

Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission

Regular Meeting Agenda

MONDAY – February 10, 2014

3:00 PM

**Board of Supervisors Chambers
707 Nevada Street
Susanville, CA.**

1. Call to order

Commissioners

Todd Eid, Chair, Public Member
Brian Wilson, City Member, Vice Chair
Rod De Boer, City Member
Larry Wosick, County Member
Jim Chapman, County Member

Alternate Members

Bob Pyle, County Member Alt.
Cheryl McDonald, City Member Alt.
Andrew Wellborn, Public Member Alt.

LAFCO Staff

John Benoit, Executive Officer
John Kenny, LAFCO Counsel
Gwenna MacDonald, Clerk

2. Approval of Agenda (Additions and Deletions)

3. Correspondence:

4. Approval of Minutes: *December 9, 2013*

5. Public Comment

This is the time set aside for citizens to address the Commission on any item of interest to the public that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. For items that are on the agenda, public comment will be heard when the item is discussed. If your comments concern an item that is noted as a public hearing, please address the Commission after the public hearing is opened for public testimony. The Chairman reserves the right to limit each speaker to three (3) minutes. Please understand that by law, the Commission cannot make decisions on matters not on the agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING

- 6. Formation of the Southern Cascades Community Services District to provide Locally Based Ambulance, Emergency Medical Services and Training for territory located in Northwestern Lassen County and Southwestern Modoc County.**
 - a. Receive Executive Officer's Report*
 - b. Conduct Public Hearing*
 - c. Consider Resolution 2014-0001 approving the Formation of the Southern Cascades Community Services District to provide locally based ambulance, emergency medical services and training.*

PUBLIC HEARING (Continued from December 9, 2013):

- 7. Continued Public Hearing regarding establishing a policy as mandated by SB-244 - Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities**
 - a. Review Executive Officer's report and revised policy and, consider resolution 2014-0002 adopting a policy regarding adding a new section entitled Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities to LAFCo Policies, Standards and Procedures.*

ACTION ITEMS:

- 8. Continued Bylaw Amendment – Rosenberg's Rules of Order**
 - a. Review and Discuss Rosenberg's Rules of Order*
 - b. Consider Resolution 2014-0003 adopting Rosenberg's Rules of Order for Lassen LAFCo's Rules of Procedure*
- 9. Authorize Payment of Claims for December 2013 and January 2014.**
 - a. Approve payment of expenses for December 2013 and January 2014.*

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- 10. Policy regarding fiscal impact analyses for certain changes of organization before LAFCo**
 - a. Discuss and provide direction to staff*
- 11. California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Update from the August 2013 Calafco Confernece**
 - a. Discuss OPR update materials*

12. Authorize Executive Officer to attend the annual Calafco Staff Workshop in Berkeley April 22nd -25th 2014

a. *Authorize Staff to attend the Calafco Annual Staff Workshop.*

13. Executive Officer's Monthly Report

*Herlong Area MSR and SOI
City of Susanville MSR and SOI
Madeline and Likely Fire services
700 Forms Due April 1, 2014*

14. Commissioner Reports - Discussion

This item is placed on the agenda for Commissioners to discuss items and issues of concern to their constituency, LAFCO, and legislative matters.

15. Adjourn to next regular LAFCO meeting for March 10, 2014

***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***

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.

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).

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 a specified time. 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 in the Clerk's office located at the City of Susanville, 66 North Lassen Street, Susanville CA. and the Lassen Co. Community Development Office located at 707 Nevada Street, Susanville CA. [such documents are also available on the Lassen LAFCo website (www.lassenlafco.org) 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

Pursuant to Government Code Sections 56700.1 and 57009 of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, and 82015 and 82025 of the Political Reform Act applicants for LAFCO approvals and those opposing such proposals are required to report to LAFCO all political contributions and expenditures with respect to a proposal that exceeds \$1,000. LAFCO has adopted policies to implement the law, which are available on the Commission's webpage. These requirements contain provisions for making disclosures of contributions and expenditures at specified intervals. Additional information may 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 (530) 257-0720 or by email at lafco@co.lassen.ca.us. Copies of reports are located on the LAFCO webpage at: www.lassenlafco.org

LASSEN COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
Board of Supervisors Chambers 707 Nevada Street Susanville, CA 96130

REGULAR MEETING
December 9, 2013 - 3:00 p.m.

Meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Vice Chairperson Wilson.

Roll call of members present: Jim Chapman, Cheryl McDonald, Larry Wosick and Brian Wilson
Absent: Todd Eid.

Staff Present: John Benoit, Executive Officer and Gwenna MacDonald, Clerk.

Motion by Commissioner De Boer to approve the agenda as submitted; Commissioner Wosick provided a second and the motion carried.

Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

Minutes

Motion by Commissioner Chapman to approve the minutes of the October 21, 2013 meeting; Commissioner De Boer provided a second and the motion carried.

At 3:02 p.m. Chairperson Eid entered the chambers and assumed his seat on the dais.

Public Comments

There were no comments.

6 Big Valley Ambulance Committee Presentation – LAFCO Fee Deposit Waiver

Valene Endacott and Dan Bouse, Big Valley residents, represented a committee formed for the purpose of creating a Community Services District to provide Ambulance Services in the Big Valley area. They updated the Commission regarding the progress of the committee. The proposed district would provide emergency medical transportation and advanced life support with district boundaries to include only the service area boundaries. Mr. Benoit was assisting with the process, and they were working on a plan for services, and have also kept Modoc County LAFCO involved. They are continuing to work on developing a budget and are gathering information in preparation for submitting a resolution before the Board of Supervisors for consideration. There has been a significant amount of interest from the area residents to serve on the Board, and the committee is working towards building momentum from the community to support the District. The committee requested a fee deposit waiver from LAFCO, in consideration of their current revenue restrictions. The Commission discussed the logistics of adopting authorizing resolutions and conducting the required public hearing through LAFCO.

Motion by Commissioner Wosick to support the LAFCO fee deposit waiver; Commissioner De Boer provided a second and the motion carried unanimously.

7 Public Hearing: Lassen County Waterworks District #1 – Bieber MSR and SOI Update

Mr. Benoit explained that the Municipal Service Review draft prepared for Lassen County Waterworks District #1 was reviewed at the October 21, 2013 workshop. The District primarily serves the area of Bieber, and he reviewed determinations regarding capacity, infrastructure, financial considerations, shared facilities, and the suggested long range plans for improvement. Input from the workshop has

been included in the final draft, and the recommendation for the Sphere of Influence was a coterminous boundary. He invited questions and comments from the Commission.

Motion by Commissioner Chapman to approve the MSR and SOI update; Commissioner De Boer provided a second and motion carried unanimously.

8 Public Hearing: Establishing SB-244 Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Mr. Benoit explained that at the previous meeting, the Commission reviewed the proposal to add Section 2.19 to Lassen LAFCO's Policies, Standards and Procedures, defining Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUCs). He described the Section as reflecting the intent of the mandates established by law and referred to Exhibit A, Section R. 3 which defines what constitutes a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community. He reviewed the criteria and observed that in the Susanville area, it is unlikely that many of the areas adjacent to the City would be classified as a DUC.

Commissioner Chapman clarified that no DUC's have been identified at this time, but cited examples of several neighborhoods adjacent to Susanville that most likely would meet the criteria of disadvantaged. He does not support a policy that would unilaterally impose standards without first identifying where these isolated pockets of qualifying DUCs exist.

Chairperson Eid opened the public hearing at 3:32 p.m. and requested comments.

Jared G. Hancock, City Administrator, appreciated Mr. Benoit's effort to respond to the legislation which has been initiated to address the issue of DUC's. Overall he believed the intent of the proposed policy amendment is on track, and suggested a few options to streamline the policy section for improved clarity.

Mr. Benoit responded that since the City of Susanville is the principle jurisdiction that will be affected by this law, that he continue working with the City to refine the verbiage and re-address with the Commission. He stressed the importance of clearly defining what a DUC is, and he is looking for consistency and predictability in moving forward.

The Commission discussed the lack of census data available and other options for determining the income level of the fringe neighborhoods. They discussed the areas adjacent to the City that would not support becoming part of the City through an annexation, and the scenarios which occur in larger jurisdictions that are not applicable to the City of Susanville and Lassen County.

There being no further comments, Chairperson Eid closed the public hearing at 3:45 p.m. It was the consensus of the Commission to bring the item back after further revisions.

9 Bylaw Amendment: Records Retention Policy Mr. Benoit reviewed the proposed amendment to the bylaws regarding records retention, noting that in the instance of records or information with potential historic significance, the retention would be adjusted accordingly. The Commission discussed options for the preservation of those types of records, including donation to the historic societies, schools or educational groups.

Motion by Commissioner Chapman to approve the Records Retention Policy; Commissioner De Boer provided a second and the motion carried unanimously.

10 Bylaw Amendment: Rosenberg's Rules of Order Mr. Benoit explained that proposed amendment was the result of a presentation at the Calafco conference regarding Rosenberg's Rules of Order which are essentially a simplified version of Robert's Rules of Order. He reviewed the

responsibilities of the Chairperson, various types of motions, and stated that the majority of it is the manner by which LAFCO meetings are already conducted.

Mayor pro tem Wilson observed that it would be preferable to unilaterally adopt the same standard for all of the local agencies. Commissioner Chapman stated that he was going to be presenting the idea for consideration by the Board of Supervisors. He provided an explanation regarding the background of Rosenberg's Rules of Order, and how it presents the content of Robert's Rules of Order in a more concise manner. He suggested conducting a workshop for local agencies, and the consideration of adoption was tabled pending the conduction of the workshop.

11 Payment of Claims: October and November 2013

Motion by Mayor pro tem Wilson to approve claims for October and November in the amount of \$9,958.02; motion carried unanimously.

12 LAFCO Webpage

Mr. Benoit explained the need for LAFCO to have an accurate and up to date website, and discussed the development of a site that he is using successfully in Lake County. He requested authorization to use the same host for Lassen LAFCO. The Commission directed Mr. Benoit to proceed with a new website.

13 Policy regarding fiscal impact analyses: changes of organization before LAFCO

Mr. Benoit reviewed the proposed language regarding annexations and the requirement to conduct a fiscal impact analysis prior to approving the annexation. The items of consideration would include the impact to the City or County's General Fund, the ability of the affected agency to provide services, and the applicable transportation-related funds. He cited examples in other communities that benefited from the fiscal impact analyses, and expressed his concern over situations where a larger annexation is approved without understanding the true costs to the existing tax payers. It was the consensus of the Commission for Mr. Benoit to work with City of Susanville staff and revisit at the February meeting.

Executive Officers Report

Mr. Benoit reported that a workshop to discuss the Herlong Area Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update would be conducted at the next meeting, and the City of Susanville MSR and SOI Update was moving along through the process.

Commissioner Reports

Commissioner Chapman reported that the Honey Lake Valley Recreation Authority JPA had been approved by the City and County, and they would be holding their first meeting on December 11, 2013.

At 4:45 p.m. motion by Commissioner Chapman, second by Commissioner Wilson to adjourn until December 9, 2013; motion carried.

Todd Eid, Chairperson

Approved: Gwenna MacDonald, Recording Secretary

Resolution 2014-0002
of the
Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission

*A Resolution of the Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission
Amending its Policies, Standards and Procedures to include a policy regarding
Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities*

RESOLVED, the Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission in the County of Lassen, State of California, that

WHEREAS, policies, standards and procedures are necessary to guide the Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission in making determinations on future projects; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has reviewed, revised and updated the policies, standards and procedures adopted by LAFCO on November 10, 2003 and Amended on July 9, 2007 by Resolution 2007-0007, on May 11, 2009 by Resolution 2009-0007, and on April 12, 2010 Resolution 2010-0002; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has conducted a workshop regarding the proposed Policies, Standards and Procedures amendment to include a policy regarding disadvantaged unincorporated communities (DUC's); and

WHEREAS, this Commission called for and held a Public Hearing on this Policies, Standards and Procedures amendment on December 9, 2013 and February 10, 2014 and at the hearing, this Commission heard and received all oral and written protests, objections and evidence which were made, presented or filed, and all persons present were given an opportunity to hear and be heard with respect to this amendment and the report of the Executive Officer.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission **DOES HEREBY RESOLVE, DETERMINE AND ORDER** as follows:

1. The attached updated Policies, Standards and Procedures Amendment shall guide the Commission in compliance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, as amended.
2. New Section II-R regarding DUC's is hereby added to Lassen LAFCo's Policies, Standards and Procedures as shown in Exhibit A.
3. Existing Section II-T "Exceptions" shall be renumbered as Section T-U

4. Any conflicting LAFCO Policies, Standards and Procedures regarding DUC's previously approved by the Commission are hereby repealed in favor of this amendment.

The foregoing resolution was offered at a Regular Meeting of the LASSEN LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION on the 10th day of February 2014, and adopted by the following vote of the Commission:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Todd Eid, Chair
Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission

ATTEST:

John Benoit, Executive Officer
LASSEN LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION,

EXHIBIT A

New Section II-R Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

R. Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

The Commission will identify Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities, as defined below, for the purpose of:

1. **Municipal Service Reviews.** Water, Wastewater, and Fire Protection Municipal Service Reviews will discuss and identify opportunities for the provision of those services to Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities located within or contiguous to the Sphere of Influence of an agency.
2. **Annexations to the City of Susanville.** Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities ten acres or larger that are located contiguous to areas proposed for annexation to the City of Susanville shall normally be included in the annexation or reorganization proposal or be separately proposed for annexation, unless the Commission has determined that the disadvantaged community would not be benefited by annexation, or if at least 50% the registered voters have indicated opposition to annexation.
3. **Definition of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.** **A Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community is defined as a developed area located within the Sphere of Influence of the principal jurisdiction that has been identified as such by LAFCo and one that meets all the following standards:**
 - a) Substantially developed with primarily residential uses
 - b) Contains at least 25 parcels in close proximity to each other that do not exceed 1.5 acres in size
 - c) Does not have reliable public water, sewer or structural fire protection service available
 - d) Contains at least 12 registered voters
 - e) Has a median household income level of less than 80% of the statewide median household income
 - f) **Has been defined in the Principal Jurisdiction's Housing Element as a Disadvantaged Community meeting the criteria established in the Government Code.**
4. **Request for Determination.** In addition to those Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities identified by LAFCo or other agencies, residents or property owners may request that LAFCo determine whether a specific area meets the criteria listed in Item 3 to be treated as a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community. Such request must be submitted by at least twelve registered voters of the area. The review shall be conducted by LAFCo staff and shall, if appropriate, be submitted for consideration and approval by the Commission.

**BEFORE THE LASSEN LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LASSEN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

IN RE:

**RESOLUTION AMENDING BYLAWS)
TO ADOPT ROSENBERG'S RULES)
OF ORDER AS A GUIDE)**

RESOLUTION NO. 2014-0003

WHEREAS, the Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission has determined that it is in the best interest of the public for the Commission to operate in accordance with approved Bylaws and therefore has adopted Bylaws on November 10, 2003 by adopting Resolution #2003-0008 and has subsequently amended its Bylaws on August 9, 2004 by adopting Resolution #2004-0006; on November 14, 2005 by adopting Resolution #2005-0008; and on June 13, 2011 by adopting Resolution #2011-0004.

WHEREAS, the Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission believes it is important to use Rosenberg's rules of order, which are easily understood by the public.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission as follows:

1. The Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission hereby amends its Bylaws to adopt new Rules of Order.
2. Section 5.7, Conduct of Meetings in LAFCo's Bylaws is hereby amended to include the latest edition of Rosenberg's Rules of Order as a guide 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. Rosenberg's Rules of Order shall be used as a guide.

3. The Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission hereby adopts a Notice of Exemption based on the General Rule exemption 15061 (b) 3 and 15308 activities for the protection of the environment since these bylaws are for internal management purposes only so LAFCo may carry out its functions.
4. All previously adopted Bylaws conflicting with the usage of Robert's Rules of Order are hereby repealed in favor of this amendment.

5. This bylaw amendment is hereby adopted.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission in the County of Lassen, State of California, on February 14, 2014 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

TODD EID, CHAIR
LASSEN LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION
COMMISSION

ATTEST:

John Benoit
LAFCO Executive Officer



Rosenberg's Rules of Order

REVISED 2011

Simple Rules of Parliamentary Procedure for the 21st Century

By Judge Dave Rosenberg



MISSION AND CORE BELIEFS

To expand and protect local control for cities through education and advocacy to enhance the quality of life for all Californians.

VISION

To be recognized and respected as the leading advocate for the common interests of California's cities.

About the League of California Cities

Established in 1898, the League of California Cities is a member organization that represents California's incorporated cities. The League strives to protect the local authority and autonomy of city government and help California's cities effectively serve their residents. In addition to advocating on cities' behalf at the state capitol, the League provides its members with professional development programs and information resources, conducts education conferences and research, and publishes Western City magazine.

© 2011 League of California Cities. All rights reserved.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dave Rosenberg is a Superior Court Judge in Yolo County. He has served as presiding judge of his court, and as presiding judge of the Superior Court Appellate Division. He also has served as chair of the Trial Court Presiding Judges Advisory Committee (the committee composed of all 58 California presiding judges) and as an advisory member of the California Judicial Council. Prior to his appointment to the bench, Rosenberg was member of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors, where he served two terms as chair. Rosenberg also served on the Davis City Council, including two terms as mayor. He has served on the senior staff of two governors, and worked for 19 years in private law practice. Rosenberg has served as a member and chair of numerous state, regional and local boards. Rosenberg chaired the California State Lottery Commission, the California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board, the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, the Yolo County Economic Development Commission, and the Yolo County Criminal Justice Cabinet. For many years, he has taught classes on parliamentary procedure and has served as parliamentarian for large and small bodies.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

About the Author	ii
Introduction	2
Establishing a Quorum	2
The Role of the Chair	2
The Basic Format for an Agenda Item Discussion	2
Motions in General	3
The Three Basic Motions	3
Multiple Motions Before the Body	4
To Debate or Not to Debate	4
Majority and Super-Majority Votes	5
Counting Votes	5
The Motion to Reconsider	6
Courtesy and Decorum	7
Special Notes About Public Input	7

INTRODUCTION

The rules of procedure at meetings should be simple enough for most people to understand. Unfortunately, that has not always been the case. Virtually all clubs, associations, boards, councils and bodies follow a set of rules — *Robert's Rules of Order* — which are embodied in a small, but complex, book. Virtually no one I know has actually read this book cover to cover. Worse yet, the book was written for another time and for another purpose. If one is chairing or running a parliament, then *Robert's Rules of Order* is a dandy and quite useful handbook for procedure in that complex setting. On the other hand, if one is running a meeting of say, a five-member body with a few members of the public in attendance, a simplified version of the rules of parliamentary procedure is in order.

Hence, the birth of *Rosenberg's Rules of Order*.

What follows is my version of the rules of parliamentary procedure, based on my decades of experience chairing meetings in state and local government. These rules have been simplified for the smaller bodies we chair or in which we participate, slimmed down for the 21st Century, yet retaining the basic tenets of order to which we have grown accustomed. Interestingly enough, *Rosenberg's Rules* has found a welcoming audience. Hundreds of cities, counties, special districts, committees, boards, commissions, neighborhood associations and private corporations and companies have adopted *Rosenberg's Rules* in lieu of *Robert's Rules* because they have found them practical, logical, simple, easy to learn and user friendly.

This treatise on modern parliamentary procedure is built on a foundation supported by the following four pillars:

1. **Rules should establish order.** The first purpose of rules of parliamentary procedure is to establish a framework for the orderly conduct of meetings.
2. **Rules should be clear.** Simple rules lead to wider understanding and participation. Complex rules create two classes: those who understand and participate; and those who do not fully understand and do not fully participate.
3. **Rules should be user friendly.** That is, the rules must be simple enough that the public is invited into the body and feels that it has participated in the process.
4. **Rules should enforce the will of the majority while protecting the rights of the minority.** The ultimate purpose of rules of procedure is to encourage discussion and to facilitate decision making by the body. In a democracy, majority rules. The rules must enable the majority to express itself and fashion a result, while permitting the minority to also express itself, but not dominate, while fully participating in the process.

Establishing a Quorum

The starting point for a meeting is the establishment of a quorum. A quorum is defined as the minimum number of members of the body who must be present at a meeting for business to be legally transacted. The default rule is that a quorum is one more than half the body. For example, in a five-member body a quorum is three. When the body has three members present, it can legally transact business. If the body has less than a quorum of members present, it cannot legally transact business. And even if the body has a quorum to begin the meeting, the body can lose the quorum during the meeting when a member departs (or even when a member leaves the dais). When that occurs the body loses its ability to transact business until and unless a quorum is reestablished.

The default rule, identified above, however, gives way to a specific rule of the body that establishes a quorum. For example, the rules of a particular five-member body may indicate that a quorum is four members for that particular body. The body must follow the rules it has established for its quorum. In the absence of such a specific rule, the quorum is one more than half the members of the body.


The Role of the Chair

While all members of the body should know and understand the rules of parliamentary procedure, it is the chair of the body who is charged with applying the rules of conduct of the meeting. The chair should be well versed in those rules. For all intents and purposes, the chair makes the final ruling on the rules every time the chair states an action. In fact, all decisions by the chair are final unless overruled by the body itself.

Since the chair runs the conduct of the meeting, it is usual courtesy for the chair to play a less active role in the debate and discussion than other members of the body. This does not mean that the chair should not participate in the debate or discussion. To the contrary, as a member of the body, the chair has the full right to participate in the debate, discussion and decision-making of the body. What the chair should do, however, is strive to be the last to speak at the discussion and debate stage. The chair should not make or second a motion unless the chair is convinced that no other member of the body will do so at that point in time.

The Basic Format for an Agenda Item Discussion

Formal meetings normally have a written, often published agenda. Informal meetings may have only an oral or understood agenda. In either case, the meeting is governed by the agenda and the agenda constitutes the body's agreed-upon roadmap for the meeting. Each agenda item can be handled by the chair in the following basic format:



First, the chair should clearly announce the agenda item number and should clearly state what the agenda item subject is. The chair should then announce the format (which follows) that will be followed in considering the agenda item.

Second, following that agenda format, the chair should invite the appropriate person or persons to report on the item, including any recommendation that they might have. The appropriate person or persons may be the chair, a member of the body, a staff person, or a committee chair charged with providing input on the agenda item.

Third, the chair should ask members of the body if they have any technical questions of clarification. At this point, members of the body may ask clarifying questions to the person or persons who reported on the item, and that person or persons should be given time to respond.

Fourth, the chair should invite public comments, or if appropriate at a formal meeting, should open the public meeting for public input. If numerous members of the public indicate a desire to speak to the subject, the chair may limit the time of public speakers. At the conclusion of the public comments, the chair should announce that public input has concluded (or the public hearing, as the case may be, is closed).

Fifth, the chair should invite a motion. The chair should announce the name of the member of the body who makes the motion.

Sixth, the chair should determine if any member of the body wishes to second the motion. The chair should announce the name of the member of the body who seconds the motion. It is normally good practice for a motion to require a second before proceeding to ensure that it is not just one member of the body who is interested in a particular approach. However, a second is not an absolute requirement, and the chair can proceed with consideration and vote on a motion even when there is no second. This is a matter left to the discretion of the chair.

Seventh, if the motion is made and seconded, the chair should make sure everyone understands the motion.

This is done in one of three ways:

1. The chair can ask the maker of the motion to repeat it;
2. The chair can repeat the motion; or
3. The chair can ask the secretary or the clerk of the body to repeat the motion.

Eighth, the chair should now invite discussion of the motion by the body. If there is no desired discussion, or after the discussion has ended, the chair should announce that the body will vote on the motion. If there has been no discussion or very brief discussion, then the vote on the motion should proceed immediately and there is no need to repeat the motion. If there has been substantial discussion, then it is normally best to make sure everyone understands the motion by repeating it.

Ninth, the chair takes a vote. Simply asking for the “ayes” and then asking for the “nays” normally does this. If members of the body do not vote, then they “abstain.” Unless the rules of the body provide otherwise (or unless a super majority is required as delineated later in these rules), then a simple majority (as defined in law or the rules of the body as delineated later in these rules) determines whether the motion passes or is defeated.

Tenth, the chair should announce the result of the vote and what action (if any) the body has taken. In announcing the result, the chair should indicate the names of the members of the body, if any, who voted in the minority on the motion. This announcement might take the following form: “The motion passes by a vote of 3-2, with Smith and Jones dissenting. We have passed the motion requiring a 10-day notice for all future meetings of this body.”

Motions in General

Motions are the vehicles for decision making by a body. It is usually best to have a motion before the body prior to commencing discussion of an agenda item. This helps the body focus.

Motions are made in a simple two-step process. First, the chair should recognize the member of the body. Second, the member of the body makes a motion by preceding the member’s desired approach with the words “I move . . .”

A typical motion might be: “I move that we give a 10-day notice in the future for all our meetings.”

The chair usually initiates the motion in one of three ways:

1. **Inviting the members of the body to make a motion**, for example, “A motion at this time would be in order.”
2. **Suggesting a motion to the members of the body**, “A motion would be in order that we give a 10-day notice in the future for all our meetings.”
3. **Making the motion**. As noted, the chair has every right as a member of the body to make a motion, but should normally do so only if the chair wishes to make a motion on an item but is convinced that no other member of the body is willing to step forward to do so at a particular time.

The Three Basic Motions

There are three motions that are the most common and recur often at meetings:

The basic motion. The basic motion is the one that puts forward a decision for the body’s consideration. A basic motion might be: “I move that we create a five-member committee to plan and put on our annual fundraiser.”

The motion to amend. If a member wants to change a basic motion that is before the body, they would move to amend it. A motion to amend might be: "I move that we amend the motion to have a 10-member committee." A motion to amend takes the basic motion that is before the body and seeks to change it in some way.

The substitute motion. If a member wants to completely do away with the basic motion that is before the body, and put a new motion before the body, they would move a substitute motion. A substitute motion might be: "I move a substitute motion that we cancel the annual fundraiser this year."

"Motions to amend" and "substitute motions" are often confused, but they are quite different, and their effect (if passed) is quite different. A motion to amend seeks to retain the basic motion on the floor, but modify it in some way. A substitute motion seeks to throw out the basic motion on the floor, and substitute a new and different motion for it. The decision as to whether a motion is really a "motion to amend" or a "substitute motion" is left to the chair. So if a member makes what that member calls a "motion to amend," but the chair determines that it is really a "substitute motion," then the chair's designation governs.

A "friendly amendment" is a practical parliamentary tool that is simple, informal, saves time and avoids bogging a meeting down with numerous formal motions. It works in the following way: In the discussion on a pending motion, it may appear that a change to the motion is desirable or may win support for the motion from some members. When that happens, a member who has the floor may simply say, "I want to suggest a friendly amendment to the motion." The member suggests the friendly amendment, and if the maker and the person who seconded the motion pending on the floor accepts the friendly amendment, that now becomes the pending motion on the floor. If either the maker or the person who seconded rejects the proposed friendly amendment, then the proposer can formally move to amend.

Multiple Motions Before the Body

There can be up to three motions on the floor at the same time. The chair can reject a fourth motion until the chair has dealt with the three that are on the floor and has resolved them. This rule has practical value. More than three motions on the floor at any given time is confusing and unwieldy for almost everyone, including the chair.

When there are two or three motions on the floor (after motions and seconds) at the same time, the vote should proceed *first* on the *last* motion that is made. For example, assume the first motion is a basic "motion to have a five-member committee to plan and put on our annual fundraiser." During the discussion of this motion, a member might make a second motion to "amend the main motion to have a 10-member committee, not a five-member committee to plan and put on our annual fundraiser." And perhaps, during that discussion, a member makes yet a third motion as a "substitute motion that we not have an annual fundraiser this year." The proper procedure would be

as follows:

First, the chair would deal with the *third* (the last) motion on the floor, the substitute motion. After discussion and debate, a vote would be taken first on the third motion. If the substitute motion *passed*, it would be a substitute for the basic motion and would eliminate it. The first motion would be moot, as would the second motion (which sought to amend the first motion), and the action on the agenda item would be completed on the passage by the body of the third motion (the substitute motion). No vote would be taken on the first or second motions.

Second, if the substitute motion *failed*, the chair would then deal with the second (now the last) motion on the floor, the motion to amend. The discussion and debate would focus strictly on the amendment (should the committee be five or 10 members). If the motion to amend *passed*, the chair would then move to consider the main motion (the first motion) as *amended*. If the motion to amend *failed*, the chair would then move to consider the main motion (the first motion) in its original format, not amended.

Third, the chair would now deal with the first motion that was placed on the floor. The original motion would either be in its original format (five-member committee), or if *amended*, would be in its amended format (10-member committee). The question on the floor for discussion and decision would be whether a committee should plan and put on the annual fundraiser.

To Debate or Not to Debate

The basic rule of motions is that they are subject to discussion and debate. Accordingly, basic motions, motions to amend, and substitute motions are all eligible, each in their turn, for full discussion before and by the body. The debate can continue as long as members of the body wish to discuss an item, subject to the decision of the chair that it is time to move on and take action.

There are exceptions to the general rule of free and open debate on motions. The exceptions all apply when there is a desire of the body to move on. The following motions are not debatable (that is, when the following motions are made and seconded, the chair must immediately call for a vote of the body without debate on the motion):

Motion to adjourn. This motion, if passed, requires the body to immediately adjourn to its next regularly scheduled meeting. It requires a simple majority vote.

Motion to recess. This motion, if passed, requires the body to immediately take a recess. Normally, the chair determines the length of the recess which may be a few minutes or an hour. It requires a simple majority vote.

Motion to fix the time to adjourn. This motion, if passed, requires the body to adjourn the meeting at the specific time set in the motion. For example, the motion might be: "I move we adjourn this meeting at midnight." It requires a simple majority vote.

Motion to table. This motion, if passed, requires discussion of the agenda item to be halted and the agenda item to be placed on “hold.” The motion can contain a specific time in which the item can come back to the body. “I move we table this item until our regular meeting in October.” Or the motion can contain no specific time for the return of the item, in which case a motion to take the item off the table and bring it back to the body will have to be taken at a future meeting. A motion to table an item (or to bring it back to the body) requires a simple majority vote.

Motion to limit debate. The most common form of this motion is to say, “I move the previous question” or “I move the question” or “I call the question” or sometimes someone simply shouts out “question.” As a practical matter, when a member calls out one of these phrases, the chair can expedite matters by treating it as a “request” rather than as a formal motion. The chair can simply inquire of the body, “any further discussion?” If no one wishes to have further discussion, then the chair can go right to the pending motion that is on the floor. However, if even one person wishes to discuss the pending motion further, then at that point, the chair should treat the call for the “question” as a formal motion, and proceed to it.

When a member of the body makes such a motion (“I move the previous question”), the member is really saying: “I’ve had enough debate. Let’s get on with the vote.” When such a motion is made, the chair should ask for a second, stop debate, and vote on the motion to limit debate. The motion to limit debate requires a two-thirds vote of the body.

NOTE: A motion to limit debate could include a time limit. For example: “I move we limit debate on this agenda item to 15 minutes.” Even in this format, the motion to limit debate requires a two-thirds vote of the body. A similar motion is a *motion to object to consideration of an item*. This motion is not debatable, and if passed, precludes the body from even considering an item on the agenda. It also requires a two-thirds vote.

Majority and Super Majority Votes

In a democracy, a simple majority vote determines a question. A tie vote means the motion fails. So in a seven-member body, a vote of 4-3 passes the motion. A vote of 3-3 with one abstention means the motion fails. If one member is absent and the vote is 3-3, the motion still fails.

All motions require a simple majority, but there are a few exceptions. The exceptions come up when the body is taking an action which effectively cuts off the ability of a minority of the body to take an action or discuss an item. These extraordinary motions require a two-thirds majority (a super majority) to pass:

Motion to limit debate. Whether a member says, “I move the previous question,” or “I move the question,” or “I call the question,” or “I move to limit debate,” it all amounts to an attempt to cut off the ability of the minority to discuss an item, and it requires a two-thirds vote to pass.

Motion to close nominations. When choosing officers of the body (such as the chair), nominations are in order either from a nominating committee or from the floor of the body. A motion to close nominations effectively cuts off the right of the minority to nominate officers and it requires a two-thirds vote to pass.

Motion to object to the consideration of a question. Normally, such a motion is unnecessary since the objectionable item can be tabled or defeated straight up. However, when members of a body do not even want an item on the agenda to be considered, then such a motion is in order. It is not debatable, and it requires a two-thirds vote to pass.

Motion to suspend the rules. This motion is debatable, but requires a two-thirds vote to pass. If the body has its own rules of order, conduct or procedure, this motion allows the body to suspend the rules for a particular purpose. For example, the body (a private club) might have a rule prohibiting the attendance at meetings by non-club members. A motion to suspend the rules would be in order to allow a non-club member to attend a meeting of the club on a particular date or on a particular agenda item.

Counting Votes

The matter of counting votes starts simple, but can become complicated.

Usually, it’s pretty easy to determine whether a particular motion passed or whether it was defeated. If a simple majority vote is needed to pass a motion, then one vote more than 50 percent of the body is required. For example, in a five-member body, if the vote is three in favor and two opposed, the motion passes. If it is two in favor and three opposed, the motion is defeated.

If a two-thirds majority vote is needed to pass a motion, then how many affirmative votes are required? The simple rule of thumb is to count the “no” votes and double that count to determine how many “yes” votes are needed to pass a particular motion. For example, in a seven-member body, if two members vote “no” then the “yes” vote of at least four members is required to achieve a two-thirds majority vote to pass the motion.

What about tie votes? In the event of a tie, the motion always fails since an affirmative vote is required to pass any motion. For example, in a five-member body, if the vote is two in favor and two opposed, with one member absent, the motion is defeated.

Vote counting starts to become complicated when members vote “abstain” or in the case of a written ballot, cast a blank (or unreadable) ballot. Do these votes count, and if so, how does one count them? The starting point is always to check the statutes.

In California, for example, for an action of a board of supervisors to be valid and binding, the action must be approved by a majority of the board. (California Government Code Section 25005.) Typically, this means three of the five members of the board must vote affirmatively in favor of the action. A vote of 2-1 would not be sufficient. A vote of 3-0 with two abstentions would be sufficient. In general law cities in

California, as another example, resolutions or orders for the payment of money and all ordinances require a recorded vote of the total members of the city council. (California Government Code Section 36936.) Cities with charters may prescribe their own vote requirements. Local elected officials are always well-advised to consult with their local agency counsel on how state law may affect the vote count.

After consulting state statutes, step number two is to check the rules of the body. If the rules of the body say that you count votes of "those present" then you treat abstentions one way. However, if the rules of the body say that you count the votes of those "present and voting," then you treat abstentions a different way. And if the rules of the body are silent on the subject, then the general rule of thumb (and default rule) is that you count all votes that are "present and voting."

Accordingly, under the "present and voting" system, you would **NOT** count abstention votes on the motion. Members who abstain are counted for purposes of determining quorum (they are "present"), but you treat the abstention votes on the motion as if they did not exist (they are not "voting"). On the other hand, if the rules of the body specifically say that you count votes of those "present" then you **DO** count abstention votes both in establishing the quorum and on the motion. In this event, the abstention votes act just like "no" votes.

*How does this work in practice?
Here are a few examples.*

Assume that a five-member city council is voting on a motion that requires a simple majority vote to pass, and assume further that the body has no specific rule on counting votes. Accordingly, the default rule kicks in and we count all votes of members that are "present and voting." If the vote on the motion is 3-2, the motion passes. If the motion is 2-2 with one abstention, the motion fails.

Assume a five-member city council voting on a motion that requires a two-thirds majority vote to pass, and further assume that the body has no specific rule on counting votes. Again, the default rule applies. If the vote is 3-2, the motion fails for lack of a two-thirds majority. If the vote is 4-1, the motion passes with a clear two-thirds majority. A vote of three "yes," one "no" and one "abstain" also results in passage of the motion. Once again, the abstention is counted only for the purpose of determining quorum, but on the actual vote on the motion, it is as if the abstention vote never existed — so an effective 3-1 vote is clearly a two-thirds majority vote.

Now, change the scenario slightly. Assume the same five-member city council voting on a motion that requires a two-thirds majority vote to pass, but now assume that the body **DOES** have a specific rule requiring a two-thirds vote of members "present." Under this specific rule, we must count the members present not only for quorum but also for the motion. In this scenario, any abstention has the same force and effect as if it were a "no" vote. Accordingly, if the votes were three "yes," one "no" and one "abstain," then the motion fails. The abstention in this case is treated like a "no" vote and effective vote of 3-2 is not enough to pass two-thirds majority muster.

Now, exactly how does a member cast an "abstention" vote?

Any time a member votes "abstain" or says, "I abstain," that is an abstention. However, if a member votes "present" that is also treated as an abstention (the member is essentially saying, "Count me for purposes of a quorum, but my vote on the issue is abstain.") In fact, any manifestation of intention to vote either "yes" or "no" on the pending motion may be treated by the chair as an abstention. If written ballots are cast, a blank or unreadable ballot is counted as an abstention as well.

Can a member vote "absent" or "count me as absent?" Interesting question. The ruling on this is up to the chair. The better approach is for the chair to count this as if the member had left his/her chair and is actually "absent." That, of course, affects the quorum. However, the chair may also treat this as a vote to abstain, particularly if the person does not actually leave the dais.

The Motion to Reconsider

There is a special and unique motion that requires a bit of explanation all by itself; the motion to reconsider. A tenet of parliamentary procedure is finality. After vigorous discussion, debate and a vote, there must be some closure to the issue. And so, after a vote is taken, the matter is deemed closed, subject only to reopening if a proper motion to consider is made and passed.

A motion to reconsider requires a majority vote to pass like other garden-variety motions, but there are two special rules that apply only to the motion to reconsider.

First, is the matter of timing. A motion to reconsider must be made at the meeting where the item was first voted upon. A motion to reconsider made at a later time is untimely. (The body, however, can always vote to suspend the rules and, by a two-thirds majority, allow a motion to reconsider to be made at another time.)

Second, a motion to reconsider may be made only by certain members of the body. Accordingly, a motion to reconsider may be made only by a member who voted in the majority on the original motion. If such a member has a change of heart, he or she may make the motion to reconsider (any other member of the body — including a member who voted in the minority on the original motion — may second the motion). If a member who voted in the minority seeks to make the motion to reconsider, it must be ruled out of order. The purpose of this rule is finality. If a member of minority could make a motion to reconsider, then the item could be brought back to the body again and again, which would defeat the purpose of finality.

If the motion to reconsider passes, then the original matter is back before the body, and a new original motion is in order. The matter may be discussed and debated as if it were on the floor for the first time.

Courtesy and Decorum

The rules of order are meant to create an atmosphere where the members of the body and the members of the public can attend to business efficiently, fairly and with full participation. At the same time, it is up to the chair and the members of the body to maintain common courtesy and decorum. Unless the setting is very informal, it is always best for only one person at a time to have the floor, and it is always best for every speaker to be first recognized by the chair before proceeding to speak.

The chair should always ensure that debate and discussion of an agenda item focuses on the item and the policy in question, not the personalities of the members of the body. Debate on policy is healthy, debate on personalities is not. The chair has the right to cut off discussion that is too personal, is too loud, or is too crude.

Debate and discussion should be focused, but free and open. In the interest of time, the chair may, however, limit the time allotted to speakers, including members of the body.

Can a member of the body interrupt the speaker? The general rule is "no." There are, however, exceptions. A speaker may be interrupted for the following reasons:

Privilege. The proper interruption would be, "point of privilege." The chair would then ask the interrupter to "state your point." Appropriate points of privilege relate to anything that would interfere with the normal comfort of the meeting. For example, the room may be too hot or too cold, or a blowing fan might interfere with a person's ability to hear.

Order. The proper interruption would be, "point of order." Again, the chair would ask the interrupter to "state your point." Appropriate points of order relate to anything that would not be considered appropriate conduct of the meeting. For example, if the chair moved on to a vote on a motion that permits debate without allowing that discussion or debate.

Appeal. If the chair makes a ruling that a member of the body disagrees with, that member may appeal the ruling of the chair. If the motion is seconded, and after debate, if it passes by a simple majority vote, then the ruling of the chair is deemed reversed.

Call for orders of the day. This is simply another way of saying, "return to the agenda." If a member believes that the body has drifted from the agreed-upon agenda, such a call may be made. It does not require a vote, and when the chair discovers that the agenda has not been followed, the chair simply reminds the body to return to the agenda item properly before them. If the chair fails to do so, the chair's determination may be appealed.

Withdraw a motion. During debate and discussion of a motion, the maker of the motion on the floor, at any time, may interrupt a speaker to withdraw his or her motion from the floor. The motion is immediately deemed withdrawn, although the chair may ask the person who seconded the motion if he or she wishes to make the motion, and any other member may make the motion if properly recognized.

Special Notes About Public Input

The rules outlined above will help make meetings very public-friendly. But in addition, and particularly for the chair, it is wise to remember three special rules that apply to each agenda item:

Rule One: Tell the public what the body will be doing.

Rule Two: Keep the public informed while the body is doing it.

Rule Three: When the body has acted, tell the public what the body did.



1400 K Street, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 658-8200 | Fax (916) 658-8240
www.cacities.org

To order additional copies of this publication, call (916) 658-8200.

\$10

© 2011 League of California Cities. All rights reserved.

♻️ Printed on recycled paper.

Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission

CLAIMS Dec. 2013 & Jan 2014

Authorize payment of the following claims:

<u>Date of Claim</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Feb 1, 2014	Staff Svcs & Expenses – Dec. 2013	\$ 3,619.50
TOTAL: December 1-31, 2013 Exp:		\$ 3,619.50
Feb 1, 2014	Jan 2014 Staff Expenses	\$ 3,964.69
Feb 1, 2014	Herlong Service Review	\$ 8,733.75
Jan 14, 2014	Public Notice South Cascades CSD	\$ 83.30
Total Jan 1-31, 2014 Expenses		\$12,781.74

DATED: Feb 10, 2014

APPROVED: Feb 10, 2014

Todd Eid, Chair or Brian Wilson, Vice-Chair
Lassen Local Agency Formation Commission

Attest:

John Benoit
Executive Officer

2013-2014 Expenditures

Lassen LAFCO

Item	Insurance	Office Expens	copies	Communication	Postage	Memberships	Legal Svcs	Ex. OFF. Svcs	Brown Act	Publications	Travel
Account Number	4521	4610	4550	4530	4641	4830	4310	4331	4332	4540	4580
Total Budgeted	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 250.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 750.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 758.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 2,500.00
Calafco dues fy 13-14						\$ (758.00)					
Conf registration Eid Chapman											
Staff Svcs July 2013			\$ (35.00)	\$ (92.68)	\$ (9.10)			\$ (2,932.50)			\$ (810.00)
WCSD and CCWD SOI MSR Notice										\$ (58.80)	
Conf Expenses Reimbursement EID											\$ (562.30)
Conf Expenses Reimbursement Chapman											\$ (816.87)
Staff Svcs August 2013			\$ (34.34)	\$ (80.48)	\$ (15.00)			\$ (2,500.00)	\$ (500.00)		\$ (130.01)
Staff Svcs September 2013				\$ (62.32)				\$ (2,500.00)			
Staff Svcs October 2013		\$ (7.50)	\$ (90.15)	\$ (65.75)	\$ (20.68)			\$ (2,422.50)	\$ (500.00)		
Staff Svcs November 2013			\$ (15.00)	\$ (77.18)				\$ (2,082.50)			
Feather Publishing LCWWD&DUC											
Kenny Snowden and Norine 11.12.13							\$ (37.96)			\$ (58.80)	
Staff Svcs December 2013 #14-09				\$ (80.87)	\$ (17.28)			\$ (2,952.50)	\$ (500.00)		
Staff Svcs January 2014		\$ (67.90)		\$ (71.76)				\$ (3,825.00)			
Feather Publishing SCCSD Legal Notice										\$ (83.30)	
TOTAL EXPENDED	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 174.60	\$ 756.66	\$ 218.96	\$ 237.94	\$ -	\$ 2,462.04	\$ 10,785.00	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 199.10	\$ 180.82
TOTAL REMAINING	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00

[illegible]

INVOICE December 2013

John Benoit

P.O. Box 2694
Granite Bay, CA 95746
Tel: (530) 257-0720
Fax (530) 797-7631

Invoice number: 2014-0009

Invoice date: 1-Feb-14

Vender ID #

Client name: Lassen LAFCO c/o City of Susanville
Address: 66 North Lassen Street
City, state, postal code: Susanville, CA 96130-3904

Telephone: 530-257-1000

Fax:

PO number:

Lafco Staff	Hours	Start / End Date	Amount
John Benoit	42.50	Dec 1-31, 2013	\$3,452.50

Total activity cost: \$3,452.50

Materials / Other Expenses	Reason / Vendor	Amount
Reproduction Costs	Dec 9, 2013 packets	\$68.85
Postage	Dec 9, 2013 packets	\$17.28
Phone & Communications	Phone Internet and fax	\$ 80.87
Office Supplies		
Travel Exp.		

Total materials cost: \$167.00

Total billing: \$ 3,619.50

December 2013

DATE	DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT	POST	DEBIT	CREDIT
1-Dec-13	LAFCo Packets for Dec. 9th				
2-Dec-13	Posting packets mailing and finalization and report on Policy re: Finances				
3-Dec-13					
4-Dec-13					
5-Dec-13					
6-Dec-13					
7-Dec-13	Meeting prep Lassen LAFCo				
8-Dec-13					
9-Dec-13	LAFCo meeting and misc Big Valley and County Planning				
10-Dec-13	City of Susanville, County BOS misc finances.				
11-Dec-13	Rhetta re; Resolution for Big Valley CSD				
12-Dec-13					
13-Dec-13					
14-Dec-13					
15-Dec-13	Ambulance Svcs Big Valley comm DanBouse and Valerie				
16-Dec-13					
17-Dec-13					
18-Dec-13	Ambulance Svcs Big Valley comm and Elections Dept				
19-Dec-13					
20-Dec-13	Misc follow up from LAFCo meeting bylaws				
21-Dec-13					
22-Dec-13	Ambulance Services Big Valley				
23-Dec-13					
24-Dec-13					
25-Dec-13					
26-Dec-13					
27-Dec-13	Accounting and finances				
28-Dec-13	Ambulance Services Big Valley misc comm initiation resolutions				
29-Dec-13					
30-Dec-13					
31-Dec-13	General Admin misc.				

INVOICE January 2014

John Benoit

P.O. Box 2694
Granite Bay, CA 95746
Tel: (530) 257-0720
Fax (530) 797-7631

Invoice number: 2014-0010

Invoice date: 1-Feb-14

Vender ID #

Client name: Lassen LAFCO c/o City of Susanville
Address: 66 North Lassen Street
City, state, postal code: Susanville, CA 96130-3904

Telephone: 530-257-1000
Fax:
PO number:

Lafco Staff	Hours		Start / End Date	Amount
John Benoit	45.00	Staff Svcs	Jan 1-31-2014	\$3,825.00
Jennifer Stephenson	38.50	HPUD MSR	Jan 1-31-2014	\$ 3,272.50
Oxana Wolfson	64.25	HPUD MSR	Jan 1-31-2014	5,461.25

Total activity cost: \$12,558.75

Materials / Other Expenses	Reason / Vendor	Amount
Reproduction Costs		
Postage		
Phone & Communications	Phone Internet and fax	\$ 71.79
Office Supplies	Website Domain	\$67.90
Travel Exp.		

Total materials cost: \$139.69

Total billing: \$ 12,698.44

Lassen LAFCO

January 2014

50B16731	45	3,621.00
16171		3,966.69

Detailed statement for the period of 1/1/2013 to 1/31/2014			
Date	Day	Hours	Description
Jennifer Stephenson, Principal			
Herlong MSR			
1/15/2014	Wednesday	7.5	Filling in missing info in overview, governance, management, and growth in WPV
1/16/2014	Thursday	4.5	Drafting WPV fire section
1/20/2014	Monday	7.75	Continued WPV fire section, phone call with deputy fire chief, research re: land uses
1/21/2014	Tuesday	4	Drafting WPV lighting and library sections
1/22/2014	Wednesday	6.25	Proofing Herlong, researching DUCs, Research re: violations, SSOs, enforcement actions.
1/23/2014	Thursday	8.5	Filling in missing info in water and wastewater sections, drafting determinations
		38.5	
			\$3,272.50
Susanville MSR			
		0	\$0.00
		0	\$0.00
Oxana Wolfson, Principal			
Herlong MSR			
1/13/2014	Monday	2.5	Cleaning up herlong
1/14/2014	Tuesday	8	Cleaning up herlong, Filling in missing info
1/15/2014	Wednesday	7	Finished finance section. Working on water section
1/16/2014	Thursday	4	Working on the water section, Filling in water tables, Following up with Pat
1/18/2014	Saturday	5	Updating profile with Pat's info. Working on water infrastructure.
1/19/2014	Sunday	8.75	Worked further on water tables. Identified missing info. Finished water infrastructure.
			Sent Pat more questions. Finished challenges section and infrastructure needs. Worked on service adequacy section for water. Started working on ww section. Drafted overview and facilities. Sent follow up questions to HPUD.
1/20/2014	Monday	10.5	
1/21/2014	Tuesday	8.75	Finished ww section. Sent more questions to HPUD.
1/22/2014	Wednesday	9.25	Finished the draft. Proofread. Sent to the District for review (with few questions in the text)
1/27/2014	Monday	0.5	Added service charges information
		64.25	
			\$ 5,461.25
Susanville MSR			

INVOICE

Feather Publishing Co. Inc.

P.O. Box B Quincy, CA 95971

Date: January 14, 2014

LAFCO-Lassen
Box 2694
Granite Bay, CA 95746

—

Publish: Hearing File # 2014-01 formation of Southern Cascades Emergency
Services CSD

TOTAL DUE: \$ 83.30

Feather Publishing Co., Inc. P.O. Box B Quincy, CA 95971

Feather River Bulletin Indian Valley Record Chester Progressive Portola Reporter
Lassen Co. Times Westwood PinePress

4.1. General Standards for Annexation and Detachment (Existing Policy)

- i) Adverse Impact of Annexation On Other Agencies or Service Recipients. LAFCO will normally deny annexation proposals that would result in significant adverse effects upon other service recipients or other agencies serving the affected area unless the approval is conditioned to avoid such impacts.

4.2. Determination of the Most Efficient Service Provider (existing policy)

LAFCO will normally approve an annexation or detachment only if the Commission determines that the annexing agency possesses the capability to provide the most efficient delivery of applicable services for the affected population.

- a) Optimum Combination of Service and Cost. For purposes of this standard, the most efficient services are those which are provided at the optimum combination of service cost and service level. In the case of providers with similar service costs, the provider with higher service levels shall be deemed more efficient. In the case of providers of similar service levels, the provider at the lowest cost shall be deemed more efficient. In comparing the providers of adequate but low-cost services, with high-quality, high-cost services, the Commission shall retain discretion to determine the optimum efficiency based on compliance with the other provisions of the standards and the preferences of the affected population.

5.3. Provision of New Services by Districts (Existing Policy)

- a) New Services not Subsidized. LAFCO will not approve a proposal for the provision of a new service where it is reasonably likely that existing ratepayers and/or taxpayers will have to subsidize the new service.

Proposed New Policy Option:

Annexation Fiscal Impact Analysis

- a) *As determined by the Commission, an Annexation Fiscal Analysis shall be required for annexations involving or contemplating new development. ~~An~~ The Annexation Fiscal Analysis report shall enumerate and describe the fiscal impacts of ~~an~~ the annexation necessitated by new development. An Annexation Fiscal Analysis shall provide fiscal impacts on the City's general fund and (or) the County's General Fund, as applicable; the ability of any affected agency to provide the service (s) and applicable transportation-related funds. LAFCO will not normally approve a proposal for a change of organization where it is reasonably likely that existing ratepayers and/or taxpayers will have to subsidize services provided to and within the proposed annexation territory or for services that are no longer*

Item # 13

provided in the event of a detachment of territory from an existing service provider.