Hearing: October 9, 2026

Item 1

Proposed Minutes

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

Location of Meeting:

The Jesse M. Unruh State Office Building, 915 Capitol Mall, Room 121,
The Boardroom, Sacramento, California, 95814 and via Zoom
August 14, 2026

Present: Member Michele Perrault, Chairperson
Representative of the Director of the Department of Finance
Member William Pahland, Vice Chairperson
Representative of the State Treasurer
Member Lee Adams
County Supervisor
Member Deborah Gallegos
Representative of the State Controller
Member Karen Greene Ross
Public Member
Member Alexander Powell
Representative of the Director of the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation

NOTE: The transcript for this hearing is attached. These minutes are designed to be read in conjunction with the transcript.

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairperson Perrault called the meeting to order at 10:13 a.m. Executive Director Gmur called the roll. Members Adams, Gallegos, Greene Ross, Pahland, Perrault, and Powell all indicated that they were present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any objections to or additional corrections of the June 12, 2026, minutes. There was no response. Chairperson Perrault asked if there was any public comment on this item. There was no response. Assistant Executive Director Supachana stated that there were no public comments online or in the room. Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any additional questions from the Members and asked for a motion to adopt the minutes. Member Gallegos made the motion to adopt the minutes. Member Greene Ross seconded the motion. Executive Director Gmur called the roll. The Commission voted to adopt the June 12, 2026, minutes by a vote of 6-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Chairperson Perrault asked if there was any public comment. There was no response. Chairperson Perrault stated that there were no public comments in the room. Assistant

Executive Director Supachana stated that there were no public comments online.

HEARINGS AND DECISIONS PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 2, ARTICLE 7 (GOV. CODE, § 17551, 17557, 17559, and 17570) (action)

Executive Director Gmur stated that there were no items on consent for this hearing; the Department of Finance notified the Commission that they will not be participating in this hearing due to a conflict; and swore in the parties and witnesses participating in the Article 7 portion of the hearing.

TEST CLAIMS

Item 2 *Race-Blind Charging*, 24-TC-07

Statutes 2022, Chapter 806, Section 2 (AB 2778); Penal Code Section 741(b), Effective January 1, 2023

City of Sacramento, County of Santa Clara, and County of Sutter, Claimants

Chief Legal Counsel Camille Shelton presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the Proposed Decision to approve the Test Claim.

Michael Benner appeared on behalf of the City of Sacramento; Tara Fonseca appeared on behalf of the County of Santa Clara; and Jennifer Dupré appeared on behalf of the County of Sutter. Arthur Palkowitz appeared on behalf of the City of Sacramento, County of Santa Clara, and County of Sutter.

Following a statement by Mr. Palkowitz, Chairperson Perrault asked if there was any further comment. There was no response. Chairperson Perrault asked if there was any public comment. There was no response. Assistant Executive Director Supachana stated that there was no public comment online or in the room. Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any questions from the Members. There was no response. Chairperson Perrault asked if there was a motion on this item. Member Adams made the motion to adopt the staff recommendation. Member Gallegos seconded the motion. Executive Director Gmur called the roll. The Commission voted to adopt the Proposed Decision by a vote of 6-0.

PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES

Item 3 *Emergency Shelters: Persons with Pets*, 24-TC-06

Statutes 2023, Chapter 344, Section 2 (AB 781); Government Code Section 8593.10(c), and (d), Effective January 1, 2024

County of Sacramento, Claimant

Chief Legal Counsel Camille Shelton presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the Proposed Decision and Parameters and Guidelines.

Mark Aspesi appeared on behalf of the County of Sacramento.

Following a statement by Mr. Aspesi, Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any public comments on this item. There was no response. Assistant Executive Director Supachana stated that there were no public comments in person or online. Chairperson

Perrault asked if there were any questions from the Members. There was no response. Chairperson Perrault asked if there was a motion. Member Powell made the motion to adopt the staff recommendation. Member Adams seconded the motion. Executive Director Gmur called the roll. The Commission voted to adopt the Proposed Decision and Parameters and Guidelines by a vote of 6-0.

INCORRECT REDUCTION CLAIMS

Item 4 *Child Abduction and Recovery*, 25-4237-I-05

Family Code Sections 3060 to 3064, 3130 to 3134.5, 3408, 3411, and 3421; Penal Code Sections 277, 278, and 278.5; Welfare and Institutions Code Section 11478.5; Statutes 1976, Chapter 1399; Statutes 1992, Chapter 162; Statutes 1996, Chapter 988

Fiscal Years: 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021

County of Los Angeles, Claimant

Executive Director Gmur stated that Commission staff received two public comments after the close of business on August 13, 2026, filed by interested persons, and that staff served those items, although it was not required.

Commission Counsel Anna Barich presented this item and recommended that the Commission adopt the Proposed Decision approving the Incorrect Reduction Claim.

Howard Gest appeared on behalf of the County of Los Angeles. Brett Haynes and Ken Howell appeared on behalf of the State Controller's Office.

Following statements by Mr. Gest, Mr. Haynes, Mr. Howell, and discussion between Chief Legal Counsel Shelton and Member Gallegos, Chairperson Perrault asked if there was any public comment. There was no response. Following additional statements by Mr. Gest, and discussion between Chief Legal Counsel Shelton and Mr. Haynes, Chairperson Perrault asked again if there was any public comment. There was no response. Assistant Executive Director Supachana stated that there was no public comment in person or online. Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any questions from the Members. Following discussion between Member Pahland, Mr. Haynes, Mr. Howell, Member Adams, Member Powell, and Commission Counsel Barich, Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any other comments or questions from Members. There was no response. Following statements by Chairperson Perrault, she asked if there was any further discussion. There was no response. Chairperson Perrault asked if there was a motion. Member Greene Ross made the motion to adopt the staff recommendation. Member Powell seconded the motion. Executive Director Gmur called the roll. The Commission voted to adopt the Proposed Decision by a vote of 6-0.

PERSONNEL (action)

Item 5 Salary Adjustment: Executive Director, pursuant to Government Code Section 17530

Assistant Executive Director Dennis Supachana presented this item and recommended the following motion: I move to adjust the Executive Director's monthly salary to – please state an amount – effective July 1, 2026 and direct staff to work with CalHR.

Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any public comments or questions on this item. There was no response. Assistant Executive Director Supachana stated that there were no public comments in person or online. Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any comments or questions from Members. There was no response. Chairperson Perrault restated the staff recommendation and asked if there was a motion. Member Adams made the motion to adopt the staff recommendation. Member Greene Ross seconded the motion. Executive Director Gmur called the roll. The Commission voted to adopt the staff recommendation to adjust the Executive Director's monthly salary to $19,319, effective July 1, 2026 and direct staff to work with CalHR by a vote of 6-0.

Item 6 Salary Adjustment: Attorney to the Commission/Chief Legal Counsel (CEA B), pursuant to Government Code Section 17529

Assistant Executive Director Dennis Supachana presented this item and recommended the following motion: I move to adjust the Chief Legal Counsel's monthly salary to – please state an amount – effective July 1, 2026 and direct staff to work with CalHR.

Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any public comments on this item. There was no response. Assistant Executive Director Supachana stated that there were no public comments in person or online. Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any comments or questions from Members. Member Adams stated that he was really pleased to see this and made the motion. Chairperson Perrault restated the staff recommendation and asked if there was a second. Member Greene Ross seconded the motion. Executive Director Gmur called the roll. The Commission voted to adopt the staff recommendation to adjust the Chief Legal Counsel's monthly salary to $19,046, effective July 1, 2026 and direct staff to work with CalHR by a vote of 6-0.

REPORTS

Item 7 Legislative Update (info)

Program Analyst Jill Magee presented this item.

Item 8 Chief Legal Counsel: New Filings, Recent Decisions, Litigation Calendar (info)

Chief Legal Counsel Shelton presented this item.

Item 9 Executive Director: Office, Budget, Workload Update, and Tentative Agenda Items for the October 2026, December 2026, and February 2027 Meetings (info)

Executive Director Gmur presented this item; described the loss of access to the Commission office due to a burst pipe and fire in the office building; that the Commission's office would be closed August 14 – August 18 for needed repairs. Executive Director Gmur announced that Carla Shelton would be retiring at the end of August, that staff wishes her the best, and that she would be missed. Ms. Shelton thanked her colleagues and managers for her rewarding career and stated that she looked forward to a retirement focused on health and family. Chairperson Perrault asked if there was any additional public comment on this announcement. Mr. Ken Louie, Chief Legal Counsel for the Department of Finance congratulated Carla on her retirement. Executive Director Gmur continued presenting the report, and described the Commission's outreach efforts, budget, and workload.

Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any public comments on Items 7, 8, or 9. There was no response. Assistant Executive Director Supachana stated that there were no public comments online or in person. Chairperson Perrault asked if there were any comments from the Members. There was no response. Chairperson Perrault congratulated Ms. Shelton on her retirement.

CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 11126 AND 11126.2 (info/action)

The Commission adjourned into closed executive session at 11:15 a.m., pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e). The Commission met in closed session to confer with and receive advice from legal counsel for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the pending litigation listed on the published notice and agenda; to confer with and receive advice from legal counsel regarding potential litigation; and to confer on personnel matters pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1).

A. PENDING LITIGATION

To confer with and receive advice from legal counsel, for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the following matters pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e):

1. *California Attorneys, Administrative Law Judges and Hearing Officers in State Employment (CASE) v. California Environmental Protection Agency* Alameda County Superior Court, Case No. 26CV192463

A. POTENTIAL LITIGATION

To confer with and receive advice from legal counsel, for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the following matter pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e):

Based on existing facts and circumstances, there is a specific matter which presents a significant exposure to litigation against the Commission on State Mandates, its members or staff.

B. PERSONNEL

To confer on personnel matters pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1).

RECONVENE IN PUBLIC SESSION

At 11:30 a.m., the Commission reconvened in open session.

REPORT FROM CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION

Chairperson Perrault reported that the Commission met in closed executive session pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e). The Commission conferred with and received advice from legal counsel for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the pending litigation listed on the public notice and agenda, and conferred with and received advice from legal counsel regarding potential litigation, and, pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1) to confer on personnel matters.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairperson Perrault asked for a motion to adjourn. Member Adams made the motion to adjourn the meeting. Chairperson asked for a second to the motion. Member Pahland seconded the motion. Executive Director Gmur called the roll. The August 14, 2026, meeting was adjourned at 11:31 a.m., by a vote of 5-0 with Member Gallegos absent.

Juliana F. Gmur
Executive Director

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ON STATE MANDATES

PUBLIC MEETING

FRIDAY, AUGUST 14, 2026

10:00 A.M.

MEETING HELD AT

THE JESSE M. UNRUH STATE OFFICE BUILDING

915 CAPITOL MALL

ROOM 121, THE BOARDROOM

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

AND

VIA ZOOM

VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS PLATFORM

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY:
KATHRYN S. SWANK
Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 13061
Registered Professional Reporter

SWANK REPORTING INC.
Telephone (916) 390-7731
KathrynSwankCSR@sbcglobal.net

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

MICHELE PERRAULT
Representative for Joe Stephenshaw
Department of Finance
(Chairperson of the Commission)

WILLIAM PAHLAND
Representative for FIONA MA
State Treasurer
(Vice Chairperson of the Commission)

LEE ADAMS III
Sierra County Supervisor
Local Agency Member

ALEXANDER POWELL
Representative for SAMUEL ASSEFA, Director
Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation

DEBORAH GALLEGOS
Representative for MALIA COHEN
State Controller

KAREN GREENE ROSS
Public Member

---o0o---

COMMISSION STAFF

JULIANA GMUR
Executive Director

DENNIS SUPACHANA
Assistant Executive Director

CAMILLE N. SHELTON
Chief Legal Counsel

A P P E A R A N C E S   C O N T I N U E D

COMMISSION STAFF
(Continued)

ANNA BARICH
Commission Counsel

JILL MAGEE
Program Analyst

CARLA SHELTON
Senior Legal Analyst

HUSHAM HAROUN
Information Technology Specialist I

---o0o---

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS

MICHAEL BENNER
City of Sacramento, Claimant
(Item 2)

TARA FONSECA
County of Santa Clara, Claimant
(Item 2)

JENNIFER DUPRÉ
County of Sutter, Claimant
(Item 2)

ARTHUR PALKOWITZ
Counsel for City of Sacramento, County of
Santa Clara, County of Sutter, Claimants
(Item 2)

MARK ASPESI
County of Sacramento, Claimant
(Item 3)

HOWARD GEST
Counsel for County of Los Angeles, Claimant
(Item 4)

BRETT HAYNES
State Controller's Office
(Item 4)

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS
(Continued)

KEN HOWELL
State Controller's Office
(Item 4)

KEN LOUIE
Chief Counsel, Department of Finance
(Item 9)

---o0o---

ERRATA SHEET

Page	Line	Correction
10	2	or the meeting is ~~jumped~~ bumped
14	17	~~CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT~~ MS. GMUR
23	17	fiscal year ~~to~~ 2017-2018
24	17	~~which~~ with
25	13	documentation~~al~~
25	17	~~allow~~ are not
48	8	I'm ~~not~~ sure
53	12	claim. There's no individual names.
69	7	The ~~Commission~~ case was dismissed

I N D E X

I N D E X   C O N T I N U E D

I N D E X   C O N T I N U E D

---o0o---

FRIDAY, AUGUST 14, 10:03 A.M.

---o0o---

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Good morning. The meeting of the Commission on State Mandates will come to order. Welcome to our hybrid meeting.

For those participating in person, I do have some housekeeping information. On the table at the back of the room are paper copies of the meeting's notice, agenda, new filings, and witness list. The electronic public hearing binder is also located there on a laptop.

Please note that the room is microphoned, so speakers and microphones on all devices must say muted for the duration of the meeting to eliminate feedback noise.

When called up for an item, the parties and witnesses will please come to the table and sit at a designated laptop. For those participating remotely, the materials for today's meeting, including the notice, agenda, new filings, and witness lists are all available on the Commission's website at www.csm.ca.gov.

When being sworn in at the beginning of the hearing and when called for an item, the parties and witnesses will please turn on their video and unmute their microphone. At the conclusion of the item, please turn off the video and mute the microphone.

In the event we experience technical difficulties or the meeting is jumped offline, we will restart and allow time for people to rejoin before recommencing the meeting.

If we are unable to restart, a notice will be posted on the Commission's website listing the items to be heard at the next meeting.

Please remember to speak slowly and accurately for the benefit of the court reporter and an accurate transcript of the hearing.

Juliana, will you please call the roll.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Here.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos.

(No response.)

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Here. Can you hear me? Here.

MS. GMUR: Yes.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Okay.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Greene Ross.

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Here.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Pahland.

MEMBER PAHLAND: Here.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Perrault.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Here.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Powell.

MEMBER POWELL: Here.

MS. GMUR: Madam Chair, we have a quorum.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. Thank you so much.

We will go ahead then and move on to Item Number 1.

Are there any objections to or additional corrections of the June 12th, 2026, minutes?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Seeing none, are there any public comments on this item?

(No response.)

MR. SUPACHANA: Madam Chair, there are no public comments online or in the room.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. Seeing none, if there are no further questions from the members or further discussion, is there a motion to approve the minutes as presented?

MEMBER GALLEGOS: I will move.

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Moved by Member Gallegos and seconded by Member Greene Ross.

If we could please have a roll call.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos.
MEMBER GALLEGOS: Aye.
MS. GMUR: Ms. Greene Ross.
MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Aye.
MS. GMUR: Mr. Pahland.
MEMBER PAHLAND: Aye.
MS. GMUR: Ms. Perrault.
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Aye.
MS. GMUR: Mr. Powell.
MEMBER POWELL: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you. That motion carries.
We will now go ahead and take up public comment for matters that are not on the agenda.
MS. GMUR: Please note that the Commission may not take action on items not on the agenda.
However, it may schedule issues raised by the public for consideration at future meetings. We invite the public to comment on the matters that are on the agenda as they are taken up.
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you so much.
With that, is there any public comment today on matters not on the agenda?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Seeing none in the room.

MR. SUPACHANA: Madam Chair, there are no public comments online.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. Hearing no public comment, we'll go ahead and move on to the next item. And I will turn it back to Juliana.

MS. GMUR: There are no items on consent for this hearing.

Let's move to the swearing in.

Department of Finance notified the Commission that they will not be participating in this hearing due to a conflict.

Will the parties and witnesses for Items 2, 3, and 4, participating remotely, please be sure that both your first and last names are listed on your Zoom window for the benefit of the court reporter.

Turn on your video and unmute your microphone. And all parties and witnesses, please rise.

Item 2. On behalf of the claimants, the City of Sacramento, the County of Santa Clara, and the County of Sutter, participating remotely, please state your names for the record.

MR. BENNER: Michael Benner on behalf of the City of Sacramento.

MS. FONSECA: Tara Fonseca on behalf of the County of Santa Clara.

MS. DUPRÉ: District Attorney Jennifer Dupré on behalf of the County of Sutter, in lieu of Jeffrey Greeson.

MR. PALKOWITZ: Arthur Palkowitz on behalf of the claimants.

MS. GMUR: Thank you.

Item 3. On behalf of Claimant, the County of Sacramento, participating remotely, please state your name for the record.

MR. ASPESI: Mark Aspesi, County of Sacramento.

MS. GMUR: Thank you.

Item 4, on behalf the claimant, the County of Los Angeles, participating remotely, please state your name for the record.

MR. GEST: Howard Gest, of Burhenn and Gest, on behalf of Claimant, County of Los Angeles.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: And now, for the State Controller's Office, participating remotely, please state your names for the record.

MR. HAYNES: Hi. Brett Haynes on behalf of the State Controller's office.

MR. HOWELL: Ken Howell, also on behalf of the State Controller's Office.

MS. GMUR: Thank you.

(Parties/witnesses stood to be sworn or affirmed.)

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony which you are about to give is true and correct based on your personal knowledge, information, or belief?

(Affirmative responses.)

MS. GMUR: Thank you.

We now ask the presenters for Items 3 and 4, participating remotely, to please turn off their video and mute their microphones.

Next is Item 2. Chief Legal Counsel Camille Shelton will please present a proposed decision on Race-Blind Charging, 24-TC-07.

MS. SHELTON: Good morning. This test claim addresses Penal Code section 741, which requires County and City agencies that prosecute felonies and misdemeanors to develop and implement a process to inform an -- to perform an initial race blind review and evaluation of a case before the prosecutor's ordinary evaluation for potential charging of a crime, based on information that has been redacted to remove the direct means of identifying the race of the suspect, victim, or witness.

The purpose of the test claim statute is to reduce the potential for unconscious bias in the criminal charging process.

No comments were received on the draft proposed decision. Staff recommends that the Commission approve this test claim as specified in the proposed decision and authorize staff to make any technical and nonsubstantive changes to the decision following the hearing.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Parties and witnesses, please state your names for the record again. Mr. Palkowitz, Mr. Benner, Ms. Fonseca --

MR. PALKOWITZ: Good morning. Arthur Palkowitz on behalf of the claimants.

MR. BENNER: Michael Benner on behalf of the City of Sacramento.

MS. FONSECA: Tara Fonseca on behalf of the County of Santa Clara.

MS. DUPRÉ: Jennifer Dupré on behalf of the County of Sutter.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Would any of the parties or witnesses would like to begin? And I'm not sure what order you would like to take it in. But I will leave it up to -- to the four of you.

MR. PALKOWITZ: Okay. Thank you.

I would like to address this matter. First of all

I would like to -- good morning to the Commission members and Commission staff.

We had an opportunity to review the proposed decision. The claimants and myself agree with the conclusions of the Commission staff, and we would ask that the commissioners approve the proposed decision.

We're here to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Are there any others that would like to provide comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. All right. Seeing none --

MR. PALKOWITZ: I believe the witnesses are available to answer any questions that the commissioners or Commission staff have.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Palkowitz. I appreciate the clarification.

Are there any -- is there any public comment on this item?

(No response.)

MR. SUPACHANA: Madam Chair, there are no public comments in the room or online.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. Thank you.

Let me go ahead then and bring it back to the members.

Are there any comments or questions from commissioners?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. Seeing none, without any further discussion, is there a motion to adopt staff recommendation?

MEMBER ADAMS: I will move.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: I will move.

MEMBER ADAMS: I would second then.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Moved by Member Gallegos and seconded by Member Lee [sic].

If I could please have a roll call.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Greene Ross.

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Pahland.

MEMBER PAHLAND: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Perrault.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Powell.

MEMBER POWELL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. That motion carries.

MS. GMUR: We now ask the presenters participating remotely for Item 2 to please turn off their video and mute their microphones.

Next is Item 3. We now ask the presenters participating remotely for Item 3 to please turn on their video and unmute their microphones.

Chief Legal Counsel Camille Shelton will please present a proposed decision and parameters and guidelines on Emergency Shelters: Persons with Pets, 24-TC-06.

MS. SHELTON: These proposed parameters and guidelines authorize reimbursement beginning January 1, 2024, for counties to provide public information about whether a cooling or warming center can accommodate persons with pets; and for cities and counties to post on their websites specified information for pet emergency preparedness.

No substantive comments have been filed on these proposed parameters and guidelines.

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed decision and parameters and guidelines and authorize staff to make any technical, nonsubstantive changes to the decision and parameters and guidelines following the hearing.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Parties and witnesses, if you would please state your name for the record.

MR. ASPESI: Mark Aspesi on behalf of Sacramento County.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you so much.

Mr. Aspesi for the claimant, County of Sacramento, would you like to begin.

MR. ASPESI: Yes. Actually, I was just here for more for if there's any comments. I mean, we agree with the -- you know, the parameters and guidelines. And have -- we issue no comments, have no concerns. So just here if there's any questions.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you. Appreciate you being available for questions.

With that, is there any public comment on this item?

(No response.)

MR. SUPACHANA: Madam Chair, there are no public comments in person or online.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you so much.

Let me go ahead and bring this back to the members, then.

Are there any questions from the members on this item?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. Seeing none, without further discussion, is there a motion to adopt staff recommendation?

MEMBER POWELL: Madam Chair, I will move to adopt the recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. Moved by Mr. Powell.

Is there a second?

MEMBER ADAMS: I would second.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Seconded by Mr. Adams.

If we could please have a roll call.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Greene Ross.

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Pahland.

MEMBER PAHLAND: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Perrault.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Powell.

MEMBER POWELL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you so much. That motion carries.

MS. GMUR: We now ask the presenters participating remotely for Item 3 to please turn off their video and mute their microphones.

Next is Item 4. We now ask the presenters participating remotely for Item 4 to please turn on their video and unmute their microphones.

I note, for the record, that we have received two public comments that were filed after close of business yesterday. They were filed by interested persons. And we have, although it is not required, been able to serve those items and get them out for everyone.

And with that, Commission Counsel Anna Barich will please present a proposed decision on an incorrect reduction claim on Child Abduction and Recovery, 25-4237-I-05.

MS. BARICH: Good morning. This incorrect reduction claim addresses reductions made to the costs claimed by the County of Los Angeles for salaries and benefits to implement the Custody of Minors - Child Abduction and Recovery Program during the audit period from July 1st, 2017, through June 30th, 2021.

This program requires district attorneys' offices to actively assist in the resolution of child custody problems including visitation disputes, the enforcement of child custody decrees, and of any other order of the court in a child custody proceeding.

The Controller found all the claimant's costs totaling over $10 million over the audit period to be unallowable.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the incorrect reduction claim for the following reasons:

First, the Controller's audit was untimely initiated with respect to fiscal year 2017-2018 reimbursement claim, as the Controller initiated the audit more than three years after the claimant filed its claim, and since no appropriation -- and since an appropriation was made for the program for that fiscal year, the audit period cannot be tolled.

Therefore, the audit for fiscal year to 2017-2018 is void.

In addition, the Controller's finding that the claimant's source documentation, in its entirety, does not comply with the parameters and guidelines, is incorrect as a matter of law, and is arbitrary, capricious, and entirely lacking in evidentiary support.

Although the Controller has authority to audit the records to verify the actual amount of mandated costs, the courts have held that the Controller's Office is required to comply with the regulatory requirements of the parameters and guidelines when auditing for State-mandated costs, and the interpretation of the documentation requirements in the parameters and guidelines is a question of law.

Here, the Controller found all costs unallowable primarily because the County did not provide contemporaneous source documentation to support the mandated function -- to support the mandated functions performed or the actual number of hours devoted to each function, and did not include a description of the specific activities or cases the employee worked on.

However, the claimant provided contemporaneous source documents in the form of timesheets, signed daily, which are expressly allowed by the parameters and guidelines as adequate source documentation, which descriptions and time spent on each reimbursable activity listed in the parameters and guidelines and time spent on activities that fell outside of the mandate.

This complies with the parameters and guidelines requirements that source documents for salaries and benefits costs be identifiable to each reimbursable activity.

No additional evidence is required by the parameters and guidelines to document the costs incurred.

Thus, the Controller's reduction for all costs on this basis is incorrect as a matter of law.

However, the Controller also found some of the claimant's individual timesheets had deficiencies, which the claimant did not dispute in this IRC, and that issue is not before the Commission.

The reimbursement claims should, therefore, be remanded back to the Controller to reinstate those amounts incorrectly reduced on the grounds that all timesheets did not conform to the documentational requirements in the parameters and guidelines.

Additionally, staff finds that Controller's assertion -- that costs related to "good cause" cases under Penal Code section 278.7 allow reimbursable -- is incorrect as a matter of law. These costs are within the scope of the mandate and are eligible for reimbursement until the defendant first appears in court on a criminal charge.

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt this proposed decision approving this incorrect reduction claim; and authorize staff to make any technical, nonsubstantive changes to the proposed decision following the hearing.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Will the parties and witnesses please state your name for the record.

MR. GEST: Howard Gest, of Burhenn and Gest, on behalf of Claimant, County of Los Angeles.

MR. HAYNES: Brett Haynes from the State Controller's Office, on behalf of the State Controller's Office.

MR. HOWELL: Ken Howell, State Controller's Office, Division of Audits.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Mr. Gest, for the claimant, County of Los Angeles, would you like to begin?

MR. GEST: Yes. Thank you.

Good morning, Chairman -- Chairperson and Members of the Commission.

As staff indicates, this is an incorrect reduction claim challenging the State Controller's disallowance in its entirety of reimbursement to the County for services mandated by the Custody of Minors - Child Abduction and Recovery Program.

There are four fiscal years at issue: The first, 2017 through 2018; and then the next three subsequent years.

The County supports the proposed decision and requests the Commission to adopt it.

The County is proud of the work that its District Attorney's Office and investigators did during this period.

During the audit period, the County filed 141 cases. It declined 244 additional cases. It handled 112 Hague Convention matters. Its investigators opened 535 civil recovery cases.

The DA's office and the investigators expended 67,328 hours on these matters. And this resulted in recovery or reunification of over 300 minors.

The State Controller's Office admits and concedes that mandated activities were performed. They don't dispute that.

However, in their audit, they devalued all of this work as zero. This was, as the proposed decision finds, arbitrary and capricious.

In support of its work, the County submitted employee timesheets as well as other documentation. As noted, the parameters and guidelines specifically provide that employee timesheets are contemporaneous source documents.

The County -- this program has been in place since

1979. The County has submitted claims every year.

Since 1994, they have been using the same documentation. And every year, the Controller's Office found the documentation to be sufficient and awarded costs, up until the 2017-2018 audit period.

Each timesheet is filled out by an employee on a daily basis. Each timesheet is certified by the employee as true and correct. Each timesheet is reviewed by a supervisor for accuracy.

And as noted, Section V of the parameters and guidelines specifically provides that timesheets are acceptable.

Each timesheet further divides the time between reimbursable and nonreimbursable time. Each timesheet further breaks down the reimbursable time into the four different categories that are set forth in the parameters and guidelines.

As the proposed decision finds, these were contemporary source documents, consistent with what the parameters and guidelines provides. And it was arbitrary and capricious for the Controller's Office to find otherwise.

As the draft decision indicates, there were two other issues:

The first issue was whether the audit for the

2017/2018 fiscal year was timely. Government Code Section 1558.5 provides that an audit has to be initiated within three years of the filing of the claim.

Here, the claim was filed on February 1st, 2019, but the audit was not initiated within five -- three years. It was initiated on August 5th, 2022, more than three years after the date.

And the -- there was no exception that applies to this rule in -- because the -- there was an appropriation, and there was reimbursement for the claim. So the statute on its face, in its plain meaning, clearly provides that it had to be initiated within three years. And, in fact, in its comments on the proposed decision, the Controller doesn't challenge this finding.

Finally, there was, as noted, the issue of whether the County was entitled for what they call "good cause" matters or "good cause" reimbursement.

Good cause is not a specific type -- case. What it is, is when a parent reasonably determines that it has a good cause to keep custody of a child, even though they may not have the custody order, they can raise that as a defense. As the -- the decision notes, this is covered by, and has been covered in the past, by the parameters and guidelines.

This Commission, earlier this year, in another child custody matter involving the County of Sacramento, found that good cause matters were reimbursable. And that is similarly found and should be found here.

As noted, there were a few questions as to whether some of the timesheets were properly filled out. We have no objection to addressing those issues on remand, although we will note that they are very minor, and as long as it is contained to that issue, we have no objection.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Gest.

Mr. Haynes and Mr. Howell for the State Controller's office, do you have any comments?

MR. HAYNES: Yes. Thank you very much. Thank you, commissioners.

I know I stated before, my name is Brett Haynes. And on behalf of the State Controller, thank you for giving us the opportunity to address you today why we think, at least, that this proposed decision should not be adopted as it is currently drafted.

We at least believe that there are certain ambiguities in the decision that may lead to abuse of the state-mandated claims system in the future. We want to address some of those.

As to the entire decision, the State Controller's Office generally stands by the written comments that it submitted, so I'm not going to be going over, you know, the decision regarding the timeliness of the audit or the good cause decision.

However, we did want to bring particular attention to some of the ambiguities in the decision, specifically in the conclusion and Section C of the decision, which we think, in our view, need additional clarification in order to protect the state-mandated system.

Specifically, in the conclusion, on bullet point 2, the conclusion that reads, "The reimbursement claims are remanded back to the Controller to reinstate those amounts incorrectly reduced on the grounds that all timesheets did not conform to the documentation requirements of the P&Gs."

To us, it is not entirely clear what this recommendation at -- what it means.

Is the Commission explicitly recommending that we reimburse all of the requested amounts to LA on the basis that these timesheets, as source documents and the timesheets alone, are enough for reimbursement?

Or is the Commission stating that we need to reimburse LA County for the costs that were disallowable only because we did not initially view those timesheets to be source documents under the P&Gs, but where there is otherwise corroborating evidence?

So essentially, to put it another way, is the timesheets alone enough?

To the extent that the Commission's decision is intended to be read as a single source evidence rule, where the timesheets in and of themselves are self-validating documents, that in an audit do not need to be supported by any other evidence, the State Controller's Office would be significantly concerned.

We are concerned not about what we do when a record is shown to be inaccurate, but what we do when the accuracy of those documents just cannot be substantiated.

Does this decision mean that a single source document alone is enough?

Not only would that affect our ability to audit these in all mandated claims moving forward, but it would essentially mean that there's -- that there's a decision that local entities would not actually need to perform the mandated activity; only that they produce a single qualifying source document stating that they did.

Our purview of the audit is to make sure that the state-mandated activity actually occurred, which is why we look, you know, holistically at all the documents.

With that in mind, local agencies can read this decision in a light most advantageous to maximize their recovery by either not keeping good records -- because if -- if the standard is, if they can produce a source document that's qualified under the P&Gs, and they have absolutely no records to support that documentation, but, likewise, in our audit we cannot find any records that disprove that assertion, that would be enough.

So, for example, an invoice -- and I'm sorry to use a -- insert a hypothetical. But an invoice could be a source document. An invoice -- if we audit and the invoice is for the purchase of a 100-foot giant golden chicken, for instance -- and, again, I apologize for the absurd hypothetical -- and we cannot find the chicken, we cannot see that the -- that anybody paid for it, we don't know where it is. But everyone says, "Oh, we bought it, and here's an invoice that's a qualifying source document." Are we therefore mandated to pay that -- that mandated cost because a single source document exists absent other evidence?

So for that reason, we think that additional clarification is needed to the scope and extent of this to prevent, really, a door being opened to an abuse of the system.

And I think that our audit manager, Ken Howell, can not only answer a lot of questions pertaining to this audit and audits regarding this mandated claim in general, but can speak to what he saw in the field regarding time records and the implications of this decision.

I am always happy to answer any questions. But I will pass it to Ken to sort of talk about what we saw in this audit even with the -- even if we considered the timesheets to be qualifying source documents and what we see generally in these audits. And why we typically look for additional substantiation.

MR. HOWELL: Thank you, Brett.

So I just want to highlight some of the additional reasons why substantiation -- additional substantiation should be required here.

For instance -- and I will talk -- and I won't talk specifically about LA. I will just talk about over the last six years of auditing probably 14 or 15 different counties at this point.

We have interviewed employees who have stated that they work on multiple different assignments throughout the year and aren't specifically assigned to just the Child Abduction Recovery Program. They might work on auto theft. They might work on a little bit of CAR. They might be pulled away from working on different assignments.

But, oftentimes, when we pull the records, we actually look at the actual contemporaneous source documentation, it might show their time as being 100 percent to the CAR program.

So a lot of times, we go out and we interview people, we're getting contradictory information. So you have got a contemporaneous source document that may have all the required elements, but we're also getting contradictory information. We're not sure exactly how to treat that in light of this decision today.

Since these are different timesheets -- and I know other agencies have called them "time studies" -- they don't often get the level of scrutiny that, say, the actual payroll documents receive. So a lot of times agent- -- or agencies or, again, individual interviews will say, "Oh, yeah. We were just told to fill these out. Or we fill them out at the end of the month. I just look back at my calendar. I just kind of put some time down. I wasn't really sure. I just kind of gave best guess" sort of thing. Okay.

So, again, contradictory information. Can you really trust the numbers that are there? Is there any additional substantiation to validate the actual time that's on the time records? Calls that into question as well.

Now, a lot of agencies don't have a formal standardized process for claiming time for reimbursement. Now, in the case of LA, they did.

Those records obviously were consistent for the -- for the four-year audit period. I won't address things back, you know, beyond outside the scope of our individual audit here. But at least for four years, the records were -- were relatively consistent in terms of the four major criteria. Obviously, the individual time increments for -- for -- on a daily basis; and then for those certain individuals.

We found some inconsistencies with the actual time records themselves, as Mr. Gest pointed out. But we did see those as well, which is very common for this particular program.

Now, in the -- in the case of LA, I think one of the supervisors actually told us that when they actually review it, they review it to make sure that the vacation and sick time wasn't being claimed on the SB90 forms. But they don't go back and validate any of the actual time that's being placed on it for the individual days, for the individual activities. They are just making sure that, say, vacation and sick time isn't being doubled up.

Okay. So they are signing it, attesting that it is accurate. But they are not actually checking to make sure that it's accurate. But they are certainly signing it.

Now, in the case of those individual agencies that don't have, say, separate line items that specifically exclude certain activities, which is after that -- the person's first appearance in a court, say if it is all lumped together, in one big pool. You know, whether it be individual dates for, say, 168 hours for a month period. Or it might just say CAR activities and no differentiation between the different types of activities.

We don't know what is unallowable based on that. We don't have any sort separate line item or anything to be able to further look at to determine, did they claim unallowable time after the first -- person's first appearance in a Califor- -- we don't know. We just simply don't know that, based on that -- those regards.

So, obviously, the overall inconsistencies within the records call into question the overall accuracy of the records, which, for us, would then require additional level of substantiation or validation of those records.

So, historically, we have always pulled those time records and questioned and costs that appear to be unsupported. And in terms of determining whether or not those costs are supported, we're going to be asking for additional information to say, okay, is it -- is eight hours really eight hours? Did you really work a hundred percent on this program? Is it -- what else do you have to be able to validate these costs?

The way that this decision reads right now, we actually think it is a -- it is kind of a major risk factor for potentially inflated claims in the future because we all know every single agency is going to read this in -- in the most advantageous way for them personally, which makes sense. Of course they would.

We're just asking for more clarity on the Commission's position related to the documentations themselves and provide greater clarity, not only for us as auditors for the State Controller's Office collectively, but then also for the agencies too, in terms of the level of documentation that is required.

Again, as Brett had mentioned, is it just the source doc alone? If it meets all the required elements, is that alone enough? Or are we allowed to find some? And if we find contradictory evidence, what do we do?

So thank you. I will be able to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Let me go ahead now and bring it back. I don't know if staff would like to make any comments in response to any of the parties and witnesses.

MS. SHELTON: Yes. Anna, I will take a first shot. And if you want to dovetail, feel free.

First of all, this decision makes it very clear that we're not looking at all different audits that the Controller has done. I -- we purposely did not look at the audit reports that the claimant put into this record.

There is an argument that the Controller is using an underground regulation.

This decision does not get into that. We do not make any findings on the other audits that you are performing.

So this decision is limited just to the County of LA and the evidence in the record with respect to County of LA.

A couple of things:

One, this is the first time the Commission has ever received an incorrect reduction claim when there has been contemporaneous source documentation on salary and benefits. We have never received this type of an incorrect reduction claim before.

In typical cases, it is where a claimant will not even provide any kind of contemporaneous source documentation, and, instead, they estimate their time or provide a declaration way after the fact. And there has been some questions by the Controller's Office on the reliability of those -- of that type of documentation.

This -- this is the first time that this has occurred. And it does have a long history.

The contemporaneous source document rule was put into the boilerplate language in 2010. Before it was put into the boilerplate language, it was -- the -- the rule was litigated in *Clovis Unified School District v. John Chiang.* In that case, they were alleging an underground reg. But that case is also important for a couple of other factors:

One, it determined that the parameters and guidelines, which are -- identify the source documents that are required for claiming are regulatory in nature. They are binding on the parties. And so that has to be determined first.

Two, the language in the Ps&Gs was proposed by the Controller. The Controller identified timesheets as reliable, contemporaneous source documents on their own, and indicated that claimants may provide additional documentation with respect to that.

So under the parameters and guidelines, the claimant, when claiming salaries and benefits, has to provide contemporaneous source documentation showing the validity of the costs.

The salaries and benefits have to be identified to -- identifiable to each reimbursable activity identified in the Ps&Gs, and the claim has to identify the employee, show the classification of the employee, describe the mandated functions, which are the reimbursable activities performed, specify the actual number of hours devoted to each function, the productive hourly rate, and the related benefits.

And when you look at these Ps&Gs, those are the only requirements for salaries and benefits.

When they were claiming -- if they are claiming costs for food and lodging and other materials and supplies for a child, then the Ps&Gs require an itemization of that.

If they are claiming costs for foster care for a child, then the parameters and guidelines require them to identify the child when claiming.

But there are no additional requirements for claiming salaries and benefits.

That said, if the Controller was reviewing these contemporaneous source documents that we have in this record here, which do identify the actual time spent on the reimbursable activities, and they are done on a daily basis -- they are signed by the employee and there's no reason to question the reliability of those timesheets unless the Controller had interviews -- I would agree, if the Controller had interviews with a county staff and the staff said, "Well, I don't know if this is correct or not," or you had other information to question -- that is within your audit authority.

But the final audit report is not written that way. It is written as if all timesheets were not contemporaneous. They are all reduced to zero because no additional -- no contemporaneous documents were prepared or filed.

And that is the reason for the denial or the -- the recommendation to approve the incorrect reduction claim here.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Can I ask a question here?

Is it -- is all of this a moot point because the audits were started too late anyway?

MS. SHELTON: Only on the first year. So only the first-year reimbursement claim is void because that audit was started too late. So there -- we have valid jurisdiction of the three --

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Got it.

MS. SHELTON: -- remaining years.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Okay. Let me -- I will go ahead and bring it back to the Commission.

But before I do that, let me just see if there's any general public comment on this item.

MR. GEST: And -- and, Ms. Chairman, I would like to respond to the state Controller's statements, if I may, for two or three minutes.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Very quickly, Mr. Gest, please.

MR. GEST: Okay. The Controller's Office raises a hypothetical. Okay? They are not saying that what they are stating applies to this particular audit. They are -- as they say, they are worried about what happens in the future. So it's a hypothetical.

I want it to be very clear that in the audit here -- and I can read from their audit -- they reviewed the annual mandated cost claims filed by the County. They complete an internal control questionnaire by interviewing key county staff employees. We reviewed time records. They were provided with case files and talked to employees.

So this is not a situation -- this case is not a situation that the Controller's Office is saying in the hypothetical. If they have a concern about future documentation, it can be brought up in future audits and addressed by the Commission at that time.

But that doesn't apply to this particular case, and they don't contend that it applies for this particular case.

And I should note that they have ways of advising counties as to what kind of documentation that are required. They have a cost manual that people are supposed to address. They can -- they can advise people of what they might be looking for in that manual. They can always seek to amend the parameters and guidelines.

But I just want to reiterate that their hypothetical does not apply to this case and should not interfere with the Commission's adoption of the proposed decision.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

MS. SHELTON: Madam Chair, can I just make clear. The recommendation here is to approve the incorrect reduction claim on the ground that they denied all in their entirety.

On a remand, they certainly have audit authority to determine that individual timesheets are problematic and to not count those.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Yes. Thank you. I appreciate the clarification.

Let me just -- I will go ahead, Mr. Haynes, in light of allowing Mr. Gest a rebuttal for two minutes, if you have additional comments that are quick -- also under two minutes -- I will allow it.

And then I do need to bring it back to the Commission and public comment.

MR. HAYNES: Yeah. And that's fine. And all comments taken, you know, as they are stated. And I appreciate staff's additional clarification.

So -- so what I heard is, on remand, just so we're clear, the State Controller still has audit ability to substantiate the time. You know, irrespective of LA -- and they very well may and have submitted substantial documentation showing that they perform state-mandated activities. Irrespective of that, we do -- we can review the timesheets to see if they are substantiated to make sure a mandated activity actually occurred. Or are we, you know, on this decision, relegated to, we add up the hours on the timesheet; we see if they match the amount of hours that's claimed, and that's enough. That's -- that's the clarity that we need.

MS. SHELTON: Okay. The source documentation requirements are required by the Ps&Gs, which are regulatory. All they have to provide are the timesheets, which are contemporaneous, unless you have issues with that, that they are not contemporaneous -- but from our view, they are -- and they have to identify the reimbursable activities. They should be signed by the employee. That is enough under the parameters and guidelines for reimbursement.

But the record indicates that there were some timesheets with problems. Some were not signed. I don't know what other problems existed. But there were individual problems with timesheet.

Then that certainly is within your audit authority to determine whether those individual timesheets are reliable or not.

We haven't seen them.

But the argument, on its face, that the -- everything is denied, because all they provided were contemporaneous timesheets, is not legally correct under these Ps&Gs. That's all they have to provide.

If the Controller wanted additional information, the Controller can amend -- request that the Commission amend the Ps&Gs.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Okay. I appreciate the information from all sides.

If I can go ahead now and bring it back, is there any general public comment either in the room or online on this item?

(No response.)

MR. SUPACHANA: Madam Chair, there are no public comments in person or online.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you so much.

Let me go ahead now and bring it back to the Commission.

Are there comments or questions from members?

Yes, Mr. Pahland.

MEMBER PAHLAND: All right. This is for the Controller's Office.

If I understand your argument, it's that timesheets themselves are not sufficient evidence of services performed.

Is that an accurate summary of your argument? Yes or no?

MR. HAYNES: They -- they may not be. They may not be.

MEMBER PAHLAND: What -- what other evidence of services performed do you envision existing other than timesheets?

MR. HAYNES: Well, it's -- it's whether the timesheets are substantiated with other evidence.

So in circumstances where, let's say, for instance, they --

MEMBER PAHLAND: Let me get to the heart of it. What other evidence would exist that somebody performed work other than their contemporaneous record of having performed that work?

MR. HAYNES: I'm not sure.

Ken, do you have examples of other audits you have done, what you have linked with timesheets, to show the work?

MR. HOWELL: Correct. Yeah. It would be -- and I -- I don't know if Camille mentioned this or not. But it was obviously addressed with the proposed decision it -- or proposed decision, was the case files and case notes.

So a lot of times, agencies will say well, you know, if you have got these time records, and we also have these case files and case notes, can we give those to you?

Sure. We will look at all of it, of course.

But oftentimes, the actual case files and the case notes don't have any sort of, you know, time increments associated with that or any sort of differentiation between, you know, is eight hours on your timesheet really eight hours? Is it an hour? Is it a half hour? Did you even work that day? Were you off that day? We don't know.

So if we looked at it -- again, if the agency gave us the case file or the case note, we would attempt to link the actual contemporaneous record to a case file or a case note and go, yeah, you did work that day. You worked eight hours on that case. It certainly appears that you did. Great.

So that -- that would be some level of substantiation or validation to the actual accuracy of the actual time record itself. But, again, as it's stated in the proposed decision, there's no requirement that they give us those case files and those case notes, because it is not written into the parameters and guidelines. That's where the whole "you can amend the parameters and guidelines if you choose to at a future date" doesn't apply to this particular IRC. Could apply to future ones if, in fact, it's adopted.

Those -- those were the sorts of things that agencies would give us out in the field over the last six years that we would look at and try to somehow substantiate the actual time records themselves.

MEMBER PAHLAND: So then I glean from your response that you are questioning whether somebody honestly completed a timesheet. You said, "I don't know if you actually worked eight hours that day although you claim to have."

MR. HOWELL: Um-hmm.

MEMBER PAHLAND: What types of professionals are the ones working on these cases? I'm assuming attorneys and law enforcement. Is that accurate or inaccurate?

MR. HOWELL: For -- for -- for the most part. Sometimes you will get investigative assistants. You might get an -- ADAs. Occasionally, you will get a DA that will work on a case. That's usually if it is going to court. You might get some -- either some higher level investigators that might be going out and searching for, you know, missing children and things like that.

It's typically those -- occasionally, you will get kind of more of a administrative individual that might also claim time for, just, recordkeeping purposes and things like that.

But those are the typical individuals that would be claiming time for this program.

MEMBER PAHLAND: So don't those types of individuals have ethical obligations and duties of honesty that go with their professions?

MR. HAYNES: Certainly. Just as --

MR. HOWELL: Yeah. Absolutely.

MR. HAYNES: -- as we all do. Of course.

MEMBER PAHLAND: All right. No further questions.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Yes. Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Thank you.

I certainly see both -- understand both sides of this issue.

It seems to me that I'm -- I'm actually amazed that this has not come up before with P&Gs. So it just seems to me that this is a reminder for all that when those are approved, make sure what you want are in those P&Gs. And it seems to me that there's always a difference between trying to validate time versus the golden chicken that is bought.

But it would seem to me whether it is a fixed asset item or time, I can under- -- I can appreciate the State wanting to be able to confirm and dig a little deeper than just the timesheet. But I guess this is a reminder to make sure how far you want to dig is in the P&Gs.

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Adams.

Others?

Yes. Mr. Powell.

MEMBER POWELL: So I have a question.

Maybe this is because I haven't seen the timesheets themselves. But you say that a -- a case record/case note, in addition to a timesheet, may be sufficient.

But my understanding -- you know, I briefly worked in DAs' offices. You know, a case note is just something you write in a file that you write at the time. You know, it is not something that anybody verifies independently.

And a timesheet is similarly something -- is contemporaneously taken; is something you write on a file and, you know, is not independently verified at that time.

And so I'm a little confused why, you know, a statement by a legal professional, that has been approved by a higher ranking legal professional, isn't sufficient. But if they had a writing on the black of a -- back of a Redweld folder, in addition to that timesheet, it would be sufficient?

I'm a little confused why that becomes acceptable, while a timesheet is not acceptable.

I file a timesheet every month --

MR. HOWELL: Sure.

MEMBER POWELL: -- and it is approved. I hope that it is not going to be rejected next month because I don't have a note.

MR. HOWELL: Sure.

Again, what -- what we have seen out in the field is we have seen -- there's a wide variety of how agencies claim these reimbursement costs. Okay?

So in the case of LA -- and I think it was -- the last gentleman that spoke that said "I'm kind of surprised this issue has never come before us," yeah, same here. I'm surprised too.

What we have seen is that agencies claim these things in a variety of ways. It might just be a gigantic general ledger dump, where it is just a total dollar amount of, you know, $300,000. That's on their claim. There's no individual time increments. There's no individual activities of the four main ones. Nothing. We have a GL dump. Okay. That's one way of doing it.

And then we have some that will just claim a time record that will just say "CAR." Again, no additional activities. Nothing else. And just a total amount of time at the end of the month: 168, 178, 767 hours, whatever. Okay. That's another way of doing it.

You have LA. LA has a different way of doing it.

County of Sacramento; they did it very differently too.

So when we -- as Brett had said, we attempt to look at this holistically based on interviews with -- with individuals that were actually responsible for putting these things together at the time. Many times, those individuals will say -- and, again, I'm not specifically mentioning LA. I'm saying in general. Because obviously, what is adopted here, people will take and kind of adopt it to the way that they are doing things in the future.

Will say things like, "Yeah, I kind of put this together just at the end of the month. I just kind of looked back at my calendar. I wasn't doing it every day. I was just doing it by the month."

Or, "The consultant told us to just put these together, and we dated them on a certain date, but we weren't doing them every month."

Okay. So when we get evidence like that, makes my brain kind of go, okay, so are these contemporaneous records? They are dated contemporaneously. They have all the required elements. But you are telling me that they are not.

So there's always this conflict between what the Ps&Gs say and what is actually happening in the field and the information that we are receiving. And we're kind of caught in the middle trying to square adherence to the guidelines, but then also making sure that we're protecting taxpayer dollars and not paying out additional costs beyond those costs that actually are allowable per the -- per the guidelines.

So there's always that push/pull in this process.

And I know I have kind of rambled, but hopefully that kind of answers your question.

MEMBER POWELL: It sounds like it to me -- thank you -- that a timesheet by itself would never be permitted.

MS. BARICH: Just to -- Mr. Powell, just to -- just to chime in, if you are interested in seeing an example of these -- of the blank timesheets that they were using, I believe you can find it on pages 48 and 49 of Exhibit A in -- in the record. The -- it shows both sides of the page, of the document.

The time -- the individual time -- the individual reimbursable activities are referenced by code numbers. And then the back sheet explains which of those code numbers are associated with which of the reimbursable activities in the parameters and guidelines.

MEMBER POWELL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Other comments or questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. You know, I will just say, I again appreciate the comments from my fellow commissioners.

I think, really, the question that -- that is being brought forward is actually more focused on whether or not the current P&Gs require enough to validate the activities that are taking place.

That being said, we have to function under what the current P&Gs are when making a decision about reimbursable activities in this case.

And so, you know, I think, as was discussed or was noted by staff, you know, if -- if there is a question -- and, again, this was brought up by several of my other commissioners around needing additional verification, in addition to the timesheets to, you know, ensure their validity -- then that needs to be illustrated in the P&Gs. And that would be something that needs to come back to be looked at to amend those.

But -- but I think the decision before us today has to be taken into consideration with the current P&Gs that are before us and what they require.

So with that, let me ask, just one more time, if there's any other further discussion.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. Seeing none, and seeing no additional public comment, is there a motion to adopt staff recommendation or otherwise on this item?

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Move to adopt.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Moved by Greene Ross.

Is there a second?

MEMBER POWELL: I will second.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Seconded by Mr. Powell.

If I could please have a roll call.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Greene Ross.

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Pahland.

MEMBER PAHLAND: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Perrault.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Powell.

MEMBER POWELL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. That motion carries.

So we will now go ahead and move on to our next item.

MS. GMUR: Next, Assistant Executive Director Dennis Supachana will please present Item 5, Salary Adjustment: Executive Director, pursuant to Government

Code Section 17530.

MR. SUPACHANA: Good morning.

At the Commission meeting on June 12, 2026, in closed session, the Commission members conducted an annual evaluation of the performance of Executive Director Juliana Gmur.

The Executive Director position has a salary range of $18,859 to $19,319 per month.

Ms. Gmur was appointed as Executive Director to the Commission on November 12, 2024, with a salary at the bottom of the range, and now she is eligible for a salary judgment.

The Commission may approve an increase of approximately 3 percent to the maximum salary of 9,319- -- $19,319, effective on July 1st, 2026.

If the Commission decides to adjust the Executive Director's salary, staff recommends this motion for a vote: I move to adjust the Executive Director's monthly salary -- salary to -- please state an amount -- effective July 1st, 2026, and direct staff to work with CalHR.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Are there any comments and questions from the public on this item?

(No response._

MR. SUPACHANA: Madam Chair, there are no public comments in person or online.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. Thank you so much.

Let me go ahead then and bring it back to the Commission.

Comments or questions from commissioners?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. Seeing none, we do have a motion before us. And I will go ahead and just read the motion one more time, which would be -- staff recommendation would be to move to adjust the Executive Director's monthly salary to $19,319, effective July 1st, 2026, and direct staff to work with CalHR.

Is there a motion to adopt the recommendation?

MEMBER ADAMS: Madam Chair, I so move.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Moved by Mr. Adams.

Is there a second?

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Seconded by Ms. Greene Ross.

Please have a roll call.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Greene Ross.

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Pahland.

MEMBER PAHLAND: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Perrault.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Powell.

MEMBER POWELL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. Thank you so much. That motion carries.

We'll go ahead now and move on to the next item.

MS. GMUR: Item 6. Executive -- Assistant Executive Director Dennis Supachana will please present Item 6, Salary Adjustment: Attorney to the Commission/Chief Legal Counsel (CEA B), pursuant to Government Code Section 17529.

MR. SUPACHANA: Hello again.

At the Commission meeting on June 12th, 2026, in closed session, the Commission members conducted an annual evaluation of the performance of Chief Legal Counsel Camille Shelton.

The Chief Legal Counsel position was established at the CEA B level. Ms. Shelton was appointed to her current position on December 9th, 2005.

State policy authorizes the salary of CEA incumbents, whose duties require membership in the State Bar of California, to be an increase above the applicable CEA range, to a maximum of $19,046 per month.

Ms. Shelton's current salary is $18,399 per month, which is below the maximum salary.

The Commission may approve an increase of approximately 2.5 percent to the maximum salary of $19,046, effective on July 1st, 2026.

If the Commission decides to adjust the Chief Legal Counsel salary, staff recommends this motion for a vote: I move to adjust the Chief Legal Counsel's monthly salary to -- please state an amount -- effective July 1st, 2026, and direct staff to work with CalHR.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

Are there any public comments on this item from those in the room or online?

(No response.)

MR. SUPACHANA: Madam Chair, there are no public comments in the room or online.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. Let me bring it back to the members.

Are there any comments or questions from Members?

Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Just a comment, Madam Chair. As a member who has been sitting here for nine years, I'm really pleased to see this. And I will be proud to make the motion.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you, Mr. Adams.

Any other comments before we entertain a motion?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. And just as a reminder, the motion would be, move to adjust the Chief Legal Counsel's monthly salary to $19,046, effective July 1st, 2026, and direct staff to work with CalHR.

So with that, I believe I have a motion from Mr. Adams.

Is there a second?

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Seconded by Ms. Greene Ross.

If he could please have a roll call.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos.

MEMBER GALLEGOS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Greene Ross.

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Pahland.

MEMBER PAHLAND: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Perrault.
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Aye.
MS. GMUR: Mr. Powell.
MEMBER POWELL: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you. That motion carries.
And we will now move on to Item Number 7.
MS. GMUR: Next, Program Analyst Jill Magee will please present Item 7, the Legislative Update.
MS. MAGEE: Good morning.
The following are the legislative updates since the last time the Commission met:
First, AB 2640, Commission on State Mandates: State mandates.
AB 2640 was introduced by Assembly Member Hadwick, with coauthors Assembly Members Alanis and Ellis; and Senators Niello and Seyarto.
This bill amends Government Code Section 17558.6, which requires the Controller to notify the claimant in writing within 30 days after issuance of a remittance advice of any adjustment to a claim for reimbursement that results from an audit or review.
This bill would instead require the Controller to notify the claimant in writing within 30 days of any adjustment that results from an audit or review.

The bill would also allow a local agency or school district, upon receipt of the notice, to elect, at its discretion, to have the Controller offset any reduced reimbursement, as prescribed, or to adjust the payment of claims.

On June 17th, 2026, this bill was amended, passed as amended, and was rereferred to the Senate Appropriations Committee with a recommendation to the consent calendar.

On June 18th, 2026, this bill was read a second time, amended, and rereferred to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

On June 29th, 2026, this bill was referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee Suspense File.

Next, SB 1439. Local government: omnibus bill.

SB 1439 was introduced by the Senate Committee on Local Government.

This bill amends Government Code Section 17560.

Existing law: In the event that revised claiming instructions are issued by the Controller between November 15 and February 15; provides a local agency or school district filing an annual reimbursement claim with 120 days following the issuance date of the revised instructions to file a claim.

Among other things, this bill would instead apply that provision if the revised claiming instructions are issued by the Controller between October 19 and February 15.

On June 18th, 2026, this bill was amended, was read a second time and amended, and was rereferred to the Assembly Committee on Local Government.

On July 2nd, 2026, this bill passed and was ordered to the consent calendar.

On August 3rd, 2026, this bill was read a second time and ordered to the consent calendar, was removed on the motion of Assembly Member Carrillo, and ordered to a third reading.

Next, AB 126. Education Finance: Education omnibus trailer bill.

AB 126 was introduced by the Assembly Committee on Budget on January 8th, 2025.

This bill amends Government Code Section 17581.6.

Among other things, this bill would add to the list of programs that are authorized for block grant funding, in lieu of program-specific reimbursement, to include requirements relating to the Menstrual Equity for All Act of 2021. Public School Restrooms: Menstrual Products, 22-TC-04.

On July 9th, 2026, this bill was approved by the Governor and chaptered by the Secretary of State.

Finally, AB 395. Holidays.

AB 395 was introduced by Assembly Member Gabriel.

This bill amends Government Code section 11131, the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

Among other things, this bill would require that a state agency shall make good faith reasonable efforts to avoid conducting any meeting, conference, or other function on a date for which the state agency knows, or has reason to know, that members of the public would be unable to participate or be present due to the ritual observance of a religious, cultural, or ancestral holiday.

This bill would now authorize a person who has suffered harm as a result of a violation of certain of the above provisions to bring a civil action for injunctive relief as provided.

On July 8th, 2026, this bill was amended, passed as amended, and rereferred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations with recommendation to the consent calendar. Then was read a second time, amended, and rereferred to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

On August 3rd, 2026, this bill was referred to the Senate Appropriation Committee's suspense file.

Staff will continue to monitor legislation for bills that impact the mandates process.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.
MS. GMUR: Thank you, Jill.
Next --
MEMBER GALLEGOS: I have a -- I have a question, please, on that, Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. That -- that is fine.
Did you want to do the question now? Or do you want to do the question once we do Items 7, 8, and 9?
MEMBER GALLEGOS: No. I would like to do it now.
I'm just wondering if it is necessary for us to have these items read to us? We can -- we can read it. And the only updates were the last item that took place in the legislature. Just as a matter of time. While I love to hear Jill's voice, I'm not sure that we actually just need the read-out of everything.
CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: I appreciate that, Member Gallegos. And we can certainly have a talk with staff around maybe trying to find a good middle point there.
But I think part of it, too, is -- is we are also reading it, but it is also an opportunity for us to make sure that the public is aware as well. So -- but we can certainly have a conversation with staff about finding a balanced approach for both time and information.
MEMBER GALLEGOS: That would be great. Or maybe

even new information from last time. Because these were also read to us at the last meeting.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Yeah.

MS. MAGEE: Correct. We only read the updates since the last time the Commission met and since the report was issued. Since our reports are issued during -- two weeks prior, we add anything to the script that isn't in the report.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you. Thank you for the clarification.

All right. We'll go ahead now and move it on to Item 8.

MS. GMUR: Next, Chief Legal Counsel Camille Shelton will please present Item 8, the Chief Legal Counsel Report.

MS. SHELTON: I do have something to report.

The California Attorneys, Administrative Law Judges, and Hearing Officers in State Employment, otherwise known as CASE, which is the union representing attorneys and hearing officers, has sued all state agencies. It's titled *CASE v. California Environmental Protection Agency.*

The Commission was served on June 22nd.

This case challenges state agencies' compliance with the Governor's Executive Order N-22-25, which requires employees to return to office four days per week beginning January -- or, excuse me, July 1st, 2026.

The allegation is that that compliance, and any policies adopted in compliance with that executive order, violates the law on the ground that environmental reviews under CEQA are first required to be conducted.

The Commission was dismissed without prejudice on July 28th, 2026.

I have no other litigation to report.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you.

MS. GMUR: Thank you, Camille.

And now the Executive Director's Report.

I have four information items for you.

First, the office. Access to the office.

On April 8, the Commission lost access to its office due to a burst pipe and a fire in the office building. The Commission's office was not damaged. The building reopened and Commission staff returned to the office on June 22nd.

The building will have a temporary electrical shutdown for additional repairs, which will necessitate the closure of the Commission's office from today, Friday, August 14, through Tuesday, August 18.

Retirement. After 13 years of service to the Commission as senior legal analyst, Carla Shelton will be retiring at the end of August.

In addition to being the law librarian and doing her paralegal work, Carla has been the driving force behind the reorganization of the Commission's records. She has spent the last year setting the staff up for success in the future.

While staff wishes her all the best in her retirement, her leadership and dedication will be missed.

Carla, did you want to say a couple of words?

MS. C. SHELTON: Yes.

I want to say thank you. After 25 years of California state service, including 13 years at the Commission, I am retiring.

I am grateful to my colleagues and managers for a rewarding career that allowed me to support my family and grow professionally.

I look forward to retirement focused on my health and family.

And many blessings to you all.

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: We're going to take a quick pause. I'm going to pause the Executive Director's Report to be able to just ask for -- if there's any additional public comment on this specific announcement.

MR. LOUIE: Hi, everyone. Ken Louie, Chief Counsel, Department of Finance.

I just want to say congratulations, Carla. I have had the pleasure of working with you. I just want to congratulate you on your retirement. And happy to hear the news and hope -- hope you the best.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you. All right.

We'll go ahead now and turn it back to Juliana.

MS. GMUR: Thank you, Carla. I'm going to miss you.

Okay. Outreach.

On July 29th, Camille Shelton and Jill Magee presented as a California State Association of Counties roundtable on the Commission's completeness review of test claims.

The presentation resulted in a lot of great feedback and lasted considerably longer than the 20 minutes allotted, as they fielded questions and demonstrated how to use the Commission's forms.

On July 30th, Camille Shelton and Laura Dougherty met with the State Public Defender and a member of her staff to explain the function of the Commission and state mandates.

The information was well received, and we anticipate more opportunities to work with her office.

This afternoon, Camille Shelton will be presenting an overview of mandates to the Department of Finance's staff.

Budget. The Budget Act of 2026 includes the Commission's operating budget of $3.239 million and is broken down as $2.823 million for personal services and $436,000 for operating expenses and equipment which, includes a $20,000 one-time increase to cover rent for the current fiscal year.

This is an increase of $48,000 from last fiscal year, after adjustments for salaries and benefits.

The Budget Act also included $90.607 million for local assistance or local agency-mandated programs, a decrease of $3.496 million from last fiscal year.

More details are available in the Executive Director's Report.

Workload. As of July 1, there are 36 pending test claims, 30 of which are regarding stormwater NPDES permits. In addition, there are one parameters and guidelines, eight statewide cost estimates, five incorrect reduction claims, and one proposed parameters and guidelines amendment pending.

Finally, tentative agenda items. This is a reminder to please check the tentative agenda items on the Executive Director's Report or the pending caseload documents on the Commission's website, which are updated at least bimonthly, to see when something is tentatively set for hearing.

Draft proposed decisions on all test claims and IRC matters are issued for review and comment at least eight weeks prior to the -- prior to the hearing date, and a proposed decision approximately two weeks before the hearing.

That's all I have, Madam Director.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Thank you so much.

Let me go ahead and bring it back.

I know we took the Items 7, 8, and 9 in a little bit of a bifurcated way at this time.

But are there any comments or questions from the public on either Items 7, 8, or 9? Additional public comments?

(No response.)

MR. SUPACHANA: Madam Chair, there does not appear to be any additional comments from the public online or in person.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. Let me go ahead, then, and bring it back to the members.

Are there additional comments or are there comments from members on any of those three items?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. I will just go ahead and add, also, my congratulations. I'm not sure if Carla is still online. But a congratulations to you and your retirement. You know, the Office of State Mandates is a small but very mighty team. And I know you will absolutely be missed. So we wish you the best of luck.

All right. With that -- and none of those items are action items. So we will now go ahead and move into closed session.

The Commission will meet in closed executive session pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e), to confer with and receive advice from legal counsel for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the pending litigation listed on the published notice and agenda; and to confer with and receive advice from legal counsel regarding potential litigation.

The Commission will also confer on personnel matters, pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1).

And we will reconvene in open session in approximately ten minutes.

Thank you.

(Closed session was held: 11:15 to 11:30 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. Thank you.

The Commission met in closed executive session pursuant to Government Code section 11126(e) to confer with and receive advice from legal counsel for consideration and action, as necessary and appropriate, upon the pending litigation listed on the published notice and agenda; and to confer with and receive advice from legal counsel regarding potential litigation.

The Commission also conferred on personnel matters pursuant to Government Code section 11126(a)(1).

And with no further business to discuss, I will go ahead and entertain a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER ADAMS: Madam Chair, so moved.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: All right. So moved by Mr. Adams.

And do I need to take a second on the adjournment?

MEMBER PAHLAND: I will second.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Seconded by Mr. Pahland.

Do I need a roll call for that or can I just adjourn?

MS. GMUR: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Ah. Roll call.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Adams.

MEMBER ADAMS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Gallegos did not rejoin us in open session.

Ms. Greene Ross.

MEMBER GREENE ROSS: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Pahland.

MEMBER PAHLAND: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Ms. Perrault.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Aye.

MS. GMUR: Mr. Powell.

MEMBER POWELL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON PERRAULT: Okay. All right. With that, the motion carries and the meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

(Proceedings concluded at 11:31 a.m.)

---o0o---

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, KATHRYN S. SWANK, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing proceedings were reported in shorthand by me, Kathryn S. Swank, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said proceedings nor in any way interested in the outcome of said proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 9th day of September 2026.

KATHRYN S. SWANK, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 13061

---o0o---