

Modoc Local Agency Formation Commission

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Website: www.modoclafco.org

Tuesday June 13, 2017 – 4:00 PM

City Council Chambers
Alturas City Hall
200 North Street, Alturas, CA 96101

1. Call to order / Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioners

Alternate Members

David Allan, County Member
Jim Irvin, City Member,
T.J. Jerry Shea, Public Member
John Dederick, City Member, Vice Chair
Kathie Rhoads, County Member, Chair

Richard Read, Public Member Alt.
Geri Byrne, County Member Alt.
Cheryl Nelson, City Member Alt.

LAFCO Staff

John Benoit, Executive Officer
Scott Browne, LAFCO Counsel
Jackie Froeming, Clerk

2. Approval of the Agenda (Additions and Deletions)

3. Correspondance

4. Consider Minutes for April 11, 2017

a. *Approve minutes from the February 14th , 2016 LAFCo Meeting*

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 Chair 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.

6. Ratify Claims for April 2017 and Authorize Payment of Claims for May 2017

- a. *Approve payment of expenses for April 2017 and May 2017.*

Public Hearing

7. Final LAFCo Budget for fiscal year 2017-2018

- a. *Review, Discuss and Conduct Public Hearing and Consider LAFCo Resolution 2017-0002 adopting a final budget for FY 2017-2018*

Other Items:

8. Discussion regarding the PRELIMINARY DRAFT Service Review and Sphere of Influence update

- a. *Discussion of findings contained in the Preliminary Draft Service Review and Sphere of Influence Report*

9. Correspondence:

10. Executive Officer's Report:

- a. *Lassen Modoc Flood Control and Water Conservation District – Service Review and Sphere of Influence*
- b. *Southern Cascades Community Services District - Sphere Update*
- c. *California Water District – Big Valley Water*

11. 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.

12. Adjourn to the next regular meeting on Aug 8, 2017

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 are available for review for public inspection in the Modoc County Planning Department office located at 203 W. 4th Street, Alturas CA. [such documents are also available on the Modoc LAFCO website (www.modoc.lafco.ca.gov) 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 Modoc 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 (530) 233-9625 or by email at lafco@modoc.lafco.ca.gov Copies of reports to the extent feasible are located on the LAFCO webpage at: www.modoclafco.org

Modoc Local Agency Formation Commission**Meeting Minutes of April 11, 2017****1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance**

Chair Rhoads called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, Alturas City Hall. Commissioners John Dederick, Jim Irvin, Jerry Shea, and Kathie Rhoads, were present. Commissioner Allan was absent.

Staff Present: John Benoit, Executive Officer.

Pledge of Allegiance**2. Approval of Agenda (Additions and Deletions)**

Commissioner Dederick made the motion to approve the agenda; seconded by Commissioner Irvin. In favor: Commissioner Dederick, Irvin, Shea and Rhoads with Commissioner Allan Absent. Motion Passed.

3. Correspondence

There was no correspondence to report

4. Consider Minutes for February 14, 2017

Commissioner Dederick made the motion to approve the minutes; seconded by Commissioner Irvin. In favor: Commissioners Dederick, Irvin, Shea and Rhoads with Commissioner Allan Absent. Motion Passed.

5. Public Comment

No public comment was offered.

6. Ratify Claims for February 2017 and Authorize Payment of Claims for March 2017

Commissioner Shea made the motion to approve; seconded by Commissioner Irvin. In favor: Commissioners Dederick, Irvin, Shea and Rhoads with Commissioner Allan Absent. Motion Passed.

Action Items:**7. Proposed LAFCo Budget for fiscal year 2017-2018**

- a. *Review, Discuss and Conduct Public Hearing and Consider LAFCo Resolution 2017-0001 adopting a proposed budget for FY 2017-2018*

Chair Rhoads opened the Public Hearing at 4:10 PM

Executive Officer Benoit presented the Executive Officer's report regarding the proposed 2017-2018 LAFCo Budget. Mr. Benoit stated the Calafco Dues will increase from \$840 per year to \$899 per year and proposed reductions in Postage, Printing, legal professional services, clerk costs, Transportation and Travel and MSR-SOI Updates. A discussion followed.

Chair Rhoads closed the Public Hearing at 4:25 PM.

Upon motion by Commissioner Dederick and seconded by Commissioner Shea, the motion passed with Commissioner's Dederick, Irvin, Shea and Rhoads voting in favor with Commissioner Allan Absent.

8. Update to Fire and EMS Service Review & Sphere of Influence update and the Lassen Modoc Flood Control District.

Executive Officer Benoit presented a progress update regarding the Lassen Modoc Flood Control District and that Lassen LAFCo is the lead LAFCo for this review and sphere.

Executive Officer Benoit also presented a progress update regarding the Fire and EMS service review and Sphere Update and indicated a difficulty in verifying the district boundary maps due to inconsistencies between tax rate areas and actual formation paperwork. Mr. Benoit, will work with the Assessor-Auditor regarding these issues.

9. Executive Officer's Monthly Report

a. Legislation: Healthcare Districts, Inactive Districts and Special District Representation

Executive Officer Benoit provided the Commission with an overview of items the California Legislature is addressing during this session. Much of this is brought about by dialogue with the Little Hoover Commission.

10. Commissioner Reports - Discussion

No commissioner reports.

11. Adjourn to next regular meeting – April 11, 2017

There being no further business to come before this Commission; Commissioner Dederick made the motion to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Commissioner Irvin to adjourn the meeting. All present in favor with the motion passing with Commissioner's Dederick, Irvin, Shea and Rhoads voting in favor with Commissioner Allan absent.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Modoc Local Agency Formation Commission

#6

CLAIMS

for

April and May 2017

Authorize the following Claims for FY 2016-2017

May 1, 2017	Staff Services April 2017	\$ 3,204.53
June 1, 2017	Staff Svcs May 2017	\$ 709.31
May 18, 2017	Modoc Record Notice Final 17-18 Budget	\$ 46.50
June 1, 2017	Fire and EMS MSR Draft	\$ 5,185.00
Apr 10, 2017	Commission Stipend Apr 10, 2017	\$ 400.00

TOTAL: \$ 9,626.34

DATED: June 12, 2017

APPROVED: June 12, 2017

**Kathie Rhoads, Chair or John Dederick, Vice-Chair
Modoc Local Agency Formation Commission**

Attest:

**John Benoit
Executive Officer**

Item	Account Number	Insurance	Memberships	copies	postage	Communications	Office Exp.	Counsel	staff Svcs	Clerk Costs	Notices and Public
		4140	4420	4210	4211	4221	4210	4008	4004	4006	4390
Total Budgeted 2015-2016		\$ 1,000.00	\$ 840.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 500.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 36,000.00	\$ 900.00	\$ 600.00
Calafco Dues 2016-2017			\$ (840.00)								
Staff Svcs July 2016				(71.97)		(67.98)	(10.00)		(2,082.50)		
Modoc Record Public Member Recruit											
Staff Svcs Aug 2016				(49.83)	(21.27)	(65.76)			(1,835.00)	(120.00)	(93.00)
Comm Stipend Aug 9, 2016				(15.00)		(64.76)	(19.50)		(1,000.00)		
Staff Svcs September 2016									(2,000.00)		(66.00)
Modoc Record Newell CWD MSR-Sol				(99.84)	(18.00)	(65.11)	(77.90)		(1,232.50)	(120.00)	(69.00)
Staff Svcs Oct 2016						(74.76)					
Staff Svcs November 2016											
Modoc Record MSR and SOI Lighting Disks				(54.00)	(16.38)	(64.80)	(30.00)		(3,000.00)	(120.00)	(48.00)
Comm Stipend Oct 4, 2016				(13.00)	(0.48)	(68.45)	(15.00)		(1,402.50)		
Staff Svcs & Exp January 2017					(5.44)	(67.91)			(2,560.00)	(120.00)	
Staff Svcs and Exp February 2017											
Meeting Stipend 2.14.15											
Modoc Record Prop 17-18 Budget											
Staff Svcs and Exp March 2017				(30.90)	(5.60)	(68.61)	(15.00)		(2,380.00)		
Staff Svcs and Exp April 2017						(68.03)	(30.00)		(3,070.00)		
Comm Stipend April 11, 2017											
Staff Svcs and Exp May 2017						(67.81)			(722.50)		
Modoc Record Final Budget											(46.50)
Total Expenditures to date		\$ (840.00)	\$ (334.54)	\$ (67.17)	\$ (432.83)	\$ (743.98)	\$ (197.40)	\$ 3,200.00	\$ (21,288.00)	\$ (480.00)	\$ (322.50)
Total Budget Remaining		\$ 1,165.46	\$ 432.83	\$ 256.02	\$ 202.60	\$ 202.60	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 14,715.00	\$ 420.00	\$ 277.50	

Audited July 1, 2016 City Fund Carryover \$ 29,466.59

16-17 Actual City/Co. Contributions
FY 2014-2015 City Anticipated FundTransf
2016-2017 County-City Funds anticipated
Funds received \$40,714.00
REVENUE FOR PROJECTS
Interest
Anticipated Funds received
Less Expenditures
Actual Cash Balance \$ (43,242.50)
\$ 26,938.09

Trans & Travel	MSR/DOI Updates	Commissioner	TOTAL
\$ 2,000.00	\$ 21,500.00	\$ 4,800.00	\$ 74,240.00
			\$ (840.00)
			\$ (4,909.95)
			\$ (93.00)
			\$ (4,091.86)
			\$ (600.00)
			\$ (3,499.26)
			\$ (66.00)
			\$ (4,110.26)
			\$ (1,307.26)
			\$ (69.00)
			\$ (500.00)
			\$ (600.00)
			\$ (4,460.18)
			\$ (1,486.43)
			\$ (3,871.35)
			\$ (600.00)
			\$ (48.00)
			\$ (2,463.61)
			\$ (3,204.53)
			\$ (400.00)
			\$ (5,975.31)
			\$ (46.50)

\$ (276.91)	\$ (15,995.00)	\$ (2,700.00)	\$ (43,242.50)
\$ 1,723.09	\$ 5,505.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 30,997.50

#7

MODOC LAFCO

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

June 13, 2017

TO: Local Agency Formation Commission
FROM: John Benoit, Executive Officer
RE: Final Budget for FY 2017-2018

I provided a "recommended" budget at the April 11, 2017 meeting, which was adopted. A Budget Justification Report was prepared for that Budget Hearing. Please refer the Budget Justification Report for information on each of the items below.

CARRY OVER FROM FY 2016-2017:

Carryover is proposed to be \$ 25,000.

CITY AND COUNTY COST SHARE:

The City and County Cost share is proposed to be \$21,335.45, which is slightly higher than last year.

SUMMARY OF EXPENSES:

Commissioner Stipends The Commission has budgeted \$4,800 for Commissioner and Alternate stipends. This includes six meeting per year. According to Resolution 2009-0005, stipends will be paid for each Commissioner and Alternate who attends LAFCO meetings.

Liability Insurance There is nothing in the Budget since the County does not charge LAFCo for this item.

Memberships The Commission recommended in its proposed budget \$899.00 for CALAFCo dues. This category has gone up per the vote of the membership.

Communications This is proposed to be \$1,000.00 for general communications for phone, internet and fax.

Office Expenses The Commission recommended in its proposed budget \$400.00 Depending upon LAFCO activity this could be augmented by an increased appropriation from unanticipated revenue.

Printing This amount is proposed to be \$800.00 to be used for general copying of reports and packets.

Postage This is proposed to be \$300.00 for public notices and mailings, the same as this year.

Legal Services The Commission recommended in its proposed budget \$2,000.00 for this item. LAFCO Counsel attends LAFCO meetings as requested by the Commission. It is anticipated if budget augmentations are needed in this category, additional appropriation would come from unanticipated revenue.

Staff Services: Executive Officer and Clerk: The Commission recommended in its proposed budget \$36,000 for these items. This translates into \$3,000.00 per month for LAFCO administration/clerk services. Notwithstanding a very complex reorganization or incorporation project for Modoc LAFCO, this amount should cover LAFCO administration. Complex projects should be fee supported thereby increasing revenue to LAFCO. It is anticipated if budget augmentations are needed in this category, additional appropriation would come from unanticipated revenue.

Legal Notices/Publications The Commission recommended in its proposed budget \$600.00 for legal notices. Given the cost of legal advertising and the projected workload this amount remains reasonable.

Special Dept. Expense – File Scanning and Management The proposed budget contained \$3,000 for the effort of scanning LAFCo files for public access and reduction of storage need.

Transportation/Mileage/Training/Conferences The Commission sent one person to the Calafco Conference in San Diego on October 25th -27th this year. Staff is normally sent to the Staff Workshop and Annual Conference. This budget does not provide enough funding for one attendee to the Calafco annual conference. More funds will be needed to send one attendee to the Calafco Annual Conference. This budget includes \$500.00 to pay a portion of staff to attend the Calafco Annual Conference and the Staff workshop in the Spring of 2018.

Municipal Service Reviews/Sphere of Influence Updates The Commission recommended in its proposed budget \$10,500.00 for this effort, which would cover additional costs of preparing Reviews/Sphere Updates as required by the LAFCO Act. This amount may not be adequate to prepare all the reviews. Funds could be augmented from the Executive Officer Services category for this item, depending upon the workload. A portion of the Sphere of Influence updates is mapping. As expected, MSR's and SOI's updates are required as determined necessary.

Recommendation:

- a. Review, discuss, amend, and consider the 2017-2018 Final Budget. A budget justification report for FY 2017-2018 was prepared by staff for the adopted proposed budget in April 2017.
- b. Adopt LAFCO Resolution 2017-0002 adopting a Final Budget.

Resolution 2017-0002
of the
Modoc Local Agency Formation Commission
Modoc County, California

Resolution of the Modoc Local Agency Formation Commission

Adopting a Final Budget for 2017-2018

WHEREAS, Modoc LAFCO is required by Government Code Section 56381(a) to adopt annually, following a noticed public hearing, a proposed budget by May 1st and a final budget by June 15th; and,

WHEREAS, the Commission has prepared a final budget for public review; and,

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer has given notice of hearing in the form and manner specified by law for adoption of both the proposed and final budget and upon the date, time and place specified in said notice of hearing, the Commission heard, discussed and considered all oral and written testimony submitted including, but not limited to, the approved budget priorities for Fiscal Year 2017-2018 and the Executive Officer's report and recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has considered the attached Final Budget in light of the requirements of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000;

NOW THEREFORE, the Modoc Local Agency Formation Commission does hereby determine, resolve, and order the following:

1. That Modoc LAFCO hereby adopts the attached final 2017-2018 budget (Attachment A).
2. Directs the Executive Officer to transmit the final budget to the Modoc County Auditor (Auditor) and all parties specified in Government Code Section 56381 (a) as promptly as possible.
3. The Commission hereby requests the Auditor to collect the funds in accordance with Government Code Section 56381 (c). In the event of non-payment of LAFCO funds by any entity subject to the LAFCO's apportionment, the Commission hereby requests and authorizes the Auditor to collect the funds from property tax revenues or any other revenue source and deposit the funds into the LAFCO account.
4. The Commission desires to use carryover funds remaining from the 2016-2017 budget to establish a contingency fund and to prepare Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence updates in the amounts specified on the attached 2017-2018 final budget.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Modoc Local Agency Formation Commission at a regular meeting of said Commission held on June 13th, 2017 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: -

NOES: -

ABSTAINS: -

ABSENT: -

Signed and approved by me after its passage this 13th day of June, 2017

Kathie Rhoads
Chair, Modoc LAFCO

Attest:

John Benoit, Executive Officer
Modoc LAFCO

3.3 Adin Fire Protection District MSR Determinations

MSR-1) The population of Adin is not expected to increase substantially in the near future. Planning, Zoning and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc. The District should maintain communication with the County Planning Department regarding these matters.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on the Adin FPD to determine if it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). There are no incorporated cities which could annex this area in any case. According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$31,500 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The Adin FPD maintains fire-fighting equipment appropriate for the area. The training schedule and training with other districts and agencies should be maintained.

MSR-4) The Adin FPD should provide current financial information to the public on a website. The Modoc County Auditor shows that the District has adequate income to cover the expenses and pay back the Federal loan.

MSR-5) The Adin FPD does cooperate with the other fire districts and the Modoc Fire Chiefs Association.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors has regular meetings at the Fire Station. Administration of the District is necessary in order to provide fire protection and emergency medical response.

3.4 Adin Fire Protection District SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Adin Fire Protection District is that the Sphere of Influence is that the SOI remain the same as the District Boundary. The Determinations are as follows:

SOI-1] No additional land is expected to be annexed to the Adin Fire Protection District.

SOI-2] The need for fire protection service to the Adin area will continue.

SOI-3] Fire Protection services are adequate for a rural area and will need to be maintained in the future. Efficient use of volunteer personnel and funds will be required.

SOI-4] Adin provides limited community services. Schools, medical services and most commercial services are provided in other, larger communities in the area.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether Adin is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

4.3 Alturas Rural Fire Protection District MSR Determinations

MSR-1) There is not much growth expected for the Alturas Rural FPD because most of the growth will occur within the City of Alturas. Planning, Zoning and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc and the District should maintain communication with the County Planning Department regarding these matters.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on the Alturas Rural FPD to determine if there are Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities within the District. According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: between \$25,000 and \$30,000 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The Alturas Rural FPD coordinates equipment and training with the City of Alturas Fire Department.

MSR-4) The Alturas Rural FPD appears to have adequate income and reserves as reported by the Modoc County Auditor.

MSR-5) The Alturas Rural FPD coordinates with the City of Alturas Fire Department but a separate Board of Directors is required. The District should become familiar with other nearby districts in case closer cooperation is required in the future.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors has regular meetings but no one responded to the Modoc LAFCo questionnaire regarding this report. A website would be helpful to the District.

4.4 Alturas Rural Fire Protection District SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Alturas Rural FPD Sphere of Influence is that the SOI remain the same as the District Boundary. The Determinations are as follows:

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the Alturas Rural FPD unless an adjacent smaller district is willing to merge with the District.

SOI-2] The need for the fire protection service of the Alturas Rural FPD will continue into the future.

SOI-3] Fire Protection services are adequate for a rural area and will need to be maintained in the future. Efficient use of personnel and funds will be required.

SOI-4] The Alturas Rural FPD area does not have a separate identity and services are provided in the City of Alturas. This is not a problem because of the close cooperation with the City of Alturas Fire Department.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether there is a DUC within the Alturas Rural FPD. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

5.3 California Pines CSD Fire Department MSR Determinations

MSR-1) Although there are lots that could be developed within the California Pines CSD, the population is not expected to increase substantially from the existing population of 350 in the near future. Planning, Zoning, and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc and the District should maintain communication with the County Planning Department regarding these matters.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on the California Pines CSD to determine if it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). There is no incorporated city which could annex this area in any case. According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$54,297 , and therefore the area is not a DUC.

MSR-3) The California Pines CSD has fire-fighting equipment. Training volunteers and training with other districts for both fire and medical emergencies should be maintained.

MSR-4) The California Pines CSD should provide the budget and audit information on the website so it is available to the public. The California Pines CSD reports to Modoc LAFCo that they are "struggling with payroll and bills."

MSR-5) The California Pines CSD does cooperate with other fire protection districts and the Modoc Fire Chiefs Association. Any shared training will be a benefit to the District.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors has five members and holds regular meetings on the third Friday of each month at 4:00 p.m. Any changes are noted on the website. It would be good to show the full agenda of each meeting and the minutes of previous meetings on the website. The information provided by California Pines CSD was most helpful in the preparation of this report.

5.4 California Pines CSD Fire Department SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the California Pines CSD Sphere of Influence is that the SOI remain the same as the District Boundary. The Determinations are as follows:

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the California Pines CSD. The fact that the California Pines is a CSD makes it more difficult to combine with a fire protection district.

SOI-2] The need for the fire protection service of the California Pines CSD will continue so the service should be maintained and funded to the greatest extent possible by the District.

SOI-3] Fire Protection services are adequate for a rural area and will need to be maintained in the future. Efficient use of personnel and funds will be required.

SOI-4] California Pines maintains a separate small community with economic interests to maintain the value of the properties. The residents depend on Alturas for shopping, and other commercial, educational and social services.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether California Pines is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a not Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

4.3 Canby Fire Protection District MSR Determinations

MSR-1) Development in Canby is limited by the lack of sewer and water systems. Planning, Zoning, and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc. The District should maintain communication with the Modoc County Planning Department regarding these matters.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on Canby to determine if it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). Since the City of Alturas is 17 miles away this would preclude annexation. According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$19,615 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) There is fire-fighting equipment and volunteers in Canby. Training and working with other fire districts should be a high priority.

MSR-4) Canby FPD has some tax revenue to work with.

MSR-5) The Canby FPD does participate in the Fire Chiefs Association. It might be appropriate in the future for the District to merge with another Fire Protection District such as the Alturas Rural FPD provided that the fire station in Canby could be maintained.

MAE-6) Even though everyone associated with the Canby Fire Protection District is a volunteer there is still a need to comply with State Law and to provide information about the District administration to the public. Use of a website or a page on the County of Modoc website would be most helpful.

4.4 Canby Fire Protection District SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Canby Fire Protection District is that the Sphere of Influence remain the same as the District Boundary. The SOI Determinations are as follows:

SOI-1] No additional land is expected to be annexed to the Canby Fire Protection District.

SOI-2] The need for fire protection for the Canby FPD will continue into the future so the service should be maintained. If it is too difficult to maintain the District combining with another district such as Alturas Rural FPD should be considered.

SOI-3] Fire Protection services are adequate for a rural area and will need to be maintained in the future. Efficient use of personnel and funds will be required as well as coordination and cooperation with other fire protection districts.

SOI-4] Canby is not a totally self-sufficient community and depends on Alturas for additional services and medical facilities.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether Canby is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

7.3 Cedarville FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) The existing population of Cedarville is estimated to be 514 and is not expected to increase substantially in the near future. The Fire Protection District serves a slightly larger population because it includes the surrounding area. Planning, Zoning, and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc and the District should maintain communication with the County Planning Department regarding these matters.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on the Cedarville FPD to determine if it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). There is no incorporated city which could annex this area in any case. According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$36,250 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The Cedarville FPD has fire-fighting equipment. Training volunteers and training with other districts for both fire and medical emergencies should be maintained.

MSR-4) The Cedarville FPD prepares a Budget and contracts with an Independent Auditor to provide an Audit. These documents should be made available to the public on a website if possible.

MSR-5) The Cedarville FPD does cooperate with other fire protection districts. It may be necessary to provide a more formal system of cooperation in the future such as a joint powers agreement (JPA) to reduce expenses. A County website for all the fire protection districts would be helpful.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors has five members and meets regularly. The use of a website to advertise meetings and make minutes available to the public would be useful. The information provided by the Cedarville FPD was most helpful in the preparation of this report.

7.4 Cedarville FPD SOI Determinations

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the Cedarville FPD. Continued cooperation with other fire districts might lead to a unified fire district for the Surprise Valley in the future.

SOI-2] The need for the Cedarville Fire Protection District will continue into the future. The District will continue to receive both medical emergency and wildland fire calls.

SOI-3] The Fire Protection service is adequate for a rural area. Efficient use of volunteers and funding will be required.

SOI-4] Cedarville is a complete community with schools, churches, medical facilities and businesses. All of these enterprises require adequate fire protection.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether Cedarville is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

8.3 Davis Creek FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) Davis Creek is not expected to increase in population. Planning, Zoning and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on Davis Creek to determine if it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). There is no incorporated city nearby in any case.

MSR-3) The Davis Creek FPD has minimal fire protection equipment and volunteers.

MSR-4) The Davis Creek FPD has minimal financial resources.

MSR-5) The Davis Creek FPD cooperates with other fire protection districts. The relationship may need to become closer in the future if the Davis Creek FPD cannot maintain a sufficient number of trained volunteers.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors maintains a regular meeting schedule but is faces with significant problems. The information provided by the Board was helpful for the preparation of this report.

8.4 Davis Creek FPD SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Davis Creek FPD Sphere of Influence is for the SOI to be the same as the District Boundary. However, the District may need to be combined with another District such as Alturas Rural FPD in the future. The SOI Determinations are as follows:

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the Davis Creek FPD.

SOI-2] The need for fire protection service for the Davis Creek area will continue so the service should be continued even if it means that the Davis Creek FPD may ultimately have to merge with another District.

SOI-3] Fire protection services need to be maintained in the future. The Davis Creek FPD may provide the model for service with minimal personnel and funds and the shared responsibility for fire chief duties.

SOI-4] The Davis Creek community does not include many services but is focused on Goose Lake and tourism. The community depends on Alturas for services.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether Davis Lake is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area may be a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

9.3 Eagleville FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) Little growth is expected in Eagleville. There are approximately 20 vacant houses in the area. Planning, Zoning and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on Eagleville to determine whether it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$22,750 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The Eagleville Fire Protection District has fire protection equipment.

MSR-4) The Eagleville Fire Protection District has a small budget, the majority of the funds are used for insurance.

MSR-5) The Eagleville Fire Protection District is a member of the Modoc Fire Chiefs Association.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors did not respond to the Modoc LAFCo Questionnaire. It is difficult to maintain a small rural fire protection district but administration as well as volunteer fire fighters is required.

9.4 Eagleville FPD SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Eagleville FPD is for the Sphere of Influence to remain the same as the District boundary. However, the Eagleville FPD may want to work on a plan to join forces with another district in the future.

SOI-1] No additional land is expected to be added to the Eagleville Fire Protection District.

SOI-2] The need for fire protection services in the Eagleville FPD will remain. The District should remain in place and determine if working with another District such as the Cedarville FPD, would contribute to greater service.

SOI-3] The Eagleville FPD has fire-fighting equipment. The District should work with other districts to determine if insurance would be more economical if the districts worked together.

SOI-4] Eagleville does not have services available but depends on other communities, primarily Cedarville, for economic, social, medical, religious, educational and commercial services.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether Eagleville is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

10.3 Fort Bidwell FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) Little additional development is expected within the Fort Bidwell Fire Protection District area. Planning, Zoning and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc. The District should maintain communication with the County Planning Department regarding actions or permits within the District.

MSR-2) There is no specific information available on the Fort Bidwell FPD to determine if it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). There are no nearby cities that could annex the area. According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$20,125 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The equipment is adequate for the District. Training volunteers remains a priority.

MSR-4) The District depends on the small amount of tax revenue it receives each year to maintain insurance coverage for the District and the Volunteers.

MSR-5) The District notes that cooperation with other fire districts in the Surprise Valley "is very good within the constraints of all volunteer groups."

MSR-6) The Commissioners meet regularly and provided a very helpful response to Modoc LAFCo for this report.

10.4 Fort Bidwell FPD SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Fort Bidwell Fire Protection District Sphere of Influence is that the SOI remain the same as the District Boundary. The Determinations are as follows:

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the Fort Bidwell Fire Protection District.

SOI-2] The need for the fire protection service of the Fort Bidwell Fire Protection District will continue. The District should maintain equipment and training to the maximum extent possible.

SOI-3] Fire protection services are adequate for a rural area and need to be maintained in the future. The tradition of volunteer service will be a challenge to maintain.

SOI-4] Fort Bidwell is not a full service community and children are sent to school in Cedarville. The Volunteer Fire Department helps to maintain a sense of community by promoting local events such as the Memorial Day Picnic.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether Fort Bidwell is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

11.3 Lake City FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) The Lake City area has no community sewer or water system. This will limit growth and development. Planning, Zoning and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc and the District should maintain communication with the County Planning Department regarding these matters.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on the Lake City area to determine if it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). There is no incorporated city which could annex this area in any case. According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$29,464 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The Lake City Fire Department has fire-fighting equipment. Training volunteers and training with other districts for both fire and medical emergencies should be maintained.

MSR-4) The Lake City Fire Protection District has minimal financial resources. A timely merger with another fire protection district such as the Cedarville FPD could allow for better fire protection and better use of finances.

MSR-5) The Lake City Fire Protection District does cooperate with other Fire Protection Districts in the area. Even if the Lake City FPD were to join with another District, such as the Cedarville FPD, it would be good to maintain the fire station and equipment in Lake City.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors has three members and meets regularly. It would be good to work with the County of Modoc and/or other fire protection districts to get a website. The return of the Questionnaire to Modoc LAFCo was most helpful.

11.4 Lake City FPD SOI Determinations

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the Lake City Fire Protection District.

SOI-2] There is a need for fire protection services in the Lake City area.

SOI-3] The fire protection services in the Lake City area appear to be insufficiently funded.

SOI-4] The Lake City area is a neighborhood rather than a full service economic or social community. Residents of Lake City depend on Cedarville for most services.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether the Lake City area is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

12.3 Likely FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) The Likely Fire Protection District is not expected to increase in population. The District should remain in contact with the Modoc County Planning Department regarding Planning, Zoning and Building regulations and proposed changes.

MSR-2) There is no specific information regarding the community of Likely being a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$17,283 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The Likely Fire Protection District has fire protection equipment and an active training program for both fire and medical emergencies.

MSR-4) The financial information presented by the Modoc County Auditor shows the advantage of a larger fire protection district with more tax revenue and a smaller percentage of the budget used for insurance.

MSR-5) The Likely Fire Protection District does cooperate with other fire protection districts through the Modoc Fire Chiefs Association.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors should have returned the questionnaire to Modoc LAFCo. Inability to return the questionnaire makes the District appear less competent to manage its affairs. Administration is necessary no matter how small the district.

12.4 Likely FPD SOI Determinations

SOI-1] The Likely Fire Protection District is not expected to annex additional land.

SOI-2] The need for the Likely Fire Protection District will continue.

SOI-3] Fire protection services are adequate for a rural area but will need to be maintained in the future with continuing training programs and cooperation with other districts.

SOI-4] The Likely community does not provide commercial, medical, social, educational and other services. As is the case in many rural areas, the Fire Protection District is the last community institution to remain and thus to provide an identity for the area.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether Likely is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

13.3 Lookout FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) Little growth is expected in Lookout because there is no sewer or water service available. Planning, Zoning and Building permits are managed Modoc County.

MSR-2) There is no specific information on the Lookout community to show if it is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC). According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$18,036 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The Lookout FPD has fire-fighting equipment. Training volunteers and training with other districts should be maintained.

MSR-4) The Lookout FPD does not appear to have adequate funds for the long-term. A discussion with the Adin FPD could be beneficial if the districts could work together and maintain both fire stations.

MSR-5) The Lookout FPD does cooperate with other fire protection districts through the Modoc Fire Chiefs Association. A greater level of working together with the Adin FPD could benefit both districts in the future.

MSR-6) With no communication from the Board of Directors of the Lookout FPD it is difficult to know that true status of the District. In addition to maintaining a level of volunteer responders it is also necessary to provide administration for the District.

13.4 Lookout FPD SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Lookout FPD is that the Sphere of Influence remain the same as the District Boundary. However, it would be appropriate for the Lookout FPD to communicate with the Adin FPD to see if the districts could work together in the future.

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the Lookout Fire Protection District.

SOI-2] The need for the fire protection service of the Lookout Fire Protection District will remain. The District needs to be forward thinking to provide the best possible service to the residents with limited resources.

SOI-3] Fire protection services appear to be marginal but are still needed.

SOI-4] Lookout is a small community with few services. Most residents depend on Adin or Alturas for comprehensive services.

SOI-5] There is no information to determine whether Lookout is a DUC. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

14.3 Tulelake Multi-County FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) Since the Tulelake Multi-County FPD includes land in two counties, the General Plan and land use regulations of the respective county (Siskiyou or Modoc) will govern the land use within that part of the District.

MSR-2) There is no specific information to determine the existence of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUCs) within the District. Both Tulelake and Newell have their own sewer and water systems. According to 2010 Census data the Median Household Income for this area is: \$29,511 , and therefore the area is a DUC.

MSR-3) The Tulelake Multi-County FPD has equipment and volunteers. They were able to respond to a large hay and equipment barn fire on February 23, 2017.¹

MSR-4) The Tulelake Multi-County FPD manages finances through the Siskiyou County Auditor. There appears to be sufficient tax revenue to support the District. The District does have a special tax for fire protection.

MSR-5) The Tulelake Multi-County FPD does cooperate with other fire protection districts in both Modoc and Siskiyou counties. Fire Departments from Merrill and Malin also responded to the February 2017 fire.²

MSR-6) The Board of Directors did respond to the Modoc LAFCo questionnaire but did not provide much information regarding the District. It would help the District to have a website to make information known to the public.

14.4 Tulelake Multi-County FPD SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Tulelake Multi-County FPD is for the Sphere of Influence to remain the same as the District boundary. The Determinations are as follows:

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the Tulelake Multi-County FPD.

SOI-2] The need for the fire protection service provided by the Tulelake Multi-County FPD will continue.

SOI-3] Fire protection services can always be improved. The District should maintain the maximum number of trained volunteers possible.

SOI-4] Tulelake and Newell have a shared history and work together as much as possible. There are more services available in Tulelake due to the larger population.

SOI-5] There is no information regarding DUCs in the District area. Based on Census Designated Places information from the 2010 census the indication is this area is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community.

¹ <https://kobi5.com/tag/tulelake/>, May 29, 2017.

² <https://kobi5.com/tag/tulelake/>, May 29, 2017.

15.3 Willow Ranch FPD MSR Determinations

MSR-1) There is little growth expected within the Willow Ranch community because there are no community sewer or water facilities. Planning, Zoning and Building Permits are managed by the County of Modoc.

MSR-2) There is no specific information to determine whether Willow Ranch is a Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community (DUC).

MSR-3) The Willows Ranch FPD has fire-fighting equipment. Training for volunteers must be maintained for both fire and medical emergencies.

MSR-4) The Willow Ranch FPD has minimal income and does not pay for General Insurance.

MSR-5) The Willow Ranch FPD does cooperate with other fire protection districts through the Modoc Fire Chiefs Association.

MSR-6) The Board of Directors did not respond to the Modoc LAFCo questionnaire.

15.4 Willow Ranch FPD SOI Determinations

The recommendation for the Willow Ranch Fire Protection District is for the Sphere of Influence to be the same as the District boundary. The Determinations are as follows:

SOI-1] No additional lands are expected to be annexed to the Willow Ranch Fire Protection District.

SOI-2] The need for the fire protection service of the Willow Ranch Fire Protection District will continue and service should be maintained.

SOI-3] Fire protection services have minimal funding ways to work with another district may have to be explored in the future.

SOI-4] The community of Willow Ranch depends on the community of New Pine Creek, Oregon for most services.

SOI5] There is no information to determine whether Willow Ranch is a DUC.