

LAFCO

Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission

105 East Anapamu Street ♦ Santa Barbara CA 93101

805/568-3391 ♦ FAX 805/647-7647

www.sblafco.org ♦ lafco@sblafco.org

September 6, 2012 (Agenda)

Local Agency Formation Commission
105 East Anapamu Street, Room 403
Santa Barbara CA 93101

Commission Workshop on Goals, Plans and Procedures

Dear Members of the Commission:

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended the Commission consider this report and provide direction as appropriate.

DISCUSSION

Introduction

On June 7 the Commission discussed scheduling a workshop or retreat to evaluate Commission goals and procedures. Staff was directed to provide information to assist in determining how the Commission wishes to proceed.

There are many options. The workshop can be part of a regular meeting or be held on a different date and location. It can be a formal discussion of specific subjects or less formal round-table about objectives for the Commission and organization of local agencies in Santa Barbara County.

Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act

LAFCO has been created in each county by the legislature to carry out State priorities. Staff believes the following sections are particularly relevant to the proposed workshop since they set forth State policies and expectations.

The initial section in the Act (Government Code Section 56001) states:

The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state to encourage orderly growth and development which are essential to the social, fiscal, and economic well-being of the state.

Commissioners: Jeff Moorhouse, Chair ♦ Lupe Alvarez ♦ Doreen Farr ♦ Craig Geyer ♦ Bob Orach ♦ Bob Short
Janet Wolf ♦ Roger Aceves ♦ John Fox ♦ Steve Lavagnino ♦ Roger Welt **Executive Officer:** Bob Braitman

AGENDA ITEM NO. 12

The Legislature recognizes that the logical formation and determination of local agency boundaries is an important factor in promoting orderly development and in balancing that development with sometimes competing state interests of discouraging urban sprawl, preserving open-space and prime agricultural lands, and efficiently extending government services.

The Legislature also recognizes that providing housing for persons and families of all incomes is an important factor in promoting orderly development.

Therefore, the Legislature further finds and declares that this policy should be effected by the logical formation and modification of the boundaries of local agencies, with a preference granted to accommodating additional growth within, or through the expansion of, the boundaries of those local agencies which can best accommodate and provide necessary governmental services and housing for persons and families of all incomes in the most efficient manner feasible.

LAFCO's basic legislated purposes are set forth in G.C. Section 53301:

Among the purposes of a commission are discouraging urban sprawl, preserving open-space and prime agricultural lands, efficiently providing government services, and encouraging the orderly formation and development of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances. One of the objects of the commission is to make studies and to obtain and furnish information which will contribute to the logical and reasonable development of local agencies in each county and to shape the development of local agencies so as to advantageously provide for the present and future needs of each county and its communities.

When the formation of a new government entity is proposed, a commission shall make a determination as to whether existing agencies can feasibly provide the needed service or services in a more efficient and accountable manner. If a new single-purpose agency is deemed necessary, the commission shall consider reorganization with other single-purpose agencies that provide related services.

G.C. Section 56377 provides that:

In reviewing and approving or disapproving proposals which could reasonably be expected to induce, facilitate, or lead to the conversion of existing open-space lands to uses other than open-space uses, the commission shall consider all of the following policies and priorities:

(a) Development or use of land for other than open-space uses shall be guided away from existing prime agricultural lands in open-space use toward areas containing nonprime agricultural lands, unless that action would not promote the planned, orderly, efficient development of an area.

(b) Development of existing vacant or nonprime agricultural lands for urban uses within the existing jurisdiction of a local agency or within the sphere of influence of a local agency should be encouraged before any proposal is approved which would allow for or lead to the development of existing open-space lands for non-open-space uses which are outside of the existing jurisdiction of the local agency or outside of the existing sphere of influence of the local agency.

Existing Santa Barbara LAFCO Policy Guidelines and Standards

The Commission has policies and standards regarding governmental organization, boundary changes and the extension of services. The “Policy Guidelines and Standards” section of the Commissioner Handbook is attached.

Santa Barbara LAFCO Workshops and Retreats

The Commission has, from time to time, received or conducted various studies.

- In July 1996 after reporting on LAFCO Purposes and Strategic Plan, staff was directed to present updated policies and standards for future review. This has occurred over time.
- In September 2003 the Commission held a retreat at Chase Palm Park in Santa Barbara, facilitated by Tom Keifer, to discuss goals, objectives and expectations for coming years.
- The Commission has conducted workshops or study sessions on a variety of specific subjects, which have included:
 - Financing Santa Maria school facilities
 - Concept of LAFCO-approved Community Planning Areas
 - Preparing Municipal Service Reviews in conjunction with updating Spheres of Influence
 - Governance options for the Eastern Goleta Valley
 - UCSB long range development plans with Vice Chancellor Mark Fischer.

Experiences by Other LAFCOs

Following the June 7 meeting we asked other LAFCOs about their experiences with conducting study sessions or retreats. For reference the responses we received are attached.

Commission Alternatives

If the Commission determines to proceed with a study session it should decide:

- Whether the session should be held as part of the regular meeting on the first Thursday of the month or should be another day and perhaps at an off-site location,
- Allotted time for the session (half day, full day, etc.)
- The topics or subjects that should be on the agenda for discussion,
- What outcome or results should be expected, and
- Whether a professional facilitator should be retained to assist in conducting the meeting.

Once the Commission determines whether to schedule a retreat or study session, the staff will proceed to finalize the desired arrangements.

Please contact the LAFCO office if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bob Braitman". The signature is stylized and includes a long horizontal line extending to the right.

BOB BRAITMAN
Executive Officer

POLICY GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

LAFCO's are charged with establishing policies and exercising their powers ". . . in a manner that encourages and provides planned, well-ordered, efficient urban development patterns with appropriate consideration of preserving open-space lands within those patterns" and with ". . . the discouragement of urban sprawl and the encouragement of the orderly formation and development of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances." (Government Code Sections 56300 and 56301) In carrying out its responsibilities, each LAFCO must conduct various studies and review and make determinations on changes of organization, reorganizations and spheres of influence. The following policies and standards have been adopted by the Santa Barbara LAFCO to assist in the review of proposals and the preparation of studies as necessary.

I. POLICIES ENCOURAGING ORDERLY FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF AGENCIES

1. Any proposal for a change or organization or reorganization shall contain sufficient information to determine that adequate services, facilities, and improvements can be provided and financed by the agencies responsible for the provision of such services, facilities, and improvements.
2. All lands proposed for annexation to cities shall be rezoned prior to the submission of an application to the Local Agency Formation Commission. The City shall be lead agency for environmental review in such cases, and environmental documentation shall accompany the application.
3. Reorganization of overlapping and competing agencies or the correction of illogical boundaries dividing agency service areas is recommended. The Commission encourages reorganizations, consolidations, mergers, or dissolutions where the result will be better service, reduced cost, and/or more efficient and visible administration or services to the citizens.
4. In order to minimize the number of agencies providing services proposals for formation of new agencies shall be discouraged unless there is evidenced a clear need for the agency's services from the landowners and/or residents; there are no other existing agencies that are able to annex and provide similar services; and there is an ability of the new agency to provide for an finance the needed new services.

II. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE POLICIES

A sphere of influence establishes the probably ultimate physical boundaries and service area of each governmental agency within the county. Once adopted, these spheres of influence are to be used by the Commission as one factor in making decision on proposal over which it has jurisdiction and as a basis for recommendations on governmental reorganization. A proposal shall not be approved solely because the area falls within the sphere of influence of an agency.

Sphere of Influence determinations are to be reviewed periodically and changed or updated as circumstances may require in the opinion of LAFCO. Such periodic review should be made approximately every five years.

The Commission will generally apply the following policy guidelines in spheres of influence determinations while also taking into account local conditions and needs.

1. The plans and objectives contained within the adopted General Plans of the cities and the county will be supported. In cases where these plans are inconsistent, the Commission will adopt findings relative to its decision.
2. Community-centered urban development will be encouraged wherever justified on the basis of reduced cost of desired levels of community services, energy conservation, and preservation of agricultural and open space resources.
3. Duplication of authority to perform similar service functions in the same territory will be avoided.
4. Multiple-service agencies will be preferred to a number of limited services districts. In this regard, city provision of multiple services will be preferred where possible because of the substantially broader authority and responsibility to provide services and controls to their constituencies, including land-use planning controls.
5. Where possible, a single larger agency rather than a number of adjacent smaller ones, established for a given service in the same general area, will be preferred.
6. An economically sound base for financing services without including territories which will not benefit from the services will be promoted.
7. Sphere of influence lines shall seek to preserve community identity and boundaries and will urge the political and functional consolidation of local government agencies that cross-cut those affected communities.

-
8. Sphere of influence lines may be larger or smaller than existing local agency boundaries and may lead to recommendations for changes of organization.
 9. Agencies which do not have major impact upon land, road, or capital facilities planning (such as cemetery districts) shall general have a sphere of influence which is coterminous with their existing jurisdictional boundaries.
 10. Agricultural resources and support facilities should be given special consideration in sphere of influence designations. High value agriculture areas, including areas of established crop production, with soils of high agricultural capability should be maintained in agriculture, and in general should not be included in an urban service sphere of influence.
 11. The Commission will consider area-wide needs for governmental services and evaluate individual districts serving the area as they relate to the total system of the existing local government in the community and alternative arrangements.

Environmental Review

A LAFCO sphere of influence determination is subject to review under the provision of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In order to enable environmental considerations to be effectively integrated into a sphere of influence determination, and environmental review will be conducted concurrently with the development of the sphere of influence determination.

Inasmuch as a sphere of influence determination represents the potential extension of the services of a local governmental agency, the environmental impacts associated with a sphere of influence are of a long-range nature. Thus the "Degree of Specificity" of the environmental review reflects the regional nature of a sphere decision. It is necessary of a general nature, focusing on the secondary, indirect impacts associates with the future extension of services within a sphere boundary.

The determination of whether or not an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is necessary for a sphere of influence determination, i.e., the "Level of Significance" associated with a sphere determination, will necessarily vary according to the environmental resources affected by a sphere designation.

1. All environmental documents shall be prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and implementing CEQA Guidelines, including applicable implementing guides of LAFCO, and the lead agency preparing the environmental document.

-
2. In cases where it is deemed appropriate, LAFCO may designate the affected agency as the lead agency. The level of environmental review shall be determined through the scoping process as provided by CEQA and shall involve all applicable agencies.
 3. If the environmental document is prepared jointly by two or more agencies, there shall be a Memorandum of Understanding prepared setting forth the project description, scope of work to be accomplished and the responsibilities of each governmental agency involved. Said Memorandum shall be approved by LAFCO prior to commencing work on the environmental document.
 4. Environmental documents prepared for use by LAFCO in the decision making process shall be summarized in a manner directly related to said process. Procedure shall be set forth by LAFCO and distributed to all governmental agencies within LAFCO's jurisdiction.

III. POLICIES ENCOURAGING CONSISTENCY WITH SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

1. All proposals approved by the Commission shall be consistent with adopted spheres of influence and Commission policies. Within the sphere of influence each agency should implement an orderly, phased annexation program.
2. Already developed unincorporated lands located within the established sphere of influence boundary of a city and which benefit from municipal services provided by such city should be annexed to that city. Vacant land in the same position should be annexed prior to development. LAFCO recognizes that costs for serving some developed unincorporated areas, when studied independently, may exceed revenues. In other cases, revenues will exceed service costs. To the fullest extent possible, cities should develop programs that propose annexation of several areas which, if combined together, achieve a net balance in city costs and revenues.
3. Districts within a city's sphere of influence should develop plans for orderly detachment of territory from the district or merger of the district as territory is annexed to the city and should plan capital improvements according, except where the type of district services provided are not provided by the city. The county shall be encouraged to ensure that development within a sphere of influence and area of interest meets city standards for public facilities and improvements by providing for city review of all county proposals within the city's area of interest.

IV. POLICIES ENCOURAGING ORDERLY URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND PRESERVATION OF OPEN SPACE PATTERNS

1. The Commission encourages will planned, orderly, and efficient urban development patterns for all developing areas. Also, the county, cities, and those districts providing urban services, are encouraged to develop and implement plans and policies which will provided for well-planned, orderly and efficient urban development patterns, with consideration of preserving permanent open space lands within those urban patterns.
2. Development of existing vacant non open space, and nonprime agricultural land within an agency's boundaries is encouraged prior to further annexation and development. However, where open land adjacent to the agencies are of low agricultural, scenic, or biological value, annexation of those lands may be considered over development of prime agricultural land already existing within an agency's jurisdiction.
3. Proposals to annex undeveloped or agricultural parcels to cities or districts providing urban services shall demonstrate that urban development is imminent for all or a substantial portion of the proposal area; that urban development will be contiguous with existing or proposed development; and that a planned, orderly, and efficient urban development pattern will result. Proposals resulting in a leapfrog, non-contiguous urban pattern will be discouraged.
4. Consideration shall be given to permitting sufficient vacant land within each city and/or agency in order to encourage economic development, reduce the cost of housing, and allow timing options for physical and orderly development.

V. POLICIES ENCOURAGING CONSERVATION OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL LANDS AND OPEN SPACE AREAS

1. Proposals which would conflict with the goals of maintaining the physical and economic integrity of open space lands, agricultural lands, or agricultural preserve areas in open space uses, as indicated on the city or county general plan, shall be discouraged.
2. Annexation and development of existing vacant non-open space lands, and nonprime agricultural land within an agency's sphere of influence is encouraged to occur prior to development outside of an existing sphere of influence.
3. A sphere of influence revision or update for an agency providing urban services where the revision includes prior agricultural land shall be discouraged. Development shall be guided towards areas containing nonprime agricultural lands, unless such action will promote disorderly, inefficient development of the community or area.

-
4. Loss of agricultural lands should not be a primary issue for annexation where city and county general plans both indicate that urban development is appropriate and where there is consistency with the agency's sphere of influence. However, the loss of any primer agricultural soils should be balanced against other LAFCO policies and a LAFCO goal of conserving such lands.

COMMISSION STANDARDS FOR REVIEW OF PROPOSALS

As authorized by State law, the Commission has adopted the following standards fro review of city annexations, district annexation, city incorporation and district formation proposals. Factors are given for both approval and disapproval. The presence of individual positive or negative factors do not dictate approval or denial, but a preponderance of positive or negative factors should be the determinant of approval or denial.

VI. STANDARDS FOR ANNEXATIONS TO CITIES

Factors Favorable to Approval:

1. Proposal would eliminate islands, corridors, or other distortion of existing boundaries.
2. Proposed area is urban in character or urban development is imminent, requiring municipal or urban-type services.
3. Proposed area can be provided all urban services by agency as shown by agency service plan and proposals would enhance the efficient provision of urban services.
4. Proposal is consistent with the adopted spheres of influence and adopted general plans.
5. Request is by an agency for annexation of its publicly-owned property, used for public purposes.

Factors Unfavorable to Approval:

6. Proposal would create islands, corridors or peninsulas of city or district area or would otherwise cause or further the distortion of existing boundaries.
7. The proposal would result in a premature intrusion of urbanization into a predominantly agricultural or rural area.

-
8. For reasons of topography, distance, natural boundaries, or like considerations, the extension of services would be financially infeasible, or another means of supplying services by acceptable alternatives is preferable.
 9. Annexation would encourage a type of development in an area which due to terrain, isolation, or other economic or social reason, such development is not in the public interest.
 10. The proposal appears to be motivated by inter-agency rivalry, land speculation, or other motives not in the public interest.
 11. Boundaries of proposed annexation do not include logical service area or are otherwise improperly drawn.
 12. The proposal is inconsistent with adopted spheres of influence and adopted general plans.

VII. STANDARDS FOR CITY INCORPORATION

Factors Favorable to Approval:

1. Need for organized municipal or urban-type services.
2. A relatively dense population in a well-defined reasonably compact area.
3. Adequate property tax revenue and a sufficiently high base for sales tax, highway users tax, motor vehicle in lieu tax, and similar State-collected and disbursed funds, in relation to anticipated costs of required services as to make incorporation financially feasible.
4. The likelihood of continued substantial growth within the proposed area and adjacent areas during the next ten years.
5. Remoteness from other highly populated areas and particularly from an existing city to which the area proposed for incorporation could be annexed.
6. Alternate means of furnishing required services are infeasible or undesirable.
7. No adverse effect upon long-range provision for adequate local governmental services by other agencies to a larger region of which the area proposed for incorporation is an integral part.
8. Is consistent with adopted spheres of influence and the county adopted general plan.

Factors Unfavorable to Approval:

9. Relatively low population density.
10. No or slight need for municipal urban-type services.
11. Population not in a reasonably compact or defined community.
12. Low property tax revenue, low retail sales of gasoline and other retail sales in relation to anticipated costs of services as to make incorporation financially infeasible.
13. Area proposed for incorporation is in close proximity to an existing city to which it could be annexed.
14. Incorporation is premature in view of lack of anticipated substantial growth within the next ten years.
15. Property boundaries do not include all urbanized areas or are otherwise improperly drawn.
16. Incorporation would have an adverse effect upon the long-range provision of local governmental services to a larger region of which the area proposed for incorporation forms an integral part.
17. The proposal is not consistent with adopted spheres of influence and adopted general plans.

VIII. STANDARDS FOR DISTRICT FORMATION

Factors Favorable to Approval:

1. Development requires one or more urban-type services, and by reason of location or other consideration such service or services may not be provided by any of the following means in descending order of preference:
 - (a) Annexation to an existing city.
 - (b) Annexation to an existing district of which the Board of Supervisors is the governing body.
 - (c) Annexation to an existing district with an independent governing body.
2. The proposal is for a primarily rural or agricultural area and is for a limited non-urban type services which cannot be provided by an existing dependent or independent district.

-
3. The proposal is consistent with adopted spheres of influence and does not conflict with city or county general plans.

Factors Unfavorable to Approval:

4. Slight need for urban-type services or required services may be provided by alternates in descending order of preference:
 - (a) Annexation to an existing city.
 - (b) Annexation to an existing district of which the Board of Supervisors is the governing body.
 - (c) Annexation to an existing district with an independent governing body.
5. By reason of relatively low revenue base in relationship to the cost of desired services, the proposal is financially infeasible and not in the public interest.
6. Due to topography, isolation from existing developments, premature intrusion or urban-type developments into a predominantly agricultural area or other pertinent economic or social reasons, urban-type development which would be fostered by proposal is not in the public interest.
7. Boundaries of the proposal do not include all of the service areas or potential service area or are otherwise improperly drawn.
8. Proposal would result in a multiplication of public districts making difficult the ultimate provision of adequate full local governmental services to a larger region of which the area proposed is an integral part.
9. District proposed is not the best suited to the purpose and better alternate types are not available.
10. Proposal is inconsistent with adopted spheres of influence and adopted general plans.

IX. STANDARDS FOR OUT-OF-AGENCY SERVICE AGREEMENTS

Considerations for Approving Agreements

Annexations to cities and special districts are generally preferred for providing public services, however, out-of-agency service agreements can be an appropriate alternative.

While each proposal must be decided on its own merits, the Commission may favorably consider such agreements in the following situations:

-
1. Services will be provided to a small portion of a larger parcel and annexation of the entire parcel would be inappropriate in terms of orderly boundaries, adopted land use plans, open space/greenbelt agreements or other relevant factors.
 2. Lack of contiguity makes annexation infeasible given current boundaries and the requested public service is justified based on adopted land use plans or other entitlements for use.
 3. Where public agencies have a formal agreement defining service areas, provided LAFCO has formally recognized the boundaries of the agreement area
 4. Emergency or health related conditions mitigate against waiting for annexation.
 5. Other circumstances which are consistent with the statutory purposes and the policies and standards of the Santa Barbara LAFCO.

Agreements Consenting to Annex

Whenever the affected property may ultimately be annexed to the agency, a standard condition for approval of an out-of-agency service agreement is recordation of an agreement by the landowner consenting to annex the territory, which agreement shall inure to future owners of the property.

Approval by Chair

The Chair may authorize cities and special districts to provide services outside of their boundaries as specified herein.

1. A request and application is received from the affected local agency, including the requisite processing fee.
2. The situation involves public health, safety or welfare to such a degree that delaying the approval of the service agreement until the next LAFCO meeting is deemed by the Chair to represent an intolerable delay or risk to the public health, safety or welfare.
3. The property to which the out-of-agency services will be extended or provided is within the sphere of influence of the affected agency.
4. If the affected property may ultimately be annexed to the service agency, the landowner shall execute and record an agreement consenting to annex the territory to the affected district and shall deposit with LAFCO or the service agency funds sufficient to process said future annexation.
5. In the absence of the Chair or if the Chair is not available to act, the Vice Chair is authorized to exercise the authorities set forth in this resolution.

-
6. The Executive Officer shall provide a report to the Commission at the next LAFCO meeting of any out-of-agency service agreements that were approved.

It is intended that the authority delegated to the Chair or Vice-Chair to approve out-of-agency service agreements be exercised in a manner consistent with the Commission's adopted standards.

X. RECONSIDERATION OF LAFCO DECISIONS

Content of requests for reconsideration

Requests for reconsideration of LAFCO resolutions making determinations will be evaluated for approval only when the applicant meets the statutory deadline for submitting the request, the request sets forth the specific modification being sought, a processing fee is paid and

- A. Reconsideration is required to correct a procedural defect in its earlier action; or
- B. Newly discovered evidence, material to the request for reconsideration and relevant to the Commission's decision on the boundary change, is available which could not, with reasonable diligence, have been discovered and produced at the time of initial LAFCO consideration.

Payment and Refund of Processing Fee

A request for reconsideration shall not be accepted as being complete until a processing fee is received. The fee to request reconsideration shall be as set forth in the LAFCO fee schedule, as it is amended from time to time.

The fee paid shall be returned to an applicant for reconsideration in the event the Commission determines that reconsideration is required to correct a procedural defect in its earlier action.

XI. STATE REVIEW OF COMPREHENSIVE FISCAL ANALYSIS (CFA)

Request for Review

Requests for State Controller review of a Comprehensive Fiscal Analysis (CFA) filed pursuant to Government Code §56833.3 must be made in writing not later than 30 calendar days from the date notice is published that the CFA is available for public review. Requests shall specify in writing the elements of the CFA the Controller is requested to review and the reasons the Controller is requested to review them.

Persons requesting the review shall be responsible for costs incurred in obtaining the review and shall deposit with the Executive Officer, at the time the request is filed and before it is found to be valid, the amount estimated by the

Executive Officer as necessary to cover the costs of the State Controller's review.

Within 30 days of issuance of the State Controller's report, the Executive Officer shall refund any amount of the deposit remaining after costs have been paid. In the event the amount to be paid exceeds the deposit, the requesting party shall be liable for the balance due.

XII. EXTENDING URBAN UTILITY SERVICES TO AGRICULTURAL PARCELS

It is the policy of the Commission to protect and preserve agriculture by avoiding the extension of potable water or wastewater services (sewers) to agriculturally zoned land because this fosters uses other than agriculture.

Any LAFCO approval of a change of organization or out of agency service agreement that allows the extension of potable water or wastewater services to a parcel zoned for agricultural use will only be approved, if at all, if the approval is limited to that portion of the parcel that includes an approved use that needs potable water or wastewater services, provided the use does not compromise agricultural viability.

This policy shall not be construed as indicating the Commission will approve proposals that lead to non-agricultural uses on agricultural parcels but rather indicates that should such approval be granted it is to be restricted to the specific area in which an approved land use requiring potable water or wastewater services is to occur.

XIII. LAPSED OR ABANDONED PROPOSALS

When the Executive Officer deems an application to be incomplete he/she shall notify the applicant in writing either by personal service or via certified mail. The applicant shall have 180 days from receipt of such notice to submit additional information and/or revised documents. If the applicant does not resubmit the application to the Executive Officer within 180 days, the application shall be considered abandoned. The proposal may be reinitiated through a new application consistent with the requirements of applicable law and LAFCO policies and fee schedule.

*Adopted June 16, 1988
Revised December 13, 1996
Revised November 4, 1999
Revised September 3, 2009
Revised July 7, 2011*

Experiences by Other LAFCOs

The Contra Costa LAFCO conducted a Strategic Workshop in August 2011. The agenda is attached and a professional facilitator was used. The LAFCO staff was a participant and did not prepare any background material.

The LAFCO staff reports the format worked well and topics of interest included the evolving role of LAFCO, the use of terms and conditions and the opportunity to prioritize activities.

The El Dorado LAFCO has not conducted a study session or retreat for several years, though they hold workshops to study specific issues. The staff prepares a report on the issues/questions/areas the Commission wants to study and attempts to provide answers, options and/or cite statutes and policies that frame the question. There have been workshops on policies relating to MSR/SOIs (both in general and specific to an agency, the El Dorado Hills incorporation effort and water.

The Los Angeles LAFCO does not conduct retreats or study sessions. If they were held it could be used to perhaps “approach” issues on a broader basis, as opposed to a single annexation, i.e., how to handle water availability or protect agricultural resources, whether to encourage island annexations and so forth.

The Napa LAFCO by practice every two years holds a “workshop” at an off-site location that rotates between the local cities. The workshop is an opportunity to step back and talk about respective duties/tasks in a more informal setting and fellowship with one another.

Each workshop is different and the agenda is developed between Executive Officer and the Chair with invited input from the Commissioners. Workshops typically last 4-5 hours and a box lunch or light breakfast is served.

Workshops have involved some policy review aspect – direct or indirect. The last workshop was in November 2011 and focused on strategic planning. We brought in an outside consultant to facilitate the discussion. It was a healthy discussion and ultimately served as the conduit for the Commission to adopt its first strategic plan.

The workshops are a chance to interact with Commissioners on a different level given it is more informal and there is no specific action on the table. It is also nice to see the Commissioners interact with each other without the usual politics in the room.

The Orange LAFCO has conducted an annual strategic planning session since 1998, following the annual adoption of budget. The purpose is to align the budget and staffing resources with ongoing and anticipated projects and produce an annual work plan.

The Commission reviews, evaluates and as necessary amends Commission procedures and policies. Topics vary. Recent sessions dealt with MSRs, SOIs, and unincorporated islands.

Strategic planning sessions help Commission and staff better understand priorities, policies and aligning of agency resources.

The Sacramento LAFCO does not hold retreats; workshops are incorporated into regular meetings; otherwise scheduling becomes a problem. There have been workshops regarding housing allocation, sustainable water, open space and agricultural preservation, geographic environmental settings and resources, Spheres of Influence and Municipal Service Reviews.

Staff develops background material, occasionally with policy recommendations, and invites experts in the field of discussion. The format is typically informal. Interested parties are encouraged to address the Commission in the Workshop setting.

The San Luis Obispo LAFCO has completed a number of proposal/policy specific study sessions. It uses study sessions on a regular basis for its SOI/MSR Update program. The staff typically provides a report and recommendation for the Commission to provide staff with input and direction. The public is given a chance to provide testimony.

The Santa Cruz LAFCO has not held a retreat. The normal opportunity to evaluate its mission is at the beginning of each budget session during review of the work program.



Commission Strategic Workshop

Lafayette Community Center - Elderberry Room
500 St. Mary's Road – Lafayette, CA

SPECIAL MEETING

15 August 2011

AGENDA

Times are
approximate

- | | | |
|-------|---|--------------|
| 7:45 | Networking Breakfast | |
| 8:30 | Welcome from Chair | |
| 8:35 | Public Comment | |
| 8:40 | Facilitator role, agenda and groundrules | Bill Chiat |
| 8:45 | Discussion; <i>Expectations and Leadership</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Outcomes for the day; leadership lessons | Bill Chiat |
| 9:10 | Group Exploration: <i>Individual Role and Responsibilities</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Expectations of LAFCo Commissioners◆ Commissioner role and responsibilities in LAFCo policy and application decisions | Participants |
| 10:00 | Brainstorm: <i>Current/Challenging Issues for CoCo LAFCo</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Brainstorm and Prioritize◆ Emerging new roles of LAFCo | Participants |
| 10:30 | Group Explorations: <i>LAFCo Role in Prioritized Issues</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Examine authorities of LAFCo to address priorities◆ What can – can't LAFCo do | Small Groups |
| 11:15 | Discussion: Adaptive Leadership in Ambiguous Times <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Leadership practices to confront and facilitate change | Bill Chiat |
| 11:45 | Closure to Workshop Discussions <ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ Actions and Next Steps on Issues | Bill Chiat |
| Noon | Adjourn | |