

**POLICY OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ADOPTION, AMENDMENT OR REPEAL OF  
COUNTY ORDINANCES  
ADOPTED APRIL 17, 2007**

*Policy to establish basic minimum procedural requirements for the adoption, amendment, or repeal of County ordinances.*

---

*It is the purpose of this policy to establish basic minimum procedural requirements for the adoption, amendment, or repeal of County ordinances.*

*The Plumas County Board of Supervisors must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Board, or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Board, would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to the affected public than the proposed action.*

*It is the policy of the Plumas County Board of Supervisors to require all recommendations of adoption, amendment or repeal of an ordinance include a cost benefit analysis as a part of the information provided for consideration by the Board of Supervisors and the public; and include a summary of the total projected cost/benefit to the affected public with the published public notice as is required.*

*The following are basic minimum procedural requirements:*

**INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASON**

*This statement of reasons shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following:*

- a. An initial statement of the reason, the specific purpose, and the rationale for the determination by the department that the factual bases for the adoption, amendment or repeal of an ordinance is reasonably necessary to carry out the purpose for which it is proposed.*
- b. An identification of the technical documents, theoretical, and empirical study, report, or similar document, if any, upon which the department relied upon in proposing adoption, amendment or repeal of an ordinance.*
- c. A description and comparison of any reasonable alternatives the Board of Supervisors should consider to the adoption, amendment or repeal of an ordinance and the departments reasons for rejecting those alternatives each having been prepared and made available with the first reading of the proposed ordinance. The department is not required to artificially construct alternatives or describe unreasonable alternatives if it can be shown there are no reasonable alternatives to consider.*
- d. Include in a description of reasonable alternatives to the adoption, amendment, or repeal of an ordinance that would lessen any adverse impact on small business and the department's reason(s) for rejecting those alternatives.*
- e. Utilize facts, evidence, documents, testimony, or other evidence on which the department relies to support an initial determination that the action will not have a significant adverse economic impact on businesses.*
- f. A copy of proposed amendments to an existing ordinance in STRIKEOUT/UNDERLINE format to be available at the Public Hearing*

### **COST EST/MATES**

*A written statement describing a determination how the proposed action may affect each of the following (a through h) and include a numerical description, projection and/or estimate to each affected item:*

- a. Cost or savings to county agencies/departments*
- b. Impact on housing costs*
- c. Impact on businesses*
- d. Affect to small businesses*
- e. Cost impact or savings on private persons or businesses*
- f. Costs or savings in state or federal funding to the County of Plumas*
- g. Costs or savings to local agencies; such as school districts*
- h. Other nondiscretionary costs or savings imposed on local agencies*

### **DETERMINATION OF MANDATE**

- a. Describe, when appropriate, the State or Federal Law, regulation, statute and/or code requiring this ordinance to be adopted if any.*
- b. Describe, when appropriate, the amendment necessary to current County Code to provide compliance with State or Federal law, regulation, statute and/or code*
- c. Describe the deficiency of current County Code requiring amendment of the Code*

### **REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

*The Board of Supervisors must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Board or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Board would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected public than the proposed action.*