

2.
3/22/2007

MINUTES
February 22, 2007

Present: Robin Lowe, Chair
Bob Buster
Terry Henderson
Robert E. Hird
Ron Starrs
Phil Williams

Absent: John Tavaglione

Present Staff: George J. Spiliotis, Executive Officer
Wayne Fowler, Senior Local Government Analyst
Crystal Craig, Local Government Analyst II
Elena Medina, Executive Assistant II
Joe Rank, Legal Counsel

1.1 CALL TO ORDER AND SALUTE TO THE FLAG.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lowe at 9:35

1.2 ROLL CALL.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2007

Minutes were approved as presented.

3. Consent (Non-Hearing Items):

a. LAFCO 2006-138-3-Annexation 78 to County Service Area 84.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Hird) to approve LAFCO 2006-138-3-Annexation 78 to County Service Area 84.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

b. LAFCO 2006-151-1-Annexation 108 to County Service Area 103.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Hird) to approve LAFCO 2006-151-1-Annexation 108 to County Service Area 103.

6/0 (Tavaglione)

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Continued:

a. LAFCO 2005-17-1,2,5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Riverside (**Continued from October 26, 2006**)

Mr. Fowler presented the report.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to approve LAFCO 2005-17-1,2,5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments - City of Riverside.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

- b. LAFCO 2005-64-4-Reorganization to Include the Formation of Desert River Community Services District and Dissolution of County Service Area 62 and 122. **(Continued from September 28, 2006; staff recommends continuance to March 22, 2007)**

Moved (Hird) seconded (Henderson) to continue LAFCO 2005-64-4-Reorganization to Include the Formation of Desert River Community Services District and Dissolution of County Service Area 62 and 122 to March 22, 2007.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

The Commission decided to take Item m. at this time.

- m. LAFCO 2006-136-4-Reorganization to Include Annexation 17 to the City of La Quinta and the La Quinta Lighting & landscape District #89-01 and Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

Mr. Fowler presented the proposal.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing.

John Criste, Terra Nova Planning, 400 S. Farrell Dr., Palm Springs, CA 92262. Mr. Criste spoke in favor of the annexation proposal and said he was available for questions.

Chair Lowe closed the public hearing.

Moved (Buster) seconded (Hird) to approve LAFCO 2006-136-4-Reorganization to Include Annexation 17 to the City of La Quinta and the La Quinta Lighting & Landscape District #89-01 and Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

6/0

The Commission decided to take Item d. at this time.

- d. LAFCO 2005-89-4&5-Municipal Service Review -Western Coachella Valley.

Mr. Fowler presented the Municipal Service Review report. Mr. Fowler stated that the Municipal Service Review report for the Western Coachella Valley included six cities, one special district and nine County Service Areas. Mr. Fowler stated that the level of cooperation from the Cities had been exceptional. He also said that the special districts had taken the request very seriously. He said that the document the Commission had before them

was a good document and he proceeded to introduce Carolyn Schaffer, Project Manager, Dudek Engineering.

Ms. Schaffer gave a brief overview of the study area and followed by addressing the special characteristics and issues of each individual city and district. Ms. Schaffer also discussed the two major issues of the study areas which were growth and economics. Ms. Schaffer proceeded to address each of the cities as outlined in the Final Draft -Western Coachella Municipal Service Review. She continued to address the County Service Areas north Sky Valley, Happy Valley Road Maintenance District, Indio Hills, and lastly in the southern portion, Pinyon Flats which provided enhanced fire protection services to the communities in the mountain area as outline in the report. She said that MSRs were a snap shot in time, and any of the determinations could change, which could affect the determinations and outcome going forward. She said that the Commission was required to consider analyses and adopt determinations for the nine areas, including growth and population infrastructure needs, financing cost avoidance, management deficiencies, and opportunities for shared facilities, rate restructuring, government structure options, and local accountability in governments. She said that growth was a key regional issue. She said that the City and the County had worked together on the growth projections which the Commission had before them. She continued to address the above-stated issues on the graphs presented to the Commission included in the draft report. She said that each of the Cities was aggressively pursuing opportunities to build their revenue base to make sure it was sustainable for the future. She also addressed the Park and Recreational services as outlined in the draft report. She said that the district was looking to expand their current sphere to include services all the way to Palm Springs. She said she was available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Buster asked if there were any logical changes that should encompass the storm water areas that need to be improved. Ms. Schaffer stated that nothing in particular came forward. She said that each of the Cities seem to be addressing their own storm water and drainage issues.

Commissioner Williams commented that the Sphere of Influence for Palm Desert had no boundaries north of the east side of the 10 freeway. He asked why it was necessary to expand their boundaries to cross the 10 Freeway. Mr. Fowler said that the area he was looking at on the map was an area developed by Del Webb and Del Webb wanted to be within the sphere of influence of Palm Desert. He said that all the spheres shown on the exhibit were existing spheres.

Mr. Hird asked what was the projection population for Pinyon Flats. Ms. Schaffer stated that the County did not give them separate population projections for that area.

Commissioner Henderson said that they were not creating new boundaries or eliminating any boundaries. She further said that the study was based on the current boundaries that existed.

Craig Ewing, Planning Director for the City of Palm Springs, 3200 E. Tahquitz Cyn Way, Palm Springs, CA 92262. Mr. Ewing expressed his support for the MSR.

Moved (Hird) seconded (Williams) to accept the MSR Report as presented by staff and consultant.

6/0

c. LAFCO 2006-49-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments - Coachella Valley Recreation and Parks District.

Mr. Fowler presented the sphere review report. He further stated that staff was recommending that the Commission amend the Sphere for the Coachella Valley Recreation and Parks District by including those portions of the City of Rancho Mirage which were currently outside of the District's boundaries and also including the corporate boundaries for the Cities of Cathedral City and Palm Springs within the Sphere of Influence for the District.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Hird) to determine that the Sphere of Influence for the Coachella Valley Recreation and Parks District be amended, by the inclusion of the Cities of Rancho Mirage, Cathedral City and Palm Springs.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

e. LAFCO 2006-25-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments -City of Desert Hot Springs.

Mr. Fowler presented the sphere of Influence review for City of Desert Hot Springs as outlined in the staff report. He further stated that staff was recommending that the Commission leave the City of Desert Hot Springs Sphere of Influence largely intact except for the removal of territory discussed in the Cathedral City portion of the staff report and the removal of the territory of the Desert Edge Community Council. He said that this will leave the City sphere access both to the west of Highway 62 and south to Interstate 10, between Indian Avenue and Palm Drive, a 2 ½ mile wide corridor.

f. LAFCO 2006-26-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments - City of Palm Springs.

Mr. Fowler presented the sphere of Influence review for City of Palm Springs as outlined in the staff report. He further stated that there was a third area of interest to amend the sphere, which was a small 2.5 acre parcel between the City of Palm Springs and Cathedral City, along Highway 111. He said that this parcel was presently in no City SOI. He said that the landowner, Mr. Beckley had expressed interest in annexation into the City of Palm Springs rather than into the City of Cathedral City. He said that the City of Palm Springs had shown reciprocal interest in this parcel. He said that this will be further discussed in the Cathedral City SOI review section.

g. LAFCO 2006-27-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments - City of Cathedral City and the Cathedral City Community Services District.

Mr. Fowler presented the sphere of Influence review for City of Cathedral City as outlined in the staff report. He further stated that staff was recommending that the spheres for both the City and the City subsidiary

Community Services District match. He said that the adopted City SOI would be the adopted Cathedral City CSD SOI.

He said that each of the Cities had met with the other Cities to discuss the potential amendments to the sphere. He said that a general agreement was reached between Palm Springs and Cathedral City to limit Palm Springs' interest to west of Palm Drive. He said that Cathedral City and Palm Springs met and they discussed several alternatives. He said that what they agreed upon was to amend the sphere to follow the centerlines of Varner Road and Palm Drive that would give each City partial access to I-10 and square the boundaries.

Mr. Fowler further stated that staff had received comments from the Desert Edge Community Council and also from Supervisor Wilson's Office. He said that the Desert Edge Community area was established in 2005 over the top of the existing sphere of influence of the City Desert Hot Springs. He said that the Edge Community Council had asked that their area be removed out of the sphere of influence of the City of Desert Hot Springs. He said that in the past the Commission had kept Community Councils all within one jurisdiction, and staff was recommending that the 1½ square mile area be removed from Desert Hot Spring's sphere.

Mr. Fowler stated that staff recommendations were as follows: Amend the Sphere of Influence for Desert Hot Springs by removing the Desert Edge Community Council area, and removing of the 46 acres south of Varner Road and east of Palm Drive from their sphere, find the action exempt from CEQA and adopt the Policy Statements with the exception of the potential communications with the Desert Edge Community Council. He said that regarding Palm Springs, staff was recommending to not make any amendments to their sphere at this time and to adopt the policy statements included in the staff report. He said that regarding Cathedral City, staff was recommending to amend the sphere of influence adding 46 acres north of the I-10 Freeway, to put off the Rancho Mirage and Cathedral City sphere of influence discussion of the Rancho Mirage sphere of influence and to put the Beckley parcel off for six months. He asked the Commission to give staff direction to prepare an Initial Study for the suggested changes on the staff report for Cathedral City, and bring it back in about three months.

Commissioner Henderson asked Mr. Fowler what was the reason for Cathedral City wanting to add the 2.5 acres to their sphere. Mr. Fowler responded that the City of Cathedral City perceived this area to be an island; therefore, they wanted to clean up the service boundaries.

Mr. Spiliotis commented that as far as LAFCO was concern the area fell under the island annexation statutes.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing.

Yvonne Parks, Councilwoman, City of Desert Hot Springs, 65877 Avenida Pico, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240. Ms. Parks spoke in favor of the of LAFCO 2006-25-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments -City of Desert Hot Springs and asked the Commission to approve the request as recommended by staff.

Bill Nunan, 69300 Midpark, Desert Crest Country Club, Desert Edge, CA 92241. Mr. Nunan spoke in favor of LAFCO 2006-25-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments -City of Desert Hot Springs and asked the Commission to approve the request as recommended by staff.

Cindy Nance, Chairperson, Desert Edge Community Council, 698 75 Silver Moon Dr., Desert Hot Springs, CA 92241. Ms. Nance spoke in opposition of being part of Desert Hot Springs Sphere of Influence. She presented a Petition with 77 signatures from Mobile Home Owners of Corkill Palms M.H.P., 17640 Corkill Road, Desert Edge Community 92241 in support of her request.

Dean Gray, Desert Hot Springs Chamber of Commerce, 66308 Avenida Barona, Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240. Mr. Gray spoke in opposition of staff's recommendation to add the 46 acres to the City of Cathedral City sphere of influence.

Ann Marie Gallant, City Manager, City of Desert Hot Springs. Ms. Gallant spoke in favor of staff's recommendation for LAFCO 2006-25-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Desert Hot Springs. She said that the City Council fully endorsed staff's recommendation.

Greg Pettis, 68-700 Avenue Lalo Guerrero, Cathedral City. Mr. Pettis spoke in favor staff's recommendation for LAFCO 2006-27-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments - Cathedral City.

Benton Beckley, 67500 E. Palm Canyon, Cathedral City, CA 92234. Mr. Beckley spoke in support of staff's recommendation for LAFCO 2006-27-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments - City of Cathedral City. He asked the Commission to grant him a six-month extension to allow him the time to discuss this matter further with the City of Palm Springs.

Don Bradley, City Manager, 68-700 Avenue Lalo Guerrero, Cathedral City, CA 92234. Mr. Bradley spoke in favor of staff's recommendation for LAFCO 2006-27-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments -City of Cathedral City.

Leisa Lukes, Planning Director, City of Cathedral City. Ms. Lukes spoke in support of staff's recommendation for LAFCO 2006-27-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments -City of Cathedral City.

Todd M. Webber, Planner, City of Rancho Mirage. Mr. Webber spoke in favor of continuing this review to allow time for all interested parties to sit down and discuss further their issues of concern and hopefully will be able to come to an agreement.

Benton Beckley, 67500 E. Palm Canyon, Cathedral City, CA 92234. Mr. Beckley requested the Commission to allow his property to remain in the County at this time with the possibility at a later time to annex to Palm Springs. Mr. Beckley stated that he did not wish to be part of the City of Cathedral City.

Mr. Fowler stated that in staff's research, they were unable to find anything regarding previous annexation of the 2.5 acre parcel. Mr. Fowler stated that there was no documentation to support that the 2.5 acre parcel was placed in any sphere.

Craig Ewing, Planning Director, City of Palm Springs, 3200 E. Tahquitz Canyon Way, Palm Springs, CA 92262. Mr. Ewing spoke in favor of staff's recommendation for LAFCO 2006-26-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Palm Springs. Mr. Ewing stated that he was in support of staff's recommendation to return to LAFCO within six months to report on the progress and preparation of an application for a sphere of influence amendment and annexation of APN 681-300-020, an approximately 2.5 acre parcel owned by Mr. Bekcley.

Chair Lowe closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Henderson stated that she had no problem with LAFCO 2006-25-4&5-SOI Review and Potential Amendments to Desert Hot Springs. She said that she was in agreement with taking Desert Edge Community Council from the sphere of influence.

Commissioner Henderson disagreed with recommendation c. of staff's recommendation stating that the City of Desert Hot Springs should send a representative to the Desert Edge Community Council meetings on a regular basis to promote a dialogue between the residents and the City.

Mr. Fowler reviewed staff's recommendation of all three spheres. He said that for Desert Hot Springs, staff was recommending the removal of approximately one and half square miles of territory located east of Long Canyon Road and north of Dillon road which was within the Desert Edge Community Council. He also said that staff was also recommending the removal of approximately 46 acres east of Palm Drive and south of Varner Road. He said that staff was also recommending that the City of Desert Hot Springs and the County of Riverside work together to recognize inhabited areas existing within their respective spheres of influences and promote increased communications with those inhabited areas. The City of Desert Hot Springs should send a representative to the Desert Edge Community Council meetings on a regular basis to promote a dialogue between the residents and the City.

Commissioner Henderson stated if staff took that sentence out, she would move for approval of the sphere.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Hird) to amend the Sphere of Influence of the City of Desert Hot Springs as recommended by staff with the modification of recommendation c. deleting the sentence stating "The City of Desert Hot Springs should send a representative to the Desert Edge Community Council meetings on a regular basis to promote a dialogue between the residents and the City".

6/0

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to approve LAFCO 2006-26-4&5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments to the Palm Springs, as recommended by staff outlined in the staff report to keep current sphere for Palm Springs with no changes.

6/0

Chair Lowe asked if there had been any comments from Supervisor Wilson's Office regarding the Cathedral City SOI Review. Mr. Fowler responded in the negative.

Commissioner Williams commented that Mr. Beckley had fought vigorously to stay out of Cathedral City and had been wanting to go to Palm Springs. If the six month continuance worked for Mr. Beckley then he will support that.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Williams) to tentative approve Sphere of Influence Amendment (addition) to the City of Cathedral City of 46 acres generally located south of Varner Road and East of Palm Avenue and continue for three months and return with a completed initial study for the area.

5/1 (Lowe voted No)

h. LAFCO 2006-61-4-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-Imperial Irrigation District.

Mr. Spiliotis presented the sphere review report, indicating that staff research confirmed no Riverside County territory was within IID's boundaries. Mr. Spiliotis further stated that there was no record that a sphere of influence was established for Imperial Irrigation District within the County of Riverside. He said that staff was recommending to establish a sphere of influence that included Imperial Irrigation District's current electricity service area in the County as it was shown on the exhibit presented to the Commission.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing and there being no proponents or opponents wishing to speak the public hearing was closed.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to establish a sphere of influence for Imperial Irrigation District to match its existing service area as recommended by staff.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

i. LAFCO 2006-88-4-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-City of Indian Wells.

Mr. Fowler presented the sphere report. Mr. Fowler further stated that the Sphere for the City of Indian Wells was coterminous. He said that the City had transmitted a letter indicating that at this time, the City did not request additional sphere beyond the currently coterminous boundaries. He said that staff concurred with the City, and will recommend that the Commission make no changes to the currently existing sphere of influence for the City of Indian Wells.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing and there being no proponents or opponents wishing to speak the public hearing was closed.

Moved (Starrs) seconded (Henderson) to determine that the current sphere of influence was adequate at this time and no change was required.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

- j. LAFCO 2006-131-5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments-County Service Area 27 (Cherry Valley).

Ms. Craig presented the sphere report and stated that CSA 27 had a County-wide sphere and staff was recommending that the Commission amend the sphere for CSA 27 to correspond with the Cherry Valley Unincorporated Community (UC) boundaries.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing and there being no proponents or opponents wishing to speak the public hearing was closed.

Moved (Starrs) seconded (Williams) to amend the sphere of influence for CSA 27 to correspond to the Cherry Valley Unincorporated Community (UC) boundaries.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

- k. LAFCO 2006-132-5-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments - CSA 85 (Cabazon)

Ms. Craig presented the sphere review and further stated that CSA 85 had a coterminous sphere. She said that staff was recommending to amend the sphere for CSA 85 to correspond with the Cabazon Unincorporated Community (UC) boundaries.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing and there being no proponents or opponents wishing to speak the public hearing was closed.

Moved (Hird) seconded (Henderson) to amend the sphere of influence for CSA 85 to correspond with the Cabazon Unincorporated Community (UC) boundaries.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

- l. LAFCO 2006-135-5-Reorganization to Include Annexation 76 to the City of Lake Elsinore (Little Valley), Concurrent Annexation to Northwest Mosquito and Vector Control District and Concurrent Detachments from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District and County Service Area 41.

Mr. Spiliotis presented the proposal as outlined in the staff report. Mr. Spiliotis stated that the proposal was an extension of the currently developing Ramsgate Specific Plan. He said that the area was under transition from vacant and rural uses to more urban development. He said that the detachment from the CSA will cause a small loss of revenue; however, the area will benefit from a full width of improvements to two dirt roads. He said that staff was recommending approval with standard terms and conditions as outlined in the staff report.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing.

Garry Grant, 27068 Jarvis St., Perris, CA 92570. Mr. Grant asked the Commission for reimbursement of the assessments they had been paying for the past five years for road improvements.

Mr. Spiliotis responded that the area will be detached from CSA 41 and those parcels will no longer be subject to the assessment which were for road

improvements. He said that the tract had been conditioned for some improvements beyond the centerline. He said that roads will be built in the area and that those parcels will benefit in the future. He said that the assessments will be discontinued once the annexation was approved.

Rolfe Preisendanz, 1305 Main Street, Lake Elsinore, CA. Mr. Preisendanz spoke in favor of the annexation proposal and stated he was available for any questions.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Williams) to approve LAFCO 2006-135-5-Reorganization to Include Annexation 76 to the City of Lake Elsinore (Little Valley), Concurrent Annexation to Northwest Mosquito and Vector Control District and Concurrent Detachments from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District and County Service Area 41. 4/0 (Lowe and Buster excused themselves)

n. LAFCO 2006-137-1&5-Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexation 77 to the City of Lake Elsinore (HWY 74 POCKET) and Concurrent Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

Mr. Spiliotis presented the annexation proposal and stated that the annexation had been submitted to fulfill a condition of approval of LAFCO 2005-50-Annexation 71 (Centex) to Lake Elsinore, approved by the Commission October, 2005. He said that staff's recommendation was for approval as outlined in the staff report which will send the proposal on to the affected owners and voters to determine the final outcome.

Commissioner Hird asked if LAFCO had received any letters within the boundaries of the annexation. Mr. Spiliotis responded in the negative.

Chair Lowe opened the public hearing.

Marcy Wilson, 28140 Missouri Trail, Perris, CA 92570. Ms. Wilson spoke in opposition of the annexation proposal.

Garry Grant, 27068 Jarvis St., Perris, CA 92570. Mr. Grant spoke in opposition of the annexation proposal.

Mr. Spiliotis clarified that that proposed annexation was not within CSA 41.

Rolfe Preisendanz, 1305 Main Street, Lake Elsinore, CA. Mr. Preisendanz asked the Commission to concur with staff's recommendation. He also said he was available for questions.

Chair Lowe closed the public hearing.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Williams) to approve LAFCO 2006-137-1&5-Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexation 77 to the City of Lake Elsinore (HWY 74 POCKET) and Concurrent Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

o. LAFCO 2006-146-3-Sphere of Influence Review and Potential Amendments -CSA 138 (Sun City).

Ms. Craig presented the sphere review and further stated that CSA 138 was within the sphere of influence of CSA 84 and since the CSA provided street lighting services staff was recommending that CSA 138 be dissolved to allow CSA 84 to provide lighting services to the area. She also said that staff was recommending a "zero" SOI for CSA 138 which indicated future dissolution.

Moved (Buster) seconded (Williams) to establish a "zero" sphere of influence which indicated future dissolution of CSA 138.
6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

5. RECEIVE AND FILE.

a. INFORMATION ITEMS: Proposals Received (Government Code Section 56857, 56751):

Moved (Lowe) seconded (Hird) to acknowledge receipt of the following proposals:
6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

- i. LAFCO 2007-02-4-Sphere of Influence Amendments to the Cities of Palm Desert (removal) and La Quinta (addition) and Reorganization to Include Annexation 18 to the City of La Quinta and the La Quinta Lighting & Landscaping District 89-01 and Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.
- ii. LAFCO 2007-03-3-Annexation 81 to County Service Area 84.
- iii. LAFCO 2007-04-3-Annexation 21 to County Service Area 145.
- iv. LAFCO 2007-05-1-Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexation 75 to the City of Lake Elsinore, Annexation to Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District and Annexation to Northwest Mosquito & Vector Control District and Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.
- v. LAFCO 2007-06-4-Reorganization to Include Annexation 58 to the City of Coachella, the Coachella Fire Protection District, (subsidiary) and Concurrent Detachments from County Service Area 125, the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District, Coachella Valley Water District and the Southern Coachella Valley Community Services District.
- vi. LAFCO 2007-07-3-Annexation 110 to County Service Area 103.
- vii. LAFCO 2007-08-3-Annexation 20 to County Service Area 145.
- viii. LAFCO 2007-09-4-Sphere of Influence Amendment to the City of Indio (addition).
- ix. LAFCO 2007-10-5-Banning Bench Unincorporated Community: Five-Year Report.
- x. LAFCO 2007-11-3,4&5-Mountain Communities Municipal Service Review.

- xi. LAFCO 2007-12-4-Eastern County Municipal Service Review.
- xii. LAFCO 2007-13-4-Minor Sphere of Influence Amendment (addition) to the City of Blythe and Reorganization to Include Annexation 51 to the City of Blythe and Detachment from the Riverside County Waste Resource Management District.

b. MONTHLY EXPENDITURE REVIEW.

Moved (Lowe) seconded (Hird) to receive and file the Monthly Expenditure Review report.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

6. REQUEST FOR A FEE WAIVER FOR LAFCO 2006-154-4-REORGANIZATION TO INCLUDE CONCURRENT ANNEXATIONS 57 (NIGOSIAN) TO THE CITY OF COACHELLA, THE COACHELLA FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT (SUBSIDIARY) AND THE COACHELLA SANITARY DISTRICT (SUBSIDIARY) AND DETACHMENTS FROM COUNTY SERVICE AREA 125 AND THE RIVERSIDE COUNTY WASTE RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DISTRICT.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Lowe) to approve the Request for a Fee Waiver for LAFCO 2006-154-4-Reorganization to Include Concurrent Annexations 57 (Nigosian) to the City of Coachella, the Coachella Fire Protection District (Subsidiary) and the Coachella Sanitary District (Subsidiary) and Detachments from County Service Area 125 and the Riverside County Waste Resources Management District.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

7. ESTABLISH AUTHORIZED POWERS OF COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICTS.

Mr. Spiliotis stated that last month's hearing staff presented the Commission with the Powers of Community Services Districts (CSD) which were currently authorized. He said that the report inadvertently omitted wastewater services as a function for the Edgmont Community Services District (ECSD).

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Williams) to accept the correction as stated in the staff report.

6/0 (Tavaglione absent)

8. SELECTION OF CONSULTANT FOR PREPARATION OF MSR-MOUNTAIN AREAS, EASTERN COUNTY.

Mr. Fowler presented the report and stated that staff was recommending that the Commission select Public Financial Management Inc. as the consultant to prepare the MSRs. Mr. Fowler also said that staff was recommending that the Commission authorize the Chair to execute a professional services agreement with the consultant for the preparation of the MSR.

Commissioner Henderson asked what brought Mr. Fowler to a level of confidence in his recommendation. Mr. Fowler responded that Dudek's price was considerably higher because they were going to hire outside fire consultants focusing on the fire issue based on the Esperanza Fires. He said

that PFM expertise was in public service reviews particularly fire and police services throughout the State.

Commissioner Henderson asked how many MSR had Dudek prepared for LAFCO. Mr. Fowler responded that they had prepared four so far.

Moved (Henderson) seconded (Starrs) to approve staff's recommendation to select Public Financial Management Inc. as the consultant to prepare the MSR for the Mountain Communities and Eastern County area.
6/0

9. MISCELLANEOUS STAFF REPORTS.

There were no miscellaneous staff reports.

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS.

Garry Grant, 27068 Jarvis St., Perris, CA 92570. Mr. Grant discussed a letter from the Riverside County Property Owners Association and requested LAFCO to provide him with certain documents relating to that letter

The Commission recessed to Executive Session at 12:39 p.m.

11. EXECUTIVE SESSION:

With respect to every item of business to be discussed in closed session pursuant to Government Code Section 54957:

a. Performance Evaluation: Executive Officer.

The Commission reconvened at 12:58 p.m.

Mr. Rank stated that there was nothing to report.

12. ADJOURNMENT.

The Commission adjourned at 12:59 p.m.

Respectfully,

George J. Spiliotis
Executive Officer