

MINUTES
April 26, 2007

Present: Robin Lowe, Chair
Bob Buster
Terry Henderson
Robert E. Hird
Ron Starrs
John Tavaglione
Phil Williams

Present Staff: George J. Spiliotis, Executive Officer
Wayne Fowler, Senior Local Government Analyst
Crystal Craig, Local Government Analyst II
Adriana Romo, Local Government Analyst II
Elena Medina, Executive Assistant II
Joe Rank, Legal Counsel

1.1 CALL TO ORDER AND SALUTE TO THE FLAG.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lowe at 9:30

1.2 ROLL CALL.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 22, 2007

Minutes were approved as presented.

3. Consent (Non-Hearing Items):

a. LAFCO 2007-03-3-Annexation 81 to County Service Area 84.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to approve LAFCO 2007-03-3-Annexation 81 to County Service Area 84.
7/0

b. LAFCO 2007-04-3-Annexation 21 to County Service Area 145.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to approve LAFCO 2007-04-3-Annexation 21 to County Service Area 145.
7/0

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

a. LAFCO 2005-10-1,2,3,5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-Northwest Mosquito & Vector Control District. (**Continued from January 25, 2007**) (**Staff recommended continuance to June 28, 2007**)

Moved (Tavaglione) seconded (Henderson) to continue LAFCO 2005-10-1,2,3,5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-Northwest Mosquito & Vector Control District to June 28, 2007.

7/0

LAFCO 2005-11-3,4,5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-Coachella Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District. **(Continued from January 25, 2007) (Staff recommended continuance to June 28, 2007)**

Moved (Tavaglione) seconded (Henderson) to continue LAFCO 2005-11-3,4,5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-Coachella Valley Mosquito & Vector Control District to June 28, 2007.

7/0

- b. LAFCO 2006-19-1&3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Murrieta, the Menifee Valley Unincorporated Community and the Wildomar Unincorporated Community. **(Continued from October 26, 2007)**

Mr. Spiliotis stated that staff was recommending that the Commission confirm the existing sphere of influence and when the City or the developer submit a sphere or influence amendment application, then the Commission will hear both proposals at the same time.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Williams) to determine that the current sphere of influence is adequate at this time for LAFCO 2006-19-1&3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Murrieta, the Menifee Valley Unincorporated Community and the Wildomar Unincorporated Community.

7/0

- c. LAFCO 2005-103-1-Consolidation of Elsinore Valley and Wildomar Cemetery Districts. **(Continued from March 22, 2007) (Staff recommends continuance to June 28, 2007)**

Moved (Tavaglione) seconded (Williams) to continue LAFCO 2005-103-1-Consolidation of Elsinore Valley and Wildomar Cemetery Districts to June 28, 2007.

7/0

- d. LAFCO 2006-20-1&3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Temecula **(Continued from January 25, 2007) (Staff recommends continuance to July 26, 2007)**

Moved (Hird) seconded (Williams) to continue LAFCO 2006-20-1&3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Temecula to July 26, 2007.

7/0

- e. LAFCO 2006-16-5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Calimesa and the Cherry Valley Unincorporated Community.

Mr. Spiliotis stated that since the City's General Plan did not go beyond the current SOI, expansion would not be appropriate at this time. He further stated that the City and affected property owners were planning on submitting one or more applications to the Commission upon completion of the City's land use review process. He said that no changes to the sphere of influence were recommended at this time.

Mr. David Lane, City Manager, City of Calimesa, 908 Park Avenue, Calimesa, CA 92320. Mr. Lane expressed that other members of the City Council were available for questions as well. He said that they were in support of staff's recommendation.

Chair Lowe asked Mr. Lane if there had been any communications with the Cherry Valley Acres and Neighbors group of Cherry Valley. Mr. Lane stated that they had not included them in their discussions to date, but they would definitely include them in the future.

John Chlebnik, Mayor, City of Calimesa, 908 Park Avenue, Calimesa, CA 92320. Mr. Chlebnik spoke in favor of staff's recommendation.

Garry Grant, 27068 Jarvis St., Perris, CA 92571. Mr. Grant discussed the Riverside County's General Plan in relation to future annexations.

Chair Lowe closed the public.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Hird) to determine that the current sphere of influence is adequate at this time for the City of Calimesa and Cherry Valley Unincorporated Community.

7/0

f. LAFCO 2006-24-3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Hemet.

Mr. Spiliotis presented the report and stated that since the City's General Plan did not go beyond the current SOI, expansion would not be appropriate at this time. He also said that an affected property owner was planning on submitting an application to the commission upon completion of the City's land use review process.

Ron Running, City of Hemet, 445 E. Florida Avenue, City of Hemet, CA 92543. Mr. Running said that they were anticipating having the General Plan update ready in the fall of this year. He said he was available for questions.

Chair Lowe closed the public hearing.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Hird) to determine that the current sphere of influence was adequate at this time for the City of Hemet.

7/0

Commission decided to take Items g. and j. at this time.

g. LAFCO 2006-140-5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-CSA 59 (Hemet/Valle Vista).

Ms. Craig presented the report and stated that staff was recommending to amend the sphere of influence for County Service Area 59 from its current County-wide SOI and establish a "zero" sphere of influence. She said that this will indicate future dissolution of CSA 59 and future Annexation to County Service Area 91.

Moved (Buster) seconded (Williams) to amend the sphere of influence for County Service Area 59 from its current County-wide SOI and establish a "zero" sphere of influence which will indicate future dissolution of CSA 59 and potential annexation to CSA 91.

7/0

The Commission decided to take Item j. at this time.

- j. LAFCO 2006-148-3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-CSA 91 (Valle Vista).

Ms. Craig presented the report and further stated that staff was recommending to amend the sphere for CSA 91 to approximate the area of potential future development in the area as shown on the County's General Plan.

Moved (Buster) seconded (Williams) to amend the sphere of influence for County Service Area 91 from its current County-wide SOI and establish a sphere of influence to approximate the Riverside County's General Plan.

7/0

The Commission decided to take Items h. and i. at this time.

- h. LAFCO 2006-141-3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-CSA 69 (Hemet)

Ms. Craig presented the report and further stated that staff was recommending to amend the SOI for County Service Areas 69 from its current County-wide SOI and establish a sphere of influence to approximate the Riverside County's General Plan.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to amend the sphere of influence for County Service Area 69 from its current County-wide SOI and establish a sphere of influence to approximate the Riverside County's General Plan.

7/0

- i. LAFCO 2006-144-3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-CSA 94 (South East Hemet)

Ms Craig presented the report and further stated that staff was recommending that the Commission establish a "zero" SOI, which indicated a future dissolution of CSA 94 and future annexation to County Service Area 69.

Moved (Buster) seconded (Williams) to amend the sphere of influence for County Service Area 94 from its current County-wide SOI and establish a "zero" SOI, which indicates future dissolution of CSA 94 and potential annexation to County Service Area 69.

7/0

- k. LAFCO 2006-150-4-Reorganization to Include Annexation 56 (Labbe) to the City of Coachella, the Coachella Fire Protection District (subsidiary) and the Coachella Sanitary District (subsidiary) and Detachments from County Service Area 125 and the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District. **(Staff recommended continuance to May 24, 2007)**

Moved (Buster) seconded (Williams) to continue LAFCO 2006-150-4-Reorganization to Include Annexation 56 (Labbe) to the City of Coachella, the Coachella Fire Protection District (subsidiary) and the Coachella Sanitary District (subsidiary) and Detachments from County Service Area 125 and the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District to May 24, 2007.

7/0

The Commission decided to take Item 4.m. and 4.n. at this time.

- m. LAFCO 2006-154-4-Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexations 57 (Nigosian) to the City of Coachella, the Coachella Fire Protection District (subsidiary) and the Coachella Sanitary District (subsidiary) and Detachments from County Service Area 125 and the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

Mr. Fowler presented the proposal.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing there being no proponents or opponents wishing to speak the public hearing was closed.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Hird) to approve LAFCO 2006-154-4-Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexations 57 (Nigosian) to the City of Coachella, the Coachella Fire Protection District (subsidiary) and the Coachella Sanitary District (subsidiary) and Detachments from County Service Area 125 and the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District as recommended by staff.

7/0

- n. LAFCO 2007-02-4-Sphere of Influence Amendments to the Cities of Palm Desert (removal) and La Quinta (addition) and Reorganization to Include Annexation 18 to the City of La Quinta and the La Quinta Lighting & Landscaping District 89-01 and Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

Mr. Fowler presented the proposal.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing.

Doug R. Evans, Community Development Director, 78-495 Calle Tampico, La Quinta, CA 92248. He said that there were staff members in the audience ready to answer any questions that the Commission might have. He further spoke in favor of the annexation and asked the Commission to approve staff's recommendation.

Mike Sollenberger, 3937 Harborwalk, Fr. Collins, CO 89525. Mr. Sollenberger stated that he was one of the owners of the senior community. He further stated that he was available to answer any questions.

Bruce Cathcart, 78947 Darby Rd., Bermuda Dunes, CA 92253. Mr. Cathcart spoke in favor of the annexation proposal.

Frank Spevacek, 309 W. 4th St., Santa Ana, 92701. Mr. Spevacek spoke in favor of the annexation.

Gary P. Harland, 42800 Washington St., G-1, Bermuda Dunes, CA 92203. Mr. Harland spoke in favor of the annexation.

Beverly Maier, 42800 Washington St., H-6, Bermuda Dunes, CA 92203. Mr. Maier spoke in favor of the annexation.

Chair Lowe closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Buster asked if staff had any comments regarding the letter in opposition from Supervisor Wilson, 4th District and the Bermuda Dunes Community Council stating that the annexation will break the integrity of the area. He also said that Mr. Hammon's letter stated that the Community of Bermuda Dunes was attempting to form a community services district to enhance the quality of life for the residents of the area.

Mr. Spiliotis responded that as far as the CSD, the Community of Bermuda Dunes had been talking about this issue for quite some time, but to date an application had not been submitted to LAFCO. He said that because the area was very small, they would have negligible fiscal impact on any revenues that a CSD could raise.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Hird) to approve LAFCO 2007-02-4-Sphere of Influence Amendment to the Cities of Palm Desert (removal) and La Quinta (addition) and Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexation #18 to the City of La Quinta and the La Quinta Lighting and Landscaping District No. 89-01 and Detachments from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

7/0

1. LAFCO 2006-152-5-Sphere of Influence Amendment (addition) to the City of Desert Hot Springs and Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexation 30 to the City of Desert Hot Springs and Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

Mr. Fowler presented the proposal and further stated that the entire application proposal consisted of approximately 2,114 acres of uninhabited, undeveloped land into the City of Desert Hot Springs for provision of municipal levels of services. He further stated that the proposal consisted of the 1,766 acre Palmwood Specific Plan and what was referred to as the

"out parcels" consisting approximately 160 acres. He said that the proposed development as outlined in the Palmwood Specific Plan, would include a 27 hole championship golf course, club house, golf academy with a par-3 hotel and spa, and 1,853 residential units of varying densities. He said that an additional 672 single family homes. He said that the proposed area was outside of the Desert Hot Springs Sphere of Influence, and the proposal sought to amend the sphere to match the boundaries of this proposed annexation. He said that the proposal had generated a great deal of controversy because of the Coachella Valley Multi Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP or HCP) and related environmental concerns within the area of the proposed development. Mr. Fowler stated that based on the information provided in the staff report to the Commission, staff was recommending denial of the annexation; however, if the Commission approved the annexation included in the staff report were the findings and language for approval.

Commissioner Henderson asked if the Specific Plan that was before the Commission was for approval. Mr. Fowler responded in the negative. Mr. Fowler stated that he used the Specific Plan to gather data for the report about the development.

Commissioner Henderson said that the actual application proposal was for a sphere amendment and an annexation of land into a community. Mr. Fowler said that it was correct, that it was not about the development that was proposed.

Mr. Spiliotis said that LAFCO had no authority to regulate land use but it was one of the required factors that the Commission must consider.

Commissioner Lowe opened the public hearing.

The following Proponents spoke in favor of the Annexation Proposal:

Michael Crosby, Founder and Developer of the Palmwood Project, 4741 E. Palm Canyon Drive, Palm Springs, CA 92262. Mr. Crosby gave a power point presentation throughout his talk. A copy was given to the Commission.

Peter Nervick, Director of Golf Operations, Palmwood Golf Club, 4741 E. Palm Canyon Drive, Palm Springs, Ca 92262. Mr. Nervick read a copy of a letter given to the Commission from Mr. Phil Michelson dated April 26, 2007.

Hank Hohenstein, City Council Member, City of Desert Hot Springs, 65950 Pierson, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240.

Jim Cornett, JWC Ecological Consultants, Palm Springs, CA 92262.

Mary Stephens, Council Member, City of Desert Hot Springs, 65950 Pierson, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240.

Roger Rostvold, Fiscal Impact Analysis Report Consultant, 73101 Highway 111, Palm Desert, CA 92240.

Scott Matas, Council Member, City of Desert Hot Springs, 65950 Pierson, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240.

Ruben Duran, City Attorney, City of Desert Hot Springs, 65950 Pierson, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240.

Ann Marie Gallant, City Manager, City of Desert Hot Springs, 65950 Pierson, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240.

Karen Patterson, 10672 Aurora Pl, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240.

Gloria Hayes, 66337 Pierson Blvd., Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240.

Thad Watkins, Landowner, 1162 Twin Canyon Lane, Diamond Bar, CA 91765.

Jill Hamilton, 13075 Santa Ysabel, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92262.

Commissioner Hird left at 11:38 a.m.

The following persons spoke in opposition of the Annexation Proposal:

Theree O'Rourke, US Fish and Wildlife Service, 6010 Hidden Valley, Carlsbad, CA 92011.

Jane Block, Endangered Habitat League, 424 Tree Trees Road, Riverside, CA 92507.

Michael Fitts, Staff Attorney for the Endangered Habitat League, Redondo Beach, CA.

Richard W. Kite, Chairman of the Coachella Valley Conservation Commission, 71205 Thunderbird, Rancho Mirage, CA 92270.

Steven Bayrd, 5955 Soza Road, White Water, CA 92282.

April Sall, The Wildlands Conservancy, Morongo Basin.

Jonathan Evans, Staff Attorney, Center for Biological Diversity, PMB 407; 8033 Sunset Blvd., Los Angeles, Ca 90046.

Chuck Nisbet, Coachella Valley Hiking Club, 2439 S. Calle Palo Fierro, Palm Springs, Ca 92264.

Joan Taylor, Sierra Club, 1850 Smoke Tree Lane, Palm springs, Ca 92264.

Rebuttal:

Brian Harnik, 45-025 Manitar Drive, Indian Wells, CA 92210. Mr. Harnik stated that Palmwood was in agreement of creating a CFD proposed by the City of Desert Hot Springs which was a key issue to address the financial concerns. Mr. Harnik stated that there was not a currently multi-species Habitat Conservation Plan. He said that it was still in the planning stages. He said that delaying the annexation was not in the best interest of the plan and asked the Commission to approve the annexation.

Rob Bernheimer, Attorney for Palmwood Development, 73101 Highway 111, Suite 1, Palm Desert, CA 92260. Mr. Bernheimer discussed a 12-year proposal outlined on the map presented to the Commission. He said that the project

brought the commercial at the key intersection to the northern gateway at highway 62 and Indian. He said that there was discussion about the MHCP, and the question was how the MHCP would be affected if the annexation was approved. He said that there was only speculation there might be potential risks if the proposal was approved. He said that when the proposed MHCP was rejected by the City of Desert Hot Springs, it was immediately known that the proposal for annexation was going to come forward to LAFCO. He said that the re-circulation of the MHCP did not happen until about two months ago. He said that they knew at that time, that the application for annexation was pending. He said that it was not right for them to come before LAFCO and ask to deny the annexation proposal because they knew about the proposal when they circulated the second plan. He said that they had plenty of time to plan for it and could have had an option at that time. He said that this was the chance for Desert Hot Springs to have a first class community within their borders. He said that the Commission's decision was not going to affect the species and critters on the property. He said that the Endangered Species Act was there to protect them. He said that LAFCO did not enforce endangered species laws and asked the Commission to approve the annexation today.

Yvonne Parks, Council Member, 65950 Pierson, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240. Ms. Parks asked the Commission to approve the annexation proposal for it was the economic future of Desert Hot Springs. She said that the city had two major gateways, one at the south along Palm Drive and the northern gateway along Highway 62 in Indian. She said that the City was growing in a natural pattern as it was developing northwest. She said that the intersection was prime commercial property. She said that the development project was a logical progression of growth in the northwestern area. She said that the City did not have the population to attract big commercial development. She said that the revenue that it will be generated by the development of the project will provide the city with the capability of enhancing the services to all the residents. She said that the project will provide the residents of Desert Hot Springs with the shopping opportunities they need. She said that the land was their future and asked the Commission to approve the annexation.

Chair Lowe allowed Katie Barrows to speak at this time.

Katie Barrows, Coachella Valley Conservation Commission, 73710 Fred Waring #200, Palm Desert Ca 92260. Ms. Barrows clarified to the Commission the Multi Species Plan process concerning the annexation.

Chair Lowe said that when a plan went out for comment, it was suppose to be an unbiased comment period. She said that the conclusion should not had been reached until the end of the comment period. She asked Ms. Barrows if that was correct? Ms. Barrows responded in the affirmative.

Chair Lowe closed the public hearing.

The Commission recessed at 12:27 p.m. and reconvened at 1:06 p.m.

Commissioner Williams asked if the Community Facilities District will adequately provide for new staff and a new building for the new fire station.

Ann Marie Gallant, City Manager responded that the development was not going to be built all at one time. She said that once the map was done and approved, the money will be available and the assessments will start for the necessary fire services. She said that at the end of the development they will finish constructing the physical structure of the new fire station. She said that all this will be an incremental growth.

Commissioner Henderson clarified that there was no separate agreement that had to be reached but only an agreement of the procedures that were already in place.

Commissioner Henderson asked what will be the status of the interchange at Indian Avenue and I-10 if the proposal was not approved.

Carolyn Luna, Environmental Department, responded that the I-10 construction was covered under the MHCP.

Katie Barrows stated that there was a current agreement with CVAG that was working parallel with the Multi Species Plan that included Indian Avenue and the I-10 interchange.

Commissioner Buster said that because the considerations stated throughout the annexation proposal, perhaps it was premature to approve the annexation at this time. He would like to know what the real mitigations were going to be before the Commission took action.

Mr. Spiliotis said that the entire Multi Species Conservation Plan had a regional growth plan.

Mr. Spiliotis clarified on the report that Government Code Section 56668(i) stated that this section was optional for the Commission to consider comments from the public agencies.

Commissioner Tavaglione asked if all City approved developments were commercial or residential. Ms. Gallant responded that there were some commercial and some residential. Mr. Mendoza went over each development.

Commissioner Tavaglione expressed his concern with the City of Desert Hot Springs and their ability to service the proposed annexation because of the history of the City. He said he was not comfortable approving the annexation at this time.

Commissioner Tavaglione asked if the CFD was going to fund police and fire for the proposed annexation. Ms. Gallant responded that the CFD will fund both. Commissioner Tavaglione stated that he was concerned about the long term operation and maintenance of police, fire, parks, libraries etc. Ms. Gallant addressed those concerns in detail and to the satisfaction of Commissioner Tavaglione.

Commissioner Henderson said that she was the current Chair of the Santa Rosa/San Jacinto Mountains National Monument. She also said that she was a non-voting alternate member to Supervisor Tavaglione of the CVC. She said that this was core habitat for two of the species that were holding the application from moving forward. She said that they were the Linanthus and the Fringed Toe Lizard. She said she was wondering whether this was an

invasive species or a natural species. She said that she totally understood the MHCP wanting to make an extra effort to address the potential problems. She commented that there were discussions going on with the County for the potential growth of a new city east called Paradise Canyon. She said that if plans were moving forward for new project that potentially endangered other habitat then she saw no reason to hold this project hostage. Commissioner Henderson said that the proposed annexation deserved to move forward and she moved to approve the proposed annexation.

Commissioner Tavaglione said that the City of Desert Hot springs was making every effort to get back on their feet and were going through the process of good planning. Commissioner Tavaglione said that he will support the annexation only after they had been given the opportunity to work the issues of concern with the MHCP. Commissioner Tavaglione moved for a 60-day continuance.

Commissioner Starrs said that delaying the annexation proposal, the City of Desert Hot Springs will lose the power they have to negotiate anything. Commissioner Starrs moved to approve the annexation proposal with the conditions that staff recommended. Commissioner Henderson seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lowe said that there was a current state law that stated that public officials could not hold another jurisdiction hostage under penalty of incarceration. Commissioner Lowe said that she was seeing hostages being taken today and she was very disappointed with this development. She said that she did not hear many of the people that were willing to find solutions for Desert Hot Springs. She said she had seen the City of Desert Hot Springs struggle for years. She said that she believed in habitat planning and it could not be done one species at a time. She said it had to be a joint effort. She expressed her disappointment with Fish and Wildlife. Commissioner Lowe disagreed with the 30 or 60-day continuance. She said that the Commission had to make a decision today which was what LAFCO was about. Commissioner Lowe stated that public comment period was to find a solution to a plan and that was what public opinion was supposed to be about.

Commissioner Tavaglione commented that he really wanted to approve the annexation but he also realized the importance of the MHCP and wanted to see it preserved in conjunction with the City of Desert Hot Springs.

Commissioner Henderson encouraged the Commission to approve the annexation and hopefully it will start the discussions among the interested parties.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to approve LAFCO 2006-152-5-Sphere of Influence Amendment (addition) to the City of Desert Hot Springs and Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexation 30 to the City of Desert Hot Springs and Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

4/2 (Buster and Tavaglione No) (Hird absent)

Commissioner Buster left at 2:02 p.m.

- o. LAFCO 2007-18-3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-County Service Area 108 (Minto Way/Sage)

Moved (Hederson) seconded (Starrs) to determine that the current coterminous sphere of influence was adequate at this time for LAFCO 2007-18-3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-County Service Area 108 (Minto Way/Sage).

5/0 (Hird and Buster absent)

Commission decided to take Items p. and 7. together.

p. Proposed Budget for Fiscal year 2007-2008.

Moved (Lowe) seconded (Williams) to approve Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2007-2008.

5/0 (Buster and Hird absent)

7. REVIEW OF COMMISSION PER DIEM REIMBURSEMENT RATE.

Moved (Lowe) seconded (Williams) to approve the increase of per diems from \$125 to \$175 for attending any posted meetings of the full Commission and CALAFCO Conferences as well as Workshops.

5/2 (Buster and Hird absent)

5. RECEIVE AND FILE.

a. INFORMATION ITEMS: Proposals Received (Government Code Section 56857, 56751):

Moved (Tavaglione) seconded (Starrs) to acknowledge receipt of the following proposals:

5/2 (Buster and Hird absent)

- i. LAFCO 2007-35-3-Reorganization to Include Annexation to the City of Murrieta and Detachments from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.
- ii. LAFCO 2007-36-3-Reorganization to Include Annexation 84 to County Service Area 84 and Detachment from County Service Area 146.
- iii. LAFCO 2007-37-3-Annexation 83 to County Service Area 84.
- iv. LAFCO 2007-38-3-Annexation 22 to County Service Area 145.
- v. LAFCO 2007-39-3-Annexation 111 to County Service Area 103.
- vi. LAFCO 2007-40-3-Incorporation of Menifee Valley.

b. MONTHLY EXPENDITURE REVIEW.

Moved (Tavaglione) seconded (Starrs) to receive and file the Monthly Expenditure Review report.

5/0 (Buster and Hird absent)

6. SELECTION OF VENDOR - LASERFICHE DATA NETWORK CONVERSION.

Moved (Starrs) seconded (Williams) to authorize the Chair to execute an agreement with AMI to perform services consistent with their proposal in an amount not to exceed \$10,228.

5/0 (Buster and Hird absent)

8. REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF THE FISCAL IMPACT REPORT REQUIREMENT BY THE CITY OF BLYTHE - LAFCO 2007-13-4.

Moved (Hird) seconded (Starrs) to approve Request for Waiver of the Fiscal Impact Report Requirement by the City of Blythe (LAFCO 2007-13-4).

5/0 (Buster and Hird absent)

9. SELECTION OF CONSULTANT FOR THE MENIFEE VALLEY INCORPORATION INITIAL STUDY (CEQA).

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to authorize the Executive Officer to select an environmental consultant to perform an initial environmental assessment of the Menifee Incorporation; Authorize the Executive Officer to negotiate a professional services agreement with the selected consultant; and Authorize the Chair to execute an agreement with the consultant.

5/0 (Buster and Hird absent)

10. MISCELLANEOUS STAFF REPORTS.

There were no miscellaneous staff reports.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS.

Garry Grant, 27068 Jarvis Street, Perris, CA. Mr. Grant discussed the annexations in the Meadowbrook area in relation to the County's General Plan.

12. ADJOURNMENT.

The Commission adjourned at 2:11 p.m.

Respectfully,

George J. Spiliotis
Executive Officer