

Comm. Hess stated he was not a fan of billboards and had voted accordingly in the past, however the location seemed appropriate and was already existing. Comm. Hess stated he was ready to support the application.

Comm. Field stated that she felt billboards were displeasing and were obsolete. Referred to Lake County's scenic beauty and stated that she felt

that it should be preserved, referred to County Counsel's head nod as an agreement stating that she could not support the extension.

Nicole Johnson stated to Comm. Field that she could not give her direction to say aye or nay on an application. Ms. Johnson stated that it was the commissioner's job to make a determination based on the facts and circumstances presented based on the county ordinances.

Comm. Field stated that she found billboards aesthetically displeasing, she had seen the billboard and did not believe that it had been maintained.

Comm. Chavez Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Hess find that the Use Permit Extension, UPX 21-02 applied by LaMonica Signs on property located at 255 Soda Bay Road, Lakeport, further described as APN: 008-019-64 is exempt from CEQA because it falls within Categorical Exemption Class 1 (file no. CE 21-52), based on the findings set forth in the Staff Report dated October 14, 2021.

3 Ayes, 1 Nays (Comm. Field) – Motion Carried

Comm. Chavez Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Hess find that the Use Permit Extension, UPX 21-52 applied by LaMonica Signs on property located at 255 Soda Bay Road, Lakeport, further described as APN: 008-019-64 does meet the requirements of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Categorical Exemption, CE 21-52 which was adopted for this project and the Use Permit Extension, file number UPX 21-02, be granted and shall extend this use for a period of five years subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the Staff Report dated October 14, 2021.

3 Ayes, 1 Nays (Comm. Field) – Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

10:11 AM Public Hearing consider approving Amendment (MMU 21-07) of original Use Permit UP 19-25. . Applicant/Owner: Coast Oak / Carl Tharp. Proposed Project: Convert 14,080 of mixed light commercial cannabis cultivation to 15,000 sq. ft. of outdoor commercial cannabis cultivation. Affects previously approved file no. UP 19-25. Location: 7560 Highway 29, Kelseyville, CA. (Eric Porter)

Eric Porter gave PowerPoint presentation. Project is within the same foot print of original approved plan so did not trigger a CEQA analysis.

10:17 A.M. Public Comment – None

Comm. Field stated that she had concerns about odor, as she currently understood it, an evaluation was not required for volatile organic compound. She would like to see more of an approach as it relates to the larger effect it had on the community.

Comm. Hess asked if any negative comments had been received for the project.

Eric Porter responded to Comm. Hess stating that no negative comments had been received and the applicant had been cultivating for over two years.

Comm. Hess stated that he remembered when the project was first brought to the commission and that the same requirements for odor control would apply.

Eric Porter stated that the applicant was already growing outdoors and would have received complaints already the applicant was previously approved for outdoor and greenhouse cultivation.

Comm. Price inquired if the applicant was approved for both outdoor and greenhouses in the initial application.

Eric Porter responded yes, the applicant was previously approved for 10,000 sq. ft. of outdoor cultivation, this would increase the outdoor cultivation to 25,000 sq. ft. No complaints had been received by neighbors over the last two years.

Comm. Field asked if what was being cultivated now would be in greenhouses?

Eric Porter responded no that it was mixed, 10,000 sq. ft. outdoor and the rest would be in greenhouses.

Nicole Johnson clarified that CEQA required an analysis to a number of impacts to the environment and that there is a guide staff follows regarding odor impacts and these impacts were analyzed and mitigated under CEQA.

Comm. Chavez referenced an ordinance that he believed was passed at the beginning of 2021 which required a certain distance from the freeway as well as having sufficient surrounding of trees, the project had both.

Eric Porter stated that there would be different circumstances where the cultivation site could impact neighbors, part of that being distance and in

this case the cultivation site was roughly 1000 ft. from the highway and there were denser populated areas across from the highway (however wind trajectory blew away from the more inhabited areas). A mitigated measure was also suggested i.e. the planting of fragrant plants around the cultivation site. The site was also surrounded by “in part” one neighbor who owned a large portion of the parcels surrounding the cultivation site.

Comm. Chavez stated that he did not see any dense residential areas close to the site.

Comm. Price stated that she appreciated the additional information regarding ownership of the surrounding parcels.

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez finds on the basis of the original Initial Study (IS 18-62) and the allowances in CEQA section 15303(c) that allow minor expansions to commercial uses to be exempt from further CEQA review, that the Amendment application applied for by Carl Tharp representing Coast Oak, Inc. on a property located at 7560 Highway 29, Kelseyville CA further described as APNs: 007-029-12, 02 and 10, will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a categorical exemption shall be approved with the findings listed in the staff report dated October 14, 2021.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Amendment (MMU 21-07) to Use Permit (UP 19-25) applied for by Carl Tharp representing Coast Oak, Inc. on a property located at 7560 Highway 29, Kelseyville further described as APNs: 007-029-12, 02 and 10, does meet the requirements of Section 27(at) and Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Amendment be granted subject to the revised conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated October 14, 2021.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

10:26 AM Public Hearing to consider MAJOR USE PERMIT (UP 19-36).

Applicant: Brian D. Pensack and Garrett W. Burdick (Lake Vista Farms, LLC). Owner: Lake Vista Farms, LLC. Proposed Project: Applicant is applying for 15-acres of outdoor commercial cannabis canopy area within five fenced cultivation areas, up to 25.8 acres. Cultivation accessory items include portable toilets, trash enclosures, vegetative waste storage area, 2,500-gallon water storage tanks at each cultivation area, and Conex shipping containers and/or 8'x8' storage sheds (or similar) for storage of pesticides, fertilizers, and hazardous materials. Onsite nursery within an existing barn. Renovated 10' x 30' shipping container to house security equipment and camera monitors, and 6' tall security fencing, secured by locked gates, to enclose cultivation areas. Address: 2050 and 2122 Ogulin Canyon Road, Clearlake CA. (Michael Taylor - Staff is Requesting a continuation of the item)

Michael Taylor Assistant Planner reviewed why a continuation was requested for the project. The project was located close to the City of Clearlake and further analysis was required.

Comm. Hess asked if the project site was on county property.

Michael Taylor responded that the proposed site was on County property but shared the same boundary as the City of Clearlake and was in an exclusion zone and had to have the support of the jurisdiction. Mr. Taylor requested a continuation with an undetermined date.

10:29 A.M. Public Comment –

Richard Knoll consultant on project requested that the item be continued to a date certain of Oct 28, 2021, stating that he was not clear why the project was being continued. A letter of support was received from the City of Clearlake.

Comm. Price asked Mr. Knoll if he felt that two weeks would be sufficient to get the necessary information staff requested.

Robert Knoll stated that he thought so and felt that they were in good shape to make it happen.

Comm. Hess asked staff if he thought that the 28th would give him adequate time to re-present the item.

Michael Taylor stated that it depended on if the applicant was able to obtain the documentation needed from the City of Clearlake.

Comm. Hess asked what the concerns were with the document provided by the City of Clearlake.

Michael Taylor stated that the conditions included on the documentation provided by the City of Clearlake could not be supported.

Nicole Johnson stated that the Letter of support from Clearlake included conditions that the Commissioners did not have authority to adopt. The letter was written in such a way that if the conditions were not included the letter was not effective and the applicant no longer had a letter of support that would meet all criteria.

Comm. Hess asked if this was a case of inserting conditions that were known that the commission could not approve.

Nicole Johnson stated that Comm. Hess was correct, there were conditions in the letter from the City of Clearlake that the Commissioners could not approve.

Comm. Hess stated that his question was a cynical one and asked if the conditions were included intentionally, knowing that the Commission could not act on the requested conditions.

Nicole Johnson stated that she was unable to speak of the intentions, but the conditions were listed specifically and the verbiage stated in the letter was one of approval provided that the conditions were adopted.

Comm. Field stated that giving the applicant the requested two weeks and revisiting the item on October 28, 2021 could give the applicants the time to work on getting a revised letter from the City of Clearlake.

Richard Knoll stated that the approval letter from Clearlake was in good faith. The letter was presented roughly a year ago and he and his team only recently found out about staff's concerns. Mr. Knoll stated that he was confident that they would be able to receive an approval letter from the City of Clearlake.

10:37 A.M. Public Comment Closed

Comm. Field Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Hess that the item be continued to a date certain on October 28, 2021.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

10:39 A.M. Consideration of reimbursement for out of county travel to a Conference hosted by the California County Planning Commissioners Association. Address: 139 2ND Street, Eureka, CA on October 15

through October 16, 2021 and the estimated cost will not exceed \$1008.

10:40 A.M. Public Comment – None

Comm. Price stated that she would be in attendance and was very excited about all the information the conference would provide including the affordable housing project as well as systems working in Humboldt County the Cannabis Industrial Zoning (CIZ).

Comm. Chavez stated he would be in attendance as well and looked forward to bringing back information learnt to Lake County.

Comm. Field stated that she was looking forward to attending portions of the Conference and was looking forward to an education.

Comm. Chavez Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Hess approve Out of County Travel for the Planning Commissioners to attend the California County Planning Commissioners Association Conference at 139 2nd Street Eureka, CA on October 15 through October 16, 2021 and the estimated cost will not exceed \$1008.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

10:46 A.M. UNTIMED STAFF UPDATE

Office News

Mary Darby Community Development Director Introduced herself, stating that she heard a few concerns and they would be taken care of in the future. She is originally from Southern California but moved to Atlanta Georgia to plan for the Olympics. Now her children are teenagers, she has decided to move back to California and move to Northern California where her husband is from.

11:49 A.M. Adjournment

