All persons are invited to testify and submit written comments to the Commission. If you challenge a LAFCo action in court, you may be limited to issues raised at the public hearing or submitted as written comments prior to the close of the public hearing. All written materials received by staff 72 hours before the hearing will be distributed to the Commission. If you wish to submit written material at the hearing, please supply 10 copies.

All participants on a matter to be heard by the Commission that have made campaign contributions totaling $250 or more to any Commissioner in the past 12 months must disclose this fact, either orally or in writing, for the official record as required by Government Code Section 84308.

Any person, or combination of persons, who make expenditures for political purposes of $1,000 or more in support of, or in opposition to, a matter heard by the Commission must disclose this fact in accordance with the Political Reform Act.

**CALL TO ORDER**

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call
3. **Public Comment**: Opportunity for members of the public to address the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) on subjects not otherwise on the agenda relating to LAFCo business. The Commission reserves the right to impose a reasonable limit on time afforded to any topic or to any individual speaker.

---

### CONSENT AGENDA

4. Approve LAFCo Meeting Minutes of February 28, 2013

5. Receive and file the March 2013 CALAFCO Quarterly

---

### PUBLIC HEARINGS

6. Public Hearing to consider and approve the Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization (LAFCO # 915), initiate Conducting Authority Proceedings and set April 25, 2013 as the Hearing date to conduct protest proceedings

7. Public Hearing to consider the Proposed LAFCo Budget for Fiscal Year 2013/14 and set May 23, 2013 as the Public Hearing date to approve the Final Budget

---

### EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT

8. A report by the Executive Officer on recent events relevant to the Commission and an update of Yolo LAFCo staff activity for the month. The Commission or any individual Commissioner may request that action be taken on any item listed.

   - Staff Activity Report - February 25 to March 22, 2013
   - 2013 CALAFCO Conference - Squaw Creek Resort August 28-30
   - Animal services community engagement plan update

---

### COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

9. Opportunity for any Commissioner to comment on issues not listed on the agenda. No action will be taken on off-agenda items unless authorized by law.

---

### ADJOURNMENT

10. Adjournment

Next meeting scheduled for: April 25, 2013 - West Sacramento Council Chambers

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing agenda was posted March 22, 2013 by 5:00 p.m. at the following places:

   - On the bulletin board at the east entrance of the Erwin W. Meier Administration Building, 625 Court Street, Woodland, California; and

   - On the bulletin board outside the Board of Supervisors Chambers, Room 206 in the Erwin W. Meier Administration Building, 625 Court Street, Woodland, California.
NOTICE
If requested, this agenda can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact the Commission Clerk for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should telephone or otherwise contact the Commission Clerk as soon as possible and at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The Commission Clerk may be reached at (530) 666-8048 or at the following address:

Yolo County LAFCo
625 Court Street, Room 203
Woodland, CA 95695

Note: Audio for LAFCo meetings will be available directly following conclusion of the meeting at www.yololafco.org.
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LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
of YOLO COUNTY

MEETING MINUTES
February 28, 2013

The Local Agency Formation Commission of Yolo County met on the 28th day of February 2013, at 9:00 a.m. in the Yolo County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 625 Court Street, Room 206, Woodland CA. Members present were Chair and Public Member Olin Woods, County Members Don Saylor and Alternate Jim Provenza, City Members Skip Davies and Bill Kristoff. Others present were Executive Officer Christine Crawford, Commission Clerk Terri Tuck, and Commission Counsel Robin Drivon

Item № 1 and 2  Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call

Chair Woods called the Meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

Clerk Terri Tuck led the Pledge of Allegiance

PRESENT: Davies, Kristoff, Provenza, Saylor, Woods ABSENT: None

Item № 3  Public Comments

None

CONSENT

Item № 4  Approve LAFCo Meeting Minutes of January 24, 2013

Item № 5  Approve LAFCo Special Meeting Minutes of January 29, 2013

Item № 6  Receive and File C & L Newsletter by Special Counsel Colantuono & Levin, a Professional Corporation

Minute Order 2013-05: The recommended actions were approved on Consent.

Approved by the following vote:

MOTION: Kristoff SECOND: Davies
AYES: Davies, Kristoff, Provenza, Saylor, Woods
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None
REGULAR

Item № 7  Authorize The Chair To Execute An Agreement Not To Exceed $4,000 With UC Davis On Behalf Of Its School Of Veterinary Medicine’s Koret Shelter Medicine Program To Provide Design/Organizational Consultation For Yolo County Animal Services (YCAS) And Authorize Staff To Process Internal Billings To YCAS Not To Exceed $12,000 To Reimburse YCAS For The Cost To Hire Contract Veterinarians To Replace The Existing Veterinary Staff That Will Be Redirected 8-10 Hours Per Week To Work On Koret Shelter Medicine Consultation Services

Public comments were made by Karen Vanderford, Julie Sontag, Janet Krovoza, and Lori Lubin.

Minute Order 2013-06: The recommended actions were approved. Additionally, staff was directed to work with all city managers and the County Administrator to be more transparent during the study process by establishing a meaningful role for community engagement and move toward establishing an advisory group to an animal services joint powers authority.

Approved by the following vote:

MOTION: Provenza SECOND: Davies
AYES: Davies, Kristoff, Provenza, Saylor, Woods
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Item № 8  Consider And Adopt The Fiscal Year 2013/14 Work Plan As The Basis For The Fiscal Year 2013/14 Draft Budget

Minute Order 2013-07: The recommended action was approved.

Approved by the following vote:

MOTION: Saylor SECOND: Davies
AYES: Davies, Kristoff, Provenza, Saylor, Woods
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

Item № 9  Executive Officer’s Report

The Commission was given a report of the staff’s activities for the period of January 21 through February 22, 2013 and was verbally updated on recent events relevant to the Commission.
Staff reported on the upcoming CALAFCO 2013 Staff Workshop Mobile Tour and invited the Commission to attend the tour.

Staff introduced LAFCo intern Tracey Dickinson who will be working as a budget analyst to complement the UC Davis Study adopted on today’s Agenda.

Item № 10 Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Davies complimented the Executive Officer and Commissioner Saylor on a job well done for organizing the Yolo Leaders Program February 27, 2013, on Community Schools Partnerships.

Additionally, Commissioner Saylor noted that the Honorable Steven M. Basha, Presiding Judge of the Yolo Superior Court, who spoke on the new Yolo Courts construction project during the Program, asked if Yolo Leaders would be a good forum for keeping elected and appointed leaders throughout the County updated on relevant issues with the courts. Commissioners Saylor and Davies both remarked that this was why Yolo Leaders was created and why it’s becoming a venue for leaders throughout the County to get information.

Item № 11 Adjournment

Minute Order 2013-08: By order of the Chair, the meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m. to the next Regular meeting scheduled for March 28, 2013.

____________________________
Olin Woods, Chair
Local Agency Formation Commission
County of Yolo, State of California

ATTEST:

____________________________
Terri Tuck
Clerk to the Commission
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2013 Staff Workshop
Work is in full stride with the planning for the 2013 Staff Workshop. Scheduled for April 10-12 (Wed – Fri), the session will be held in Davis at the Hallmark Inn and Odd Fellows Hall, and is being hosted by Yolo LAFCo. *Retooling for the Next 50 Years...Fewer Resources and Higher Expectations* is the theme. Guest speakers include Keynote Speaker Michael Coleman (Principal Fiscal Policy Advisor to the League of California Cities and the California Society of Municipal Finance Officers), JoAnne Speers (Executive Director Institute for Local Government), Gary Winuk (FPPC Chief of Enforcement), and Bill Chiat (CSAC Leadership Institute). A great Mobile Workshop is also planned. Registration and sponsorship information is available on the CALAFCO website.

2013 Annual Conference Update
In November the Board decided to move the conference up one week to August 28 – 30 so as not to conflict with the Rosh Hashanah holiday. We are still at the Resort at Squaw Creek, and our hosts are the Nevada, Placer, and El Dorado LAFCos. The Planning and Host Committees, under the leadership of Josh Susman, SR Jones, Kris Berry, José Henríquez, and Sam Martinez, have begun their work of creating a value-added program and experience, and we look forward to seeing everyone there. This year’s theme is *“Clarity of Vision: The Golden Age of LAFCo”*, to celebrate LAFCo’s 50th anniversary. More information on the annual conference will be coming soon. For now, save the dates!

CALAFCO U Course Scheduled
Mark your calendar for June 6th in San Luis Obispo for Performance Measures and Other MSR Strategies to Analyze Local Agency Efficiencies. Details will be made available soon. Several other CALAFCO U sessions will be scheduled for later in the year. Thank you to all who provided input on potential topics.

CALAFCO Board holds Strategic Planning Retreat
On February 7, the Board held their biennial strategic planning retreat at the Duck Club in Irvine. During the day-long retreat, the Board reviewed the Association’s accomplishments over the past two years – including the many positive outcomes from the regional structure, affirmed expectations of the role and responsibilities of representing CALAFCO as a Board Member, discussed the challenges and opportunities facing LAFCos and the Association, and reviewed and amended the organization’s 2-year strategic plan and strategies. All of this work will be finalized in the Association’s 2013-2015 Strategic Plan which is scheduled to be presented to the Board for adoption at their May 2 meeting.

CALAFCO Board Actions
During their regular meeting on February 8, the Board addressed several administrative issues:
- The quarterly financial reports were reviewed. The budget is on track for the year with no changes anticipated. All financial reports are located on the website.
- The Board considered the 2013-14 dues. CALAFCO Bylaws call for the dues to increase annually by the state CPI. Last year for the first time in four years, the Board did not delay the CPI increase which resulted in an increase in dues of the CPI. As costs to provide member services continue to increase, this year the Board again did not delay the CPI increase for FY 2013-14. The dues increase will be 2.3%.
- The Board adopted the CALAFCO 2013 Legislative Policies with the amendments as recommended by the Legislative Committee. The Legislative Priorities will be revisited in May to ensure alignment with the new strategic plan and strategies. The policies are available on the website.
- The Board amended the policy for electronic (absentee ballot) voting so that the absentee ballot will now ask the voter to “rank” their candidate choices in the numerical order of preference, and these ballots will now count towards in the case of a run-off election. This action was referred to the Nomination Committee for implementation.
- GC§56133 – The Board deliberated again on whether or not to pursue amending this piece of legislation. After considering the recommendation from the Legislative Committee to move forward with the proposed amendments (10-8 vote), and after hearing a large amount of information from both proponents and opponents of the proposed changes, the Board directed the Chair to appoint an ad-hoc sub-committee to review the Legislative Committee’s recommendation and work together to craft proposed language changes that would create greater consensus. The Board directed the ad-hoc sub-committee to report directly back to them with their findings at the May 2 Board meeting. The ad-hoc sub-committee consists of one (1) Board member and eight (8) Executive Officers from throughout the state, as appointed by the Board Chair, Ted Novelli.
News from the Board of Directors

CALAFCO QUARTERLY
March 2013

CALAFCO Board 2013 Committees
The CALAFCO Board appointed members to the 2013 standing committees as follows:

Legislative Committee
Matt Beekman
Robert Bergman
John Leopold
Mike McGill
Eugene Montanez
Mary Jane Griego (a)
Juliana Inman (a)
Gay Jones (a)
Mike Kelley (a)
Ted Novelli (a)

Nominations Committee
Robert Bergman
Jerry Gladbach (Chair)
Gay Jones
Mike McGill

Awards Committee
Julie Allen
Matt Beekman (Chair)
Larry Duncan
Jerry Gladbach
Mary Jane Griego
Mike McGill

2013 Annual Conference
Louis Cunningham
John Leopold
Josh Susman (Chair)
Stephen Tomanelli

CALAFCO Announces New Executive Assistant
At the February 8th meeting the Board officially approved the appointment of our new Executive Assistant, Jeni Tickler. For over 12 years, as Principal of Professional Events, Jeni has been responsible for the complete process of creating, managing, promoting and executing a wide array of campaigns and events with the singular goal of exceeding her clients’ expectations. Jeni is highly skilled at developing innovative programs and partnerships. She assesses and develops campaigns and events tailored to specific project and agency needs. Jeni has successfully implemented a variety of programs for a diverse array of clients including public agencies, private entities, advocacy groups, professional associations and non-profit organizations.

Since 2007, Jeni has served as the Communications and Event Manager for the Sacramento Valley Section California Chapter of the American Planning Association (APA). In this capacity, she formed and facilitated a working group discussion on Sustainability in the Sacramento Region. As a result of this ongoing dialogue facilitated by Jeni, she organized and managed a collaborative effort to bring Sacramento an annual series of monthly seminars where land use, design, planning professionals, and social equity and environmental advocates have a forum to discuss how their individual practices will have to change in order to create a sustainable region and meet the challenge of reducing greenhouse gases and adapting to climate change. Jeni is typically in the CALAFCO office on Wednesdays and Thursdays.

Legislative Activities
2013 is the first year of the Legislature’s two-year session and with a large number of new legislators, state Democrats have a supermajority in the Legislature. The CALAFCO Legislative Committee began work in November and held meetings in December and again in January. The next meeting is scheduled for March 22 in Oakland. The deadline to introduce new bills for the 2013 year was February 22nd. In total, there were 2,298 bills introduced: 1,436 in the House and 862 in the Senate.

CALAFCO is currently tracking 38 bills that may affect members. A legislative report – updated daily – is available in the member’s section of the website.

This year, the Assembly Omnibus bill contains ten (10) proposed changes to Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg, and after being fully vetted several times by the Legislative Committee, the Assembly Local Government Committee staff and Committee Chair are reviewing the document. Other noteworthy CALAFCO sponsored and/or supported bills include:

- **AB 453** (Mullin) Would allow LAFCos to apply directly for grants that support the preparation of sustainable community strategies and other planning efforts.

- **AB 743** (Logue) Eliminates the January 1, 2014 sunset date on annexation of island areas, and increases the potential size of the island area to be annexed from 150 to 300 acres.

As it is still very early in the bill process, CALAFCO is currently maintaining a watch position on a number of bills related to water, CEQA, and local government. In addition to the daily legislative report, all Legislative Committee information is also posted in the member’s section of the website.

2012 Annual Conference in Monterey A Success
239 commissioners, staff and associate members attended the annual conference held in Monterey this past October. There was good representation of LAFCOs, with 50 of the 57 member LAFCOs represented. Evaluation results showed a very positive overall rating of 5.2 on a six point scale. Participants mentioned the quality of the session topics and speakers, the location, and the value of networking opportunities as some of the highlights. Financially the conference exceeded the goals established by the Board. Our thanks to Monterey LAFCo for hosting and John Leopold (Santa Cruz) as Chair.
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To: Olin Woods, Chair, and Members of the Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission

From: Christine Crawford, Executive Officer

Date: March 28, 2013

Subject: Public Hearing to Consider and Approve the Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization (LAFCO № 915), Initiate Conducting Authority Proceedings and Set April 25, 2013 as the Hearing Date to Conduct Protest Proceedings

Staff Recommendation

1. Receive staff presentation and open the Public Hearing for public comments on the item.

2. Close the Public Hearing and consider the information presented in the staff report and during the public hearing.

3. Find that the project is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with the findings contained in the March 28, 2013 staff report.

4. Adopt Resolution 2013-02 approving the Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization (LAFCO № 915), initiate conducting authority proceedings and set April 25, 2013 as the hearing date to conduct protest proceedings subject to the findings and conditions contained in the December 3, 2012 staff report.

Background

The Davis Public Cemetery District exists to provide cemetery services within its District boundary in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code. The Davis Cemetery District maintains one 27 acre cemetery located on Pole Line Road and East Eighth Street in Davis. The existing cemetery is located on 12 acres of active cemetery and approximately 15 acres of undeveloped land.

On July 26, 2012, the Commission approved the Davis Cemetery District Municipal Service Review (MSR) and Sphere of Influence (SOI)
which created a SOI boundary extending north of Davis up to County Road 27 and east all the way to the Sacramento River and taking in all of the territory in Yolo County south and east of that boundary including the City of West Sacramento and the community of Clarksburg (see Attachment A).

**Analysis**

**Project Description**
This request for Change of Organization (annexation) was initiated by agency resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Davis Cemetery District on October 17, 2012. The Davis Cemetery District filed an application on January 7, 2013 to annex all the lands within their SOI territory, totaling approximately 126,130 acres. The existing cemetery in Davis has sufficient capacity to accommodate the new territory and no new cemetery sites are proposed. The project would allow residents in the subject territory a public cemetery option for burial services. This District is not seeking any property tax revenue for this subject territory and cemetery burial costs will be handled by the District instituting a two-tiered fee system correlating to the tax rate areas zone of benefit.

**Applicable State Law and Local Policies**

*Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act*

Government Code Section 56668.3 outlines the following factors to be considered by the Commission for a reorganization that includes the annexation of territory to any district:

1. Whether the proposed annexation will be for the interest of present and future landowners and inhabitants within the territory to be annexed,
2. Any resolution raising objections (financial or service concerns) that may be filed by an affected agency,
3. The adequacy of existing and planned future services to meet the probable future needs of the territory,
4. Any other information which the commission deems appropriate for consideration.

The proposed territory was thoroughly evaluated by the Commission when it considered approval of the District’s SOI in July 2012. This annexation request would formalize the intent to annex created by the SOI. The proposed annexation will be relatively benign for residents and landowners in the subject territory as the annexation will not affect property taxes and merely provides residents with an option for public cemetery services that they currently do not have. Therefore, the annexation would be for the interest of present and future landowners and inhabitants within the territory to be annexed. No objections or concerns have been raised by any affected agency, landowner or resident of the subject territory. And as established by the District’s 2012 Municipal Services Review, the existing cemetery has sufficient capacity to serve the expanded District territory.
Public/Agency Notification and Involvement

Due to the large size of the proposed annexation territory, the project was routed to 31 “affected agencies” (defined as any city, special district, school district or fire district that serves any portion of the project area) for review on January 17, 2013 and no comments were received except some minor corrections required by the surveyor. The City of West Sacramento City Council considered the item at their February 6, 2013 meeting and the City Council voted to support the annexation of West Sacramento into the Davis Public Cemetery District as proposed, with no accompanying property tax assessment. Following receipt of the corrected maps, LAFCo issued a Certificate of Filing on March 18, 2013.

Per Government Code Section 56157(h) when a public hearing notice is required to be mailed to more than 1,000 addresses, public notice may instead be provided by publishing 1/8 page sized notices in a newspaper of general circulation. A 1/8

CEQA

Commission approval of the annexation of approximately 126,130 acres to the Davis Cemetery District is a discretionary action subject to CEQA. However, the project does not involve any land use changes and will not result in the physical construction of any infrastructure or other improvements, as the project will utilize the existing cemetery for burial services. Therefore, staff recommends that the project is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Summary and Next Steps

The proposed annexation would provide residents with an option for public cemetery services that currently do not exist. Therefore, the annexation would be for the interest of present and future landowners and inhabitants within the territory to be annexed. No objections or concerns have been raised by any affected agency, landowner or resident of the subject territory. And the existing cemetery has sufficient capacity to serve the expanded District territory. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the project.

If the Commission approves the Change of Organization (annexation), a protest hearing will be held at the April 25, 2013 meeting to provide any landowners or residents in the territory an opportunity to protest the annexation. Staff is investigating the feasibility of conducting the April Commission meeting in West Sacramento to facilitate this process. If any protest is received that equals less than 25 percent of the registered voters or landowners in the subject territory, then the Commission would order the Change of Organization (annexation).
Attachments

A. Project Map
B. Draft LAFCo Resolution 2013-02
C. Davis Cemetery District Resolution dated October 17, 2012
D. Project Correspondence
E. Application and District Service Plan submitted January 7, 2013

Findings

CEQA

1. **Finding:** The Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization (annexation) (LAFCo № 915) is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

   **Evidence:** The project does not involve any land use changes and will not result in the physical construction of any infrastructure or other improvements to provide burial services. All services will be provided at the existing cemetery located in the City of Davis and it has sufficient capacity to serve the additional territory. Therefore, there is no possibility that the project may have an impact on the environment and is therefore, not subject to CEQA.

Project Findings (in Accordance with Government Code Section 56668.3)

2. **Finding:** The annexation will be for the interest of present and future landowners and inhabitants within the territory to be annexed.

   **Evidence:** The proposed annexation will be relatively benign for residents and landowners in the subject territory as the annexation will not affect property taxes and merely provides residents with an option for public cemetery services that they currently do not have. Therefore, the annexation would be for the interest of present and future landowners and inhabitants within the territory to be annexed.

3. **Finding:** No resolutions raising objections have been filed by an affected agency regarding the proposed project.

   **Evidence:** LAFCo has not received any objections (resolutions or otherwise) filed by an affected or interested agency regarding the proposed project. No objections from any landowners or the general public have been received.

4. **Finding:** The Davis Cemetery District has adequate services to meet the existing and probable future needs of the territory.

   **Evidence:** The Davis Cemetery is 27 acres in size and only 12 acres is currently developed for burial plots and access with capacity remaining. Therefore, there is adequate services and capacity to meet the future needs of the territory.
**Conditions of Approval**

1. The applicant and the real party of interest, if different, agree to defend, indemnify, hold harmless and release the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission, its agents, officers, attorney and employees from any claim, action or proceeding brought against any of them, the purpose of which to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of this application or adoption of the environmental review which accompanies it. This indemnification obligation shall include, but not be limited to, damages, costs, expenses, attorney fees, or expert witness fees that may be asserted by any person or entity, including the applicant, arising out of or in connection with the approval of this application, whether or not there is concurrent passive negligence of the part of the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission its agents, officers, attorney or employees.

2. Project approval is subject to Conducting Authority Proceedings and a Protest Hearing set for April 25, 2013. If less than 25 percent of the registered voters or landowners in the subject territory protest the annexation, then the Commission will order the Change of Organization (annexation) and staff will complete the project accordingly.

3. The project will be subject to all appropriate LAFCo, State Board of Equalization and County fees, including the Clerk-Recorder and Surveyor, prior to recording of the Certificate of Completion for the Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization.

4. The effective date of the approval of this Change of Organization is five (5) days after the date the Certificate of Completion is recorded by the County Recorder.
RESOLUTION № 2013-02

Approving the Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization (LAFCO № 915), Initiating Conducting Authority Proceedings and Setting April 25, 2013 as the Hearing Date to Conduct Protest Proceedings

WHEREAS, on October 17, 2012 the Davis Cemetery District (District) Board of Trustees adopted a resolution initiating a proposal to annex approximately 126,130 acres to the District; and

WHEREAS, on January 7, 2013 the District submitted an application to Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) for Change of Organization for the subject territory; and

WHEREAS, the District is not seeking any property tax revenue for the subject territory and waived its right to a tax exchange, therefore the project is not subject to a negotiated exchange per Revenue and Taxation Code Section 99(b)(3); and

WHEREAS, the project was routed to all subject, affected and interested agencies and 1/8th page public notices were published in the Davis Enterprise and West Sacramento News Ledger; and

WHEREAS, a Certificate of Filing was issued on March 18, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the project was analyzed in accordance with all applicable sections of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act, LAFCo Standards of Evaluation and all other matters presented as prescribed by law; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Officer reviewed the proposal and prepared and filed a report with recommendations with this Commission at least five (5) days prior to the date of the March 28, 2013 meeting during which the project was set to be considered; and

WHEREAS, an opportunity was given to all interested persons, organizations, and agencies to present oral or written testimony, protests, objections, and any other information concerning the proposal and all related matters; and

WHEREAS, at said meeting, the Commission reviewed and considered the CEQA documentation and the Executive Officer’s Report including all the information, recommendations, findings and conditions contained therein; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission approves the Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization (LAFCO № 915) as shown in Attachment A, initiates conducting authority proceedings and sets April 25, 2013 as the hearing date to conduct protest proceedings subject to the following findings and conditions of approval:
Findings

CEQA
1. Finding: The Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization (annexation) (LAFCo No 915) is exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061 (b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines.

   Evidence: The project does not involve any land use changes and will not result in the physical construction of any infrastructure or other improvements to provide burial services. All services will be provided at the existing cemetery located in the City of Davis and it has sufficient capacity to serve the additional territory. Therefore, there is no possibility that the project may have an impact on the environment and is therefore, not subject to CEQA.

Project Findings (in Accordance with Government Code Section 56688.3)
2. Finding: The annexation will be for the interest of present and future landowners and inhabitants within the territory to be annexed.

   Evidence: The proposed annexation will be relatively benign for residents and landowners in the subject territory as the annexation will not affect property taxes and merely provides residents with an option for public cemetery services that they currently do not have. Therefore, the annexation would be for the interest of present and future landowners and inhabitants within the territory to be annexed.

3. Finding: No resolutions raising objections have been filed by an affected agency regarding the proposed project.

   Evidence: LAFCo has not received any objections (resolutions or otherwise) filed by an affected or interested agency regarding the proposed project. No objections from any landowners or the general public have been received.

4. Finding: The Davis Cemetery District has adequate services to meet the existing and probable future needs of the territory.

   Evidence: The Davis Cemetery is 27 acres in size and only 12 acres is currently developed for burial plots and access with capacity remaining. Therefore, there is adequate services and capacity to meet the future needs of the territory

Conditions of Approval
1. The applicant and the real party of interest, if different, agree to defend, indemnify, hold harmless and release the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission, its agents, officers, attorney and employees from any claim, action or proceeding brought against any of them, the purpose of which to attack, set aside, void, or annul the approval of this application or adoption of the environmental review which accompanies it. This indemnification obligation shall include, but not be limited to, damages, costs, expenses, attorney fees, or expert witness fees that may be asserted by any person or entity, including the applicant, arising out of or in connection with the approval of this application, whether or
not there is concurrent passive negligence of the part of the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission its agents, officers, attorney or employees.

2. Project approval is subject to Conducting Authority Proceedings and a Protest Hearing set for April 25, 2013. If less than 25 percent of the registered voters or landowners in the subject territory protest the annexation, then the Commission will order the Change of Organization (annexation) and staff will complete the project accordingly.

3. The project will be subject to all appropriate LAFCo, State Board of Equalization and County fees, including the Clerk-Recorder and Surveyor, prior to recording of the Certificate of Completion for the Davis Cemetery District Change of Organization.

4. The effective date of the approval of this Change of Organization is five (5) days after the date the Certificate of Completion is recorded by the County Recorder.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission, State of California, this 28th day of March 2013, by the following vote.

AYES: Davies, Kristoff, Rexroad, Saylor, Woods
NOES: None
ABSENT: None

______________________________
Olin Woods, Chair
Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission

ATTEST:

______________________________
Christine Crawford, Executive Officer
Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission

Approved as to form:

______________________________
Robyn Drivon, Commission Counsel

Resolution 2013-02
Adopted March 28, 2013
THE DAVIS CEMETERY DISTRICT
YOLO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION 2012-01

WHEREAS the Board of Trustees ("Board") of the Davis Cemetery District ("District") desires to initiate proceedings to annex to the District's service area all territory which falls within the extent of the District's Sphere of Influence but is not currently within the District boundary, as pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (commencing with section 56000 of the Government Code) ("Act");

WHEREAS the proposed area of annexation, specifically between the current District boundary and CR 27 to the north and extending from the current District boundary to the County boundary to the east, taking in West Sacramento and Clarksburg, as depicted on the map attached hereto as Exhibit A;

WHEREAS the areas proposed for annexation are not currently served by any public cemetery district;

WHEREAS the Davis Cemetery District is the public cemetery district in the closest proximity to the proposed areas of annexation and has ample burial space to meet the needs of residents in the proposed areas of annexation along with the needs of current District residents;

WHEREAS the District does not seek any property tax revenue from the proposed area of annexation and thus requests that the tax exchange negotiation process be waived;

WHEREAS the Board requests that the Yolo County LAFCO initiate proceedings to approve the annexation of said property to the District in order to enable the District to provide burial services to the annexation area;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of the Davis Cemetery District as follows:

(1) The Board hereby finds and determines that the recitals contained herein are true and correct.

(2) The Board requests that the Yolo County LAFCO initiate proceedings to annex the identified property as authorized and in the manner provided by the Act.

(3) The Board hereby approves the plan for providing burial services to the annexation area attached hereto as exhibit B and authorizes the Superintendent and his designees to make any changes therein as may be requested by the LAFCO.

(4) The Board hereby requests that the LAFCO provide any related notices to the District's Superintendent.
The foregoing resolution was duly PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Trustees of
the Davis Cemetery District at a meeting thereof held on this 17th day of October, 2012 by
the following roll call vote:

Ayes: 4

Noes: 0

Abstain: 0

Absent: 0

[Signatures]

Marilyn Mangfield, Chairperson
Board of Trustees
Davis Cemetery District

Dennis Dingemans, Trustee

Val Dolcini, Trustee

Dennis Dahlin, Trustee
Davis Cemetery District Proposed Sphere of Influence
10 Year
EXHIBIT B
PLAN OF SERVICE FOR THE ANNEXATION AREA

Upon annexation, residents within the annexed area will have the same privileges as the other customers of the District regarding any and all interment services offered by the District. Because no property tax revenues will be collected from residents in the newly annexed area, the pricing for said residents in the newly annexed area shall be at a Tier Two rate, which shall be determined by adding the current "former resident fee" to the applicable current District pricing for interment services.
March 5, 2013

The attached application was submitted to the Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission on January 7, 2013 and this notice is being sent to the following affected agencies (and its departments) and school district(s) in accordance with Government Code Section 56658(b):

**Routed To:**

**County/Cities:**
- City of Davis – Clerk
- City of West Sacramento – Clerk
- City of Winters – Clerk
- City of Woodland – Clerk
- County of Yolo – Clerk
  - Assessor – Linda Park*
  - Auditor-Controller – Sheryl Hardy*
  - Environmental Health – Jill Cook*
  - Elections – Kris Mann*
  - Surveyor – Ken Misner**
- County Service Areas (PPW) – North Davis Meadows, Garcia Bend #9
  ** See Supplemental Questionnaire
  ** Full Size Maps Provided

**Special Districts:**
- Cemetery District –
- Community Service District –
- Fire Protection District – West Plainfield, Springlake, East Davis, Elkhorn, West Sacramento, No Man’s Land, Clarksburg
- Sacramento-Yolo Port District
- Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito Vector Control District
- Reclamation District – 2035, 785, 537, 900, 765, 307, 999, 2068, 150
- Resource Conservation District – Yolo, Dixon
- Water District – YCFCWCD

**School Districts:**
- YC Office of Education – Jorge Ayala
- Davis Joint Unified – Winfred B. Roberson, Jr.
- Esparto Unified – Aida Buelna
- River Delta Unified – Richard Hennes
- Washington Unified – Dayton Gilleland, Ed.D
- Winters Joint Unified – Brent Cushingbery
- Woodland Joint Unified – Debra LaVoi, Ed.D
- Community College – Los Rios, Yuba

**Subject Agency:** (Petition-Initiated Only)
- 

**Project Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Number:</th>
<th>915</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application Title:</td>
<td>Davis Cemetery District Annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor’s Parcel Number:</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location:</td>
<td>See attached map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description:</td>
<td>The Davis Cemetery District has submitted an application (see attached application) to expand its existing boundaries by annexing all the lands in its Sphere of Influence. The existing cemetery in Davis has sufficient capacity to accommodate the new boundary area and no new cemetery sites are proposed. The project would allow residents in the subject territory a public cemetery option for burial services. The District is not seeking any property tax revenue for this subject territory. Cemetery burial costs will be handled by the District instituting a two-tiered fee system correlating to the tax rate area zone of benefit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

In accordance with Government Code Section 56658(b), as an “affected agency”, which is defined as any agency that provides facilities or services in the subject territory, please review this attached application information and **respond with any comments and/or recommended conditions within 21 days or by March 19, 2013** so that staff may conduct a more informed analysis. If we do not receive a response, we will presume that your agency has “no comment”. If you require more time for review, please contact Executive Officer Christine Crawford at (530) 666-8048 or at christine.crawford@yolocounty.org.

Your comments are:  
- Attached  
- No comment

Signature/date  

Print Name
March 18, 2013

Joseph Cattarin
Superintendent
Davis Cemetery District
820 Pole Line Road
Davis, CA 95618

Re: Davis Cemetery District Annexation - Project No. #915
Certificate of Filing

Dear Mr. Cattarin:

The purpose of this letter is to provide the District notice that your application is complete and hereby accepted for filing in accordance with Government Code Section 56658 of the Cortese Knox Hertzberg Act. All of the outstanding items documented in our February 12, 2013 District letter have been satisfied.

Please note that the public hearing for your application has been scheduled for Thursday, March 28th at 9:00 AM in the County Board of Supervisors Chambers located at 625 Court Street in Woodland. You can expect to receive a copy of the agenda packet and staff report for your item no later than March 19th. If you have any questions in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Christine M. Crawford, AICP
Executive Officer
February 28, 2013

TO: Christine Crawford, LAFCO

FROM: Howard Newens, Auditor-Controller
By: Sheryl Hardy-Salgado, Deputy

SUBJECT: LAFCO 915-Davis Cemetery District -Annexation and expansion of Sphere of Influence. (Not subject to a tax exchange)

Pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code 99 and related subsections, the County Assessor’s Office provided this office with a list of tax rate areas of those properties located within the boundaries of the proposed annexation to Davis Cemetery District. Utilizing the Assessor’s information below is a listing of the local agencies located in the territory subject of the jurisdictional change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Agency Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>County General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>County ACO Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>County Road District #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Levee Maintenance Area #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Dixon Resources Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>City of West Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Clarksburg Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>East Davis Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Springlake Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>West Plainfield Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Elkhorn Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>No Mans Land Fire District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Sacto-Yolo Mosquito &amp; Vector Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Reclamation District #307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Yolo County Resources Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Yolo County Flood Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>County Service Area #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Agency Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 0430</td>
<td>County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 2120</td>
<td>Davis Joint Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 4140</td>
<td>Washington Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 6160</td>
<td>Woodland Joint Unified School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Los Rios Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Yuba Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>River Delta School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Educational Revolving Augmentation Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There will be no property tax loss or exchange between agencies for the subject properties.

No new Tax Rate Areas will need to be created. The Auditor's Office acknowledges the subject properties for Annexation to Davis Cemetery District thus expanding the boundaries within the Davis Cemetery District Sphere of Influence.

Respectfully,

Sheryl Hardy-Salgado, Deputy
Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector
Property Tax Accounting Unit

HN:sh
CC: Patrick Blacklock, CAO
Howard Newens, AC-TTC
CA State Water Resources
Dixon Resources Cons Dist
City of West Sacramento
Clarksburg Fire District
East Davis Fire District
Springlake Fire District
West Plainfield Fire District
Elkhorn Fire District
No Mans Land Fire District
SYMVC
RD #307
YCRCD
YCFCD
YCOE
Davis Unified School District
Washington Unified School District
Woodland Unified School District
River Delta School District
Los Rios Community College
Yuba Community College
February 12, 2013

Joseph Cattarin
Superintendent
Davis Cemetery District
820 Pole Line Road
Davis, CA 95618

Re:  Davis Cemetery District Annexation - Project No. #915

Dear Mr. Cattarin:

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with an update regarding the status of your application for the Davis Cemetery District Annexation. Your project was routed to applicable County departments and "affected agencies" (defined as any agency that serves any portion of the proposed annexation area) for review and comment (see attached). Comments were due on February 7, 2013 and we only received one comment from the County Surveyor with some minor map corrections. In addition, the City of West Sacramento considered the annexation proposal at its February 6, 2013 Council meeting and voted to support the District’s annexation request (see attached agenda report). Concurrently, we have been reviewing your application to ensure we have all the information necessary to complete the processing of your project.

The following list contains all outstanding items required to complete the processing of your project:

1. Please have your surveyor complete the corrections noted in the surveyor’s memo dated February 5, 2013 (see attached)

2. Please complete the Party Disclosure Form to report any campaign contributions by your Board of Trustees to LAFCo Commissioners (see attached). If the District has nothing to report, please check the "not applicable" box and sign.

Once we've received these items listed above, your application will be deemed complete and we will issue a Certificate of Filing for this application setting a public hearing date where the Commission may approve, modify or deny the proposal.
If the Commission approves the proposal, then a second public hearing will be scheduled at the following month’s regular meeting date for the Commission to conduct “protest proceedings” to give landowners an opportunity to protest the annexation. If protest is received (oral or written) by less than 25% of the landowners, then the Commission will order the annexation without an election. If protest is received from between 25% and 50% of the landowners, the Commission will order the annexation subject to an election within the annexation area. If protest is received by more than 50% of the landowners, the annexation is terminated.

Following an annexation order and satisfying any project conditions that may be contained in the staff report, a Certificate of Completion would be prepared and filed with the County Recorder. We also would file the Statement of Boundary Change with the State Board of Equalization. The effective date of the annexation would be five days after the Certificate of Completion filing date.

If you have any questions or comments please contact me at 530-666-8048. We look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Christine M. Crawford, AICP
Executive Officer

Attachments:
A. LAFCo Project Routing Form, January 17, 2013
B. City of West Sacramento Agenda Report, February 6, 2013
C. Memo from the County Surveyor, February 5, 2013
D. Party Disclosure Form
Local Agency Formation Commission of Yolo County  
625 Court Street, Suite 203, Woodland, CA 95695  
Phone (530) 666-8048  
lafco@yolocounty.org www.yololafco.org

PETITION FOR PROCEEDING PURSUANT TO  
THE CORTESE-KNOX-HERTZBERG  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION ACT OF 2000  
Section I

The undersigned hereby petition(s) the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission for approval of a proposed change of organization or reorganization, and stipulate(s) as follows:

This proposal is made pursuant to Part 3, Division 2, Title 5 of the California Government Code (commencing with §56000, Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000).

1. Short Title:

   Annexation of identified property to the Davis Cemetery District

2. The specific change(s) of organization proposed is/are:  
   
   Annexation
   
   If other is selected please explain:


3. The boundaries of the territory(ies) included in the proposal are as described in Exhibit(s) attached.

4. The territory(ies) included in the proposal is/are:  
   
   Inhabited

5. This proposal is  ☒  is not ☐ consistent with the Sphere of Influence of the affected city and/or district(s).
6. The reason(s) for the proposal is/are:

The District wishes to extend the opportunity for interment services to areas of southeastern Yolo County which are currently not served by any public cemetery district.

7. The proposal is requested to be made subject to the following terms and conditions:

No tax revenue will be requested as a result of the annexation of the identified property.

8. Give a general description of the territory's natural and manmade features:

Please see addendum by surveyor Jim Frame.

9. List the Assessor's Parcel Number(s) for the affected parcels in the proposal (use additional sheet if necessary).

Please see addendum by surveyor Jim Frame.

10. Provide (separately) mailing labels for all landowners and registered voters within 300' of outside proposal boundary (may provide WORD/EXCEL computer disc with label list instead).
11. Have alternatives to this proposal been considered?
   ⭕ Yes ⭝ No   If so, please list and explain:

12. Describe the proposed changes in land use for this proposal (if applicable).

There is no change in land use.

13. If a change in land use will occur if the proposal is accepted, what is your expected timetable for the completion of the changes?

14. Is there 100% written landowners consent for this proposal?
   ⭜ Yes ⭝ No (Please attach consent).
15. Name and identify all affected counties, cities, or districts:

Yolo County, City of West Sacramento, City of Clarksburg

16. Signature for Petition Designee (main contact person)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Joseph Cattarin, Superintendent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>820 Pole Line Road</td>
<td>Print Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:cemetery@dcn.org">cemetery@dcn.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, CA 95618</td>
<td>Date: 1-4-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Zip Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If a Petition Designee is also a landowner or voter applicant, provide requested information on both numbers 16 and 18.
DISTRICT SERVICE PLAN

Section II

Title: Annexation of identified property
LAFCO #
District: Davis Cemetery District

To be filled out by the annexing district or applicable planning department. Please type answers. Add additional pages if the space provided is not sufficient. If answers to these questions supporting this project are contained in the environmental documents or in the County General Plan or other document, the questions may be answered by referring to the appropriate page(s) of these documents. Checklist of documents to be provided to LAFCO (if applicable).

☐ Copy of any approved Development Plans and Conditions
☐ Change to Current Zoning by County, or existing zoning
☐ Environmental Impact Report, Negative Declaration or Certificate of Exemption
☐ Notice of Determination filed with County Clerk

SECTION A - DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

(COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF DEVELOPMENT IS PROPOSED ON THE SUBJECT SITE)

1. Is this proposal in conformity with the County’s General Plan? ☑ Yes ☐ No
2. Will this proposal create islands, strips, or corridors of land within the district boundaries? ☐ Yes ☑ No
3. Does the proposed boundary conform to existing geographical boundaries? ☑ Yes ☐ No
4. What is the designation and zoning in the County General Plan and is that consistent with the proposed use? ○ Yes □ No □
   (If the use will be inconsistent, please explain below)

5. Will a change in zoning be required to implement the proposed development plans? ○ Yes □ No
   a. Has the County concurred with the proposed changes? ○ Yes □ No □

6. Has the County Board of Supervisors reviewed the development plans of the proposal? ○ Yes ○ No
   If so, what was their determination and when was the decision made?

   If not, is there a plan to submit? ○ Yes ○ No
   If so, please provide that plan
7. What type of development is planned, and what are the densities proposed?

8. What is the present population of the proposal area?

   Unknown

9. How many dwelling units or other buildings are located on the site?

   Unknown

10. How many dwelling units or commercial type buildings are expected when the area is fully developed?

    Unknown

11. What is the anticipated range in sizes for these buildings and the attendant parcels?

    Unknown

12. What is the expected population when developed?

    No change
13. What is the likelihood of significant growth in adjacent areas (both incorporated and unincorporated)?

n/a

14. To what extent will this development influence or contribute to growth in these adjacent areas?

None

SECTION A
PREPARED BY: Joseph Cattarin
Date: 1-4-13

TITLE: Davis Cemetery District Superintendent

Signature

SECTION B - SERVICES

1. Is there a need for urban services in the area at the present time? Yes No
2. What services will the district provide, and if so, when? If the annexing district will not provide the service, please note who will, if known.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Service</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Drainage</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Maintenance</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Maintenance</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Sweeping/Refuse Removal</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please explain how these services will be financed.

By user fees for services rendered.

4. If any other services, not listed, will be required for the new development please list and explain how the service will be provided (for example animal control, ambulance service, pest and rodent control, schools, etc.)

No
5. If the annexing district will impose development fees, identify for what use and specify how they will be determined.

\[\text{N/A}\]

6. Explain how the annexing district will provide services. Provide whatever engineering summaries are available and any other relevant report on the viability of this proposal. For example, what physical improvements and sizing are necessary for service provision such as water, sewer, and storm drainage and how they will be financed, for construction, maintenance, and operation?

\[\text{No physical expansion of the cemetery is required. Adequate capacity exists. See 2012 MSE.}\]

7. Which services will require user fees? How will those fees be determined?

\[\text{Interment fees will be determined by pricing to current residents plus an additional "tier two" fee to offset lack of tax revenue}\]
8. What is the estimated date the district will begin providing services?

January, 2013

SECTION B
PREPARED BY: Joseph Cattarin

TITLE: Superintendent

Signature

Date: 1-4-13

SECTION C - FISCAL

1. Will the existing tax revenue and user fees provide adequate revenue to support the required services when developed? Yes ☐ No ☐

If not, what methods will be used to increase the revenues to necessary levels?
2. What types of revenue sources will be proposed for use by the district?

3. Will the district pursue any bonded indebtedness?  ○ Yes  ○ No
   Please discuss.

4. Will there be a need for zones of benefit within the proposed new district?  ○ Yes  ○ No

SECTION C
PREPARED BY: ___________________________ Date: 1-4-13
TITLE: Superintendent

Signature: ________________________________
SECTION D - GOVERNMENTAL ASPECTS

1. Will the proposed change of boundary create a division of existing communities or commercial areas identifiable on the basis of appreciable social, economic or other factors?  ○ Yes  ○ No
   If so, please explain?

2. Is the subject area within the current Sphere of Influence for the district?  ○ Yes  ○ No

3. What effect might this development have on social or economic interests in the area and the district?
   It is anticipated that it will provide economic relief for families who need interment services by providing a lower cost option than the commercial option currently available.

4. What alternative courses of action have been considered to achieve results comparable to those proposed in this application?
   None
5. Why is this proposal more advantageous than others?

Please see #3 above.

6. Will implementation of this proposal create problems of duplicated authority infringement on Sphere of Influence by one entity or another, or significant operational problems for a local agency in the general area? ○ Yes ○ No

SECTION D
PREPARED BY: Joseph Cattarin
TITLE: Superintendent
Signature

Date: 1-4-13

SECTION E - ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An Environmental Impact Report, Negative Declaration or Certificate of Exemption, must be available to the Local Agency Formation Commission before the Commission will issue a "Certificate of Filling" accepting the complete documentation to initiate the proposed action by the Commission.

1. Provide the supporting approval documents for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or Negative Declaration Environmental Impact Report (NDEIR) prepared, a certified resolution for this proposed action and a copy of the Notice of Determination filed with the County Clerk Recorder.

If no environmental review has been done, please explain.

n/a - no previous project. See 2012 MSR.
2. If the proposal area is more than 20 acres of agricultural land, what mitigation measures were adopted to minimize the loss of that land to agriculture? Please list and explain:

\[ n/a \]

3. Will this project be consistent with the Yolo County Right to Farm Ordinance #1133, and not adversely affect the economic viability or constrain the lawful responsible practices of adjacent agricultural operations? Please explain:

\[ n/a \]

4. The Yolo County LAFCO Agricultural Conservation Policy is attached. Please review this document and explain how this proposal is consistent with this policy.

\[ n/a \]
SECTION F - OTHER

1. Add any comments or information that should be considered by the Commission:

   

   

SECTION F
PREPARED BY: Joseph Cattarin                      Date: 1-4-13

TITLE: Superintendent

Signature
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Meeting Date: 03/28/2013

Information

SUBJECT
Public Hearing to consider the Proposed LAFCo Budget for Fiscal Year 2013/14 and set May 23, 2013 as the Public Hearing date to approve the Final Budget

Attachments

Item 7-Staff Report
Item 7-ATT-Budget Worksheet

Form Review
Form Started By: Terri Tuck
Started On: 03/20/2013 12:26 PM
Final Approval Date: 03/20/2013
To: Olin Woods, Chair, and Members of the
Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission

From: Christine Crawford, Executive Officer
Terri Tuck, Commission Clerk

Date: March 28, 2013

Subject: Consider the Proposed LAFCo Budget for Fiscal Year
2013/14 and Set May 23, 2013 as the Public Hearing Date to
Approve the Final Budget

Recommended Action
1. Receive staff presentation on the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year
   2013/14.
2. Open the Public Hearing for public comments on the item.
3. Close the Public Hearing.
4. Consider the information presented in the staff report and during
   the Public Hearing. Discuss and direct staff to make any changes
   deemed appropriate.
5. Set May 23, 2013 as the Public Hearing to consider approving the
   Final LAFCo Budget for Fiscal Year 2013/14.

Background

The attached LAFCo budget includes proposed revenues and
expenditures for LAFCo in the 2013/14 fiscal year (FY). This proposed
budget maintains adequate support for the Commission to meet the
responsibilities of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg (CKH) Act and the
Shared Services Program for FY 13/14.

Yolo County LAFCo adopts an annual budget with notice to the four
cities and Yolo County. In accordance with the CKH Act, a proposed
budget must be adopted by May 1 and final budget by June 15 of each
year. Following approval of the final budget and no later than July 1, the
auditor requests payment from each agency. In order to meet these
timelines, the final budget is scheduled to be adopted at the May 23, 2013 meeting and invoices will go out thereafter.

**Agency Funding**

In accordance with the CKH Act, the cities and County split the cost of LAFCo funding 50/50. A formula for the split of the cities’ share is outlined in Government Code Section 56381 (b)(1); which would be in proportion to a city’s tax revenue or an alternative method approved by a majority of the cities. Beginning in FY 2007-08, the cities of Yolo County have developed an alternative formula to apportion their 50% of LAFCo funding by averaging a city’s general tax revenue (less grant monies) and population.

The table below illustrates the formula and percentage apportionment of the Yolo LAFCo budget for this fiscal year. The percentages fluctuate slightly from year to year but overall remain relatively consistent. The latest Department of Finance population estimates are for January 1, 2012 and the latest report from the State Controller’s Cities Annual Report is for FY 10/11.

**Apportionment Formula and % Share of FY 2013-14 LAFCo Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>% City Share of Tax Revenue</th>
<th>% City Share of Population</th>
<th>% Average of Revenue and Population</th>
<th>% of LAFCo Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34.12%</td>
<td>17.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32.73%</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29.93%</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenues**

The Revenues include anticipated income from other agencies, interest, and fees. The following table highlights the draft budget apportionment to each agency.

**Proposed Budget - Agency Apportionment of LAFCo Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>% of LAFCo Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget Share</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>17.06%</td>
<td>$62,437</td>
<td>($2,295)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
<td>$59,893</td>
<td>($3,034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>$5,904</td>
<td>$337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>$54,766</td>
<td>($74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>$183,000</td>
<td>($5,066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$366,000*</td>
<td>($10,132)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total Revenue from agencies. Does not include other revenue from interest and/or application fees.
Agency costs are projected to remain relatively consistent, with a slight reduction in costs for most agencies and a reduction in overall agency costs of $10,132.

**Fund Balance**

There is currently $182,949 in LAFCo’s fund balance and this number is anticipated to increase slightly at the close of this fiscal year. However, based on our last audit we have an estimated liability of $50,000 for other post-employment benefits (OPEB) for the previous retired Executive Officer. Staff is working on an agreement with the County (and County staff seems amenable) to share in this cost since the majority of the previous Executive Officer’s employment was with Yolo County. But an agreement has not been negotiated yet, so the budget conservatively assumes the entire liability for now.

An additional change from last year’s budget was the Commission adoption of LAFCo’s Administrative Policies and Procedures that indicates that the Commission should strive to include a contingency budget equal to or greater than 20% of the overall budget. Therefore, this contingency has been appropriated in the proposed budget for the first time and consequently may give the false impression that overall LAFCo costs have increased.

With the OPEB and contingency set aside, $58,049 of the fund balance remains that could be used to offset agency costs. However, staff recommends that since this amount is not significant to each agency, it may be preferable to hold onto these monies for shared services programming in consultation with the city and county managers. Staff will have an opportunity to review the proposed budget and this approach with the fund balance with the city and county managers on March 22, 2013 and staff will provide any updated recommendations if necessary.

**Expenditures**

**Salaries and Benefits**

Overall, the total salary and benefits is projected to increase 7% from the previous year. This is due to a projected 5% step increase for the Executive Officer and a 2.5% longevity pay increase for the Clerk. These salary increases have been assumed to provide a conservative budget estimate for the Commission, however these increases are discretionary. Health insurance costs are another source of notable increase.

**Services and Supplies**

Overall, LAFCo related expenditures in services and supplies are primarily maintained at current levels with minor modifications. Some of the accounts (food, office expenses, postage and printing) were reduced somewhat to better reflect actual costs in the current fiscal year. Also, a new line item for miscellaneous expenses has been added to this budget to accommodate costs when LAFCo is in a hosting role, such as thank you gifts for a few selected speakers who have gone unusually above and beyond to help LAFCo and/or Yolo Leaders.
The proposed budget includes a $3,000 placeholder for auditing services. The County has issued a request for proposals (RFP) for auditing services and LAFCo is included in this RFP but proposals are not due back yet. The $3,000 figure is an estimate based on the contract for the previous audit of the last four years (where there previously had been none) was $23,195. Staff is expecting that now that our previous audits are in order, the costs would go down. It should be noted that LAFCo has no adopted policy on the frequency of audits, but assuming we can piggyback on the County’s for a nominal cost, it may be worthwhile keeping it up every year. Staff anticipates clarification on this cost before the final budget is considered in May.

County IT has suggested that LAFCo assume the same costs for this year as the previous year. The $400 for the GIS software licensing fee may look new but it’s actually not. It wasn’t budgeted for last year because there was confusion and staff incorrectly understood that IT license fees would have been included in one of the other three accounts.

The professional services budget is an estimate of contracts that may come up for municipal service reviews and or shared services. Staff has been talking with SACOG about sharing an analyst that would work in shared services for both agencies and would provide a bridge between both complimentary efforts. A portion of the professional services budget would pay for an hourly rate for the SACOG analyst (currently estimated at $43/hour). Overall, the budget reduces the appropriation from last year, knowing that there is a contingency and/or fund balance that can be applied to any needed contracts.

The budget includes estimates to purchase two new computers for the office, one for the Executive Officer and the second for our extra work station. LAFCo was notified from IT that these two computers were aged beyond what would be supported by Microsoft and posed a potential risk to the network. The cost includes two new hard drives, but the existing monitors can be reused. The budget also adds a budget for a computer replacement fund to provide funds to replace office computers every four years.

**Conclusion**

The Proposed Budget maintains adequate support for the Commission to meet the responsibilities of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg (CKH) Act and the Shared Services Program. Overall, the expenditures have gone down 2.6% as compared to the previous fiscal year (excluding the contingency which skews the bottom line). Staff is working hard to maintain costs comparable to last year’s budget as the Shared Services Program continues to increase in scale and scope. Staff recommends keeping the reserve available to the cities and County for any shared services program costs that may arise.

**Attachment**

A. Proposed LAFCo Budget FY 2013/14 – Financing Sources
B. Proposed LAFCo Budget FY 2013/14 – Financing Uses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>FY 12/13 Revenue Budgeted</th>
<th>FY 13/14 Proposed Revenue</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Agency Apportionment FY 13/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82-4100</td>
<td>INTEREST</td>
<td>$ 1,500</td>
<td>$ 1,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5820</td>
<td>OTHER GOVT AGENCY-COUNTY</td>
<td>$ 188,066</td>
<td>$ 183,000</td>
<td>$(5,066)</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5821</td>
<td>OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WEST SACRAMENTO</td>
<td>$ 62,927</td>
<td>$ 59,893</td>
<td>$(3,034)</td>
<td>16.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5822</td>
<td>OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WOODLAND</td>
<td>$ 54,840</td>
<td>$ 54,766</td>
<td>$(74)</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5823</td>
<td>OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WINTERS</td>
<td>$ 5,567</td>
<td>$ 5,904</td>
<td>$ 337</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-5824</td>
<td>OTHER GOVT AGENCY-DAVIS</td>
<td>$ 64,732</td>
<td>$ 62,437</td>
<td>$(2,295)</td>
<td>17.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-6225</td>
<td>LAFCO FEES</td>
<td>$ 5,200</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$ 800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-7600</td>
<td>OTHER SALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FUND BALANCE CONTINGENCY OFFSET</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 74,900</td>
<td>$ 74,900</td>
<td>$ 366,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL AGENCY FY 13/14 COST** $376,132 $366,000 $(10,132)

**TOTAL OTHER SOURCES** $6,700 $82,400 $75,700

**TOTAL FINANCING SOURCES** $382,832 $448,400 $65,568

**FUND BALANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT FUND BALANCE</td>
<td>$182,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEB LIABILITY</td>
<td>$(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINGENCY</td>
<td>$(74,900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMAINING FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE</td>
<td>$58,049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed LFACO Budget - Financing Uses - Schedule B

**Fiscal Year:** 13/14  
**Fund No:** 368

### Salaries and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>FY 2012/13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 13/14 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Explanation of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86-1101</td>
<td>Regular Employees</td>
<td>$148,772</td>
<td>$155,826</td>
<td>$7,054</td>
<td>EO Step B to C 5% increase 6/2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1102</td>
<td>Extra Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1107</td>
<td>Payoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1201</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>$26,492</td>
<td>$29,705</td>
<td>$3,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1202</td>
<td>OASDI</td>
<td>$10,630</td>
<td>$11,044</td>
<td>$414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1203</td>
<td>Medicare Tax</td>
<td>$2,510</td>
<td>$2,682</td>
<td>$172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1400</td>
<td>Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1500</td>
<td>Worker's Compensation Insurance</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-1600</td>
<td>Other Benefits</td>
<td>$34,360</td>
<td>$39,576</td>
<td>$5,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Salary &amp; Benefits</strong></td>
<td><strong>$225,764</strong></td>
<td><strong>$241,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,069</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Services and Supplies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>FY 2012/13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 13/14 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Explanation of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86-2090</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2130</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$(500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2202</td>
<td>Insurance - Public Liability</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2271</td>
<td>Maintenance - Equipment</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2330</td>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>CALAFCO dues increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2360</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>New acct for speaker gifts/hosting supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2390</td>
<td>Office Expense</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$(1,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2391</td>
<td>Office Expense - Postage</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$(250)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2392</td>
<td>Office Expense - Printing</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$(250)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2417</td>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>$3,159</td>
<td>$3,159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2418</td>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>$1,066</td>
<td>$1,066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2419</td>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>$3,742</td>
<td>$3,742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2421</td>
<td>Auditing &amp; Fiscal Services</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Placeholder - pursuing shared audit w/County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2422</td>
<td>Information Tech Services</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>License for GIS software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2423</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2429</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Specialized Services</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$(10,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2460</td>
<td>Publications &amp; Legal Notices</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2491</td>
<td>Rents &amp; Leases - Equipment</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2495</td>
<td>Records Storage &quot;Archives&quot;</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2520</td>
<td>Small Tools &amp; Minor Equipment</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>2 computers need to be upgraded per IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2548</td>
<td>Training Expense</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-2610</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Travel</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$(2,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-3102</td>
<td>Payments to Other Govt Institutions</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$(800)</td>
<td>Costs are charged back to applicants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>$157,067</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,467</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(26,600)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Financing Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account #</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>FY 2012/13 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 13/14 Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Explanation of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86-6110</td>
<td>PC Equipment Replacement Fund</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>Set aside to upgrade 3 computers every 4 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-6900</td>
<td>Appropriations for Contingency</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$74,900</td>
<td>$74,900</td>
<td>Per new Admin Policy (20% of total budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Appropriations</strong></td>
<td><strong>$382,831</strong></td>
<td><strong>$448,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,569</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting/Milestone</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/26/2013</td>
<td>Meeting w/Center for Land Based Learning-City of Winters</td>
<td>CALAFCO Staff Workshop-Mobile Tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Yolo Leaders Forum</td>
<td>Topic – Community Schools Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services – CA Forward Meeting</td>
<td>Shared Services Case Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2013</td>
<td>Conference call w/CALAFCO Program Committee</td>
<td>CALAFCO Staff Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services – Animal Services meeting w/ Joe Krovoza, Don Saylor, Skip Davies, Patrick Blacklock and Steve Pinkerton</td>
<td>Animal Shelter work plan &amp; time line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/2013</td>
<td>Nishi Property in Davis</td>
<td>Bi-monthly project planning meeting w/ UCD, City &amp; County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/2013</td>
<td>Conference call w/ CALAFCO Program Committee</td>
<td>CALAFCO Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Conference call w/ County &amp; cities</td>
<td>Yolo Animal Services/UCD Study-Agency check-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Patrick Blacklock, Vicky Fletcher) (Carol Richardson) (Steve Pinkerton) (John Donlevy, Jr.) (Paul Navazio) (Dr. Kate Hurley, Dr. Cynthia Delany)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/2013</td>
<td>Women’s History Month Luncheon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services – Meeting w/ County &amp; Valley Vision (Kevin Yarris, Patty) (Tara Thronson)</td>
<td>Next Yolo Leaders Topic-Broadband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Conference call w/ SACOG (Kirk Trost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/2013</td>
<td>Kick-off Meeting w/ RSG, Inc. (Ken Lee)</td>
<td>Yolo County Water Districts MSR/SOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/2013</td>
<td>Intro Meeting w/ County PPW (David Morrison) (Ken Lee)</td>
<td>Yolo County Water Districts MSR/SOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/2013</td>
<td>Kick-off Meeting w/ Yolo-Zamora Water District (Twyla Thompson)</td>
<td>Yolo County Water Districts MSR/SOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting/Milestone</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/2013</td>
<td>Kick-off Meeting w/Yolo County Flood Control &amp; Water Conservation District (Tim O'Halloran, Christy Barton)</td>
<td>Yolo County Water Districts MSR/SOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/2013</td>
<td>Kick-off Meeting w/Dunnigan Water District (Donita Hendrix)</td>
<td>Yolo County Water Districts MSR/SOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/13/2013</td>
<td>Meeting w/ Olin Woods</td>
<td>LAFCo Agenda review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/14/2013</td>
<td>Monthly meeting w/ Don Saylor</td>
<td>Misc items, Yolo Leaders planning committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Meeting w/County &amp; City of Woodland (Patrick Blacklock, Mindi Nunes, Kevin Yarris, Dave Sammut) (Paul Navazio, Lynn Johnson, Troy Thompson, Greg Meyer)</td>
<td>Fleet/Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Meeting w/ County (Patrick Blacklock, Mindi Nunes, Robyn Drivon)</td>
<td>Animal Services employee transition options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Meeting w/ County &amp; animal advocates (Patrick Blacklock, Diane Parro) (Evelyn Dale)</td>
<td>Animal Services update for Evelyn Dale et al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Lunch meeting w/ SACOG (Mike McKeever)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/20/2013</td>
<td>Meeting w/ catering staff (Jeff)</td>
<td>CALAFCO Staff Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2013</td>
<td>33rd Annual Farm Bureau Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-meeting w/ SACOG</td>
<td>Shared Services Task Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/22/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Yolo Managers Meeting</td>
<td>Attended meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/22/2013</td>
<td>Shared Services-Meeting w/ County (Patrick Blacklock, Mindi Nunes, Ed Prieto, Esmeralda Andrade)</td>
<td>Review LAFCo’s timeline for animal services JPA approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNOUNCING...
THE 2013 CALAFCO ANNUAL CONFERENCE
AUGUST 28-30, 2013
LAKE TAHOE, CALIFORNIA

“Clarity of Vision: The Golden Age of LAFCO”
Join us as we celebrate the 50th Anniversary of LAFCOs!

Hosted by
El Dorado, Nevada, & Placer LAFCOs

Deluxe Rooms at $169*/night
* CALAFCO rate for Deluxe Room excludes tax & resort fees

SAVE THE DATE!
Conference details will be made available soon