AGENDA
Wednesday, January 25, 2017
6:00 P.M.
Joint Chambers—Basement Level
1010 10th Street, Modesto, California 95354

The Stanislaus Local Agency Formation Commission welcomes you to its meetings. As a courtesy, please silence your cell phones during the meeting. If you want to submit documents at this meeting, please bring 15 copies for distribution. Agendas and staff reports are available on our website at least 72 hours before each meeting. Materials related to an item on this Agenda, submitted to the Commission or prepared after distribution of the agenda packet, will be available for public inspection in the LAFCO Office at 1010 10th Street, 3rd Floor, Modesto, during normal business hours.

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.
   B. Introduction of Commissioners and Staff.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
   This is the period in which persons may speak on items that are not listed on the regular agenda. All persons wishing to speak during this public comment portion of the meeting are asked to fill out a “Speaker’s Card” and provide it to the Commission Clerk. Each speaker will be limited to a three-minute presentation. No action will be taken by the Commission as a result of any item presented during the public comment period.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. Minutes of the December 7, 2016 Meeting.

4. CORRESPONDENCE
   No correspondence addressed to the Commission, individual Commissioners or staff will be accepted and/or considered unless it has been signed by the author, or sufficiently identifies the person or persons responsible for its creation and submittal.
   A. Specific Correspondence.
   B. Informational Correspondence.
   C. “In the News.”
5. DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS AND DISQUALIFICATIONS

6. CONSENT ITEMS
The following consent items are expected to be routine and non-controversial and will be acted upon by the Commission at one time without discussion, unless a request has been received prior to the discussion of the matter.

A. SCHEDULE OF FEES AND DEPOSITS UPDATE. (Staff Recommendation: Adopt Update.)

7. OTHER BUSINESS

A. MID-YEAR BUDGET REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017. (Staff Recommendation: Receive and File Report.)

B. ANNUAL ELECTION OF OFFICERS. (Staff Recommendation: Appoint a chairperson and vice-chairperson and adopt Resolution No. 2017-01.)

C. NOTICE OF 2017 EXPIRING TERMS FOR PUBLIC MEMBERS AND APPOINTMENT OF A SUBCOMMITTEE. (Staff Recommendation: Direct staff to initiate the Public Member recruitment process and appoint a subcommittee.)

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS
Commission Members may provide comments regarding LAFCO matters.

9. ADDITIONAL MATTERS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRPERSON
The Commission Chair may announce additional matters regarding LAFCO matters.

10. EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT
The Commission will receive a verbal report from the Executive Officer regarding current staff activities.

A. On the Horizon.

11. ADJOURNMENT
A. Set the next meeting date of the Commission for February 22, 2017.
B. Adjourn.
LAFCO Disclosure Requirements

Disclosure of Campaign Contributions: If you wish to participate in a LAFCO proceeding, you are prohibited from making a campaign contribution of more than $250 to any commissioner or alternate. This prohibition begins on the date you begin to actively support or oppose an application before LAFCO and continues until three months after a final decision is rendered by LAFCO. No commissioner or alternate may solicit or accept a campaign contribution of more than $250 from you or your agent during this period if the commissioner or alternate knows, or has reason to know, that you will participate in the proceedings. If you or your agent have made a contribution of more than $250 to any commissioner or alternate during the twelve (12) months preceding the decision, that commissioner or alternate must disqualify himself or herself from the decision. However, disqualification is not required if the commissioner or alternate returns the campaign contribution within thirty (30) days of learning both about the contribution and the fact that you are a participant in the proceedings.

Lobbying Disclosure: Any person or group lobbying the Commission or the Executive Officer in regard to an application before LAFCO must file a declaration prior to the hearing on the LAFCO application or at the time of the hearing if that is the initial contact. Any lobbyist speaking at the LAFCO hearing must so identify themselves as lobbyists and identify on the record the name of the person or entity making payment to them.

Disclosure of Political Expenditures and Contributions Regarding LAFCO Proceedings: If the proponents or opponents of a LAFCO proposal spend $1,000 with respect to that proposal, they must report their contributions of $100 or more and all of their expenditures under the rules of the Political Reform Act for local initiative measures to the LAFCO Office.

LAFCO Action in Court: All persons are invited to testify and submit written comments to the Commission. If you challenge a LAFCO action in court, you may be limited to issues raised at the public hearing or submitted as written comments prior to the close of the public hearing. All written materials received by staff 24 hours before the hearing will be distributed to the Commission.

Reasonable Accommodations: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, hearing devices are available for public use. If hearing devices are needed, please contact the LAFCO Clerk at 525-7660. Notification 24 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Clerk to make arrangements.

Alternative Formats: If requested, the agenda will be made available in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC 12132) and the Federal rules and regulations adopted in implementation thereof.

Notice Regarding Non-English Speakers: Pursuant to California Constitution Article III, Section IV, establishing English as the official language for the State of California, and in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedure Section 185 which requires proceedings before any State Court to be in English, notice is hereby given that all proceedings before the Local Agency Formation Commission shall be in English and anyone wishing to address the Commission is required to have a translator present who will take an oath to make an accurate translation from any language not English into the English language.
STANISLAUS LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

MINUTES
December 7, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hawn called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

A. Pledge of Allegiance to Flag. Chair Hawn led in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

B. Introduction of Commissioners and Staff. Chair Hawn led in the introduction of the Commissioners and Staff.

Commissioners Present: Brad Hawn, Chair, Public Member
Amy Bublak, Vice-Chair, City Member
Jim DeMartini, County Member
Terry Withrow, County Member
Michael Van Winkle, Alternate City Member
William O’Brien, Alternate County Member
Annabel Gammon, Alternate Public Member

Staff Present: Sara Lytle-Pinhey, Executive Officer
Javier Camarena, Assistant Executive Officer
Jennifer Goss, Commission Clerk
Robert J. Taro, LAFCO Counsel

Commissioners Absent: Tom Dunlop, City Member

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of the September 28, 2016 Meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Van Winkle, seconded by Commissioner Bublak and carried with a 5-0 vote to approve the Minutes of the September 28, 2016 meeting by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Bublak, DeMartini, Gammon, O’Brien and Van Winkle
Noes: Commissioners: None
Ineligible: Commissioners: None
Absent: Commissioners: Dunlop
Abstention: Commissioners: Hawn and Withrow
4. **CORRESPONDENCE**

A. Specific Correspondence.
   1. Email from Denny Jackman regarding item 7A, received December 5, 2016.

B. Informational Correspondence.
   1. 2016 CALAFCO Annual Conference Report.
   2. 2016 Legislative Update

C. “In the News”

5. **DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS AND DISQUALIFICATIONS**

None.

6. **CONSENT ITEMS**

*A. OUT-OF-BOUNDARY SERVICE APPLICATION – 311 W. HATCH ROAD (MODESTO).* The Commission will consider a request to extend sewer service outside the City of Modesto’s existing city limits to serve a property at 311 W. Hatch Road. The proposal is intended to provide sewer service to a new commercial building on site. The extension is considered categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to section 15303(d) of the CEQA Guidelines. APN: 038-026-050. (Staff Recommendation: Approve Resolution No. 2016-24.)

Motion by Commissioner Withrow, seconded by Commissioner Bublak, and carried with a 5-0 vote to approve Resolution No. 2016-24, by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Bublak, DeMartini, Hawn, Van Winkle and Withrow
Noes: Commissioners: None
Ineligible: Commissioners: Gammon and O’Brien
Absent: Commissioners: Dunlop
Abstention: Commissioners: None

*B. 2017 WORK PROGRAM - MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW & SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATES.* (Staff Recommendation: Adopt the 2017 Work Program.)

Motion by Commissioner Withrow, seconded by Commissioner Bublak, and carried with a 5-0 vote to adopt the 2017 Work Program, by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Bublak, DeMartini, Hawn, Van Winkle and Withrow
Noes: Commissioners: None
Ineligible: Commissioners: Gammon and O’Brien
Absent: Commissioners: Dunlop
Abstention: Commissioners: None
7. PUBLIC HEARING

A. LAFCO APPLICATION 2016-05 – KEYES 19 NORTH AND SOUTH CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION TO THE KEYES COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT. Request to annex a 19-acre residential subdivision to the Keyes Community Services District to provide water and sewer services. The subdivision consists of two areas (North & South) adjacent to one another in Stanislaus County. The project site is located north of Norma Way, west of Tanya Way, and South of Norma Way, west of Washington Road in Keyes. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Commission, as a Responsible Agency, will also review and consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared by Stanislaus County, as Lead Agency. (Staff Recommendation: Approve Resolution No. 2016-23.)

Javier Camarena, Assistant Executive Officer, presented the item with a recommendation of approval.

Chair Hawn opened the Public Hearing at 6:08 p.m.

FAVOR: Matt Vinson, O'Dell Engineering, spoke on behalf of the applicants.

OPPOSED: No one spoke.

Chair Hawn closed the Public Hearing at 6:09 p.m.

Motion by Commissioner DeMartini, seconded by Commissioner Withrow, and carried with a 5-0 vote to adopt Resolution No. 2016-23 by the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioners: Bublak, DeMartini, Hawn, Van Winkle and Withrow
Noes: Commissioners: None
Ineligible: Commissioners: Gammon and O'Brien
Absent: Commissioners: Dunlop
Abstention: Commissioners: None

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

None.

9. ADDITIONAL MATTERS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRPERSON

Chair Hawn presented a plaque to outgoing Commissioner O'Brien, thanking him for his years of service to LAFCO as a County Member.

10. EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT

A. On the Horizon. The Executive Officer informed the Commission of the following:

- At the January meeting the Commission will hear reports on the mid-year budget, audit, fee schedule and election of officers.
- Staff is anticipating additional out-of-boundary applications and applications involving districts.
11. **ADJOURNMENT**

A. Chair Hawn announced that the next meeting date and time will be January 25, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

B. The meeting was adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

**NOT YET APPROVED**

Sara Lytle-Pinhey, Executive Officer
CALAFCO Board and Staff Changes
Results of the recent CALAFCO Board of Directors elections netted no new Board members for 2017. All incumbent Board members won their election, so the Board of Directors membership stays the same.

At the October Board meeting during the Annual Conference, the appointment of Carolyn Emery (Orange LAFCo) was made to represent the southern region as the Deputy Executive Officer (DEO). We said farewell to Paul Novak who served in this role for the past two years.

CALAFCO Board 2017 Committees
At their December 9 meeting, the CALAFCO Board appointed members to the 2017 standing committees as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Committee</th>
<th>Nominations Committee</th>
<th>Awards Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly (North)</td>
<td>Cheryl Brothers</td>
<td>Mike Kelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Curatalo (South)</td>
<td>Shiva Frentzen</td>
<td>Gerard McCallum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiva Frentzen (Central)</td>
<td>John Leopold (Chair)</td>
<td>John Marchand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kirby (At-Large)</td>
<td>Josh Susman</td>
<td>Anita Paque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Leopold (Coastal)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ricky Samayoa (Chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McGill (At-Large)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay Jones (a) (At-Large)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kelley (a) (South)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Paque (a) (Central)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sblend Sblendorio (a) (Coastal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Susman (a) (North)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2017 Annual Conference
Jim Curatalo
Bill Kirby (Chair)
Sblend Sblendorio
Josh Susman

Conferences and Workshops Update

2016 ANNUAL CONFERENCE A SUCCESS
A final Conference report was provided to the Board on December 9. The Conference was held October 26 – 28 in Santa Barbara at the beautiful Fess Parker DoubleTree. Our theme this year was **Orchards to Oceans: Balancing California’s Diversity**, and the host was Santa Barbara LAFCo. Approximately 285 commissioners, staff, associate members, guests and speakers attended the Conference. A total of 48 LAFCOs were represented.

Participant evaluations rated the overall experience a 5.2 out of 6.0 with an evaluation return rate of 25%. While the books are still being finalized, it appears that financially the Conference was a success. We had a total of $19,500 in sponsorship revenue, with 16 total sponsors of varying levels. CALAFCO thanks all of our sponsors for your support and participation in this event.

Our program and speaker lineup was diverse, and highlighted by our luncheon keynote speaker Jean-Michel Cousteau.

CALAFCO wishes to thank our host, Santa Barbara LAFCo, for all of their work in planning the mobile workshop, lining up the luncheon keynote speaker, and tending to many of the details. In particular, we thank Jeff Moorhouse, Roger Welt, Paul Hood, Michael Allen and Jacquelyn Alexander. We also thank Conference Chair Sblend Sblendorio, Program Committee Chair David Church, everyone who worked to plan the program and all of you who volunteered and helped on site.

All program presentations were placed on the CALAFCO website the week after the Conference.

2017 STAFF WORKSHOP

The 2017 Staff Workshop is set for April 5-7, 2017 at the beautiful Doubletree by Hilton in downtown Fresno. Our host for this workshop will be Fresno LAFCo. The Program Planning Committee will begin their work the first week of January.

CALAFCO Congratulates the 2016 Annual Achievement Award Recipients
CALAFCO wishes to congratulate all of this year’s nominees, and especially those who received the 2016 Achievement Award.

- Outstanding Commissioner – Don Tatzin (Contra Costa LAFCo)
- Outstanding LAFCo Clerk – Cheryl Carter-Benjamin (Orange LAFCo)
- Outstanding LAFCo Professional – Steve Lucas (Butte LAFCo)
- Distinguished Service – Peter Brundage (Sacramento LAFCo)
- Project of the Year – Countywide Water Study (Marin LAFCo)
- Government Leadership – Southern Region of CALAFCO
- Most Effective Commission – San Luis Obispo LAFCo
- Outstanding CALAFCO Member – John Leopold (Santa Cruz LAFCo)
- Lifetime Achievement – Bob Braitman (Retired EO) and Ed Robey (Lake LAFCo)
CALAFCO Board Actions
The Board met on October 28 and appointed the staff members of the 2017 Legislative Committee and adopted their 2017 meeting calendar.

During the Board’s meeting on December 9, they took the following actions:
- Received and filed the 1st quarter financial reports
- Received and filed the Annual Conference report
- Heard a presentation from Erin Gilhuly, President of CV Strategies and agreed to consider a change in scope of work for next year’s contract
- Decided on the priority topics for their January Strategic Planning Workshop
- Unanimously approved the 2017 legislative priorities.

CALAFCO White Papers and Other Publications
The White Paper on the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA) and LAFCos is being released the last week of December on the website and will be widely distributed the first week of January. The purpose of this paper is to summarize how SGMA will impact LAFCos across the state.

We are currently partnering with the American Farmland Trust (AFT) on a White Paper on Ag Policies. Work on this project is underway with an anticipated July completion date.

At the Annual Conference CALAFCO introduced the publications completed in collaboration with the CA Special Districts Association (CSDA). The first is a Special District Formation Guide. The Guide is intended as informational only and not written to promote or discourage the formation of a special district. The intent is to inform anyone considering forming a special district of the many factors involved and resources needed. The other publication distributed is the Countywide RDA Oversight Board Special District Appointments Guide. The Guide is an informational document on the process of appointing special district representatives to countywide oversight boards, and provides guidance on potential questions related to the process of RDA Oversight Board consolidations and the appointment of special district representatives to those Boards. Both of these Guides are on the CALAFCO website.

CALAFCO Legislative Update
This was a very full legislative year for CALAFCO. A full legislative update was provided to the membership at the Annual Conference in late October.

The new Legislature has convened and is currently in recess until January 4. It is expected to be another full year.

During their December 9 meeting, the CALAFCO Board of Directors deliberated at length about the 2017 legislative priorities. In the end, they unanimously decided to sponsor an Omnibus bill that contains only changes addressing risks and vulnerabilities for LAFCos. Further, the Association’s focus in 2017 will be on those things that place our members in a vulnerable position. As a result, we will be working on things that follow-up recommendations and opportunities identified in our written testimony to the Little Hoover Commission. We will also be working closely with CSDA and the Healthcare Districts Association in addressing issues that were identified in 2016 as a result of legislation.

CALAFCO will sponsor a bill that addresses the ongoing legal concerns of Government Code Section 56653 (previous attempts in 2015 and 2016 were unsuccessful), and co-sponsor a bill with CSDA that simplifies the process of seating special districts on LAFCo (this process will remain voluntary).

We continue to be engaged with the Administration and Water Board on drinking water accessibility issues, and expect another bill similar to last year’s SB 1318 (Wolk) to be introduced again.

CALAFCO has been asked to engage with OPR and the Strategic Growth Council in the creation of a Guide pertaining to Urban Growth Management.

CALAFCO Associate Members’ Corner
This section highlights our Associate Members. The information below is provided to CALAFCO by the Associate member upon joining the Association. All Associate member information can be found in the CALAFCO Member Directory.

We are pleased to welcome a new Silver Associate Member to CALAFCO, the Santa Ynez CSD.

Santa Ynez Community Services District
Founded in 1971, the Santa Ynez Community Services District provides wastewater collection and transportation and street lighting, serving approximately 688 wastewater connections. Effluent collected by the District is treated at the City of Solvang wastewater treatment plant. For more information about the District, visit their website at www.sycsd.com, or contact the General Manager Jeff Hodge at jhodge@sycsd.com.

City of Rancho Mirage
The City of Rancho Mirage has been a Silver Associate Member since July 2010. With a population of just over 18,000, the City of Rancho Mirage is located in the County of Riverside. The City offers an abundant amount of sunshine, great climate, and related resort-style living. For more information about the City, contact the City Manager Randy Bynder at randall@ranchomirageca.gov, or visit the website at www.ci.rancho-mirage.ca.us.
Lamphier-Gregory
A Silver Associate Member since September 2010, Lamphier-Gregory provides on-call planning and environmental consultant services to various LAFCos including Alameda and Contra Costa on long-term contracts. For more information about Lamphier-Gregory, visit their website at www.lamphier-gregory.com or contact Senior Planner Nathaniel Taylor at ntaylor@lamphier-gregory.com.

Policy Consulting Associates
A Silver Associate Member since September 2010, Policy Consulting Associates prepares interdisciplinary research studies for LAFCos, COGs, counties, cities, states, elected representatives and candidates, with an emphasis on MSRs and fiscal studies. The PCA team’s combined experience covers the spectrum of governance configurations and alternatives, and runs the gamut of services under LAFCo jurisdiction. To learn more about PCA, contact either Jennifer Stephenson or Oxana Wolfson at info@pcateam.com or visit their website at www.pcateam.com.

QK (formerly known as Quad Knopf)
A Silver Associate Member since September 2010, QK provides planning, engineering, biology, environmental and survey services to public and private clients. Their planners have previous experience working for public agencies, including serving as LAFCo Analysts. They specialize in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valley regions. For more information on QK, visit their website at www.qkinc.com, or contact Steve Brandt at steveb@qkinc.com.

CALAFCO wishes to thank all of our Associate Members for your support and partnership. We look forward to continuing to highlight our Associate Members in each Quarterly Report.

Your LAFCO Legal Resource

Local Agency Formation Commissions can count on Best Best & Krieger LLP for dynamic solutions to nearly every legal challenge they may face.

General Counsel | Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act
Environmental Compliance | Labor & Employment
Municipal Services | Planning & Development
Litigation | Public Finance | Public Ethics

www.BBKlaw.com

Indian Wells | Irvine | Los Angeles | Ontario | Riverside
Sacramento | San Diego | Walnut Creek | Washington, D.C.
CALAFCO on the Road Again...
By: Pamela Miller, CALAFCO Executive Director

This past year I’ve had the pleasure of tooling around the state to visit various LACFos. As part of the Association’s Strategic Plan, one of the objectives is to have the Executive Director connect and visit with six LACFos each year. The past few years I visited some really cool places, so I thought I would start an annual column on where I visit and the uniqueness of each place. Going forward, this will be an article you can find in the Annual Edition of The Sphere.

We are, undeniably, a diverse state. And it is amazing to me as a native Californian just how much of the state I have yet to see and fully experience. So I really appreciate the opportunity to visit with you, our members, to share what is happening in Sacramento and what CALAFCO is doing. But more importantly, to better understand the issues each of you is dealing with today.

Last October I visited with the Bay Area Executive Officers who were meeting in Napa. Having previously worked in Napa, I was excited to drive through the always beautiful vineyards on my way to the meeting. During my visit I answered questions about the new organizational changes being implemented and learned what was happening in each of the Bay Area LACFos.

In January of this year I visited Fresno LACFo while doing a site visit for the 2017 Staff Workshop. With a beautiful skyline as a backdrop to a bustling city, I found myself wondering why I had not visited here before. I was surprised (although I am not sure why) to drive through acres and acres of vineyards and learned that Fresno State has one of the state’s leading Viticulture and Enology programs. It was interesting to hear Fresno LACFo staff discuss some of the challenges they were facing as they worked to obtain information from service providers to conduct their MSRs. I appreciated the cooperative nature in which they approached the conversation and the suggestions offered by their Commission. I’m looking forward to returning to Fresno in April 2017 for our Staff Workshop.

At the end of January, I was down in the heart of Los Angeles attending the annual meeting of the Southern Region (now an annual pilgrimage for me). There again I was able to share with commissioners and staff the newly implemented changes the Association had adopted and answered a number of questions the region had about our new models. It was interesting to hear their discussions regarding their own implementation of a shared service model. I also shared the legislative platform CALAFCO adopted for 2016. A short train ride back to airport that same afternoon and I was quickly on my way back home.

It was not until late September that I was able to get back out on the road, and, boy, was this a trip worth waiting for. I spent four days visiting several of our most northern LACFos, including Del Norte, Humboldt and Shasta. They were very gracious hosts, and I owe a huge shout out to George Williamson and his team for letting me set up camp in their office, driving me around and even offering themselves as my tour guides.

The drive was scenic and serene with the beautiful Klamath Falls River winding its way alongside the road. A pretty amazing view by itself, but add the Pacific Ocean and some Redwoods in there from time to time and WOW. Visiting Del Norte allowed me to share for the first time with this commission what is happening in Sacramento and with CALAFCO. I also fielded a number of historical questions about CALAFCO as well as legislative questions. Before departing we visited Battery Point Lighthouse, which first lit up the night sky December 10, 1856.

From there it was a wonderful drive back to Humboldt, which I was told is not complete without an elk siting. Well sure enough, there were plenty to see, and I thank our driver (who I think prefers to remain nameless) for stopping, making U-turns and pulling by the side of the road (all safely and fully legal – of course), so that this city slicker could get a good eyeful. We came across a number of herds, and the last one was the largest and most impressive.

The next day I tagged along with Humboldt LACFo staff to make a LACFo 101 presentation to the local APA chapter. Once done, I was very politely asked to leave so I could take in some of the sites. I gladly obliged the request and found myself hiking among the redwoods at Arcata Redwood Park. I got lost in the serenity of time and space while there.

That evening, I was treated to a very special welcome reception at the home of Humboldt commissioner Bob McPherson. He and his wife were very gracious hosts, opening up their magnificent home. I learned quite a bit about the history of the area from them and was treated to this sunset ocean view from their kitchen window.

The next morning I attended the Humboldt LACFo meeting, which was very interesting in that they discussed the dissolution of a special district that had gone inactive, as well as a proposed annexation into the City of Fortuna. It was a great opportunity for me to hear residents who lack drinking water share their story, first-hand (a story being told all around the state) and to listen to the Commission do its due diligence in the questions they asked LACFo and City staff.

Upon my departure I stopped off at the Arcata Marsh and Wildlife Sanctuary. The interesting thing about this marsh is that it integrates...
conventional wastewater treatment with the natural processes of constructed wetlands, thereby turning wastewater into a resource. It was an interesting and beautiful place.

After tooling down the highway to Redding, the next morning I had the pleasure of attending the Shasta LAFCo meeting, at which they were treated to not only a CALAFCO 101 but also a LAFCo 101 session. It was a great opportunity for me to field lots of questions and reconnect with this Commission. No visit to Redding would be complete without stopping to admire the Sundial Bridge at Turtle Bay. Spanning the Sacramento River, the Sundial Bridge is an environmentally-conscious structure, intentionally constructed without river footings to leave the salmon-spawning habitat undisturbed. While world-renowned and environmentally sensitive, Sundial Bridge also inspires onlookers with its "bird in flight" design, symbolizing overcoming adversity, and serves as a real sundial.

My final stop before heading into Sacramento was in Butte County to visit the offices of Butte LAFCo. It was here I was treated to a peek at the Oroville Dam. It was very interesting to note that, in the first stages of construction, under the direction of Governor Edmund G. Brown on April 24, 1963, a sackful of sand and gravel from each of the 58 counties in the state was used in the first concrete poured at the base of the dam. While the lake was low, it was a beautiful site. Thanks Steve Lucas for the tour!

My last stop of 2016 came the week after the Annual Conference visiting Santa Cruz LAFCo. It was in Scotts Valley to be exact. I learned a few interesting facts about Scotts Valley, thanks to the Keeper of LAFCo Knowledge, Pat McCormick (also the Executive Officer of Santa Cruz LAFCo). The LAFCo meeting was held in Scotts Valley City Hall, a quaint building nestled on a hill with a beautiful view of the surrounding mountains. Just below City Hall sits the Historical Scott House, built in 1853. This area is home to significant archaeological finds and contains one of the longest records of human occupation known in the Western North America. Today this historical landmark is part of a wonderful City Park.

The LAFCo meeting was another interesting one, with a proposed sphere of influence update for Scotts Valley Water District and a robust discussion about MSRs for Fire Districts. Turns out several of the Fire Districts want a more detailed MSR (they got one the first round and did nothing with the recommendations, so this round of MSRs was approached a bit differently), and after a very interesting discussion, the Commission decided to accept the MSRs as presented with the exception of three of the twelve districts, which will be looked at more closely in the future. It was interesting to observe the dialogue that occurred between the district personnel and Commission as they worked towards a common understanding of each other’s perspectives. After all the excitement was over, I made a brief CALAFCO presentation to the Commission and was able to acknowledge Commissioner John Leopold for receiving the Outstanding CALAFCO Member award and for his time as Chair of the Board.

After over four years of being the Executive Director for this great Association, I grow prouder of who we are and what we do, and of the great things you - our membership - are doing in your respective communities. I look forward to packing up, hitting the road, and visiting more of you very soon!

Happy Holidays to all of our Members and your families.

May 2017 bring all of us peace and prosperity.

CALAFCO Board of Directors and Staff
CORRESPONDENCE – IN THE NEWS

Newspaper Articles

➤ Turlock Journal, January 3, 2017, “Turlock seeing increasing development through infill projects.”

➤ The Ceres Courier, January 4, 2017, “County one of the fast growing populations in the state.”


➤ The Modesto Bee, January 17, 2017, “Modesto triumphs in Del Rio well lawsuit, though appeal considered.”

➤ The Modesto Bee, January 18, 2017, “North County Corridor slams on brakes again.”

Other News

➤ East Bay Times, December 13, 2016, “Contra Costa County adopts agriculture and open space policy”.


Turlock seeing increasing development through infill projects
Population growth beginning to rebound from recession drop

By Kristina Hacker

As Turlock heads into 2017, residential development is on the rise; however, the large, new subdivisions that have dominated building in the past are being replaced with more infill projects.

The Vista student housing complex — the tallest residential buildings in Turlock currently under construction between Dels Lane and Crowell Road — is a perfect example of the direction growth in Turlock has taken over the past few years and is expected to take in the year to come.

The Vista, which includes three four-story buildings 50 feet in height, with 180 units, 600 beds and 618 parking spaces, is an infill project. It’s a high-density residential complex that is being built in what was empty land amongst already-established neighborhoods.

While many long-time residents of the area protested the construction of the towering structures near their single-story homes, many in Turlock (including the City Council) were glad to see residential development return to town.

New residential development, like The Vista, reflect a rebounding population for Turlock.

Turlock is ranked 121st in the state in terms of overall population, at 72,050, out of 482 cities, according to statistics recently released by the State Department of Finance. Turlock saw about a 1 percent growth in population from July 2015 to July 16.

That 1 percent is a far cry, however, from the average 2.9 percent growth per year Turlock saw from 1990 to 2000, or the 2 percent per year growth from 2000 to 2010.

The recession years hit Turlock hard, with a drop in yearly growth to .5 percent between 2007 and 2010.

"Looking at the change we're growing a little faster, but we're well below the 1990 to 2000," said City of Turlock Director of Planning Debbie Whitmore.

The changing rate of growth can also be seen in the number of building permits issued over the past nine years.

At the height of building boom, 2003, the City of Turlock issued 818 building permits for single-family homes and 130 multi-family complexes. In 2007, those permits dropped to 144 single-family and 17 multi-family. In 2010, the City only issued 54 permits for single-family developments and zero multi-family units.

It’s still slow-going as the City of Turlock had only issued 44 single-family building permits from January through November 2016, and six multi-family for the same time period.

"We are just now starting to see some interest," said Whitmore. "We're getting an awful lot of interest in builders doing single lot homes and college student rental units."

Whitmore said that infill projects generally cost the developers a lot less money as the infrastructure — water, sewer, electric, gas lines — are already in place. The City of Turlock also encourages infill development on vacant parcels through incentives and streamlined approval process for projects.
IN THE NEWS – The Turlock Journal, January 3, 2017 (Continued Page 2)

There are plenty of diverse areas available for developers interested in building multiple homes, like the East Tuolumne and Morgan Ranch Master Plan areas.

The East Tuolumne Master Plan, initially adopted in 2005, encompasses approximately 100 acres of land designated in the Turlock General Plan for very low density residential uses (up to three dwelling units per acre) along East Tuolumne Road between North Quincy and North Waring Roads. The intent of the Master Plan is to provide a smooth transition between the more dense residential development to the west and the more rural / agricultural properties located east within the County’s jurisdiction, as well as establish a distinct eastern edge for the City.

The Turlock City Council approved the Morgan Ranch Master Plan in 2015, a planned development on the south side of Turlock that offers a smaller product that would be available for entry-level housing, something that is sorely needed in Turlock according to Whitmore.

"We starting to see the growth happen in the north part of the county...but Morgan Ranch, we’re still a little further to the south and we haven’t seen quite the same ability to invest to get that infrastructure started," said Whitmore.

One area that will start to be developed in 2017 is the Monte Verde subdivision, a 107-unit new housing subdivision that was approved by the City Council in April 2014.

The approximately 17.84 acres located at the corner of Countryside Drive and Tuolumne Road, in the city’s North West Triangle Specific Plan area will be developed by Florsheim Homes.

Florsheim President Randy Bling said that he is hoping to start improvements on the Countryside Drive property this year.

Bling said that while Florsheim just finished a lot in Hughson, development in Stanislaus County as a whole has been pretty slow — but far more than during the height of the recession.

"We’ve done well over 150 homes this year and in 2010 we only had 40 or 50. There are more home buyers this year and the prices have stabilized," said Bling.

While Bling said it’s always a tough call with politics and new people taking office, he’s seen slow growth and a fairly good market.

"Everything is coming back, interest rates ...still historically low and it’s a good time to buy right now," he said.

While the return of new housing is seen as an economic indicator, there are benefits to slow and steady growth, according to Whitmore.

"I think this is a very nice pace of growth and allows the city to adjust...allows people to be more directly integrated into the city because you don’t have a huge growth in one development," she said.

"In Turlock you see natural growth, not as many commuters."
IN THE NEWS – The Ceres Courier, January 4, 2017

COUNTY ONE OF THE FAST GROWING POPULATIONS IN THE STATE

By Kristina Hacker

Stanislaus County is the fifth fastest growing county in California.

The Department of Finance on Dec. 19 indicated the county’s population grew by 1.23 percent or 6,636 residents between July 1 of 2015 and 2016. Overall California grew by 295,000 residents for a 0.75 percent growth rate. There were an estimated 39.4 million people as of July 1 living in California. At the current pace, California will top 40 million people by mid-2018.

Rounding out the top five counties are Yolo at 1.97 percent, San Joaquin at 1.56 percent, Placer at 1.44 and Riverside at 1.35 percent.

Stanislaus had 545,008 residents on July 1. When San Joaquin County’s 738,873 residents and Merced County’s 272,610 residents are added to the mix there are 1,556,491 residents in the three-county Northern San Joaquin Valley region.

Stanislaus' was mostly attributed to natural increase - births exceeding deaths. There were 7,758 births in the county during the 12-month period as opposed to 4,379 deaths for a net natural gain of 3,379 residents.
The department reported the birth rate declined to 12.42 births per 1,000 population from 13.69 births per 1,000 in the 2010 census.

As the Baby Boomer generation ages the death rate has slowly increased to 6.71 deaths per 1,000 population compared to a rate of 6.26 in 2010.

The department says net migration added 70,000 persons to California last year. That includes all foreign immigrants regardless of legal status, residents who left the state to live abroad, and the balance of people who move to and from the California from within the United States.

Other highlights of the state’s county population report include:

• The state’s nine largest counties are Los Angeles, San Diego, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Santa Clara, Alameda, Sacramento, and Contra Costa. Each has over one million residents. They represent 70 percent of California’s population.

• Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, Orange, and San Bernardino counties posted the highest numeric population gains and accounted for nearly half of the state’s growth. Growth in these counties was due primarily to natural increase, although most of the counties had positive net migration as well.

• Although natural increase was a significant source of growth in the state, 14 counties experienced natural decrease (more deaths than births during the year) - Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Lake, Mariposa, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Trinity, and Tuolumne.

• Alpine is the smallest county with 1,148 residents. That reflects a loss of nine residents since July 1, 2015.

• Los Angeles is the largest county at 10,229,245 residents accounting for 25.99 percent of the state's population. Los Angeles gained 43,758 residents.
Water battle, roads and cannabis will keep Stanislaus supervisors busy in 2017

By Ken Carlson

Supervisors will swear in three board members Tuesday, leading into 12 months that look hardly routine for county leaders.

Former state Assemblywoman Kristin Olsen will recite the oath of office along with Supervisors Vito Chiesa and Jim DeMartini, who are beginning new terms. The ceremony begins at 8:30 a.m., with a reception to follow and the regular board meeting at 9 a.m.

The county is marching into a new year with a voter-approved tax to generate funds for road repairs and expressway construction. In addition, it is embroiled in the battle against a state plan to increase unimpaired flows in the Merced, Stanislaus and Tuolumne rivers.

It has less than 12 months to develop local controls over legalized marijuana, while the Sheriff's Department gears up for a gradual opening of a Public Safety Center expansion.

As a health services provider for the poor, the county could face turmoil if Republicans in Congress follow through with a repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

Chiesa, who begins a third term, is expected to take over as board chairman for what could be a pivotal year. In addition to dealing with transportation and water issues, Chiesa wants to work with the nine cities on a uniform policy for control of marijuana sales and commercial cultivation under Proposition 64.

Legalized pot was approved by 57 percent of California voters in November. Local jurisdictions have not decided what approach to take with marijuana but must have rules in place by Jan. 1, 2018.

Pay raise for supervisors

Supervisors are getting a 3.75 percent raise this month to $78,360 a year and $87,768 for the chairman.

County leaders don't need to take a vote to increase their pay. An ordinance makes them eligible for a 3.75 percent increase each year if their salaries are more than 20 percent less than the average supervisor's pay in Fresno, Kern, Madera, Merced, Monterey, Sacramento and San Joaquin counties. A second criterion for an increase is growth in the value of county property assessments over the previous year.

Olsen, who replaces Bill O'Brien in supervisory District 1 (Riverbank and Oakdale), will earn 32 percent less as a county supervisor. The salary for the former 12th District Assembly member peaked at $115,124 when she served as minority leader. Newly elected 12th District Assemblyman Heath Flora will be paid $104,118 a year, thanks to a 4 percent raise given to state legislators in December.
Olsen is poised to follow O’Brien as the county’s representative on the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District board. In other committee assignments that could be approved Tuesday, Supervisor Terry Withrow and Chiesa will serve on the Stanislaus Council of Governments’ executive committee. Dick Monteith and Olsen will oversee county projects on the Capital Facilities Committee.

Chiesa will succeed O’Brien on the Stanislaus Regional 911 commission, which has dealt with contentious issues among its member agencies.

DeMartini and Withrow will continue as county representatives on the Local Agency Formation Commission, with Olsen serving as an alternate.

Tuesday’s swearing-in ceremony at 8:30 a.m. and the 9 a.m. regular meeting will be held in the basement chambers of Tenth Street Place, at 1010 10th St., in downtown Modesto.
Modesto triumphs in Del Rio well lawsuit, though appeal considered

By Garth Stapley

Modesto did not violate the civil rights of some rural homeowners north of town who weren’t notified before city leaders decided to sink a well serving the nearby Del Rio community, appellate justices said in a ruling Friday.

The neighbors disagree and are considering an appeal to the California Supreme Court, their attorney said. The well has yet to be drilled.

Friday’s ruling reverses that of a judge in Modesto who had sided with the neighbors in May 2015. They had worried that a big municipal well could suck dry their shallow domestic wells.

**THERE IS NO INDICATION THAT (THE NORTH MODESTO GROUNDWATER ALLIANCE) EVER ATTEMPTED TO MAKE AN EVIDENTIALY SHOWING THAT ITS MEMBERS’ PROPERTY OR PROPERTY VALUES WERE ACTUALLY LIKELY TO BE HARMED.**

Appellate court ruling

Calling themselves the North Modesto Groundwater Alliance, the neighbors sued after the Modesto City Council approved well construction without alerting them, giving them no chance to object.

Modesto acquired Del Rio’s water operations from a private company in 1995. To settle a separate lawsuit, the city promised to make improvements, including drilling two wells and installing a 20-foot water tank.

The neighbors’ lawsuit stalled those plans and prompted the city to conduct more studies. A draft environmental impact report was recently circulated suggesting that neighbors need not worry about their wells competing with Modesto’s.

Friday’s ruling in Fresno’s 5th District Court of Appeal had nothing to do with the recent study but declared that neighbors failed to prove that their properties would be “substantially harmed” by a new city well nearby.

**THE CITY’S ACTION IN PROCEEDING WITH PROJECT APPROVAL WITHOUT INDIVIDUAL NOTICE TO NMGA’S MEMBERS WAS NOT ARBITRARY, CAPRICIOUS, ENTIRELY WITHOUT EVIDENTIALY SUPPORT, OR PROCEDURALLY UNFAIR, BECAUSE INDIVIDUAL NOTICE TO NEIGHBORS IS NOT REQUIRED WHEN AN AGENCY MAKES A LEGISLATIVE DECISION.**

Appellate court ruling

City officials did not violate neighbors’ rights “because individual notice to neighbors is not required when an agency makes a legislative decision,” the panel of three appellate justices found. Modesto had published a notice in The Modesto Bee before approving the well and tank project.

“The city could not abuse its discretion by not doing that which it was not obligated to do,” says the ruling, written by Judge Bruce Smith, with Judges Brad Hill and Gene Gomes concurring.

Neighbors had sued eight months after a statute of limitations had passed, but Stanislaus Superior Court Judge Roger Beachesene had allowed the case to continue on the theory that their rights had been compromised. They had not, appellate justices found, so neighbors “had no constitutional right to pursue a stale claim,” the ruling says.
"The city is very happy with it," said attorney Rick Jarvis.

Daniel W. Smith, the neighbors' attorney, said his clients are mulling their next step, including "the option of seeking review by the California Supreme Court."
North County Corridor slams on brakes – again

By Garth Stapley

Another delay has stalled the unveiling of documents crucial to the North County Corridor, a future east-west expressway skirting Modesto, Riverbank and Oakdale.

A long-awaited draft environmental study – with loads of information on how the road could affect people, farms and other business – won’t be ready to circulate this month, as promised in September. It could become public in a couple of months, under the most optimistic scenario.

The delay this time is blamed on California legislators’ failure to address transportation funding, a huge disappointment at the State Capitol last year.

For 10 years, the state has assumed federal responsibility for environmental decisions affecting highway projects using at least some federal road money. The arrangement expired Jan. 1 and federal transportation officials don’t have enough staff to absorb those tasks, including final steps of reviewing the huge project in north Stanislaus County.

A comprehensive transportation package in Sacramento would have included renewal of the state and federal arrangement. But tricky politics doomed the package last year, hurting progress on the North County Corridor and other projects.

New legislation – Assembly Bill 28, coauthored by Sen. Cathleen Galgiani, D-Manteca – would fix the problem with environmental decisions. But that process won’t start rolling until next month, so local transportation officials postponed a meeting scheduled for Wednesday of the governing board for the North County Corridor, as well as a public hearing tentatively set for late February.

"At best, this will delay the release of our environmental document by a couple of months," county Public Works Director Matt Machado said in a notice.

The study initially was promised in summer 2015 and has been delayed several times since for various reasons.

The 18-mile expressway would run from northeast Modesto to Highway 108 east of Oakdale, with freeway interchanges at McHenry Avenue, Coffee and Oakdale roads, and Roselle Avenue, and roundabouts on the east end. Final route selection is up to the California Department of Transportation, perhaps in 2018.

A bypass of Oakdale has been talked about for six decades. The latest version could cost $700 million.
Contra Costa County adopts agriculture and open space policy

By Aaron Davis

BRENTWOOD — The county’s local regulatory commission recently adopted county-wide policies to preserve farms and open land and put limits on urban sprawl, but specifics and details continue to be worked out.

On Nov. 9, the Contra Costa Local Agency Formation Commission adopted policies governing the conversion of open space and agricultural lands into land for development.

The commission looked at three separate versions that gave a varying degree of responsibility to either LAFCO or the developer to propose conditions when converting these lands to other uses.

“We did, at the end of the day, strike a balance between the development community and the farming, ranching and environmental communities,” said Lou Ann Texeira, executive officer of Contra Costa LAFCO.

Nearly 18 months after the process began, with votes split down the middle on certain issues and letters of support or opposition coming in from cities, conservation groups, farmers’ associations and developer’s associations, the commission agreed to the first version of its policy.

Version 1 allows the applicant to come up with his own proposals to minimize impacts on agricultural operations or open spaces, without baseline measures from LAFCO, as a starting point with the opportunity to review after one year.

“There was concern from the building community, so the commissioners said ‘Let’s start with version 1 and when we review it in a year, we will see how it’s worked out and reassess whether we need to beef it up a little,’” Texeira said.

The adopted version will still go through some refinement, but conservation agencies such as the Greenbelt Alliance, and agricultural agencies, such as the Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust, support it.

“We were hoping that the county would have a county-wide policy and it appears they will, which is good,” said Tom Bloomfield, chairman of the Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust. “There is still lots of language that needs to be finalized, such as whether the funds go to a qualified land trust or a community development department.”

Bloomfield said that the Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust asked for a policy requiring the mitigation of one acre of agricultural land for every one acre converted to urban uses, and this was included in the final version.
RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Commission adopt the updated Schedule of Fees and Deposits for 2017.

DISCUSSION

Government Code section 56383 allows LAFCOs to recover costs by charging fees, provided that the fees do not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing those services for which the fee is charged. LAFCO collects application fees for review of boundary changes, sphere of influence requests, out-of-boundary service extensions, and other LAFCO services. The majority of these fees are deposits. Projects are then cost-accounted to reflect the actual cost of processing the application. Should the cost be less than the deposit, the difference is refunded to the applicant. Should the cost exceed the deposit, the applicant is immediately notified and invoiced.

2017 Changes

Effective January 1, 2017, LAFCOs are also charged with review of certain fire agency contracts. These reviews are similar to out-of-boundary requests and as such have been assigned a $1,500 application fee (deposit).

The Commission also collects fees on behalf of outside agencies, as required, including the California Department of Fish & Wildlife, whose fees have recently increased and are reflected on LAFCO’s updated Schedule of Fees and Deposits for the applicant’s information.

Minor changes have also been made to the fee schedule to reflect collection of actual costs for hardcopies of the agenda and/or packet and a reduced fee for copies of the hearing itself (now available in digital format).

Staff has reviewed the other application deposit amounts and found that no other changes to the Schedule of Fees and Deposits are needed at this time. The proposed Schedule of Fees and Deposits with updated amounts is attached.

Attachment: Proposed LAFCO Schedule of Fees and Deposits
## SCHEDULE OF FEES AND DEPOSITS

(Effective January 26, 2017)

1. **FILING FEES** (All fees are deposits, unless otherwise noted)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Boundary Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or District Annexation</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or District Detachment</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or District Reorganization</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. District Formation, Consolidation, Dissolution</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of a County Service Area (CSA), includes Sphere of Influence (SOI Adoption)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of a Service that a CSA May Provide</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of a Special District (includes SOI Adoption)</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Consolidation/Merger</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Dissolution</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a Subsidiary District</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation of Latent Powers by a District</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Sphere of Influence Amendment</strong></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Incorporation</strong></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Disincorporation</strong></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Out of Boundary Service Extension Request</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Executive Officer Review (Flat Fee)</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commission Review</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Fire Service Contract Review</strong></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Request for Reconsideration</strong></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(This fee shall be returned to the applicant if the Commission determines that the reconsideration is required to correct a procedural defect in its earlier action.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Special Meeting Request</strong></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J. Continuance Request by Applicant</strong></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **SUPPLEMENTAL FEES**

A. **Notice of Hearing/Radius Map:**  
Section 56157 of the Government Code may require that mailed notice to all registered voters and owners of property within 300 feet of the exterior boundary of the property that is the subject of a LAFCO hearing. The applicant shall be required to reimburse LAFCO for the direct cost of preparing a radius map, ownership list, registered voter list and postage if the Executive Officer determines that such a notice must be given.

B. **Outside Consultant(s) Fees:**  
An additional fee may be charged based on actual cost to hire outside consultant(s) to prepare incorporation feasibility studies, comprehensive fiscal analyses and special studies, etc.

C. **County Surveyor:**  
LAFCO utilizes the services of the County Surveyor for review of legal descriptions. The first two hours of staff time associated with these tasks are included in the application fee. Projects requiring more than two hours of County Surveyor review are charged at actual cost.

D. **Mapping Fees:**  
The County may also assist LAFCO in updating its boundary maps on the Geographical Information System (GIS). The first three hours of staff time associated with these tasks are included in the application fee. Projects requiring more than three hours of GIS mapping are charged at actual cost.

E. **Service/Duplication Costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Item</th>
<th>Cost Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copy of Commission Hearing</td>
<td>$20 per tape, $5 per meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Copying – Black &amp; White</td>
<td>1st ten pages free, $0.10 per page after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archive Retrieval</td>
<td>Actual Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mailed Subscriptions (1-Year Fee)| Agenda Only – $10  
Agenda & Minutes – $15  
Full Agenda Packet – $150  
**Actual Cost**           |
| Staff Research & Studies      | Limited to one half-hour of staff time, then Actual Cost |
| Pre-Application Fees          | Limited to one half-hour of staff time, then actual cost |
F. Outside Legal Counsel Fees: Actual Cost

LAFCO may require the services of outside legal counsel to process an application. An additional fee may be charged, at the discretion of the Executive Officer, based on the actual cost to hire outside counsel.

3. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) FEES

*CEQA compliance is required for most LAFCO actions; these fees are in addition to the Filing Fees.*

| CEQA Exemption – LAFCO as Lead Agency | $57 |
| Initial Study – LAFCO as Lead Agency | Actual Cost |
| Prepare Negative Declaration - LAFCO as Lead Agency | Actual Cost |
| Prepare EIR – LAFCO as Lead Agency | Actual Cost |
| Stanislaus County Clerk/Recorder Filing Fees* | $57 |
| Fish & Game Filing Fees* | |
| - Negative Declaration | $2,210.00 | $2,216.25 |
| - Mitigated Negative Declaration | $2,210.00 | $2,216.25 |
| - Environmental Impact Report (EIR) | $3,069.75 | $3,078.25 |

*Other agency fees – subject to change without notice.*

4. OTHER ACTIONS

A. Non-Scheduled Municipal Service Reviews Actual Cost

B. Petition Verification Actual Cost

Petition verifications are performed in-house whenever possible; however, some proposals require petition checks to be performed by either the County Elections Department or Assessor’s Office. These departments will bill LAFCO for the service, which is then passed on to the applicant.

5. STATE CONTROLLER’S REVIEW OF COMPREHENSIVE FISCAL ANALYSIS – FOR AN INCORPORATION PROPOSAL

For any request made pursuant to Government Code Section 56801, the requestor shall include a deposit of $25,000 to cover the costs of the State Controller’s review. The requestor may be required to deposit additional amounts, as requested by the Executive Officer, to complete the review. Upon completion of the State Controller’s review and final billing to LAFCO, the requestor will either be: (a) refunded the amount that the deposit exceeds the actual cost of the State Controller’s review; or (b) charged the amount that the actual cost of the State Controller’s review exceeds the deposit(s). (The deposit amount includes a 10% administration and coordination fee, which is non-refundable.)
6. **WORKSHOP FEES**

Proponents or opponents of actions pending before the Commission may request that a workshop be held in their area. If the Executive Officer agrees to conduct such a workshop session, the requesting party shall reimburse LAFCO all costs associated therewith.

7. **FEE POLICIES**

A. All deposits are initial payments toward the actual costs of processing ("project costs"). Project cost includes all staff time and materials. Materials include, but are not limited to, charges for advertisement of hearings, map and legal description review (up to 2 hours), postage, copies, signature verification, in addition to fees for project reviews by affected agencies.

B. If the actual costs exceed the deposit, the Executive Officer shall bill the applicant. The application shall not be processed further until the additional costs are paid. All final bills must be paid by the applicant prior to filing the Certificate of Completion.

C. The Commission may, at its sole discretion, contract for outside assistance to assist in processing and review of an application before it. The types of assistance include, but are not limited to, legal, engineering, environmental, planning, appraisal, management, and clerical fields. The estimated or actual costs, as determined by the Commission for such assistance shall be deposited with the Executive Officer before an application will be processed further.

D. Applicants are also responsible for payment of appropriate State Board of Equalization fees. The Executive Officer will determine the appropriate fee in accordance with the State Board of Equalization fee schedule. The fee, payable to the “State Board of Equalization”, shall be collected by the Executive Officer prior to the Certificate of Completion.

E. Filing fees and deposits may be appealed before the Commission prior to the submittal of an application. A request for waiver shall be submitted in writing to the LAFCO Executive Officer and shall specify the reasons for the request. The appeal will be considered at the next regular meeting of the Commission.

F. If the actual project costs are less than the deposit, the LAFCO Staff will refund the unused portion of the deposit to the applicant. For an application that has been denied, a refund of the unused portion (if applicable) shall be issued. The refund shall be made after the reconsideration period has closed. For an application that is approved, the refund shall be made when the LAFCO file is closed (typically when LAFCO receives written notice from the State Board of Equalization that the boundary change has been accepted). Refunds may not include fees which LAFCO collects for outside agencies.
TO: LAFCO Commissioners
FROM: Sara Lytle-Pinhey, Executive Officer
SUBJECT: MID-YEAR BUDGET REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016-2017

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Commission accept this financial update. No budget adjustments are needed at this time.

DISCUSSION

The Mid-Year Budget Report provides an overview of LAFCO’s expenses and revenues through the second quarter for the Commission’s information. The Commission’s adopted budget for the current fiscal year is $412,505. At mid-year, expenditures totaled $189,883, which represents approximately 46% of the adopted budget. Below is an overview of LAFCO’s expenses and revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adopted Budget (2016-2017)</th>
<th>Actual (Mid-Year)</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$332,382</td>
<td>$156,420</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>77,373</td>
<td>$32,836</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Charges</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>$627</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$412,505</td>
<td>$189,883</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County Contributions</td>
<td>$330,936</td>
<td>$330,936</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications / LAFCO Services</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>$18,551</td>
<td>309%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,460</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$336,936</td>
<td>$350,947</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Years’ Carry-Over</td>
<td>$75,569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$412,505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more detailed listing of individual accounts is attached for the Commission’s information. The following highlights the expense and revenue categories through mid-year:

- **Salaries and Benefits:**

  Through the end of the second quarter, $156,420 has been expended on Salaries and Benefits. Expenditures in this budget category represent approximately 47% of the total amount budgeted for the fiscal year.

  There was an unanticipated expense in Salaries and Benefits associated with the restoration of the Professional Development benefit. Under the County’s benefit system, LAFCO staff is eligible to be reimbursed for certain professional and educational growth expenses (e.g. training, books, software, etc). The maximum impact of this benefit is
$2,200. This amount will be easily absorbed in the Salaries and Benefits category. Staff estimates that at year-end, the overall Salaries and Benefits category will be within the Commission’s budgeted amount.

- **Services and Supplies:**

  At the end of the second quarter, expenditures under the Services and Supplies category totaled $32,836. This represents 42% of the total amount budgeted. Of note is the following:

  - Expenditures for the Commission’s general liability insurance, office lease, and membership dues are billed as one-time costs early in the fiscal year.
  
  - Expenses for building maintenance and janitorial services have exceeded budget estimates originally provided by the Tenth Street Place JPA. This was due to the timing of the Tenth Street Place JPA’s budget adoption and an increase in costs that they have distributed to all tenants in the building.
  
  - Following adoption of the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget, the Commission directed Staff to research the costs to begin videotaping and televising LAFCO’s meetings. Costs for this media expense were identified as being relatively minor and easily absorbed by the Miscellaneous Expense account (intended for unanticipated services and supplies costs). During the next budget year, it is anticipated that these costs will be budgeted separately, subject to the Commission’s approval.
  
  - Charges for legal services are typically billed on a quarterly basis following the completion of the quarter. Although LAFCO has not yet been billed for services in the second quarter, it is anticipated that legal service expenditures will be well within the budgeted amount by the year’s end.

- **Other Charges:**

  This budget category contains expenses associated with a shared copier lease and copy costs. At Mid-Year, expenditures under this budget category were $627 or just 23% of the amount budgeted. This lower amount is as a result of Staff’s efforts to decrease the number of paper copies associated with agendas and projects.

- **Revenues:**

  The County and nine cities have paid their apportionment shares totaling $330,936. Additionally, revenue received from LAFCO application fees and services thus far totals $18,551, exceeding a conservative estimate of $6,000. Staff anticipates that this will increase by year-end, as additional out-of-boundary and annexation applications are expected to be submitted in the coming months.

- **Reserves:**

  For Fiscal Year 2016-2017, the Commission identified a General Reserve Fund (15%) of $62,000 and an Accrued Leave Fund of $51,800. To date, neither of these reserve funds has been used. These amounts will be reviewed during the proposed budget.
CONCLUSION

The Commission’s Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Budget continues to be financially sound. Each category is projected to be within their budgeted amounts by year-end. Any funds anticipated to be remaining at the end of the fiscal year will be used to offset agency contributions in the following year’s budget. No budget adjustments are recommended at this time. If future modifications are needed, Staff will immediately bring forth those requests to the Commission for consideration.

Attachments: LAFCO Expense and Revenue Summary – July 1, 2016 to December 31, 2016
### EXPENSE AND REVENUE SUMMARY
**JULY 1, 2016 - DECEMBER 31, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Final Budget FY16-17</th>
<th>Actuals 12-31-2016</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries and Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50000+  Salaries and wages</td>
<td>$210,931</td>
<td>$104,115</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52000  Retirement</td>
<td>53,350</td>
<td>23,778</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52010  FICA</td>
<td>18,483</td>
<td>8,097</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52020  Deferred comp - part-time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53000  Group health insurance</td>
<td>39,731</td>
<td>14,883</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53009  OPEB health insurance liability</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53020  Unemployment insurance</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53051  Benefits admin fee</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53081  Long term disability</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54000  Workers compensation insurance</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55000  Auto allowance</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55080  Professional development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55130  Deferred comp mgmt/conf</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salaries and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>$332,382</td>
<td>$156,420</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60400  Communications (SBT - Telecom)</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61000  Insurance (SDRMA)</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61030  Fiduciary liability insurance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62200  Memberships (CSDA, CALAFCO)</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>5,321</td>
<td>100.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62400  Miscellaneous expense</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62450  Indirect costs (A87 roll forward)</td>
<td>(423)</td>
<td>(924)</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62600  Office supplies</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62730  Postage</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62750  Other mail room expense</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63000  Professional &amp; special serv</td>
<td>10,923</td>
<td>7,107</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building maintenance</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office lease</td>
<td>3,683</td>
<td>3,683</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/RM overhead</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63090  Auditing &amp; accounting</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63400  Engineering services</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63640  Legal services</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63990  Outside data proc services (IT &amp; GIS Lic)</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65000  Publications &amp; legal notices</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65660  Special dept expense (Biennial Audit)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65780  Education &amp; training</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65810  Other supportive services (messenger)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65890  Commission expense</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67040  Other travel expenses</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67201  Salvage disposal</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Services and Supplies</strong></td>
<td>$77,373</td>
<td>$32,836</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Charges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73024  Planning dept services</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>$627</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Charges</strong></td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>$627</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$412,505</td>
<td>$189,883</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>$336,936</td>
<td>$350,947</td>
<td>104.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40680+  Agency Contributions</td>
<td>330,936</td>
<td>330,936</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36414  Application &amp; Other Revenues</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>18,551</td>
<td>309.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40400+  Miscellaneous/Reimbursements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17000  Interest Earnings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S AGENDA REPORT
JANUARY 25, 2017

TO: LAFCO Commissioners
FROM: Jennifer Goss, Commission Clerk
SUBJECT: Annual Election of Officers (Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson)

BACKGROUND

The Commission’s adopted Policies and Procedures includes Rules of Order, which establishes the terms and rotation schedule for the annual election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson. The established annual term of office for these officers is from February 1st through January 31st.

Based on the current rotation of officers, as established in the adopted Rules of Order (Rule 4), the Office of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be rotated among the members according to the following sequence: Chairperson – City Member and Vice-Chairperson – County Member. Alternate members are not eligible to be officers.

Thus, Commissioner Bublak, as the current Vice-Chair is eligible for Chairperson, as well as Commissioner Dunlop, and the Vice-Chairperson would be selected from the two Regular County Members, Commissioner Jim DeMartini and Commissioner Terry Withrow. (See attached Rotation Schedule.)

RECOMMENDATION

If your Commission agrees with the terms of office and the rotation of officers as per Rule 4, it is recommended that the Commission adopt the attached Resolution selecting a new Chairperson (City Member) and a Vice-Chairperson (County Member) for the annual term of February 1, 2017 to January 31, 2018.

Attachments: LAFCO Resolution No. 2017-01
Rotation Schedule

(I: LAFCO\Admin\Election of Officers\2017\EO Report)
STANISLAUS COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY
FORMATION COMMISSION

RESOLUTION

DATE: January 25, 2017

NO. 2016-01

SUBJECT: Annual Election of Officers (Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson)

On the motion of Commissioner , seconded by Commissioner , and approved by the following:

Ayes: Commissioners:
Noes: Commissioners:
Ineligible: Commissioners:
Absent: Commissioners:

THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED:

WHEREAS, in accordance with Government Code Section 56334 and Commission Rules of Order, the members of the Commission shall elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson at the first meeting in January of each year;

WHEREAS, the Commission’s Rules of Order, under Rule 4, provides for the systematic rotation of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson among its members;

WHEREAS, the terms of the present officers expire on January 31, 2017; and,

WHEREAS, based on adopted Commission Policies and Procedures, the rotation of its members for the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, a City Member and a County Member are in line for these office seats, respectively.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission:

1. Elects Commissioner as Chairperson and Commissioner as Vice-Chairperson for a term of office commencing February 1, 2017 through January 31, 2018.

ATTEST: ____________________________
Sara Lytle-Pinhey
Executive Officer
### COMMISSIONER ROTATION SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotation</th>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Vice-Chairperson</th>
<th>Rotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2/2009 - 1/2010</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>DeMartini</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2/2010 - 1/2011</td>
<td>DeMartini</td>
<td>Saletta</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2/2012 - 1/2013</td>
<td>Goeken</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2/2013 - 1/2014</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td>Bublak</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2/2014 - 1/2015</td>
<td>Bublak</td>
<td>DeMartini</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2/2015 - 1/2016</td>
<td>DeMartini</td>
<td>Hawn</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2/2016 - 1/2017</td>
<td>Hawn</td>
<td>Bublak</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2/2017 - 1/2018</td>
<td>Bublak</td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2/2018 - 1/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: LAFCO Commissioners

FROM: Sara Lytle-Pinhey, Executive Officer

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF 2017 EXPIRING TERMS FOR PUBLIC MEMBERS AND APPOINTMENT OF A SUBCOMMITTEE

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission direct the Executive Officer to initiate the Public Member recruitment process. It is also recommended that the Commission appoint a subcommittee for the initial screening of applications.

BACKGROUND

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg (CKH) Act sets forth the composition of the Commission. For Stanislaus County, this includes two county members, two city members, and one public member. Each category also has one alternate member.

Appointments for the county and city members are made by the Board of Supervisors and City Selection Committee, respectively. Appointments for the public members are made by the county and city members on LAFCO. Public members must receive an affirmative vote of at least one member from each of the other categories (city and county). The term of office for a public member or alternate public member is limited to four years in each position and until a replacement is appointed by the Commission.

DISCUSSION

Each of the Commission’s Public Members terms of office is scheduled to expire this year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Appointing Authority</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad Hawn, Public Member</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>May 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annabel Gammon, Alternate Public Member</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>May 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If appointments for the affected seats are not made by May 1st, the current seat holders may remain on the Commission until replaced as provided under LAFCO law.

Recruitment Process and Subcommittee

In accordance with Government Code Section 56325(d) and the Commission’s policies, whenever a vacancy occurs in the public member or alternate public member position, a notice of vacancy shall be posted and a copy of the notice shall be sent to the clerk or secretary of the legislative body of each local agency within the county. In addition, Staff also advertises vacancies through its website, social media, and press releases.

Once applications are received, a subcommittee (typically one city member and one county member) reviews the applications and brings its recommendation to the full commission. The following table outlines the suggested timeline for the recruitment and selection process.
CONCLUSION

At this time, it is recommended that the Commission select a subcommittee of a County member and City member to review applications and direct Staff to proceed with the Public Member recruitment schedule as outlined above.