

LAFCO MEMORANDUM

SANTA BARBARA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

105 East Anapamu Street • Santa Barbara CA 93101 • (805) 568-3391 + Fax (805) 568-2249

March 2, 2023 (Agenda)

TO: Each Member of the Commission

FROM: Mike Prater
Executive Officer

SUBJECT: CALAFCO White Paper entitled “Planning for a Sustainable and Predictable Future”

This is an Informational Report. No Action is Necessary

DISCUSSION

This White Paper on Planning for a Sustainable and Predictable Future, Clarifying LAFCo Authority to Determine Government Code Section 56133(e) Exemption Eligibility, 2022 was developed by CALAFCO in collaboration with staff from Butte LAFCo, San Diego LAFCo, and Ventura LAFCo and is based on the experiences of a number of LAFCos. The White Paper is intended address the lack of coordination and communication between agencies that ensues when cities and special districts inappropriately determine to go it alone and exempt themselves from notifying LAFCo – the defined regulatory agency for agency boundary changes and service provision – of extending services beyond their boundaries. A brief history and clarification for implementing Government Code Section 56133(e) are discussed along with an outline of the exemptions to be considered. Staff will share this White Paper with Cities and Special District Members.

Attachments

Attachment A – White Paper entitled “Planning for a Sustainable and Predictable Future, Clarifying LAFCo Authority to Determine Government Code Section 56133(e) Exemption Eligibility”

Please contact the LAFCO office if you have any questions.

PLANNING FOR A SUSTAINABLE AND PREDICTABLE FUTURE

Clarifying LAFCo Authority to Determine Government
Code Section 56133(e) Exemption Eligibility

2022



California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions (CALAFCO)
San Diego County LAFCo - Butte LAFCo - Ventura County LAFCo

www.calafco.org

ATTACHMENT A



ATTACHMENT A



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Background	6
Key Issues	10
<i>Key Examples</i>	11
Proposed Solution	16
Conclusion	17

INTRODUCTION

Good Planning Requires Oversight

The State of California has a history of prolific and, at times, unplanned growth but none more pronounced than in the years following World War II. Between 1940 and 1960 the population doubled and by the early 1960's California became the most populous state in the nation.¹ This rapid rise in population after the war led to rapid conversion of open space and agricultural land into suburbs. However, without oversight or a planning strategy, the resulting infrastructure was often haphazard or duplicative, which led to inefficiencies in service delivery while consuming valuable agricultural land.² The California legislature recognized the need for a separate yet local entity to provide oversight in the planning and provision of services, and enacted legislation creating Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCoS). The year was 1963, long before the words climate change or sustainability crept into the lexicon, yet the action was nonetheless prescient as strategic planning today is considered a core principle in sustainable infrastructure.³

In fact, a 2016 Brookings Institute report titled *Delivering on Sustainable Infrastructure for Better Development and Better Climate* found that sustainable infrastructure not only is key to avoiding extreme climate change but does so without deterring economic growth.

However, beyond that, sustainable infrastructure is also:

*...the key to poverty reduction and societal well-being in part because it enhances access to basic services and facilitates access to and knowledge about work opportunities, thus boosting human capital and quality of life. Sustainable infrastructure helps reduce poverty and extreme hunger, improve health and education levels, assist in attainment of gender equality, allows for the provision of clean water and sanitation, and provides access to affordable energy for all.*⁴

Additionally:

*...badly designed infrastructure can have significant adverse distributional, environmental and health impacts that can worsen poverty levels. Literature is abundant with examples of large-scale infrastructure investments that exacerbated income inequality, resulted in increased mortality and morbidity rates, and wrought irreversible ecosystem damage.*⁵

¹ James N. Gregory. "The Shaping of California History." Encyclopedia of American Social History (New York: Scribners, 1993).

² CALAFCO. "What is LAFCo's History?" <https://calafco.org/lafco-law/faq/what-lafcos-history>

³ Shirin Malekpour, Rebekah R. Brown, Fjalar J. de Haan. "Strategic planning of urban infrastructure for environmental sustainability: Understanding the past to intervene for the future." *Cities*, Volume 46, 2015, Pages 67-75.

⁴ Amar Bhattacharya, Joshua P. Meltzer, Jeremy Oppenheim, Zia Qureshi, Nicholas Stern. "Delivering on Sustainable Infrastructure for Better Development and Better Climate." Global Economy and Development at Brookings Institution. *The New Climate Economy*, Global Commission on the Economy and Climate. December 2016. p 2.

⁵ *Ibid.* p 5.

Fortunately, the state legislature gave LAFCos the regulatory oversight to provide this exact type of strategic land use and service planning through service reviews that they conduct when determining the spheres of influence (or the probable service boundaries) of an agency. Clearly, the stakes to ensure good planning of infrastructure and services could not be higher. That is why it is problematic when local entities avoid or ignore the LAFCo process.

This paper considers the lack of coordination and communication between agencies that ensues when cities and special districts inappropriately determine to go it alone and exempt themselves from notifying LAFCo – the defined regulatory agency for agency boundary changes and service provision – of extending services beyond their boundaries. Due to a lack of clarity, some agencies incorrectly assume they are exempt from LAFCo review under Government Code Section 56133(e) – a section that provides only limited conditions for such exemptions. This paper also considers the ramifications of this lack of clarity, including who determines whether a condition for exemption has been met and whether the proposed service provider is the most efficient and appropriate.

This paper is a collaboration of the California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions (CALAFCO), and staff from Butte LAFCo, San Diego LAFCo, and Ventura LAFCo and is based on the experiences of a number of LAFCos.



BACKGROUND



In 1963 when LAFCOs were created, the Legislature had three main policy objectives:

1. Discouraging urban sprawl;
2. Preserving open-space and prime agricultural lands; and,
3. Encouraging the efficient provision of government services and encouraging the orderly formation and development of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances.⁶

⁶ California Government Code Sections 56001, 56300, 56301, 56375.

Those objectives, and all LAFCo authorities, are codified under the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000⁷ which delegates the Legislature’s power to coordinate and oversee the boundaries of cities and special districts to LAFCos, as well as to provide regional growth management services.

Known as the Legislature’s “watchdog” for local governance issues⁸, each LAFCo is governed by a board of locally elected officials, including city council members, county supervisors, representatives from special districts (in 32 of the 58 LAFCos), and at least one member of the public appointed by the other members.

For LAFCos to achieve their objectives, the Legislature empowered them with the exclusive authority to determine the jurisdictional boundaries and service areas for each city and special district in the state. Indeed, a city or district must seek LAFCo approval to expand its jurisdictional boundaries or provide a service outside its jurisdictional boundaries. Coordinating and overseeing city and special district boundaries and service areas means LAFCos in each of the 58 counties have direct oversight on who can most efficiently provide services, the timing and location of development, and the type of services that are and are not available to support the development.

It is the Legislature’s preference that municipal services should only be provided to territory that is within a service provider’s jurisdictional boundaries and, to this end, it has placed limitations on the ability of a city or district to provide services outside those boundaries. State law provides that LAFCos shall have the power “To authorize a city or district to provide new or extended services outside its jurisdictional boundaries pursuant to Section 56133.”⁹ Government Code Section 56133 requires that a city or district obtain LAFCo approval in order to provide a new or extended service by contract or agreement outside its boundaries.¹⁰

However, the Legislature has limited LAFCo authority to approve such a service to two narrow circumstances:

1. The service is in anticipation of a later change of organization to be approved by LAFCo, usually annexation.¹¹ This ensures that the territory to be served will eventually be brought within the jurisdictional boundaries of the service provider in the future.
2. The service is to respond to an existing or impending threat to public health and safety,¹² as determined by LAFCo. This ensures that the service will not induce development but is limited to addressing public health and safety.

⁷ California Government Code Sections 56000-57550.

⁸ Fifth District: 274 Cal.App.2d 545. 1 July 1969

⁹ Government Code Section 56375(p)

¹⁰ Government Code Section 56133(a) – “A city or district may provide new or extended services by contract or agreement outside its jurisdictional boundary only if it first requests and receives written approval from the [local agency formation] commission of the county in which the affected territory is located.”

¹¹ Government Code Section 56133(b) – “The commission may authorize a city or district to provide new or extended services outside its jurisdictional boundary but within its sphere of influence in anticipation of a later change of organization.

¹² Government Code Section 56133(c) – “The commission may authorize a city or district to provide new or extended services outside its jurisdictional boundary and outside its sphere of influence to respond to an existing or impending threat to the health or safety of the public or the residents of the affected territory...”

Absent LAFCo's determination that either of these two circumstances exist, LAFCo has no authority to approve the service and, as a result, the city or district has no authority to provide the service. It is this limitation on the authority of cities and special districts that prevents them from bypassing LAFCo review when proposing to extend services outside their boundaries.

However, state law identifies certain service scenarios under which a city or district may provide services outside its boundaries without obtaining LAFCo approval. The Legislature took care to limit these "exemptions" to services that will not induce or promote development, again ensuring that LAFCo review is necessary for services that would promote development.

California Government Code Section 56133(e) outlines these exemptions as follows:

1. Two or more public agencies where the public service to be provided is an alternative to, or substitute for, public services already being provided by an existing public service provider and where the level of service to be provided is consistent with the level of service contemplated by the existing service provider.
2. The transfer of nonpotable or nontreated water.
3. The provision of surplus water to agricultural lands and facilities, including, but not limited to, incidental residential structures, for projects that serve conservation purposes or that directly support agricultural industries. However, prior to extending surplus water service to any project that will support or induce development, the city or district shall first request and receive written approval from the commission in the affected county.
4. An extended service that a city or district was providing on or before January 1, 2001.
5. A local publicly owned electric utility, as defined by Section 9604 of the Public Utilities Code, providing electric services that do not involve the acquisition, construction, or installation of electric distribution facilities by the local publicly owned electric utility, outside of the utility's jurisdictional boundary.
6. A fire protection contract, as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 56134.

While the language seems relatively clear cut at first reading, the lack of clarity has led to problems in the field that undermine the Legislature's intent for planning oversight by LAFCo. These exemptions have sometimes been utilized improperly as a "loophole" by local agencies to bypass LAFCo altogether; from executing contracts to sell water during a drought and utilizing a self-determined definition of "surplus water," to providing new and extended services which should be subject to thorough and transparent consideration by LAFCo on behalf of the general public. When confronted with the erroneous interpretation, some local entities have withdrawn their service contracts and initiated a LAFCo application; however, others, have been recalcitrant and uninterested in coordination with all affected local agencies.

Additionally, these self-exempted services lack the transparency and public process offered by LAFCo that is demanded by the taxpayers of the cities and districts who ultimately are responsible for funding the service. In addition, bypassing LAFCo review removes LAFCo as the external check to ensure that agricultural and open space lands are not being converted prematurely – as is the codified desire of the State of California.

In recent years, local LAFCOs have unearthed an increasing number of service contracts that have gone unreported and unevaluated by LAFCo because the parties to the contract, despite the clear intent of the law, self-determined that LAFCo notification was not necessary. Such contracts are not only the antithesis of strategic regional planning, which is the core of sustainable infrastructure, but they also are occurring in a fashion that is not transparent to district users, offer no oversight regarding the provision of services to disadvantaged unincorporated communities, and hold no guarantees of efficiency or that agricultural and open space land will be protected.



Discovery of these contracts after the fact requires significant local agency staff time to research, coordinate, and interface with local entities. Additionally, while the threat of litigation can and has been utilized by a number of LAFCOs to force compliance, not every county has the resources to fund their LAFCOs sufficiently to cover extraneous legal expenses. This last point is of significant importance as it allows those persons or entities with ample financial resources to sidestep the law because the affected LAFCo may be unable to defend itself or the law. Unfortunately, having to address these contracts after the fact consumes taxpayer dollars in the form of additional staff time to address it – with varying amounts of success – or costly litigation which many small counties simply cannot afford.

KEY ISSUES

Some local agencies have entered into contracts to provide new or extended services outside their boundaries, without benefit of LAFCo consideration, using the exemptions under Government Code Section 56133(e).

This practice creates numerous problems including:

1. Conflict Among Agencies

Unintentionally creating conflict between local agencies when a service encroaches into the jurisdiction of another agency and competing for grant money, customers, etc.

2. Disorderly Boundaries

In some instances, the extension of services outside of an agency's jurisdictional boundary in lieu of annexing the territory to the agency – including island areas – can create disorderly service areas. This can lead to jurisdictions with overlapping service areas causing duplicative services and conflict between agencies. In addition, an extension of services outside an agency's boundaries may exacerbate urban sprawl which is under LAFCo's authority to manage.

3. Conflicts with existing Government Code Section 56133(b)

Government Code Section 56133 (b) provides that a city or district may extend a service outside its boundaries only with LAFCo approval and only if the service is in anticipation of a later change of organization, usually annexation, as determined by LAFCo. When agencies fail to check-in with their local LAFCo on an extension of service, they undermine LAFCo's authority in determining whether this extension is in anticipation of a future annexation. Pertinently, this results in: (a) inhibiting LAFCo's ability to exercise its current authority to manage the orderly growth of an agency, and (b) allows agencies to extend their service areas without oversight or consideration of the current and future needs of the community.

4. Undermining the Legislature's Intent and LAFCo Authority

LAFCos are empowered by the Legislature to coordinate the orderly delivery of municipal services in concert with community needs and in step with regional growth management objectives. Together these are the main principle of strategic planning and, by extension, the core of sustainable infrastructure which alleviates a host of societal problems. Self-exempted service contracts create unnecessary costs and liabilities that are otherwise completely avoidable and significantly reduce a LAFCo's ability to plan sustainable infrastructure.

5. Creates Unpredictably in the Development Process

Private landowners make significant decisions about property based on established norms and laws and when these laws are not implemented equally throughout the community, county or state, the resulting uncertainty is troubling.

Development interests are also denied the predictability and certainty of the consistent implementation of local land use laws and the carefully planned and financed local infrastructure plans.

KEY EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 1

Mission Resource Conservation District (San Diego County)

In July 2018, San Diego LAFCo received a formal written complaint from the Resource Conservation District of Greater San Diego County alleging that the Mission Resource Conservation District was providing new and extended services by contract beyond its jurisdictional boundary. The complaint alleged that Mission RCD actively solicits, receives, and acts on grant awards to provide services (vegetation control, irrigation audits, etc.) outside of its boundary and within the boundary of the RCD of Greater San Diego County.

Upon review of the complaint the San Diego LAFCo found the claims to be substantiated and in March 2019 issued a Cease and Desist order directing Mission RCD to immediately stop specified outside service activities due to failure to comply with Government Code Section 56133. Mission RCD responded to the cease and desist order by formally self-exempting themselves at a public Board meeting and in doing so citing eligibility to do so under Government Code Section 56133(e) despite the objections from San Diego LAFCo. The issue remains an open dispute with litigation on multiple fronts remaining a distinct possibility.

EXAMPLE 2

City of American Canyon/County of Napa (Napa County)

During the preparation of an inaugural Municipal Service Review (MSR) (2003-2004) on the City of American Canyon, Napa LAFCo became aware that the City was providing new and extended water services - outside its jurisdictional boundary - and predominantly within the County Airport Industrial Area located north of the City.

The enactment of Government Code Section 56133 was flagged in the MSR and proceeded to become the subject of a stand-alone analysis performed in 2007 by Napa LAFCo. Attorneys for both American Canyon and the County of Napa asserted that the City was exempt from needing LAFCo approval under Government Code Section 56133(e) so long as the outside services were within an extended "service area." Napa LAFCo proceeded – as a compromise championed by the County – to retroactively and prospectively approve all outside water service extensions within a geographically defined area (Napa County Airport and Industrial zoned lands) while directing the City to comply with Government Code Section 56133 for any future new and/or extended outside services. This latter directive remains in dispute with American Canyon as illuminated in the most recent MSR prepared by Napa LAFCo in 2018-2019.

KEY EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 3

City of Chico Sewer Connections (Butte County)

In 2013, Butte LAFCo became aware that the City of Chico had connected 62 unincorporated parcels to its sewer system without first obtaining the approval of Butte LAFCo. The City operated under the belief that these sewer connections were somehow exempt from LAFCo review under Government Code Section 56133(e). Once discovered by Butte LAFCo, the City was required to submit a LAFCo extension of sewer services application and pay all associated fees. This issue was on the verge of litigation before the City conceded LAFCo was correct. This misstep by the City seriously delayed the annexation of many unincorporated islands that would have otherwise been annexed in order to receive sewer services and remain consistent with state law to ensure orderly development, logical city boundaries, and the effective delivery of services. The delay in annexation cost some residents the ability to further develop their parcels which ultimately affected housing production and increased development pressure on fringe lands on the edge of the City Sphere of Influence.

EXAMPLE 4

Rock Creek Reclamation District Flood Prevention Projects (Butte County)

The Rock Creek Reclamation District desired to conduct flood control maintenance outside of its jurisdictional boundaries and believed that such efforts were exempt from LAFCo review under Government Code Section 56133(e). While the District may have been well intentioned, it is vitally important that local agency services and functions related to regional public works projects be coordinated with all affected local agencies - which is exactly what the LAFCo process is intended to accomplish.

Butte LAFCo informed the District that theirs was an incorrect reading of the law and requested they submit the proposal to Butte LAFCo. The District finally agreed, but only just before more aggressive steps were undertaken by Butte LAFCo.

LAFCo's role is to ensure that all local agency services provided are consistent with state law to ensure orderly development and the effective delivery of services.



KEY EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 5

City of Hollister/County of San Benito County (San Benito County)

In 2004, the County of San Benito, the City of Hollister, and the countywide San Benito County Water District entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishing the Hollister Urban Area (HUA). Under the MOU, the City of Hollister agreed to upgrade its wastewater treatment plant to serve approximately 90% of the area identified within the HUA boundary, which was to be developed in the future. However, the agreement was silent on LAFCo's role and ignored the fact that City sewer extensions into the County required LAFCo review and approval.

In November 2012, after the approval of the MOU by all parties, county staff prepared a brief report and Resolution for LAFCo to adopt the HUA boundary at a LAFCo Commission meeting. The report and resolution failed to reference a sphere of influence or formation of an entity that would have been under the purview of LAFCo to establish. Additionally, the report and resolution failed to state that the purpose of having LAFCo adopt the HUA was to satisfy provisions of Government Code (GC) Section 56133. Unfortunately, after Commission approval the City discontinued seeking LAFCo approval of sewer extensions outside the city limits from November 2012 to January 2015. One large project during this post-LAFCo period involved over 1,200 dwelling units.

On January 22, 2015, after both a thorough review of the prior actions to establish the HUA and an introduction of GC Section 56133 to the LAFCo Commission, the Commission adopted a resolution, confirming "...that the City must first request and receive written approval from the Commission" before extending sewer service outside the City limits.

On August 15, 2016, the City of Hollister, despite having been previously advised of LAFCo processes, entered into another agreement - this time with regional potable water service provider Sunnyslope County Water District (CWD). In this agreement, the jurisdictions self-determined that they were exempt, under GC section 56133(e)(1), from LAFCo approval authority. To justify this self-determination, Section 1.02 of that agreement references a 2007 "Billing and Collection Agreement" in which Sunnyslope CWD agreed to collect the monthly sewer bills for the City for any property where the District would collect a water bill. Since the Billing and Collection Agreement was not in accordance with the provisions or intent of GC Section 56133, the City and District were non-compliant with state law. However, Sunnyslope CWD continues to maintain that the City sewer extensions are exempt.

KEY EXAMPLES

EXAMPLE 6

Coachella Valley Water District/City of Coachella (Riverside County)

Riverside LAFCo became aware of the City of Coachella and the Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) providing new and extended services beyond its jurisdictional boundary in 2021 as part of its Comprehensive Countywide City Municipal Service Review process. The City of Coachella confirmed that it and CVWD are actively providing water and wastewater services outside their boundaries. CVWD boundaries overlaps the City of Coachella's boundaries and SOI boundaries. The City provides wastewater within their Sanitary District which extends outside its boundary, however never requested nor received approval from Riverside LAFCo. Separately, the City provides water outside of its boundary by contract - executed in 2007-2008 - and similarly did not request or receive approval from Riverside LAFCo.

Since the services were extended without benefit of any public process, a conflict has now arisen with the City of Indio who is arguing that they are better suited to service the area with both water and wastewater. Riverside LAFCo is currently reviewing the claims and seeking resolution.

EXAMPLE 7

Lake Sherwood Community Service District (Ventura County)

Ventura LAFCo became aware that the Lake Sherwood Community Services District had since 2001 approved dozens of new potable water service connections to properties located outside its boundaries without LAFCo approval. The CSD, which when formed absorbed most of a private mutual water company, believed that it could provide new water service to any of the properties that were within the now defunct mutual water company, even though they were outside the CSD's boundaries. The CSD never consulted with LAFCo, but instead self-exempted these service extensions from LAFCo review believing that since the mutual water company's existence predated January 1, 2001, serving these properties was exempt from LAFCo review under Government Code Section 56133(e)(4). It was only after multiple meetings and legal opinions that the CSD accepted that these services were not, in fact, exempt from LAFCo review, because the exemption applies only to services that were actually being provided prior to 2001. The resolution to the unlawful connections involved many months of LAFCo staff time, tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money, and the formation of new waterworks district, all of which could have been avoided had the CSD been required to consult with LAFCo before providing the services.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

Government Code Section 56133(e) should be amended to explicitly confirm that LAFCoS - not local agencies - are the authorized entity to determine whether a contracted service requires LAFCo approval pursuant to Section 56133(b) and (c) or is exempt from the LAFCo process under 56133(e).

This can be accomplished by either:

1. Amending the preface of Government Code Section 56133(e) to add “as determined by the commission”, or
2. By adding a new subparagraph (f), which states: “Final determination regarding the applicability of exemptions under subparagraph (e) above shall rest solely with the commission.”

CONCLUSION

The Legislature clearly and significantly delegated its authority to LAFCoS to regulate, examine and plan for the establishment, expansion, and reorganization (consolidations, mergers, etc.) of cities and most special districts and their municipal services against current and anticipated community needs. This regional planning is a cornerstone of consistent, predictable, and sustainable infrastructure. The intent behind Government Code Section 56133 is to limit new and/or extended municipal services outside of an agency's jurisdictional boundary to ensure that those services do not conflict with the objectives of the LAFCo and the Legislature. Due to this lack of specificity, some contracting public agencies are interpreting Section 56133(e) as not requiring any notification to LAFCo and are, in effect, exempting themselves from any notification to

LAFCo. However, LAFCos maintain that the legislative intent behind

the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act makes it clear that the final determination of whether a service contract is exempt from

a LAFCo process is a function for the LAFCo – not the contracting entities. The latter is further reinforced

by the fact that a LAFCo's lack of knowledge of

a service that has been exempted, even when

rightfully exempted, impacts later service review

determinations and can introduce situations that

LAFCos were specifically created to prevent:

inefficient and duplicative services.

Consequently, an amendment to Government

Code Section 56133(e) is needed to clarify and

make explicit that it is the LAFCo, and not the

contracting service providers, which determines

when a proposed new or extended service requires

LAFCo approval or whether that service qualifies for

an exemption from a LAFCo process under Government

Code Section 56133(e).

