

MINUTES

County of Inyo Board of Supervisors

August 9, 2016

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Inyo, State of California, met in regular session at the hour of 8:30 a.m., on August 9, 2016, in the Board of Supervisors Room, County Administrative Center, Independence, with the following Supervisors present: Chairperson Jeff Griffiths, presiding, Dan Tothoroh, Rick Pucci and Mark Tillemans. Absent: Matt Kingsley.

PUBLIC COMMENT Chairman Griffiths asked for public comment and there was none.

CLOSED SESSION Chairman Griffiths recessed open session at 8:34 a.m. to convene in closed session with all Board members present except for the absent Supervisor Kingsley to discuss the following items: No. 1 **CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – EXISTING LITIGATION.** (Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9). *Native American Heritage Commission v. Inyo County Planning Department and Inyo County Board of Supervisors*, Inyo County Superior Court Case No. SICVPT 1557557 (Munro Petition for Writ of Mandate); and No. 2 **CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS** [Pursuant to Government Code §54957.6] – Employee Organizations: Deputy Sheriff’s Association (DSA); Elected Officials Assistant Association (EOAA); Inyo County Correctional Officers Association (ICCOA); Inyo County Employees Association (ICEA); Inyo County Probation Peace Officers Association (ICPPOA); Law Enforcement Administrators’ Association (LEAA). Unrepresented employees: all. Agency designated representatives: County Administrative Officer Kevin Carunchio, Assistant County Administrator Rick Benson, Deputy Personnel Director Sue Dishion, Information Services Director Brandon Shults, County Counsel Marshall Rudolph, and Assistant County Counsel John Vallejo.

OPEN SESSION Chairman Griffiths recessed closed session and reconvened the meeting in open session at 10:06 a.m. with all Board members present minus Supervisor Kingsley.

PLEDGE Chairman Griffiths led the pledge of allegiance.

REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION County Counsel Marshall Rudolph reported that no action was taken during closed session that is required to be reported.

PUBLIC COMMENT Chairman Griffiths asked for public comment. Earl Wilson of Lone Pine spoke. He told the Board about efforts to reorganize OHV sticker money to use as much as possible on state parks, which could have future impacts on the Adventure Trails System Pilot Project. Chairman Griffiths said tomorrow in Bishop would be a meeting of the State Boats and Waterways Commission and in a similar vein one of the main points local residents would be making with them is that boating sticker money needs to stay with boating activities.

COUNTY DEPARTMENT REPORTS Clerk-Recorder Kammi Foote said exciting things are happening in her office, starting with the signing of the Mining Claims Act into law. She said it will help a lot of miners not have their documents rejected when they submit them for recording. She added that Inyo County is one of four elections offices in the U.S. selected to be featured in the Elections Assistants video series on technology. The first one is called “Creating a Data Culture in Your Office.” She gave a shout-out to the IT Department for being extremely helpful in creating new tools for elections. One of the tools allows residents to look online to see if they are registered voters of Inyo County. The other is a look-up tool for polling places. She also told the Board to watch for a blog on elections that she wrote for CSAC.

Suzanne Rizzo said the Child Services Division is in the midst of its annual Back-to-School Backpack Program. This year staff planned to give out 200 backpacks filled with supplies to youth all over the County and in Mammoth Lakes. She then read from a letter from Rep. Paul Cook commending Child Service’s efforts to help prepare youth for school. She said this past

week she met with the Owens Valley Career Development Center and the TANF plan for 2016-2019 does include the opt-out plan for families to receive TANF assistance instead of Child Support Services aid. She said the estimated impact is to 40 cases.

CAO Carunchio offered his thanks to HHS Director Jean Turner and Chief Probation Officer Jeff Thomson for their continued work on juvenile services programming issues. He said he thought the article in today's Inyo Register did a great job encapsulating the larger issues affecting Inyo County.

**ADVERTISING
COUNTY
RESOURCES – CPSP
PAYMENTS**

Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to approve final County of Inyo Community Project Sponsorship Grant payments to the Bishop Chamber of Commerce and Visitors Bureau for \$2,000 for the 2016 California High School Rodeo Association State Finals and \$4,000 for the 2016 Blake Jones Trout Derby; to the Lone Pine Chamber of Commerce for \$2,500 for the Inyo Photo Shoot Out Contest, \$2,500 for the Summer Concert Series, and \$2,500 for the 2016 Inyo County Visitor Guide; to the Friends of the Mt. Whitney Fish Hatchery for \$2,250 for the 2016 Independence Father's Day Weekend Fishing Derby; and to the Friends of Inyo for \$3,000 for the 2016 Owens Lake Bird Festival. (Community Project Sponsorship Grant projects are funded from the Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Advertising County Resources Budget.) Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

**ADVERTISING
COUNTY
RESOURCES CAL
EXPO
REIMBURSEMENT**

Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to approve a payment to Laura Smith up to \$6,678.86 as a reimbursement for expenses incurred in the staffing and operation of the Inyo County CalExpo Exhibit at the 2016 State Fair. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

**MOTOR POOL – MR.
K'S BLANKET
PURCHASE ORDER**

Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to authorize the issuance of a blanket purchase order to Mr. K's in the amount of \$20,000 from the Motor Pool Budget, contingent upon the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 budget. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

**COUNTY COUNSEL
SERVICE
AGREEMENT WITH
GBUAPCD**

Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to approve the agreement between Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District and the County of Inyo for the County Counsel's Office to provide certain legal services to the District from the period of July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017, for the sum of \$12,500, contingent upon the Board's adoption of the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 budget, and authorize the Chairperson to execute the agreement on behalf of the County. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

**CHILD SUPPORT
AWARENESS
PROCLAMATION**

Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to approve a proclamation declaring August 2016 as Child Support Awareness Month in Inyo County. Motion carried unanimously.

**P.W. REJECT
FLOORING PROJECT
BIDS**

Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to declare the bids submitted by G&S Carpet Mills, Inc. for the Annex Building and Bishop Senior Center Flooring Project as not in the County's best interest; and B) reject the bids submitted by G&S Carpet Mills, Inc. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

**P.W. ON-CALL
ARCHITECTURAL
SERVICES**

Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to A) approve the contract between the County of Inyo and Eastern Sierra Engineering of Reno, Nevada for on-call Architectural and Engineering Consulting Services in the amount not to exceed \$83,330.80 for the period of August 9, 2016 to August 9, 2019; and B) authorize the Chairperson to execute the Project contract contingent upon obtaining appropriate signatures and the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 budget and future budgets. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

**COUNSEL-PLANNING-
CAO CANNABIS
BALLOT QUESTIONS**

At the request of the Board at its August 2 meeting, County Counsel's Office prepared two resolutions related to commercial recreational and medicinal marijuana activity in Inyo County. The first resolution includes two advisory questions to possibly put to the voters on November 8 under two different measures: Inyo County Medical Cannabis Advisory Measure: "Should the County of Inyo adopt a land-use ordinance which would allow commercial cannabis businesses within the County, included but not limited to cultivation, processing, manufacturing, sales, distribution, warehousing and transportation of MEDICAL cannabis?" and Inyo County At the request of the Board at its August 2 meeting, County Counsel's Office prepared two resolutions related to the commercial activity involving recreational and medicinal marijuana in Inyo County.

COUNSEL-PLANNING-
CAO CANNABIS
BALLOT QUESTIONS
(continued)

The first resolution includes two advisory questions to possibly put to the voters on November 8 under two different measures: Inyo County Medical Cannabis Advisory Measure: "Should the County of Inyo adopt a land-use ordinance which would allow commercial cannabis businesses within the County, included but not limited to cultivation, processing, manufacturing, sales, distribution, warehousing and transportation of MEDICAL cannabis?" and Inyo County Recreational Advisory Measure: "If Proposition 64, the Marijuana Legalization Initiative Statute, passes, should the County of Inyo adopt a land-use ordinance which would allow commercial cannabis businesses within the County, included but not limited to cultivation, processing, manufacturing, sales, distribution, warehousing and transportation of RECREATIONAL cannabis?" The second resolution sets forth the Inyo County Cannabis Business Tax Measure: "Shall the County ordinance adding Chapter 3.50 to the Inyo County Code imposing a 5% gross receipts tax on commercial marijuana businesses (but no less than \$1,250 per growing cycle for cultivation businesses) in the unincorporated area of Inyo County, and authorizing the Board of Supervisors to increase the tax to a maximum of 12.5% over time, be adopted?" County Counsel Rudolph explained that the resolutions, and the ordinance itself, were put together using the resolutions and ordinances of Humboldt, Calaveras and Mendocino counties as examples. He said it's important to note that if the voters approve the tax measure, the ordinance can be amended by the Board at any time in the future without having to go back to the voters – as long as the Board is not raising the tax. CAO Carunchio thanked Rudolph and Assistant Counsel John Vallejo for their hard work, calling the finished product "remarkable" and built with a lot of flexibility. Rudolph also pointed out that these measures will be put before the entire Inyo County electorate even though the measures only apply to the County's unincorporated areas. Chairman Griffiths noted the City Council is excited to hear these questions are going to the voters because they want to know where their constituents stand on the issue. Rudolph mentioned other options for the Board: including a pro-argument to go along with the tax measure, and printing the Ordinance in its entirety or directing voters where to find it in its entirety. The Board eventually directed staff to write an argument in favor of the tax measure, later named Measure I by the County Clerk, and, for cost reasons, decided against printing the ordinance in the ballot book in its entirety. It was decided Rudolph and Vallejo would write and submit the impartial analysis. Discussion followed about the specific wording of the questions posed to voters, with the Board expressing a desire to keep it simple and with as few words as possible. The Board agreed that with regard to the advisory questions, they preferred the term "regulations" instead of "a land-use ordinance" and at the suggestion of CAO Carunchio, decided that the word "commercial" should appear in all-caps in the two questions, just as the words "recreational" and "medical" do. Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Totheroh to approve proposed Resolution No. 2016-31 titled, "Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Inyo, State of California, Calling an Election to Present to the Voters of the County Two Advisory Questions Regarding Local Land Use Control of Commercial Cannabis Businesses and Ordering Consolidation of Said Election with the General Election to be Conducted on November 8, 2016" (2/3rd vote required), with the phrase "a land-use ordinance" changed to "regulations" and the word "commercial" made all-caps. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0. The Board then moved on to Measure I specifically. Assistant Counsel Vallejo told the Board that in theory, the tax could take effect immediately if approved by voters. However, the ordinance doesn't call for it to start until Jan. 1, 2017. He discussed the structure proposed and noted that they decided against a flat-tax structure because of the possibility of a major commercial operation going under-taxed. He noted that starting in 2020, the Board can start increasing the tax up to 2% a year to a maximum of 12% if it wants. The ordinance also allows the county to lower the tax or repeal it altogether. Chairman Griffiths said he thought that was important in order to keep prices lower than what's charged on the black market. Supervisor Tillemans said the black market is always going to be there and keeping a low tax is not going to extinguish it. But he said he thinks most people will prefer to purchase their cannabis from a regulated, clean facility where the product is tested. There will always be people who buy illegal weed anyway, he said. In response to possible concerns about burdening growers with a tax, Rudolph and Carunchio reminded the Board that all businesses are required to pay a variety of taxes. Carunchio said that businesses pay both state and federal taxes but voters decided to impose a 12% bed tax on top of that anyway. He said this situation is very much the same. Chairman Griffiths clarified whether someone growing only 20 plants would still have to pay the minimum of \$1,250 and upon confirmation, wondered whether the County would then be prohibiting cottage business. He said he thought the tax should have a "floor" number for smaller operations, and said it seemed draconian to tax a business \$1,250 if they don't even make \$1,000 a year. Rudolph told the Board to remember that they modeled this tax structure off of Mendocino County, which is specifically trying to foster cottage businesses. Rudolph also reminded the Board it can lower the tax or grant exemptions at any time. He also said the state

*COUNSEL-PLANNING-
CAO CANNABIS
BALLOT QUESTIONS
(continued)*

licensing process will already make it prohibitive for smaller operations to go into business, so it's unlikely someone who can't afford the tax will be starting a commercial operation. Rudolph and Vallejo said the only reason to change the structure now would be if the Board thought it would hurt the measure's chances of getting approved. Other jurisdictions included the minimums and they spent months and months studying the issue and potential tax base. Supervisor Totheroh said he didn't think the \$1,250 minimum would make a difference and Chairman Griffiths said he thought it would. CAO explained it's better to create the ceiling and find you can go lower than start too low and become a magnet for operations looking to take advantage. Ultimately, Griffiths said he'd be happiest with the minimum taken out but he wasn't going to hold up approval. Supervisor Tillemans noted that the people likely to be impacted by the tax are most likely listening to these conversations and know the tax can be lowered. Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to approve in accordance with Government Code Section 53724 proposed Resolution No. 2016-32 titled, "Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Inyo, State of California, Calling an Election to Present to the Voters of the County a Proposed Ordinance Adding Chapter 3.50 to the Inyo County Code Pertaining to Cannabis Business Taxes and Ordering Consolidation of Said Election with the General Election to be Conducted on November 8, 2016" (2/3rd vote required), with all-caps on the first appearance of the word "commercial" and second appearance of the word "business." Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

*PLANNING
PRESENTATION OF
DRAFT COMMENT
LETTER ON DRAFT
FOREST PLAN
REVISION AND DEIS*

Planner Cathreen Richards presented the Board with a Draft Comment Letter to the Inyo National Forest on the Draft Forest Plan revision and the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The letter was drafted based on evaluations the Planning Department conducted on the Draft Plan and DEIS based on the County's documented list of priorities for public lands and discussions of the evaluations that took place at the June 28 and July 19 Board meetings. Richards noted that several main areas of concern have been consistently expressed by this and previous Boards during the Forest's planning efforts. These include: losses to multiple uses on the Forest (grazing, certain types of recreation and mining); increased land area being recommended for wilderness; road closures; losses to a full range of recreation opportunities; losses of economic opportunities provided by the forests due to additional restrictive designations; and potential changes to the County's culture largely based on traditional uses of the Forest. Richards noted that many of the County's comments and concerns remain the same in the Draft Letter, such as the inadequacy of the DEIS in fully representing the Inyo National Forest or the County's comments – due to the fact that the plan covers three different forests and uses timber as a means of measuring economic benefit. The County is still concerned about missing evaluations on grazing and the losses of recreational opportunities because of Species of Specific Concern. She said by not having these evaluations, the plan does not provide a full range of alternatives. The letter does include the additional comment that mining opportunities provide living wage jobs whereas tourism-related jobs are typically minimum wage. The letter also points out the plan doesn't adequately address the issue of permitting delays and related problems, and notes that the cultural landscape should include European Americans who have deep ties to the Eastern Sierra landscape. The letter also goes through each proposed wilderness area and points out where the County disagrees with the potential nomination. Other areas, while not suitable for wilderness designation, should be left alone because they do have unique characteristics. The County proposes pulling back the South Sierra Wilderness westward to the 6,000-foot contour line because the eastern section does not have many wilderness characteristics. Richards said the plan also does not account for a greater potential of flooding, because of less snowpack and more precipitation coming in the form of rain instead of snow. She noted staff has received copies of letters from entities asking the Regional Forester for a 45-day extension to the comment period. She said comments are due on August 25 and the Planning Department would update the draft letter based on the Board's input. Supervisor Kingsley was unable to attend the meeting and provided his comments in written form ahead of time. He noted that because of the rugged nature of some of the wilderness areas proposed in Alternative C, they don't need wilderness designation to remain primitive. He said their location also provides a buffer to the existing wilderness areas to the east. Kingsley added that the landscape in these areas is primarily covered in sage brush, which is not a type of vegetation that needs wilderness protection. Pinion/juniper are also included in these areas and do need protection either. He said in the last 100 years, pinion trees have been spreading at an alarming rate and when they burn result in cheat grass infusion. He also said that during the Travel Management Process, many routes were labeled unauthorized and now these areas with unauthorized routes are proposed as having wilderness characteristics. He also said they are incorrectly mapped and still in use. Public comment was accepted. Earl Wilson of Lone Pine said he agreed with Supervisor Kingsley's outlook and said

(continued)
**PLANNING
PRESENTATION OF
DRAFT COMMENT
LETTER ON DRAFT
FOREST PLAN
REVISION AND DEIS**

poor maps are being used. He said the areas don't truly reflect what wilderness is. He advocated leaving the rugged, hard to access areas as they are. John Louth of Bishop urged the Board to support Alternative B, which he said represents the best and most realistic solutions for the issues facing the Inyo National Forest. He also said he hopes the discussions don't degenerate into a "more wilderness" versus "no more wilderness" debate, which is a matter for Congress to decide when it takes up the issue. Louth also said he is worried about an aggressive fire management system and said the "go slow" approach is best. Dan Connors of Bishop said he wanted to talk about a comment made at the Board meeting a couple weeks ago about Big Bear being packed with tourists and wall-to-wall cars as if it were a wonderful thing. He said he doesn't want that for Inyo County and asked the Board members to do him a favor: pull over on their drive home this evening, take some deep breaths and see and connect with where they are. He said Inyo can become the capitol of peace and quiet. Connors also referenced studies by the Headwaters Economics Group showing the economic benefits of federally protected lands. He said unlike Kevin Costner in *Field of Dreams*, we don't even have to build it; all we have to do is preserve it and they will come and bring their money. Chairman Griffiths said he doesn't remember any comments about Big Bear. Linda Arcularius of Bishop thanked staff for the work on the draft letter, which she said was one of the most thorough, thought-out and data-based that she has read. She said maintaining forest health should be the first priority because without that, nothing else matters. Alternative D offers the best chance, she said. She added that the Forest Plan doesn't adequately address the tree mortality issue here in California, where more than 66 million trees have died. Protecting people from such a compromise to public safety should be the Board's first priority. She urged the Board not to let the Forest Service set the standard lower than the County has advocated for for years and spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on. Howard Arcularius of the Inyo-Mono Farm Bureau and California Farm Bureau said they have requested a 45-day extension. He noted the letter staff drafted is excellent and the Inyo-Mono Farm Bureau supports the comments on multiple use and grazing, and impacts to multiple use from wilderness. The Bureau wants no additional wilderness, or at least no more than is called for in Alternative B. John Louth spoke again, this time on behalf of Friends of the Inyo. He submitted a five-page letter for the record and urged the Board to support the INF's Preferred Alternative, B, and not get bogged down in wilderness but rather look at the broad issue. Sydney Quinn of Big Pine said the County's letter was very biased in favor of Alternative D and asked the Board to support Alternative B since it is the Preferred Alternative and it seems only appropriate. She advocated for the White Mountains Wilderness Addition because of its good ecological integrity and opportunity for solitude. She said the area is incredibly pristine and deserves protection. Piper Mountain is an incredible area, she said. Quinn noted she has not been to the South Sierra area but she hears it's special because it's where the Mojave meets oak woodlands, but the Planning Department's recommendation is probably reasonable. She asked the Board to keep perspective on wilderness, noting that 600,000 total acres were considered, and said there is historical opposition to new wilderness in Inyo County. Fran Hunt of the Sierra Club thanked the County for its hard work over many months. She said the current situation in Western national forests was created by well-intentioned but overly aggressive fire suppression that's increased fire risk to the level of catastrophic. She said the INF plan includes a chance to move in a healthier direction through carefully managed use of fire and prescribed burns. She said she hoped the County would encourage the INF to place an increased emphasis on partnerships, maybe even committing to hiring or designating a partnership coordinator. She said it was encouraging to see the County possibly supporting four wilderness additions. She said fire is on everyone's minds and she wants to dispel the notion that you can't fight fire in wilderness. The 2009 legislation that added wilderness to the Inyo and also created the Magic Mountain Wilderness in Southern California allows for the use of mechanized equipment under the authority of the Forest Service, she said. SP Parker of Sierra Mountain Center said he runs a business taking people into the mountains, including handicapped and elderly clients. He said he'd like the Board to think about the future 100 years from now. He said the Sierra has clean air, water and wide-open spaces and that's what the communities are able to sell. Those commodities are only going to get more important, he said. Mike Prather of Lone Pine said that in his lifetime, he wants to have the Inyo County Board of Supervisors support new wilderness in the Inyo National Forest, to have the Board on record with something other than a kneejerk reaction. He also said some comments had been made regarding the Travel Management Plan that are undermining the work that went into it. He said a diverse group of stakeholders put eight years of work into that plan, shook hands on it and a deal is a deal. Supervisor Tillemans asked his fellow Board members how they felt about asking for an extension. He said he himself was still learning about the different areas being proposed for wilderness designation. Chairman Griffiths said he supported an extension request, but thought the County was ready to submit its

(continued)
**PLANNING
PRESENTATION OF
DRAFT COMMENT
LETTER ON DRAFT
FOREST PLAN
REVISION AND DEIS**

comments by the existing deadline. Supervisor Tillemans commented that the Headwaters Study was based on whether communities also had things like commercial air service and tech schools, which Inyo County does not. So he wasn't convinced adding 30,000 acre of wilderness would boost Inyo's bottom line. But he said he did support expansion of some wilderness, just not at the expense of grazing allotments. Richards noted that Piper Mountain does not have grazing but it does have roads being illegally used. Someone from the audience noted that the roads have signs to deter that activity. Chairman Griffiths said he was recently up there with a map he had made by the Forest Service that could be laid on top of the final Travel Management map and he could attest that not all unauthorized routes are signed and some routes in wilderness areas are being used. He said he agreed with Prather that a deal is a deal and one part of that deal was the Forest Supervisor saying it would be possible to go back after Travel Management and petition to have some of the roads re-opened. Designating the areas that surround them as wilderness eliminates the promised option of being able to re-evaluate some of the more questionable routes. Griffiths then suggested just moving the proposed wilderness boundary slightly so that those routes would not be included. Supervisor Tillemans asked that the County's letter also include language that access to wildlife guzzlers be preserved. He said he was leaning toward Alternative B with some modifications to wilderness boundaries as discussed to preserve questionable routes for future evaluation. Chairman Griffiths noted that fire officials have told him there really is no difference between the fire management outlined in Alternatives B and D, other than that D calls for more mechanical treatment. Supervisor Totheroh said he didn't see an awful lot of concern for extension until receiving copies of letters prior to the meeting, and would support what constituents wanted. He said he wanted two separate letters to the Sequoia and Sierra national forests discussing the smoke issues from their wildfires and that they have the ability to use things for biomass that Inyo County doesn't. He said he's rather see the Species of Specific Concern listed in the Plan than becoming formally listed and triggering strict regulations. He also noted he spoke with the Forest Supervisor who is looking to add a potential partnership czar position, and maybe Inyo County should be looking at ways to help with that. Supervisor Pucci said he'd be happy to ask for an extension but doesn't want to stop talking about the issues in the meantime. He said he thought the INF did a pretty good job and knows they worked hard. He said lack of funds should never get in the way of good planning and it's easy to criticize someone when they have to invent the wheel. He also supported the idea of a volunteer coordinator. Pucci praised staff's letter and asked that the County's concerns about permitting issues and the volunteer process be added. To conclude: the Board directed Richards to send a letter to the Regional Forester asking for an extension of the comment period; adjust the boundaries of wilderness in Alternative B to take out unauthorized roads but note where the Board supports wilderness; add language to ensure there will be access to guzzlers in perpetuity regardless of who's Forest Supervisor; move the boundary of the South Sierra proposed wilderness to 6,000 feet; add language about utilizing grazing for fire suppression; note the County's support of Alternative D for fire management; advocate for the addition of a piece of wilderness on the west side of Deep Springs North; send separate letters to the other forests about the impact of smoke on the County's recreation-based economy; add that the County would like to see a partnership coordinator; and note that the County wants the permit discussion expanded.

RECESS/RECONVENE Chairman Griffiths recessed the meeting at 3:38 p.m. for a break and reconvened the meeting in open session at 3:48 p.m. with all Board members present except for the absent Supervisor Kingsley.

**P.W. WEST BISHOP
IMPROVEMENT
PROJECT PLANS**

Public Works Director Clint Quilter told the Board the project was under a very short time frame, noting that if the County didn't move on this it would lose its funding in the next month or so. He also said it's quite likely that once Public Works goes out to bid, they will submit a change order to eliminate Carol Lane from the list of roads to be worked on because it's just not feasible to construct a new road there. Quilter further noted that they will have to be careful not to do anything on Pa Me Lane other than fixing the road itself because of a lack of curbs and gutters and resulting drainage issues. Moved by Supervisor Totheroh and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to: A) Approve the plans and specifications for the West Bishop Improvement Project; and B) Authorize the Public Works Department to advertise and bid the project. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0. Supervisor Pucci noted for the record that he lives on one of the streets to be worked on.

HHS CONTRACT WITH PATEL & ASSOCIATES Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to ratify and approve the contract between the County of Inyo and Patel & Associates for auditing services for the period of July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018 in an amount not to exceed \$9,300 per year, or a total of \$27,900, contingent upon approval of future budgets; and authorize the Chairperson to sign. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

HHS CONTRACT WITH TRIPLE P AMERICA Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Totheroh to ratify and approve the contract between the County of Inyo and Triple P America for the period of July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2018 for training services in an estimated amount of \$150,000 for Fiscal Year 2016-2017, an estimated amount of \$50,000 for Fiscal Year 2017-2018 and not to exceed \$200,000 for the two-year term, contingent upon approval of future budgets; and authorize the Chairperson to sign. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

HHS MATERNAL CHILD AND ADOLESCENT HEALTH AGREEMENT Health and Human Services Director Jean Turner pointed out the agenda said “Linda Mann” not “Manning,” even though the Agenda Request Form she submitted had the name correctly written as “Manning.” Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to ratify and approve the Maternal Child and Adolescent Health (MCAH) Agreement #201614 between the County of Inyo and California Department of Public Health for the period of July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 in the amount of \$122,719; authorize Linda Mann, PHN and MCAH Director, to sign the Agreement Funding Application (AFA) Policy Compliance and Certification and the attestation of compliance with the Sexual Health Education Accountability Act of 2007; and authorize the Chairperson to sign the AFA Policy Compliance and Certification. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

GULLY WASHER EMERGENCY CAO Carunchio said he had no updates regarding the local emergencies but did note there was a 10-acre fire currently burning in Horseshoe Meadows. Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to continue the local emergency, known as the “Gully Washer Emergency,” that resulted in flooding in the central, south and southeastern portion of Inyo County during the month of July, 2013. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

LAND OF EVEN LESS WATER EMERGENCY Moved by Supervisor Totheroh and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to continue the local emergency, known as the “Land of EVEN Less Water Emergency,” that was proclaimed as a result of extreme drought conditions that exist in the County. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

DV DOWN BUT NOT OUT EMERGENCY Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Totheroh to continue the local emergency, known as the “Death Valley Down But Not Out Emergency,” that was proclaimed as a result of flooding in the central, south and southeastern portion of Inyo County during the month of October, 2015. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Totheroh to approve of the minutes of the Board of Supervisors regular meeting of July 12, 2016. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT Chairman Griffiths asked for public comment and there was none.

BOARD MEMBERS AND STAFF REPORTS Chairman Griffiths reported attending the Bishop City Council meeting the night before, where police dog X-Ray was officially retired. He also noted the City will hold off on any marijuana related ordinances for now but is excited to see the County putting advisory questions on the ballot as it will provide the City with valuable information. Chairman Griffiths said the City has done a lot of work to regulate indoor, private growth and the County will probably have to address that as some point.

CORRESPONDENCE – ACTION Moved by Supervisor Tillemans and seconded by Supervisor Pucci to consolidate the Southern Inyo Fire Protection District Special Election with the Statewide General Election to be held on November 8, 2016. Motion carried unanimously, 4-0.

ADJOURNMENT Chairman Griffiths adjourned the meeting at 4:03 p.m., with the Board scheduled to meet next on Tuesday, August 16, 2016 at 8:30 a.m. in the County Administrative Center in Independence.

Chairperson, Inyo County Board of Supervisor

*Attest: KEVIN D. CARUNCHIO
Clerk of the Board*

by: _____
Darcy Ellis, Assistant