



Gray Davis
GOVERNOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA



Tal Finney
INTERIM DIRECTOR

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW GUIDELINES

Governor's Office of Planning and Research

AUGUST 2003

FINAL

2. GROWTH AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR THE AFFECTED AREA

In identifying an agency's growth and population projections, LAFCO may wish to address the following factors in its review:

	FACTOR / ISSUE
1.	Projected growth and demographic changes in and around the agency's service areas.
2.	Historic and expected land use absorption trends.
3.	Estimate of future service needs.
4.	Impact of land use plans and growth patterns on service demands.
5.	Impact of service plans and policies on growth and/or land use patterns for adjacent areas, on mutual or regional social and economic interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county.
6.	Relationship between an agency's boundary and SOI with the projected growth in the study area.
7.	Compatibility of service plan(s) with other local agency land use/development plans.
8.	Projected household size of new and existing residential dwellings.
9.	Compatibility between agency service plans, regional growth projections and efficient urban development.

3. FINANCING CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

In identifying an agency's financing constraints and opportunities, LAFCO may wish to address the following factors in its review:

	FACTOR / ISSUE
1.	Implementation of appropriate financing/funding practices.
2.	Potential for shared financing and/or joint funding applications.
3.	Combination of enterprise and/or non-enterprise financing functions.
4.	Comparative analysis of financing rates among other agencies in study area.
5.	Bond rating(s).
6.	Ability to obtain financing.
7.	Existing and/or proposed assessment district(s).
8.	Debt-to-services ratio by area and subarea incomes.
9.	Opportunities for additional revenue streams, including joint agency grant applications, untapped resources, or alternative government structures.
10.	Methods to pay down existing debt(s), including using excess revenues.

	FACTOR / ISSUE
6.	Rate comparison between sub-regions based on demographic information.
7.	The services that ratepayers and/or assessed properties are receiving for which they are paying.
8.	Financial impacts on existing customers caused by the funding of infrastructure needed to support new development.
9.	Impacts of standby rates (charges assessed to under-or-undeveloped land used for rural, agricultural or open space uses) on open space and affordable housing plans.
10.	Relationship between rate and service polices and the provision of decent and affordable housing.
11.	Availability of reasonable emergency reserves.
12.	Use of annual savings.

6. OPPORTUNITIES FOR SHARED FACILITIES

In identifying an agency's opportunities for shared facilities, LAFCO may wish to address the following factors in its review:

	FACTOR / ISSUE
1.	Current shared activities with other service providers, including shared facilities and staff.
2.	Suggested existing and/or future shared facility opportunities by the agency.
3.	Opportunities for conjunctive and/or joint use projects, such as groundwater storage/parks, schools/parks, or flood detention/parks.
4.	Duplication of existing and/or planned facilities of other service providers.
5.	Availability of excess capacity to serve customers of other agencies.

7. GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE OPTIONS

In identifying an agency's government structure options, LAFCO may wish to address the following factors in its review:

	FACTOR / ISSUE
1.	Available government options to provide more logical service boundaries to the benefit of customers and regional planning goals and objectives.
2.	Recommendations by a service provider and/or an interested party for government options.
3.	Anticipated proposals to LAFCO that will affect the service provider.
4.	Prior proposals or attempts by the agency to consolidate and/or reorganize.
5.	Availability of government options that improve public participation, local accountability, and governance.
6.	Impacts of government structures on the potential for displacement of current residents.

**Governor's Office of Planning and Research
LAFCO Municipal Service Review Guidelines**

	FACTOR / ISSUE
26.	Identification of illogical boundaries and their effect on rates.
27.	Impact of government structure options on an agency's financial stability.
28.	Rationale for an agency's emergency and/or undesignated reserves (fund equity or balance), particularly in relation to their gross annual revenue.
29.	Changes and/or modifications in boundaries in order to promote planned, orderly, and efficient patterns of urban development.
30.	Changes and/or modifications in boundaries in order to avoid premature inducement, facilitation, or conversion of existing open space lands, including: the direction of growth away from prime agricultural and important open space lands towards infill areas or areas containing nonprime agricultural land; the development of vacant land adjacent to existing urban areas and within existing spheres of influence.
31.	Boundary adjustments in order to minimize the amount of land needed to accommodate growth in the next 5-10 years within the spheres of influence of special districts and cities.
32.	Prevention of extensions of urban services to important agriculture and open space areas not planned for growth or within the boundaries of the city or special district.
33.	Impact of a change in government structure on the implementation of regional transportation, water quality, air quality, fair share housing allocation, environmental justice, airport land use, open space, agricultural, and other environmental polices or programs.
34.	Impacts of government structures on fair housing programs.
35.	Available government options that improve the ability to provide and explain budget and financial data.
36.	Opportunities for improvement in the quality and/or levels of service through changes in government structure.
37.	Impact of investment policies on service levels and quality.
38.	Evaluation of bond rates, ability to borrow or obtain grants, budget practices and other aid.
39.	Ability to gain environmental benefits (wetland restoration, water conservation, and other conservation policies) through government structure options.
40.	Opportunities to integrate services without excessive cost.
41.	Cost-benefit analysis of potential changes in government structure through merging staff, staff reduction by attrition, phasing out of elected or appointed positions, and management staff.
42.	Opportunities for improved service delivery and/or an increase in system standards by system integration through changes in government structure.
43.	Identify prohibitions in the affected Principal Acts that would affect government structure options, including pending litigation, court judgments, other legal issues, restricted assets, financial or other constraints.
44.	Integration of debts and obligations analyses.
45.	Potential successor agencies.

	FACTOR / ISSUE
19.	Review of environmental and safety compliance measures.
20.	Current litigation and/or grand jury inquiry involving the service under LAFCO review.

9. LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND GOVERNANCE

In evaluating an agency's local accountability and governance structure, LAFCO may wish to address the following factors in its review:

	FACTOR / ISSUE
1.	Compliance with state disclosure laws and the Brown Act.
2.	Level of public participation (i.e. open meetings, accessible staff and elected officials, an accessible office open to the public, a phone and/or message center, a web site, customer complaint and suggestion opportunities).
3.	Agency representatives (i.e., board members, employees, and staff).
4.	Public outreach efforts (i.e. newsletters, bill inserts, TV, web site).
5.	Media involvement (i.e. meetings publicized, evening board meetings, evening or weekend public planning sessions).
6.	Accessibility of meetings (i.e. meetings publicized, evening board meetings, evening or weekend public planning sessions and translations for non-English speakers and the hearing impaired).
7.	Election process.
8.	Participation of service users in elections (i.e. elections publicized, day and evening voting).
9.	Public access to adopted budgets.
10.	Budget reports' compatibility with state law.
11.	Audits.
12.	Access to program progress reports.
13.	Current provision of service(s).