

# **Lake Local Agency Formation Commission**

## **Regular Meeting Agenda**

**JANUARY 15, 2014 -- 9:30 am**

**City of CLEARLAKE** – City Council Chambers

14050 Olympic Dr. Clearlake, California

*“Lake LAFCo oversees orderly development and protects natural resources and agricultural lands”*

### Commissioners

Ed. Robey, Chair (Public Member)  
Frank Gillespie (Special District Member) Jeri  
Spittler, (City Member)  
Stacy Mattina, Vice Chair (City Member)  
Gerry Mills, (Special Dist. Member)

### Alternates

Jeff Smith (County Alternate)  
Joey Luiz (City Alternate)  
Jim Abell, (Spec. District Alternate)  
Suzanne Lyons (Public Alternate)

Denise Rushing (County Member)  
Jim Comstock (County Member)

### Staff

John Benoit, Executive Officer  
P. Scott Browne, Legal Counsel  
Lora Ceccon, Clerk to the Commission

**1. Call to Order – Roll Call**

**2. Approval of Minutes – September 25, 2013 minutes**

**3. Public Comment**

This is the time for the public to address the Commission on any matter not on the agenda. Testimony related to an item on the agenda should be presented at the time that item is considered.

**4. Consent Agenda**

*Action: Review and authorize payment of expenses for November and December 2013*

**5. CONTINUED FROM November 20, 2013 - Review and amend as determined by the Commission, LAFCo's adopted Local Procedural Guidelines for Municipal Service Reviews (adopted on August 20, 2003); and LAFCo's action on April 15, 2009 regarding establishment of Municipal Service Review Advisory Committees (Adopted on April 15, 2009); LAFCo's adopted Policies and Procedures for Municipal Service Reviews (Adopted on May 20, 2009)**

*a) Review the adopted Guidelines, Minutes, and Policies*

- b) *Review of LAFCo Protocols used in the preparation of a Service Review*
  - c) *Provide direction to staff for inclusion, deletion or amendment to of any of the above and (or) take action with regarding any of the above.*
  - 6. **California Within Limits - “Establishing Boundaries, Shaping the Future” presented by Peter Detwiler at the LAFCo Symposium on December 9, 2013.**
  - 7. **Establish Regular and Alternate meeting schedule for 2014.**
    - a. *Adopt regular and alternate meeting schedule for 2014*
  - 8. **Executive Officer’ s report**
    - a. *Out of Area Services*
    - b. *City of Clearlake and Fire Service Review*
    - c. *Watershed Protection District Servie Review*
    - d. *RCD’s Service Review*
  - 9. **Commissioner Reports**
- This item is placed on the agenda for Commissioners to discuss items and issues of concern to their constituency, LAFCO, and legislative matters.
- 10. **Correspondence**
  - 11. **Adjourn to LAFCO’s next regular meeting: Wednesday March 19, 2014 in Lakeport**

*The Commission may take action upon any item listed on the agenda. Unless otherwise noted, items may be taken up at any time during the meeting.*



**Any member appointed on behalf of local government shall represent the interests of the public as a whole and not solely the interest of the appointing authority Government Code Section 56325.1**

Public Comment

Members of the public may address the Commission on items not appearing on the agenda, as well as any item that does appear on the agenda, subject to the following restrictions:

- Items not appearing on the agenda must be of interest to the public and within the Commission’s subject matter jurisdiction.
- No action shall be taken on items not appearing on the agenda unless otherwise authorized by Government Code Section 54954.2 (known as the Brown Act, or California Open Meeting Law).
- The total amount of time allotted for receiving public comment may be limited to 15 minutes.
- Any individual’s testimony may be limited to 5 minutes. Time to address the Commission will be allocated on the basis of the number of requests received.

Public Hearings

Members of the public may address the Commission on any item appearing on the agenda as a Public Hearing. The Commission may limit any person's input to 5 minutes. Written statements may be submitted in lieu of or to supplement oral statements made during a public hearing.

Agenda Materials

Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Commission after distribution of the agenda area available for review for public inspection at the City of Lakeport and City of Clearlake Community Development Departments office located at City Hall in Lakeport and Clearlake [such documents are also available on the Lake LAFCO website as noted below to the extent practicable and subject to staff's ability to post the documents prior to the meeting].

#### Accessibility

An interpreter for the hearing-impaired may be made available upon request to the Executive Officer 72 hours before a meeting.

The location of this meeting is wheelchair-accessible.

#### Disclosure & Disqualification Requirements

Any person or group of persons acting in concert who directly or indirectly contribute \$1,000 or more in support of or in opposition to a change of organization or reorganization that has been submitted to Lake LAFCO must comply with the disclosure requirements of the Political Reform Act of 1974 applicable to local initiative measures to be submitted to the electorate. These requirements contain provisions for making disclosures of contributions and expenditures at specified intervals; they may be reviewed at Government Code §§56700.1 and 81000 *et seq.* Additional information about the requirements pertaining to local initiative measures to be presented to the electorate can be obtained by calling the Fair Political Practices Commission at (916) 322-5660.

A LAFCO Commissioner must disqualify herself or himself from voting on an application involving an "entitlement for use" (such as an annexation or sphere amendment) if, within the last twelve months, the Commissioner has received \$250 or more in campaign contributions from the applicant, any financially interested person who actively supports or opposes the application, or an agency (such as an attorney, engineer, or planning consultant) representing the applicant or an interested party. The law (Government Code Section 84308) also requires any applicant or other participant in a LAFCO proceeding to disclose the contribution amount and name of the recipient Commissioner on the official record of the proceeding.

Contact LAFCO Staff LAFCO staff may be contacted at (707) 592-7528 or by mail at Lake LAFCO c/o John Benoit, Executive Officer P.O. Box 2694, Granite Bay, CA 95746 or by email at [johnbenoit@surewest.net](mailto:johnbenoit@surewest.net) or by fax at (916) 797-7631. Agenda items are located on the Lake County Webpage at <http://www.lakelafco.org>

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF LAKE COUNTY  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
November 20, 2013

**PRESENT:**

Ed Robey, Chair, Public Member  
Frank Gillespie, Special Districts Member  
Jeri Spittler, City Member  
Stacy Mattina, City Member  
Gerry Mills, Special District Member  
Denise Rushing, County Member  
Jim Comstock, County Member

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Jeff Smith, County Alternate  
Suzanne Lyons, Public Alt.  
  
John Benoit, Executive Officer  
P. Scott Browne, Legal Counsel  
Lora Ceccon, Clerk

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. There was a quorum present.

**2. Approval of Minutes – September 25, 2013**

**Commissioner J. Comstock moved to approve the September 25, 2013 minutes, second by Commissioner F. Gillespie; motion carried.**

**3. Public Comment – No public comments.****4. Consent Agenda**

**Commissioner S. Mattina moved to authorize payment of the September and October 2013 expenses, second by Commissioner J. Comstock; motion carried.**

**5. Discussion and Direction regarding a proposed Policy, Standard and Procedures amendment to address Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities**

John reviewed Exhibit A, 2.19, Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities. He stated that although there may not be any DUCs in Lake County, a policy is still required. The number of parcels (3.b) is discretionary. Discussion followed regarding certain communities in the county that would be considered DUCs.

John suggested adding, under #2, City Annexations, a requirement that the total acreage be 5 acres or more. There is also some discretion on total acreage. Additionally, there should be a requirement for the size of the annexation. Should the size of the annexation be 5 acres also? The Commission agreed that this is a good recommendation.

S. Browne advised the Commission that a certain number of parcels, is not required; can leave it at 12 registered voters. The Commission agreed to eliminate #3.b) regarding the requirement of at least 25 parcels.

John will prepare a resolution for the Commission's consideration and approval. The Commission directed staff to schedule this item under consent agenda for the next Lafco meeting.

**6. Bylaw Amendment to include detailed Records Retention Policy**

J. Benoit reviewed the Bylaw Amendment Section 5.10 © Amended Records Retention Policy. This is a comprehensive records retention policy. John has talked with both City Managers and is actively searching for a new location to store documents. Discussion followed regarding a location for storage and making documents accessible to the public. It was suggested that the issue of storage be agendaized for a future meeting.

**Commissioner G. Mills moved to approve Resolution 2013-0010 a resolution amending bylaws to include a records retention policy, second by Commissioner J. Spittler, motion carried by roll call vote. (7-0)**

**7. Discussion of Rosenberg's Rules of Order consider adoption of new rules of procedure for LAFCo.**

J. Benoit reviewed Rosenberg's Rules of Order for the Commission (included in today's agenda packet). John suggested eliminating Roberts Rules of Order and adopting Rosenberg's Rules of Order as guidelines, as they are simple and easy to understand. S. Browne stated that Rosenberg's Rules do not address how many votes it takes to pass an action. John advised the Commission that the bylaws require four votes to pass an action. Members agreed that this works well for the Commission, and has never been an issue.

John stated that the word "guidelines" should be added to the resolution. Under #2 Section 5.7(g), Conduct of Meetings in LAFCo's Bylaws is hereby amended to include the latest edition of Rosenberg's Rules of Order as a guideline to read as follows:

*Rules of Procedure*

*Except as otherwise provided herein, the rules of order governing the conduct of business at all meetings of the Commission shall be the latest edition of Rosenberg's Rules of Order to be used as a guideline.*

**Commissioner J. Comstock moved to approve Resolution No. 2013-0011 a resolution amending bylaws to adopt Rosenberg's Rules of Order, with the addition as stated above, second by Commissioner D. Rushing with**

**discussion. Mr. Dunlap asked if Commissioner Comstock meant to include the latest issue of Rosenberg's Rules. Commissioner Comstock amended his motion to include the latest issue of Rosenberg's Rules, Commissioner Rushing agreed with the amendment, motion carried by roll call vote. (7-0)**

**8. Watershed Protection district MSR Committee progress report – Betsy Cawn**

Betsy Cawn stated that a status report was provided in today's agenda packet. She also distributed a draft committee report regarding the Lake County Watershed Protection District. Ms. Cawn advised the Commission that the committee had assembled information identifying "facts" about the functions of the district. Scott DeLeon has concurred with those facts.

Commissioner D. Rushing explained why the Watershed Protection District (WPD) was formed stating that the purpose was to obtain grants. Staff believed very strongly that the WPD did not have the authority the committee is saying they have. Legal council needs to weigh in, and the Board of Supervisors is waiting for their comments.

Discussion continued regarding audit requirements, transparency and information gathering. J. Benoit stated that a WPD MSR will be prepared with the goal to complete a draft by the end of the year. The MSR is not a "got you" document, and Lafco does not get involved with personnel issues. D. Rushing said the among the purposes of the MSR is to shine a light on issues identified. The Commission directed staff to send the MSR draft to Mr. DeLeon for review and comment and then to the district board.

**9. Review and amend as determined by the Commission, LAFCo's adopted Local Procedural Guidelines for Municipal Service Reviews (adopted on August 20, 2003); and LAFCo's action on April 15, 2009 regarding establishment of Municipal Service Review Advisory Committee (Adopted on April 15, 2009); LAFCo's adopted Policies and Procedures for Municipal Service Reviews (Adopted on May 20, 2009)**

J. Benoit explained that when the guidelines were created, in 2003, no one really understood what an MSR was since no one had ever done one, and much has been learned since 2003. Lafco's guidelines are antiquated and need to be re-examined. He further explained that the level of content for an MSR is proportionate to the budget. The overall purpose of the MSR is to support the SOI.

John advised the Commission that there is no policy on the role of an MSR Committee. There is a need for some direction on an MSR Committee and their role.

Discussion followed regarding the level of detail in an MSR and the costs associated with completion of the MSR.

Break – 11:34 to 11:40

Commissioner D. Rushing stated that county staff could not attend today's meeting, so they have asked that Lafco not make a decision regarding this item until such time as they can attend and comment.

This item will be continued to the next meeting on January 15, 2014 in Clearlake.

**10. Executive Officer's report**

John advised the Commission that he will be meeting today with Special Districts regarding Paradise Cove, CSA 16. Also, a Lafco symposium will be held on December 9, 2013; 50 years of Lafco. John can forward information to those interested in attending.

- a. Callayomi Co. WD annexation* – John reported that this project is again gaining momentum; expect an application soon.
- b. City of Clearlake and Fire Service Review* – Clearlake is being reviewed by city staff and still gathering information from fire service providers.

**11. Commissioner Reports**

Commissioner D. Rushing provided an update on issues of concern for citizens of Lucerne.

**12. Correspondence**

John provided information on the Valley Oaks planned development near Middletown. He also stated that a sphere of influence amendment will be needed for the Hidden Valley Lakes CSD.

**13. Adjourn to LAFCO's next regular meeting: January 15, 2014 in Clearlake**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:53 a.m.

# Lake Local Agency Formation Commission

# 4

## CLAIMS

November 2013 and December 2013

### FY 2013-2014 Expenses

<u>Date of Claim</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Dec 1, 2013	Staff Services Nov 2013	\$ 4,799.00
Dec 1, 2013	Special Projects - Nov 2013	
	MSR/SOI	\$ 825.00
10.16-13 to 11.15.2013	Browne- Legal	\$ 1,750.00
Jan 1, 2014	Staff Svcs August 1-31, 2013	\$ 4,590.67
Nov 20, 2013	Commission Mtg. Stipend	\$ 540.00
11.16-13 to 12.15-13	Browne Legal	\$ 1,750.00
TOTAL:		\$ 14,254.67

DATED: January 15, 2014

APPROVED: January 15, 2014

---

Ed Robey, Chair or Stacey Mattina Vice-Chair  
Lake Local Agency Formation Commission

Attest:

---

John Benoit  
Executive Officer



Amount Budgeted	Comm Stipend Supplies	Memberships	Books & Periodic	Attorney Services	LAFCo Clerk	Office Stipend	Staff Svcs	Legal Notices	Trans Travel	Conf Regis	SOI Water	Gen Reserve
2012-2013 Adopted Budget	\$ 5,280.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 758.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 48,488.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Accrued exp in 2012-2013 and exp. Brought forward o FY 2013-2014	\$ 5,280.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 758.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 48,488.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
Calafco Hotel deposit Gillespie												
Calafco Hotel deposit Lyons												
Calafco Hotel Deposit Jb for Spittler												
Calafco Hotel Deposit Martina												
Calafco Registration -5												
Calafco Reg. Robey Awards												
Calafco Dues FY 13-14			\$ (758.00)									
Emerg Req Mobile Wkshp Spittler												
Browne Ending 7.15.13				\$ (500.00)								
Jb July 13 staff svcs												
July 17, 13 Mtg Stipends												
Browne Ending 8.15.13												
Jb Aug 13 Staff Svcs												
Jb 1/6 share Calafco Conf 8.27.13												
Jb Sept 13 Staff Svcs												
Browne Ending 9.15.13												
Sept 25, 2013 Mtg Stipend												
Jb Oct Staff Svcs												
Browne Ending 10.15.13												
Spittler Hotel expenses Pd by Benoit												
Gillespie Conf Reimbursement												
Martina Conf Reimb												
Lyons Conf. Reimb												
Robey Conf. Reimb												
Spittler Conf. Reimb												
Meeting stipend Nov 20, 2013												
Jb Nov 13 Staff Services												
Browne Ending 11.15.13												
BUDGET TRANSFER												
Insurance 1/2 year taken by Auditor's office												
Browne Ending 12.15.13												
Jb Dec 13 Staff Svcs												
Expenditures to date	\$ (1,740.00)	\$ -	\$ (758.00)	\$ 0	\$ (8,000.00)	\$ (624.99)	\$ (3,300.00)	\$ (24,258.02)	\$ -	\$ (1,071.32)	\$ (2,073.00)	\$ -
Remaining in Account	\$ 3,540.00	\$ 250.00	\$ -	\$ 200.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 1,375.01	\$ 3,700.00	\$ 24,229.98	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,328.88	\$ (573.00)	\$ 10,000.00

[illegible]

### 3.3 Municipal Service Reviews

In order to establish an appropriate sphere for an agency, LAFCO must have adequate information on present and future service needs in the area and the capabilities of the agency to meet those needs. To this purpose, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act requires LAFCO to conduct service reviews prior to establishing or updating spheres of influence. A service review is a comprehensive review of provision of specified services within a designated geographic area. Its purpose is to evaluate the provision of services on a regional basis and to recommend actions, when necessary, to promote the efficient provision of those services. The service reviews are intended to help LAFCO, the public and other agencies better understand the public service structure and evaluate options for the provision of efficient and effective public services. LAFCO uses the information and analysis provided by the Municipal Service Review (MSR) to ascertain whether an agency can provide adequate and efficient services to the areas in the agency's sphere within the applicable time frame.

LAFCO will prepare or update the appropriate Municipal Service Reviews prior to or in conjunction with the adoption or update of an agency's sphere of influence plan. In general, LAFCO will conduct such reviews on a service-by-service basis for designated geographic areas. The Commission will periodically develop and implement a multi-year coordinated schedule for preparing MSRs and updating spheres of influence, in accordance with the legislature's direction to review each agency's sphere of influence every five years and update as necessary and provided for in LAFCO's budget.

- a) **General Standards.** LAFCO shall prepare Municipal Service Reviews in conformance with the provisions of Government Code §56430. A Municipal Service Review must provide information specific to each agency to support the Commission's written determinations with respect to the following:

Growth and population projections for the affected area.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs or deficiencies.

Financial ability of agencies to provide service.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies.

Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery.

- b) **Municipal Service Reviews Must Support Spheres of Influence.** In addition to the requirements discussed above, Municipal Service Reviews shall contain information on

which the Commission can base its determination of the appropriate sphere of influence for an agency, including:

- i) Identification of existing land uses and a reasonable projection of land uses, which would occur if services were provided consistent with each agency's sphere of influence plan. This analysis should include maps and explanatory text detailing the following:
    - Present designated and actual land uses in the area, improved and unimproved properties, and agricultural and open space lands, as defined by G.C. Sections 56064 and 56059.
    - Proposed future land uses in the area.
  - ii) Discussion of present and probable future needs for public facilities and services in the sphere area. The discussion should include consideration of the need for all types of major facilities, not just those provided by the agency.
  - iii) A determination of the present and future capacity of facilities and adequacy of services the agency provides or has plans to provide. The review must include specific information and analysis of how the agency will meet anticipated growth in demand within its current boundaries and within the area included in its sphere. This information will guide the Commission's designation of appropriate sphere horizons in the Sphere of Influence Plan. The required information should include the following:
    - Maps and explanatory text that indicate the location and capacity of existing and proposed facilities, including a plan for timing and location of new or expanded facilities.
    - An estimate of projected revenue and expense over the sphere horizons, specifically identifying the cost of planned new facilities or services and projected source(s) of revenue to fund those new facilities or services.
    - Actual and projected costs of services to consumers in current dollars. A statement of actual and projected allocations of the cost of services between existing and new residents shall be included.
  - iv) Identification of any relevant social or economic communities of interest in the area. For example, an area which is completely within one subdivision governed by a single homeowner's association should be noted, in order to avoid unnecessary division of the territory between service agencies.
- c) **Uses of the Municipal Service Review.** Upon approval of the Municipal Service Review, it will be utilized by LAFCO both in establishing the agency's sphere of influence and in the consideration of all proposals affecting that agency.

**Exhibit "A"**

**Local Procedural Guidelines for Municipal Service Reviews**

**LAFCO Resolution 2003-05 Adopted August 20, 2003**

**Lake County Local Agency Formation Commission**

**Local Procedural Guidelines  
for Municipal Service Reviews**

***LOCAL PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES:***

**Purpose and Objectives of Service Reviews**

The purpose and objective of Municipal Service Reviews (MSR's) is to develop recommendations that will promote more efficient and higher quality service patterns, identify areas for service improvement, and assess the adequacy of service provision as it relates to determination of appropriate sphere boundaries. A MSR is based on a specific growth period and a realistic growth projection rate for that period keeping in mind local conditions and circumstances.

**Approach and Scope**

The Commission will review services comprehensively, on a service-by-service basis within logical sub-regions, given consistent and specific target growth periods and a realistic estimate of growth adopted for that period. Some studies will review multiple services, if the Commission deems such grouping appropriate. When appropriate, notwithstanding local conditions and circumstances, the Commission will follow the methodology developed by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research as provided in the Final Draft Service Review Guidelines. Where feasible, MSR's shall provide information comparing service levels and cost structure between the various agencies providing similar services within the study area to assist the Commission when it is considering which agency is best able to provide services.

**Schedule for Completion of Studies**

The Commission's goal is to comply with the provisions of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act by completing reviews of all services by the end of 2007. The Commission has adopted a schedule for the reviews. The schedule reflects the Commission's effort to balance various factors, such as the need to update particular Sphere Plans, consideration of major annexation proposals, opportunities for improved efficiency and governance, availability of staff and financial resources, community needs and demand for information, and other factors.

The Commission will re-evaluate the schedule from time to time and may reposition studies to accommodate changes in the factors listed above. Typically this will be done as part of the Commission's annual work plan,

**Exhibit "A"****Local Procedural Guidelines for Municipal Service Reviews****LAFCO Resolution 2003-05 Adopted August 20, 2003**

which, according to LAFCO budgeting policy, shall occur prior to the preparation of the Proposed Budget in March or April of each year.

**Conducting the Studies**

The Commission will work with public and private service providers to obtain information to make statutorily required determinations and will actively seek opportunities to collaborate with service providers in this regard (e.g., by collecting data as service providers update their General Plans, Water Master Plans, and Capital Improvement Plans). However, LAFCO will not delegate responsibility or decision-making with respect to Service Reviews to affected agencies.

Assuming a sufficient budget appropriation, the Commission may utilize consultants to conduct the studies, particularly for services that involve complex infrastructure or in cases where the study might generate controversy and the impartiality of an outside consultant would be beneficial. The Commission may utilize its staff to conduct studies when staff resource levels are adequate to carry out the work.

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act places responsibility for the conduct and financing of these studies on LAFCO, and since the Act apportions the cost of LAFCO among the cities and the County, it is most appropriate to include the cost of conducting the studies in LAFCO's annual budget based on LAFCO's work plan. Funding for Sphere Updates and (or) service reviews, which are inconsistent with LAFCO's annual work plan, shall be borne by the applicant agency.

The Commission will adopt its written determinations resulting from each Service Review at a noticed public hearing. The affected public and private service providers shall be given a copy of the draft service review at least 30 days prior to the hearing and shall have opportunity to comment in writing and orally at the hearing.

**Service Reviews and Sphere Updates**

The purpose of Service Reviews is to support preparation and updating of Spheres of Influence, in accordance with the provisions of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act. Therefore, as appropriate, the Commission will coordinate Sphere of Influence updates with the Service Reviews.

Service reviews will generally qualify for exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act as they do not directly result in any action. Recommendations resulting from Service Reviews will be considered for

**Exhibit "A"**

**Local Procedural Guidelines for Municipal Service Reviews**

**LAFCO Resolution 2003-05 Adopted August 20, 2003**

possible implementation as part of an agency's Sphere of Influence update or in conjunction with a change of organization that is subject to the CEQA process.

The Commission may consider minor sphere amendments exempt from the requirement to prepare a service review under the following circumstances: the agency's sphere has been updated within the last five years and complies with current sphere policy requirements, and the amendment will not require an update to the Master Service Element or the agency's Capital Improvement Plans.

Agencies with sphere plans that have not been updated may request the Commission waive its sphere policy compliance deadline for consideration of minor annexations. The Commission will only grant such a waiver where the Commission finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the annexation is of such a limited nature that the updating of the sphere and service review is not likely to significantly affect the Commission's decision.

## **Methodology and Assumptions**

Each agency under LAFCO jurisdiction is assessed in each category using the criteria described below.

### **Growth and population projections for the affected area**

- ❖ Trends in historical growth as identified from Department of Finance and Census data.
- ❖ The amount and percent of population growth projected by the Department of Finance over a 10 year period.
- ❖ The type and extent of any significant planned or proposed development as reported by the agency and the County.

### **The Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities Within or Contiguous to the Agency's SOI (Domestic Water, Fire and Wastewater services only)**

- ❖ The existence of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities as determined by the Department of Water Resources, based on its definition of size of "community."

### **Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs or deficiencies**

- ❖ The age and condition of facilities as reported by the agency and/or regulatory agencies.
- ❖ The physical and operational capacities of each facility, system portion, vehicle, etc.
- ❖ Capacity constraints as reported by the agency.
- ❖ Percent of quantifiable capacity in use in most recently completed calendar year, as well as during peak use periods.
- ❖ The need for capacity redundancy and/or safeguards against service interruptions.
- ❖ Service adequacy as determined by available service specific industry standards (i.e., response times and certification rates for fire services).
- ❖ If available, an assessment of the adequacy of the agency's system, operations, and management, including any required improvements, as evaluated and recommended by the regulatory agency (i.e., Department of Public Health for water service providers).
- ❖ Infrastructure needs and agency's plans to address these needs, as reported by the agency, or identified in capital improvement plans.
- ❖ Management practices: To establish public trust and accountability, best management practices include 1) preparing a budget before the beginning of the fiscal year, 2) conducting periodic financial audits, 3) maintaining relatively current financial records, 4) evaluating rates and fees periodically, 5) planning and budgeting for community service needs, 6) adopted policies related to expense



reimbursement, conflict of interest, code of ethics, Brown Act compliance, and public requests for information, and 7) an established process to address complaints.

*Financial ability of agency to provide services*

- ❖ The adequacy of the level of financing and any financing challenges or constraints as reported by the agency.
- ❖ Significant deficiencies to internal fiscal control as identified in the most recent audit.
- ❖ Rates: The degree to which the rates (and other revenue, if applicable) are able to cover annual operating and capital costs, anticipated future capital costs, and maintain a healthy reserve.
- ❖ The degree to which the agency is investing in capital as compared to depreciation of capital assets.
- ❖ Capital planning: Whether or not the agency has an up-to-date capital improvement plan with estimated timing and anticipated financing sources for each project.
- ❖ Capital reserves: the capital reserve fund balance at the end of the most recent fiscal year and the anticipated capital funding needs based on identified infrastructure needs and estimated costs.
- ❖ Reserves: the audited unrestricted fund balance as of the end of the most recent fiscal year.

*Status of and opportunities for shared facilities*

- ❖ The degree of existing cost minimization efforts through facility, personnel and equipment sharing.
- ❖ The potential for facility, personnel, and equipment sharing as reported by the agency or identified by LAFCo.

*Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies*

- ❖ Degree of transparency and public access as defined by agency efforts to 1) engage and educate constituents through outreach activities, 2) make available information on a website, 3) comply with open meeting and public records laws, and 4) cooperate with the LAFCo MSR process and requests for information.
- ❖ Compliance with principal act and general code requirements for public agencies, including 1) governing body configuration and manner of selection, 2) staffing requirements, 3) submittal of audits and budgets as required to the County Auditor's Office, 4) submittal of financial reports to the State Controller's Office, and 5) submittal of Form 700s to the Fair Political Practices Commission.
- ❖ Governance and Service Delivery Options: The potential to restructure the governance of agencies and/or service providers, or change the service provider with the goal of increasing service efficiency.

## Lake LAFCO

### 2014 Regular Meeting Schedule

**3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday at 9:30 AM**

**Regular Meeting Dates:**

*Alternative Meeting Dates (only as needed):*

**January 15 Clearlake**

*February 19 Lakeport*

**March 19 Lakeport**

*April 16 Clearlake*

**May 21 Clearlake**

*June 18 Lakeport*

**July 16 Lakeport**

*August 20 Clearlake*

**September 17 Clearlake**

*October 15 Lakeport*

**November 19 Lakeport**

*December 17 Clearlake*

Regular meetings of the Commission are scheduled for the third Wednesday of every month at 9:30 a.m. in the Lakeport City Council Chambers, 225 Park St, Lakeport, California or the Clearlake City Council Chambers 14050 Olympic Dr. Clearlake, California. The specific location of each meeting shall be in accordance with the meeting schedule adopted at the January LAFCO meeting. Alternative meeting dates shall remain on the schedule and shall be considered regular meeting dates. For meetings in Lakeport, if the Lakeport Council Chambers are not available, the meeting will occur at the Lake County Board of Supervisor's Chambers, 255 N. Forbes St. Lakeport, CA. The Commission may, at its own discretion, meet at a different time or place from time to time, provided that public notice of such time and place is given in accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Government Code Section 54954 and applicable provisions of the LAFCO Act.

The Chair or Executive Officer may call a special meeting of the Commission. The Chair shall call a special meeting if requested by two or more Commissioners. Any special meetings of the Commission shall be called in the manner provided by Section 54956 of the Government Code. The order calling the special meeting shall specify the time and place of the meeting and the business to be conducted and no other business shall be conducted at that meeting. The special meeting may be called for any day prior to the date established for the next regular meeting of the Commission.