Last year, SB 89 – one of the budget trailer bills – was signed into law. It severely reduced the vehicle license fees (VLF) for all cities and eliminated them for cities incorporated after 2004 or for inhabited territory annexed to cities after 2004. This created a fiscal crisis for the four most recently incorporated cities, all of which are in Riverside County.

Early this year Senator Gloria Negrete McLeod introduced SB 1566 to correct this gap. Despite intense efforts from the League of Cities and the affected cities, the bill died in Senate Appropriations Committee in May.

Not only creating a financial penalty for the affected cities, it shapes a policy issue for the state: If VLF is no longer available for incorporations and inhabited annexations – will there be another new city or inhabited annexation in California? It turns out the pressure continued on the Legislature, and during the very last two days of the session AB 1098 (Carter) was gutted and amended to restore VLF funding to incorporations and annexations since 2004, and into the future. At the time of publication the bill passed the Legislature and is on the Governor’s desk for action. The cities’ futures may rest with his action.

Still, the issues of funding new cities and annexations remain. This issue of The Sphere features articles which explore questions of incorporation, annexation and disadvantaged unincorporated communities.

Adding to the drama, on August 3rd The Los Angeles Times published an editorial entitled: New California cities? Not now. Sorry, Jurupa Valley, Menifee, Wildomar and Eastvale, but we can't afford you.

The editorial took aim at the cities, claiming that the state could not afford to “subsidize” these cities with state cash any longer. Unfortunately it contained erroneous information and assumptions about the nature and use of VLF funds and (any) state subsidies to new cities. It correctly observed that we are suffering the consequences of the cut in VLF in 2004. Done at a time of budget surpluses when the state could backfill lost VLF revenues, the funds soon were unavailable resulting in SB 89 last year. A response to the editorial was submitted by the mayors of the four cities and the Chair of the Riverside Board of Supervisors. It’s instructive to read the editorial and response in the context of the broader issues of incorporation and annexation. You will find them on page 14.
FROM THE CHAIR

Future of CALAFCO is Bright

CALAFCO has come a long way under the stewardship of Bill Chiat. Bill has laid the foundation for CALAFCO to become even more effective. This is because of the relationships Bill has developed with the LAFCos, the Legislature and the Governor’s office.

I see CALAFCO continuing to be recognized as the premier organization that can provide unbiased information regarding cities and special districts, not only for the Legislature and Executive branch of the State, but also for cities, special districts and the public. I see CALAFCO being respected by the Legislature and hence providing the tools necessary for the Legislature to carry out its responsibilities in an ever-changing society.

Within the Regions I already see more interest among Commissioners wanting to be elected to the CALAFCO Board. This is great because the Board then gets new ideas, making the Board even stronger. I predict that the interest among Commissioners to get on the Board will become even more exciting. I also see some LAFCOs within a Region pursuing shared staff and consulting services, e.g. GIS and auditing.

With the continuing fiscal challenges counties, cities and special districts have – and I predict that these challenges will continue long after the economy gets back to the way it was – the need for the Municipal Service Reviews will become ever more valuable. The MSRs can help point to those services that will be impacted by dire financial conditions. This will provide LAFCos the opportunity to encourage consolidations or other options for shared resources in their work with local agencies.

Perhaps the biggest challenge to LAFCos is sustaining agriculture. Recognizing the increase in the State’s population and accompanying desire for cities to expand, on the one hand, and the increasing dependence on California agriculture to feed the nation and the world, on the other hand, sustaining agriculture will not be an easy task.

One item that will aid LAFCos is the authority to act as an arbitrator to a final decision regarding tax sharing agreements to end stalemates. Decisions that are made on a timely basis will gain public confidence in the governmental process.

In conclusion, Bill Chiat will leave us some large shoes to fill, but I am confident that Pamela Miller, with the support and guidance from the CALAFCO Board, will do a great job.
Commissioners Appointed to CALAFCO Board of Directors

Two vacancies created on the Board of Directors when commissioners lost elections were filled by Board appointments. In both cases recruitments were held for interested commissioners and a recommendation made by the Board members from that region.

In May the Board appointed Contra Costa LAFCo Commissioner Michael McGill, P.E. to fill a special district Board vacancy in the Coastal Region. Commissioner McGill is a member of the Central Contra Costa Sanitary District Board of Directors. He replaces Cathy Schlottmann, formerly of Santa Barbara LAFCo, who was not reappointed as a commissioner.

In July the Board appointed Stanislaus LAFCo Alternate Commissioner Matthew Beekman to fill a city Board vacancy in the Central Region. Commissioner Beekman is the Mayor Pro Tem of the City of Hughson. He replaces former Yolo Commissioner Stephen Souza who lost his reelection bid.

The Board expressed its gratitude to both Cathy Schlottmann and Stephen Souza for their service to the Association.

Both appointed seats will be up for election at the CALAFCO Business Meeting in October.

FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The View from the Balcony

We rarely take the opportunity to step a happening in the complex environments in which we operate without occasionally stopping to look around and reflect on what we see. Since announcing my retirement from CAway from fray of daily challenges to take a look at what’s going on around us, to “get on the balcony.” It’s hard to understand what’s LAFCO, I have had a chance to do some of that observation from the balcony and have also benefited from the observations of many others – both inside and outside CALAFCO – who have shared their reflections on LAFCo.

We live in a world that is challenging the very role of government in our lives. The structures and systems many of us grew up with no longer work. Over my 35 years of public service I have had the privilege to serve in city, county, special district and state governments, and now in state association leadership roles. The challenges we face today are unlike anything I’ve seen before. They require organizations to constantly assess the needs of the communities they serve and the services they provide. The opportunities we face require adaptive solutions and adaptive leadership: to consider new approaches, mobilize discovery, take risks, let go of past conceptions, shed certain ways, and generate new capacity among staff and boards to thrive anew.

From the balcony I see six adaptive challenges for LAFCo for your consideration:

1. Facilitating Adaptive Challenges in Municipal Service Delivery

Much has been said about new paradigms in service delivery. Several LAFCos have taken leadership roles in facilitating shared services, functional consolidations and other approaches to sustain effective local services. The need for these and other adaptive approaches will only increase; they require continued learning and experiments in how to provide services in an ever-transforming world. LAFCo can play a critical facilitative role in bringing together service provider to learn, plan, try solutions and learn again. And the parties at the table will continue to evolve. Service provision may come to include more private providers, not-for-profits, mutual corporations and others in addition to local agencies. Both LAFCo and local agencies need to consider entirely new ways of providing services. Traditional solutions are less likely to be sustainable. LAFCo has the opportunity to position itself as a valuable facilitator to these adaptive challenges.

2. Oversight of Local Agencies

A significant adaptive challenge for LAFCo from the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 was its expanded role in oversight and review of local agencies. Now, the reality of Bell, Vernon, Stockton, sanitary agencies in Marin and others has raised the question of who should be watching local agencies. As far back as 1969 the courts have
found LAFCo’s role to be the “… watchdog the Legislature established to guard against the wasteful duplication of services…” Recent legislative hearings have examined the oversight issue and LAFCo’s role. A general session at the 2012 annual conference will further explore this issue. As commissions consider the next round of MSRs, some are grappling with whether they should expand their review of finances, governance, conflict of interests and agency effectiveness and whether they have a role in identifying potential problems outside of service delivery and capacity. From an outsider’s perspective the questions may be: If not LAFCo, then who? From a LAFCo’s perspective the question might be: “So what if we identify something?” While these are adaptive challenges are bigger than LAFCo, certainly LAFCo could – and could be in the best position to – have a role in the solutions.

3. Managing Growth and the New Urbanism

Depending on whom one asks and where one asks it, those outside of LAFCo will give a range of responses on LAFCo’s effectiveness in preventing sprawl and encouraging orderly growth. The economic catastrophe in California has stopped growth and provided a few years for reflection on where growth will go in the future. Some LAFCOs have used this opportunity to review policies. It’s only a matter of time before growth comes back to California. But it is likely to be a different kind of growth. New state policies such as SB 375 and AB 32 will affect how growth will occur, and the financial means to fund local services have been altered as well. Community expectations may be changing as well. Denser urban housing, shorter commutes, public transportation and similar trends will affect how communities grow. Most general plans (and LAFCo policies?) are lagging this change.

The financial mechanisms have been altered as well. How should LAFCos respond? How should policies regarding spheres of influence, annexations, service extensions and agency formation be reviewed or revised in light of this opportunity to observe what is happening with respect to growth now and in the future?

4. Growth in Unincorporated Territory

Who should manage growth in the unincorporated areas? Should LAFCo have a role? This has been a long-contested issue. It was again addressed in CKH in 2000 and the compromise solution (GC §56434) expires at the end of the year with no one interested in its extension. Still, LAFCo has a regulatory role to manage orderly growth and prevent sprawl for cities and special districts, but not counties. There are solid arguments on both sides of the equation, but clearly LAFCo cannot meet the legislative mandates for agricultural preservation and orderly growth or local policies adopted in response to the previous point if it has no authority on growth in unincorporated, undeveloped territory within the county.

5. Service Delivery and Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Over the entire eight years of my tenure (and well beyond) there has been discussion regarding the modification of GC §56133 to allow more authority for LAFCo to extend services outside boundaries and spheres. A task group worked extensively over the last two years to craft language which provides expanded authority with limitations. The proposal has CALAFCO Board support, but there still remains a need to work with other stakeholders and some LAFCOs to bring the language to the legislature next winter.

In my work with stakeholders in disadvantaged unincorporated communities over the last three years, one thing became very clear. In most cases annexation of those communities to nearby cities is not practical, political and/or financially feasible. What IS feasible and has a greater potential for actually getting badly needed services to these communities is to allow service extensions outside of boundaries and spheres. This avoids the issues of annexation but does open up the potential for unintended growth.

This adaptive challenge requires new thinking, taking some risk in oversight of services and growth, and abandonment of certain assumptions and beliefs in order to implement.

Continued on page 9
Dear CALAFCO Members:

We are proud to report to you that the Association continues as a strong, vibrant educational resource to members and as an advocate for LAFCo and LAFCo principles to statewide decision makers. In 2012 the Association maintained a high level of educational services as well as a healthy agenda of legislative issues. During the year we saw active involvement of LAFCos from around the state and had the privilege of welcoming a number of new Board members who enrich the Board’s perspectives. We are excited with both the program quality and participation in the Staff Workshop and the CALAFCO U courses this year. Monterey LAFCo and the Annual Conference planning committee have done an outstanding job with the 2012 Conference. We are sad to say goodbye to our retiring executive director, Bill Chiat, but look forward to working with our new ED, Pamela Miller. Finally, the Association remains on solid financial ground. The recently adopted budget maintains member service levels and retains a healthy reserve.

Our achievements are the result of the dedicated efforts of the many volunteer LAFCo staff who contribute their time and expertise. The Board is grateful to the Commissions that support their staff as they serve in the CALAFCO educational and legislative roles on behalf of all LAFCos. We are also grateful to the Associate Members and event sponsors that help underwrite the educational mission of the Association and allow us to keep registration fees as low as possible to encourage more participation.

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

CALAFCO educational and information sharing-services are the Board’s top priority for member services. The Association focuses its resources in four areas: the Staff Workshop, Annual Conference, CALAFCO University courses, and electronic resources including the web site and the member list-serves.

Staff Workshop and Annual Conference We continued the tradition of quality education programming with the Staff Workshop held in Murphys in April and the Annual Conference in Monterey in October. The Workshop, hosted by Calaveras LAFCo, brought together 96 LAFCo staff from around the state for a three-day workshop at the Ironstone Winery Conference Center. It created an opportunity for LAFCo staff to visit a part of the state most of them had never seen. An exceptional program centered on the theme “LAFCos in a Brave New World” with sessions including LAFCo’s role in regional planning, addressing agency labor agreements in shared services and consolidations, implementation of SB 244-Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities, leadership practices to meet adaptive challenges, how the economy is affecting service delivery, GIS mapping and more. A special series of sessions was specifically designed for clerks and included records management, use of technology and best practices among the topics. The unique mobile workshop brought participants to the historic Utica Water Authority where they visited the wood flumes, canals, penstocks, and historic powerhouse facilities along the district’s 27-mile water delivery system.

Over 200 LAFCo commissioners and staff are expected at the 2012 Conference in Monterey. Hosted by Monterey LAFCo, the program centers on the theme “The Power of Partnerships” and includes a range of sessions on current issues: sustaining agriculture; shared services; LAFCo oversight of local agencies; services outside boundaries; and strategic thinking in trying times. The Conference attracted an impressive list of speakers, including Assembly Member Roger Dickinson, Food and Agricultural Secretary Karen Ross, Department of Conservation Director Mark Nechodom, and Panetta Institute for Public Policy director Sylvia Panetta. The popular mobile workshop highlighted sustainable agricultural practices that help Monterey growers feed the world.

CALAFCO University The Association offered four courses in 2012 on a range of current issues. The courses allow staff, commissioners and other interested parties to explore in depth LAFCo processes, policies and actions. All four were timely topics and well-attended. LAFCos and Health Care Districts was held in February in San Jose, Shared Services and Service Efficiencies was held in April in Murphys just before the staff workshop, Cities Merge? Municipal Consolidations and Bankruptcies was held in Los Angeles in June, and CEQA for LAFCos was held in September in Sacramento. These courses are possible only with the volunteer efforts of LAFCo staff and associate members. Thank you in particular to Orange, Los Angeles, Santa Clara and Calaveras LAFCos, BB&K, Colantuono & Levin, Baracco & Associates and all the others who contributed to the classes. A special thanks to June Savala (Los Angeles LAFCo) for coordinating the courses this year.
**Accreditations**

CALAFCO’s educational activities have all been accredited by the American Planning Association to provide AICP credits for certified planners. This benefit is provided at no cost to LAFCo staff and helps them maintain their certifications. In addition, both the Conference and Workshop have sessions for LAFCo counsel that have been accredited for MCLE credits by the California Bar.

**Web Site**

The CALAFCO web site is a vital resource for both LAFCos and the community with questions about local government in California. The site consistently attracts between 5,500 and 6,500 visits per week. The vast majority of the visits are for the reference and resource materials found on the site and referral information to member LAFCos. The design of the site has remained virtually unchanged since it was launched in the early 2000s. After a lengthy planning and design period, we are very excited to announce the launch of an all new CALAFCO Web Site! Among the many improvements is a new look, easier navigation with drop-down menus, a sophisticated search function, self-generated passwords for the Members’ section, better organization of materials and a host of other resources. We are grateful to the volunteers who worked with the executive director to develop the site and to Emmanuel Abello, Santa Clara LAFCo, who designed, built and launched the site. Please check it out at www.calafco.org.

**List-Serves**

The list-serves maintained by the Association continue to be an important communication and information sharing tool among LAFCo staff. In total, we now maintain eight list serves to help members share information, materials, and expertise. This year our webmaster upgraded his servers, and we launched a new list serve system. The launch created an overload on the system, but staff was able to quickly remedy the problems. The new system is better able to handle content and attachments and is much easier for CALAFCO staff to administer. It required no changes on the part of the users.

**White Paper**

CALAFCO was approached by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to update an obsolete state publication on general plans and city annexations. The publication was written in 1997 before the rewrite of LAFCo law in 2000. CALAFCO partnered with OPR and helped fund the rewrite of the publication *LAFCos, General Plans and City Annexations*. This new publication integrates the city annexation process with CEQA and local general plans. The CKH Act provides opportunities for dovetailing the requirements of the Planning and Zoning, CEQA and annexation laws which, in turn, can promote efficiency in processing applications. The publication was written by Associate Members Ken Lee (RSG, Inc.) and Holly Whatley (Colantuono & Levin) and reviewed by Carole Cooper, Steve Lucas, Lou Ann Texeira and Bill Chiat. The document is available to download from the CALAFCO web site.

**LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

CALAFCO maintained a full legislative agenda this year. While the Association sponsored only one bill this session, it was lengthy and complex. During this second year of the session, CALAFCO staff tracked over 30 different bills that could affect LAFCo. The top priority of the Legislative Committee was **AB 2698**, the Assembly Local Government Committee Omnibus bill. While normally this annual bill contains minor technical changes to Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg, this year the 23-page bill sponsored by CALAFCO contained the first phase of a major project to clean up the many conflicting and confusing protest provisions in the Act. This culminates a lengthy project to consolidate all of the protest provisions into a single section of the Act. While no substantive changes were made to the law, the goal was to set the stage for subsequent phases to eliminate conflicting statutes and bring consistency to the provisions. These policy changes will take careful work with stakeholders, but we believe we made a substantial first step with **AB 2698**. The legislation was signed into law by the Governor on July 9th.

We are grateful to the support of San Diego LAFCo, and in particular former LAFCo Counsel Bill Smith for authoring the language in the bill. We also appreciate the efforts of Legislative Committee Vice Chair Harry Ehrlich (San Diego LAFCo), Assembly Local Government Committee chief consultant Debbie Michel, and our sister associations which assisted in bringing this effort to fruition.

Highlights of other legislation we worked include:

- **AB 2238 (Perea)** – This bill originally included significant unfunded mandates for LAFCo to study alternative service delivery structures in MSRs for agencies that serve or could serve disadvantaged unincorporated communities. Staff worked extensively with the author and sponsors to successfully remove the mandate. The bill was eventually gutted and amended to focus on emergency water grants and have no effect on LAFCo.
Several substantial legislative proposals for 2013: The Legislative Committee is currently working on web site. Information is updated daily. For a complete list of CALAFCO bills, please visit the project will be to enact more substantive changes to the protest provisions, to make them more consistent and easier to apply. Extension of Services Outside Boundaries The Legislative Committee has examined this for years, but in 2011-12 an intensive effort led by Keene Simonds (Napa LAFCo) led to a near-consensus on language that would increase LAFCo flexibility in certain situations to extend services outside of boundaries and spheres. The Board is supportive of the language and expanded authority, but it will require work with other affected stakeholders in the environmental, agricultural and local agency communities prior to introducing a bill this winter. Disincorporation Law - State law is terribly out-of-date with respect to municipal consolidations and mergers. The June CALAFCO U course examined the issues in depth. Because there is a potential for a disincorporation – or certainly many people are looking at the law – the Legislative Committee is examining the possibility of updating the law. Thank you to Orange LAFCo for organizing and preparing a White Paper on legislative questions; it is available on the web site.

The positive results of the Committee’s efforts would not be possible without the leadership of Committee Chair Bill Chiat and Vice Chair Harry Ehrlich (San Diego LAFCo), along with the volunteer efforts of the 20 LAFCo staff, counsel and Board members who serve on the Committee. The work of this group is critical in crafting legislation, providing recommendations to the Board on legislative issues and supporting the legislative process.

ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

A Change in Leadership In February, Executive Director Bill Chiat announced his retirement following the October Conference. The Conference marked his eight year of service as executive director. The Board reluctantly accepted the retirement and initiated a process for selecting a new executive director. This provided an opportunity for the Board to reflect and consider the capacities and strengths it desired in the ED, along with affirming what the Board sees as the role and responsibilities of the ED. The Board expressed great appreciation for Bill’s leadership over the years and affirmed the ED model created when he was hired.

The Board appointed a Selection Committee to manage the process. The Committee included Chair Jerry Gladbach (Southern Region), Vice Chair Ted Novelli (Central Region), Secretary Mary Jane Griego (Northern Region), Treasurer John Leopold (Coastal Region) and CALAFCO Executive Officer Lou Ann Texeira. A Request for Professional Services Proposals was issued in February. Eleven complete proposals were submitted … an impressive number! In May the Board met and identified key qualifications and capacities they wanted in the new executive director. The Selection Committee met and screened the proposals based on the criteria set by the Board. While all eleven had merit, the Committee selected four candidates to interview in the next step. The interviews were conducted by the Selection Committee in Sacramento in June, and two finalists were identified to be interviewed by the full Board and staff officers in July. Following the interviews the Board selected Pamela Miller and offered her a contract as new Executive Officer. Pamela begins her work as Executive Director on September 17th. The Board included funds in the budget to allow overlap in executive directors and a smooth transition. We look forward to working with Pamela and are excited about the energy and talents she brings to the Association.
New Board Members  During 2012 three Board members left CALAFCO as a result of outcomes from local elections. We are honored to welcome these new commissioners to the Board:

- **Eugene Montanez** – Riverside LAFCo (city member, Southern Region)
- **Mike McGill** – Contra Costa LAFCo (district member, Coastal Region)
- **Matthew Beekman** – Stanislaus LAFCo (city member, Central Region)

We are grateful for the time contributed by all 16 Board Members and the support from their LAFCOs for serving on the Board of Directors.

Financial Policies and Reporting  The Association continues to stand on a strong financial base. The Board maintains policies and current filings which are in compliance with all federal and state requirements for 501(c)(3) organizations. The CALAFCO Policy Manual, IRS Form 990 and other key Association documents are available on the CALAFCO web site. The Association also maintains its records with the national non-profit reporting organization, GuideStar (www.guidestar.com). In 2012 CALAFCO once again earned the GuideStar Exchange Seal in recognition of its transparency and completeness in documentation.

All financial records are reviewed quarterly by an outside CPA with reports to the Treasurer and the Board. The Board also reviews the annual IRS Form 990 tax filing prepared by the CPA and staff.

2012-13 Budget  The Board has managed the financial resources of the Association closely. For the first time in four years LAFCo dues were increased by the CPI as authorized in the Association By Laws. While only a 2.2% increase, the Board felt it was necessary to keep up with the increasing costs of operating the Association.

The adopted budget for 2012-13 provides only minor changes from the 2011-12 budget. The budget increased $1,100 over the previous year, largely to accommodate a short overlap between executive directors. The close of the fiscal year showed a greater year-end balance than anticipated in the adopted budget, allowing the Association to avoid the use of reserves as authorized when it adopted the budget in February. The approved budget is $359,192, which includes a $15,367 contingency. There are small increases in rent, professional services and conference and workshop expenses in the budget which are offset by increases in revenues from dues and returns from the conference. The budget is balanced and does not tap any of the reserve funds.

Restricted Fund Reserve  Since 2005 an important goal established by the Board has been to grow and maintain a fund reserve to support member services in uncertain economic times and avoid the need to tap members for additional funds, as had been done in the past. With an initial goal of 35% of non-conference operating expenses, the reserve is currently at $120,754, about 53% of the annual operations budget outside of the conference and workshop. The reserve is not part of the annual budget and requires a vote of the Board to use its funds. The Association has not used the fund reserve since the early 2000s. CALAFCO maintains its funds with the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF). While the interest rate has remained low again this year, we have not lost any of the principle in our savings or investments.

Finally we want to recognize the outstanding leadership of our executive director **Bill Chiat** and executive officer **Lou Ann Teixeira** (Contra Costa LAFCo). Added to that is our appreciation for all the contributions of executive assistant **Jamie Szutowicz** in the CALAFCO office, deputy executive officers **Marjorie Blom** (Stanislaus LAFCo), **June Savala** (Los Angeles LAFCo) and **Steve Lucas** (Butte LAFCo), and Legal Counsel **Clark Alsop** (BB&K). These people, along with many other volunteers, associate members, and members of the Board have all worked together this year to bring many achievements and a strong Association to you, our member LAFCOs.

Sincerely Yours,

The CALAFCO Board of Directors
6. Broader Representation on Commissions

Over the years I’ve been asked by those outside LAFCo about the objectivity of LAFCo commissioners and their ability to separate LAFCo decisions from the decisions of their city, county or district. LAFCo law is clear about this representation and most LAFCos go to great lengths to educate their commissioners. As a county executive I observed on more than one occasion where one of my supervisors voted differently at a LAFCo meeting than the Board preferred. Nonetheless the make-up of commissions does continue to raise the question. The 29 LAFCos with special district representation have helped address this concern by having a broader base which helps break up any voting blocks. Getting districts on the remaining 28 LAFCos is an adaptive challenge. When I served as an executive in a sanitation district we argued that districts should be considered equal partners in service provision with cities and counties and should have a seat at the table on decisions of services and growth. LAFCo is one of the few, if not only, governing board where that can happen. It benefits the districts, the customers of the districts and the community as a whole to have a broader perspective on every commission (San Francisco is the obvious exception). Perhaps the time has come for legislative action to require districts to be seated on every LAFCo in the same manner as cities and counties.

So that’s my view from the balcony. We’ve made much headway in addressing these adaptive challenges – I note, for example, the 45 bills CALAFCO has supported, sponsored or influenced over the last eight years, 39 of which have become law. But there are more challenges out there and it will take the adaptive leadership of commissioners and staff to continue for continued progress on the LAFCo mission of orderly growth, prevention of sprawl, preservation of agricultural and open space lands, and sustainable municipal services.

I hope you too will take a moment every now and then for your own trip to the balcony. It can be an eye-opening exercise to look at what is happening around you; to reflect on what you learn; and to strategically apply it to the direction of the commission.

Best wishes in these great adaptive opportunities!

Chiat, Szutowicz Leaving CALAFCO

Thank you Jamie and Bill!

The 2012 Annual Conference marks the end of an era for CALAFCO. In February Executive Director Bill Chiat announced his retirement. Shortly after that Executive Assistant Jamie Szutowicz announced she accepted a full time position with another agency. Both Bill and Jamie serve CALAFCO as part-time independent contractors.

After eight years as Executive Director, Bill plans to free up some of his time to expand his culinary education (and practice). He will continue his work as Dean of the CSAC Institute for Excellence in County Government and his organizational development and facilitation consulting practice, Alta Mesa Group LLC.

Jamie joined CALAFCO five years ago and brought order to the chaos of boxes, data and files that filled the CALAFCO office. She brought that same order to the registration process and records for workshops, conferences and classes, along with organizing our financial records and working closely with the CPA, executive officer and treasurer to manage our financial records

Jamie is responsible for countless innovations at CALAFCO, including establishment of the membership database, event registration system, credit card registration, and the QuickBooks financial system. She also created the financial procedures for tracking all Association income and expenses. She has updated the directories and implemented cost reduction strategies such as reduced rates for insurance. Then there’s the fabulous cooking too (which Bill got to enjoy every now and then!). Jamie brings a smile to everyone she greets at the registration tables at CALAFCO events. She says working with all the LAFCo folks was her greatest joy. She will certainly be missed!

Jamie has been named Event and Officer Manager for the Power Inn Alliance, a Property and Business Improvement District in Sacramento.

Both Jamie and Bill will be leaving following the Annual Conference in October.
On February 8, 2012, the Los Angeles Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) voted to deny the application for the incorporation of East Los Angeles. This denial terminated the most recent East Los Angeles incorporation effort which extended for almost five years.

While many of the feasibility issues influencing LAFCo’s denial were unique to East Los Angeles, other communities throughout the State face similar constraints to incorporation. A diagnosis of these constraints suggests a number of steps that could be taken to lay a foundation for improved local governance and increased potential for a successful incorporation in the future, both in East Los Angeles as well as other unincorporated communities.

Factors Contributing to Incorporation Infeasibility

A variety of factors contributes to the fiscal weakness of East Los Angeles. Some of these factors are “cyclical,” such as the persistent weak economic conditions; others are “structural,” such as California’s local government finance regime that disadvantages communities seeking incorporation in various ways; and still others are “endemic,” unique to an area, such as the limited development capacity in East Los Angeles or its weak economic base and retail sales performance.

Understanding these factors is very important to evolving a governance and community development strategy. While little can be done about cyclical factors, structural factors, while challenging, can be addressed over time. Most importantly, the endemic factors that are a key limiting factor in East Los Angeles can be addressed in a variety of ways, thus strengthening the likelihood of incorporation in the future.

Lack of Economic Base — The primary factor limiting the ability of a community to incorporate is an insufficient economic base to generate the revenues necessary to fund public services. Without adequate revenues, the need to increase taxes to achieve feasibility is likely to terminate most incorporation efforts.

In 2010, median household income in East Los Angeles was $39,900 compared to $52,700 for Los Angeles County. Recent successful incorporations, for example Menifee, California, averaged above $70,000. Incomes are one indicator of property values and sales tax potential. Sales tax generated in East Los Angeles, typically a major source of funding for cities, is $30 per resident compared to $140 per resident for all cities in Los Angeles County. There are no regional retailers or “big box” stores in East Los Angeles to generate sales taxes. The area includes few hotel rooms to yield hotel tax, another common source of city revenue. The area is largely built-out, without many opportunities for future growth and development.

An increase in local utility users tax was considered as one option to improve feasibility in East Los Angeles; however, this created additional resistance to incorporation in this low-income community.

Adverse Economic Conditions and Government Budget Reductions — A significant downturn in the economy reduces current and projected revenues available for a new city. The realignment of State revenues eliminated Vehicle License Fee (VLF) revenues to new cities, a major source of funding particularly in the initial years of a city. VLF accounted for more than 20 percent of East Los Angeles’s budget. Redevelopment areas were eliminated in 2011, removing a source of funding for economic development and capital improvements.

County Access to Funding Sources — County funding of services in unincorporated areas is often limited, which provides impetus to
incorporation efforts. In East Los Angeles, there exists some dissatisfaction with the provision and allocation of funding to certain County-provided services. However, in urbanized counties such as Los Angeles, access to a broad revenue base and range of revenues can enable a county to provide some services at a relatively high level. These service levels can create a costly hurdle to incorporation as it can be difficult for a proposed new city to generate similar funding.

For example, libraries in East Los Angeles maintain hours that exceed those of most cities in the County, and sheriff protection expenditures are greater than the levels found in many cities. These services are the result of a shift of property tax and other general fund revenues generated in wealthier areas of the County to services in East Los Angeles, as well as County “Prop. 172” funds which are unavailable to new cities.

Uncertainty About Future Governance and Regulation — A community that has relied on county government may have little local governance experience and leadership. Residents, if generally satisfied with current services, may tend to prefer the county government they know rather than the uncertainty of a future, unknown city government. Typically, the business community will prefer county governance, viewing it as providing less local oversight and regulation, and perhaps easier to influence relative to a locally elected city council.

The East Los Angeles business community was one source of opposition to incorporation, expressing wariness about the potential for increased city regulation. Many residents stated their satisfaction with services provided by the County and concern about potential reductions in revenues and services that may accompany a new city. Recent incidents in other cities involving abuse of public authority and financial resources also raised issues about local governance.

**Organizational Options for East Los Angeles**

Despite LAFCo’s finding of infeasibility and the related denial of the incorporation petition, various options are available to the community that could improve local economic conditions, governance, and quality of life in the near term and enhance the future potential for incorporation, as described below. Discussion and debate in community forums could improve prospects for adoption and implementation of these mechanisms, and increase local dialogue to mitigate the divisiveness that marked the incorporation process.

1. **Unincorporated Area Budget (UAB)** — Residents and members of the business community could work with the County to create and review a local UAB. The UAB would provide an informal budget, based on actual County budgets allocated to the area, for services and revenues generated in the community.

   During the East Los Angeles incorporation hearings, discussion occurred about the possibility of creating a UAB to help better inform the community about where their tax dollars were spent and what levels of services were being provided. Commissioner Gloria Molina, Los Angeles County Supervisor, proposed that “…we should publish a budget on a regular basis for East Los Angeles.”

   This UAB could facilitate discussion and a better understanding about local municipal services, reducing the level of effort and time that would be required to prepare this information during a future incorporation effort. The UAB would also help the community to better understand the prospects for incorporation and, ideally, it would help to establish a stronger working relationship with the County.

2. **Special Studies** — As part of a LAFCo Special Study, a detailed “Governance Options” analysis could be prepared. This analysis could include evaluation of a potential Municipal Advisory Council (MAC)/Area Planning Commission (APC) and Community Services District (CSD), described further in the next item. Reorganization of various services could be considered.

3. **Municipal Advisory Council/Area Planning Commission** — A MAC, which can also serve as an APC, could provide an entity to represent community interests and review the UAB, as well as provide input into services and planning.

   As established in Section 31010 of the Government Code, the board of supervisors of any county may by resolution establish and provide funds for the operation of a municipal advisory council for any unincorporated area in the county to advise the board on matters of public health, safety, welfare, public works, and planning. Unless the board of supervisors specifically provides to the contrary, a municipal advisory council may represent the community to any state, county, city, special district or

---

1 In 1993, voters approved Prop. 172, which increased State sales tax for the purpose of partially compensating for the loss of local revenues (e.g., property tax shifted to the State’s Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund, or ERAF, in 1993-94). New cities formed after 1993 do not qualify for an allocation of Prop. 172 funds. The funds are restricted to “public safety” purposes.

2 On May 1, 2012 the County of Los Angeles’s Chief Executive Officer requested that Departments submit expenditures and revenues associated with delivering services to East Los Angeles for Fiscal Year 2010-11. This request was in response to the constituents of East Los Angeles “interested in obtaining financial information about their community” expressed during the incorporation process.
school district, agency or commission, or any other organization on any matter concerning the community.

California Government Code Sec. 65902 states that a county “may provide that an area planning commission shall exercise all of the functions and duties of a board of zoning adjustment or a zoning administrator in a prescribed portion of the county.” The APC shall hear and decide applications for conditional uses or other permits, and applications for zoning variances.

4. Community Services District — A CSD can be created and authorized to perform virtually any service that any special district can perform in California (GC 61100). The creation of a CSD would establish an independent governance entity as transition toward incorporation; it would act as a central, organizing entity for actions related to municipal services and establish working relationships between local government, the business community, and residents. A CSD in East Los Angeles could provide local control of certain services/districts (i.e., the current Belvedere Garbage District and existing lighting and landscape assessment districts), create a vehicle for future funding sources, and provide oversight of the UAB. The CSD could be empowered to provide service as a MAC and an APC.

The adoption of new taxes and assessments is rarely an easy process, particularly if it is perceived as the consequence of forming a new level of government such as a city. However, special taxes are more palatable when directly linked to maintenance and enhancement of specific services. Adoption of taxes, managed by a CSD before incorporation, could significantly improve city feasibility prospects and reduce local opposition driven by tax uncertainties.

5. Economic Development Plan — An Economic Development Plan could be developed to identify strategies specific to the unique characteristics of East Los Angeles, to help in focusing countywide resources and economic development programs on building the local economy and tax base. The plan could address specific concerns of local businesses about the appropriate role of governmental regulation and issues related to the “informal economy” prevalent in the area. The plan could help to inform the community and decision makers about opportunities as well as constraints that limit the ability of local businesses to financially support economic development activities. Incentives for investment in the community from the private and public sectors would be important elements of the plan.

One of the plan’s key objectives in East Los Angeles would be to enhance the current revenue base, which in turn would improve fiscal prospects for a future city. The East Los Angeles CSD, or MAC/APC, could act as a forum for local input and direction on the plan.

6. Funding of Economic Infrastructure — The CSD, or MAC/APC, could work with the County on strategies (e.g., creation of an Infrastructure Finance District [IFD]) to fund economic development in accord with strategies and goals of the Economic Development Plan and seek special taxes and/or assessments to fund targeted services and improvements, in addition to regional, State, and federal grants.

In East Los Angeles, an IFD could partially restore funding to the former redevelopment areas that existed within East Los Angeles as well as other potential areas targeted by the Economic Development Plan.

7. Incorporation Legislation — The local governing entity could provide a forum and a political body to work in conjunction with other entities toward legislation to improve potential viability of incorporation. For example, it would work on legislation to restore funding for new cities, provide for additional non-property tax funding based on transfer of services, and address other issues related to incorporation.

Conclusion

While East Los Angeles was unsuccessful in its recent incorporation effort, pursuing options such as those listed above can provide an improved foundation for cityhood. At the same time, the community would gain more responsive local governance, increased influence over land use decisions and public services, and opportunities to enhance the local business environment and economy. East Los Angeles is unique in many ways; yet, other urbanized areas considering incorporation face similar challenges. In these cases it may be valuable to pursue a similar agenda of improved governance and community development in advance of, or as a part of, incorporation efforts.

Richard L. Berkson is a Principal with Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. (EPS) and prepared the Comprehensive Fiscal Analysis of the Proposed Incorporation of East Los Angeles. EPS is a long-time Gold Associate member of CALAFCO.

Visit [www.calafco.org](http://www.calafco.org). Keep up to date on LAFCo issues, laws, legislation, legal decisions, educational materials, and resources.
Off the Island!

By Scott E. Porter

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCos) are charged with determining in which instances cities may annex unincorporated territory and may approve annexations after protest proceedings give landowners and voters opportunity to stop a proposal or require an election on it. Government Code section 56375.3 authorizes a streamlined procedure for annexations involving an “island” of unincorporated territory of 150 acres or fewer — in these cases no protests are permitted. The term “island” is not defined.

The Attorney General issued a recent opinion clarifying the island annexation rule. First, she concluded: “For purposes of Government Code section 56375.3, an “island” is an area of unincorporated territory that is (1) completely surrounded, or substantially surrounded—that is, surrounded to a large degree, or in the main—either by the city to which annexation is proposed or by the city and a county boundary or the Pacific Ocean, or (2) completely surrounded by the city to which annexation is proposed and adjacent cities. An “island” may not be a part of another island that is surrounded or substantially surrounded in this same manner."

A LAFCo still may determine, in light of the whole record before it, whether a particular area is an “island.” The Attorney General expressly declined to provide a mathematical formula as to what is sufficient to constitute an island (as the Legislature had also refused to do) but cited a case identifying an “island” only 68% surrounded by incorporated territory.

The Attorney General took the analysis further. She also concluded that the statutory requirement that a city annex an “entire” island means that the LAFCo may not allow annexations that “split up an unincorporated island that exceeds 150 acres into smaller segments to utilize the streamlined “island annexation” procedures.”

Although opinions of the Attorney General are not legally binding precedent, courts typically grant the decisions great weight in formulating their decisions, especially on public law questions that are rarely litigated. As a result of this opinion, LAFCos may be less willing to approve island annexations in reliance on the streamlined annexation procedures.

Scott E. Porter is an attorney with Colantuono & Levin PC. Colantuono & Levin PC is a Gold Associate Member of CALAFCO.

Planning for Disadvantaged Communities

By David J. Ruderman

Since October of last year, when the Governor signed SB 244 (Wolk, D-Davis), California’s cities have been required to count their DUCks—i.e., disadvantaged unincorporated communities. Although the goals of SB 244 are laudable, cities have expressed concern about the impacts of SB 244. There were efforts in the Legislature this year by the League of Cities to clarify SB 244 and provide cities more flexibility to carry out their goals, but attempts to make any changes in SB 244 failed. CALAFCO encouraged all parties to get a year of experience under their belts before making any changes to the law.

SB 244 requires cities and counties to review and update the land use elements of their general plans to map and analyze the service needs of unincorporated communities within or adjacent to their spheres of influence. In some ways SB 244 may limit a city’s ability to annex territory because it prohibits LAFCos from approving an annexation of territory greater than 10 acres (or as determined by commission policy) where a DUC is contiguous unless an application to annex the DUC is also filed. Cities argue this dual annexation requirement may discourage all annexations, not just those of DUCs. There are also exceptions where LAFCo can show there is no support in the DUC for annexation.

In March, Sen. Bill Emmerson (R-Riverside) introduced SB 1498 sponsored by the League of Cities to repeal the dual annexation requirement. It also proposed allowing LAFCOs to approve the extension of services beyond a city or district’s sphere of influence to support existing or planned uses involving public or private properties. However, the bill failed to pass out of committee.

(Editor’s note: CALAFCO did not support SB 1498 because it removed the annexation requirement.)

David J. Ruderman is an attorney with Colantuono & Levin PC. Colantuono & Levin PC is a Gold Associate Member of CALAFCO.
New City Editorial and Response from the Los Angeles Times

The Los Angeles Times

EDITORIAL

New California cities? Not now.

Sorry, Jurupa Valley, Menifee, Wildomar and Eastvale, but we can't afford you.

August 3, 2012

If communities in California have the desire and the tax base to make it on their own as independent cities, without increasing the resource burdens on their county governments or their neighbors or the state, then as a rule of thumb they are to be able to give it a go. Self-governance and home rule are integral parts of American liberty.

But in their first few years after incorporation, cities are likely to need a financial boost from the rest of us, and right now, well — sorry, Jurupa Valley, Menifee, Wildomar and Eastvale, but we can't afford you. With three much more established cities already in bankruptcy (Stockton, San Bernardino and Mammoth Lakes), another one or two teetering and yet another recently emerged from proceedings (Vallejo), and with tax revenue down and budgets being cut for basic state functions, California must watch its money carefully. There's no booster cash to launch those four new Riverside County cities, and now the very youngest, Jurupa Valley, which voted to become a city a year ago, says it might have to disincorporate.

Not to be flip, but that's the way it goes. Communities that dream of cityhood must, for now, either be truly independent by forgoing state cash and taxing themselves at higher rates to make ends meet, or defer their plans until taxes elsewhere in the state can again afford to send them a multimillion-dollar birthday present.

Of course, some politicians in the Inland Empire look at things a little differently. They find it convenient to view the cutoff of taxpayer money from other quarters in California as some sort of betrayal. They call it a state money grab and insist that the rest of us owe them cash to start their new cities. A year ago, when state lawmakers first diverted the funding to pay for needed public safety programs instead, some Republican officials said Gov. Jerry Brown targeted the cuts at them out of spite for their failure to support his request to put a tax extension on the ballot. A Riverside County supervisor called for secession and a new state of South California — and that pointless and unfortunate diversion of attention is the aspect of the story that made the national media, because it fits the shallow mold so easily: liberals versus conservatives, the deserts and mountains versus the coast, north (including, somewhat, L.A. County) versus south.

The real story is the hypocrisy of those who agilely govern against government and taxes and yet insist that government keep sending them other people's tax money — to help them form new governments, no less — when prudence requires spending the funds elsewhere. But there is enough blame to spread thickly across the map, and it begins with the scheme hatched in the late 1990s to cut the vehicle license fee from 2% of a vehicle's value, the rate it had been set at for 60 years.

Really? We're going to discuss the car tax again? Yes, because that's how Californians pay for local government, especially after we cut and capped property taxes in the 1970s. The car tax pays for cities and counties to meet their local health and welfare mandates and accounts for a huge chunk of cities' general fund money. Take out the amount it costs the Department of Motor Vehicles to collect it, and what's left over is the amount the state has on hand to help new cities organize and operate. So it stands to reason that when you slash the tax down to 0.65%, you're going to have a lot less to spend on starting up new cities.

Californians didn't notice it at first, because Sacramento had a budget surplus at the time and picked up the tab directly. Once the state had made up for the lost car tax money, cities old and new came to expect that the dollars would be there forever.

But of course they weren't. The state needed that money to underwrite local public safety programs such as the one the Los Angeles Police Department uses to fight gangs, and when a temporary increase in the tax (though not up to its historic level) lapsed last year, the state had to dip into its base car tax money for those same public safety functions.

Meanwhile, California had been ordered to unpick the prisons that voters had filled by passing various conservative tough-on-crime measures. Public safety realignment diverts car tax money from things like starting new cities to jails and other programs that now must plug holes for which formerly would have gone to state prison.

California's in a jam, and it's not because we've raised taxes, but because we've cut them while irresponsibly spending down surpluses. We can't afford things we once paid for. That's the problem that has come home to roost in Jurupa Valley. Cityhood dreams are important. But public safety — and solvency — come first.

Copyright © 2012, Los Angeles Times
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BLOWBACK

Throwaway cities in the Inland Empire? Hardly.

By Elan Bening, Jeff DeGrandpre, John Denver, Ronald O. Laveridge and Laura Roughton

August 8, 2012

We cannot even begin to say how disappointed we are by The Times' Aug. 3 editorial regarding the Inland Empire and our four recently incorporated Riverside County cities of Jurupa Valley, Eastvale, Wildomar and Menifee. The implication that all other California cities are subject to the same state's community of interest is simply not true. To the contrary, we have been subsidizing other communities for years as unincorporated areas when our locally paid tax dollars left our area because we weren't cities.

Since the passage of Proposition 47 in 1996, vehicle license fees (VLF), which date back to 1935, have been a constitutionally protected local source of revenue. Even before 1935, individual cities actually instituted their own VLF assessments. To ease collection and to promote uniformity, the Legislature replaced the locally administered programs with the more familiar state-wide coordinated billing process of today.

Although VLF monies were taken from all cities, the monies taken from our four cities and those municipalities that conducted inhabited annexations after 2006 are the ones subsidizing today's law enforcement grants and the realignment process. Thanks to the passage of SB 89 in 2011, we lost our VLF distribution and received pennies on the dollar in grant money in return. In essence our cities are disproportionately paying for programs ab initio by the state.

Our four cities alone lost more than $16 million that would have funded our own law enforcement needs. Two of our jurisdictions, Jurupa Valley and Wildomar, have already been forced to reduce the number of law enforcement officers to below the level we had when we incorporated. The primary source for public safety in our four cities was the VLF. If insolvency caused by state action force disincorporation of any of the four cities, then Riverside County will have to reassume responsibility for municipal services, including public safety, and without adequate offsetting revenues.

Up to now, VLF disbursements to counties were not earmarked for law enforcement. Realignment monies and law enforcement grants do not offset the cost of daily law enforcement operations; those operations actually helped to ease the county's burden for providing public safety, as this service became our responsibility. Incorporation was supposed to bring a higher level of public safety primarily funded with VLF revenue. Jurupa Valley and Wildomar residents currently receive fewer law enforcement services than those levels enjoyed by their counterparts in older communities.

So The Times' basic message of "we need ours and you don't" is irresponsible. People in different communities deserve equal protection. We deserve to have safe communities with local representation, as our citizens voted at each incorporation election. We are not throwaway cities.

The 2004 state budget agreement included the VLF for property tax swap. Though it established reimbursement amounts in the form of additional property tax revenues to existing cities and counties, it left future inhabited annexations and incorporations fiscally unviable. In 2006, AB 1602 addressed this inadequate funding by providing special supplemental allocation of city VLF revenue to new annexations and incorporations after 2004. Such funding was extended by SB 301 in 2008 — that is, until the aforementioned SB 89 wiped out that funding in June 2011. It is important to remember that our four cities do not receive the same proportionate amount of property tax enjoyed by the 478 California cities that incorporated before 2006.

The attempt to level the playing field by granting more VLF monies to newly incorporated cities was meant to offset this property tax imbalance. The elimination of our VLF revenue now expands the distance between the new and the old. With our solution stalled in committee (SB 1566), time will tell if there is truly an inequality between the many and the few, a tyranny of the majority.

Additionally, our state-caused financial troubles don't just stop at our municipal boundaries. The inability of one community to protect its residents affects those in surrounding communities as well.

What The Times seems to suggest is that the nearly 266,000 residents of Jurupa Valley, Eastvale, Menifee and Wildomar (and the rest of Riverside County, for that matter) is that their public safety needs are less important than those in every other California city. So much for fiscal, social and economic justice.

Ben Bening, Jeff DeGrandpre, John Denver, Ronald O. Laveridge and Laura Roughton are the mayors of, respectively, Wildomar, Eastvale, Menifee, Riverside and Jurupa Valley. John F. Towne is chairman of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.
Napa LAFCo Adopts “Tag Line” to LAFCo

Napa LAFCo is pleased to announce it has established an official tagline for the agency titled “We Manage Governmental Boundaries, Evaluate Municipal Services, and Protect Agriculture.” The decision to establish a tagline is borne from Commissioners’ collective desire to more effectively convey the agency’s core responsibilities to the public and other governmental agencies with specific focus on post formation activities.

The tagline was unanimously approved on June 4, 2012.

New Ventura LAFCo Member

The Ventura LAFCo has selected Linda Ford-McCaffrey to fill an unexpired Alternate Public Member term ending January 1, 2013. Ms. Ford-McCaffrey holds a juris doctor degree and has a background in environmental planning and consulting. She has also worked for the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority and the Southern California Regional Rail Authority.

2013 CALAFCO Staff Workshop
April 11th – 13th, 2013
Hallmark Inn
Davis
Hosted by Yolo LAFCo

2013 CALAFCO Annual Conference
September 4th – 6th, 2013
The Resort at Squaw Creek
North Lake Tahoe
Hosted by Nevada, Placer and El Dorado LAFCOs

Ventura LAFCo Approves Annexation of Last Remaining Islands in the City of San Buenaventura

At its meeting on July 18, 2012, the Ventura LAFCo approved a reorganization to annex 12 islands of territory to the City of San Buenaventura pursuant to the island annexation provisions of the Government Code. A total of 255 parcels were included in the proposal. All but one of the islands is located in the southeastern portion of the City and is referred to as the ‘Montalvo’ community. All of the islands are entirely surrounded by the City and all are currently receiving City water service. Public sewer service will be provided to most of the territory by the Montalvo Community Services District, which currently serves the area.

Although the City was compelled to initiate the island annexation to comply with a LAFCo condition imposed on a previously approved proposal to annex undeveloped territory on the eastern edge of the City, the City took extraordinary steps to roll out the welcome mat to the residents. Both prior to and after initiating the proposal and with the assistance of LAFCo staff, the City held meetings to address the affected residents’ concerns. They also distributed detailed fact sheets to help residents understand the island annexation law and the changes they will face regarding utility charges, fees, and zoning regulations.

Surprisingly, only a handful of residents attended the subsequent LAFCo hearing and no one spoke in opposition to the annexation. Without a doubt, this happy outcome would not have been possible without the City’s cooperation and proactive efforts.

2013: LAFCo’s Golden Anniversary
THE VIEW
Scenes from the CALAFCO Workshop in Murphys

Hosted by Calaveras LAFCo at the beautiful Ironstone Winery and Conference Center

Photos by Jamie Szutowicz

CALAFCO GOLD ASSOCIATE MEMBERS
Thank you for your support

CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSIONS
1215 K Street, Suite 1650
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.calafco.org

CALAFCO provides educational, information-sharing and technical support for its members by serving as a resource for, and collaborating with, the public, the legislative and executive branches of state government, and other organizations for the purpose of discouraging urban sprawl, preserving open-space and prime agricultural lands, and encouraging orderly growth and development of local agencies.

Calaveras LAFCo Workshop

Bill Chiat’s ‘call for leadership’ conversation

Kathy Rollings-McDonald speaks at Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities session

Host EO John Benoit

Discussion at EO Roundtable

LAFCo’s Role in Regional Planning session

Bill Smith on Protest Provisions