

SAN MATEO



LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

455 COUNTY CENTER, 2ND FLOOR • REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063-1663 • PHONE (650) 363-4224 • FAX (650) 363-4849

July 12, 2017

To: LAFCo Commissioners

From: Martha Poyatos, Executive Officer

Subject: Legislative Report

Bills Currently Being Tracked by the CALAFCO Legislative Committee

As reported previously, CALAFCO has sponsored or co-sponsored three bills this year:

- AB 464 (Gallagher), and AB 979 and AB 1725 (Assembly Local Government Committee). This bill makes necessary technical changes to existing LAFCo law to solidify the current practice of LAFCos approving annexations of territory already receiving services from a local agency through an out-of-area service agreement (Government Code Section 56133). CALAFCO requested letters from local LAFCos requesting the Governor's signature. Please see attached San Mateo LAFCo letter requesting signature. The Governor signed the bill on Monday, July 10.
- AB 1725. This is the annual omnibus bill used by CALAFCO to make non-substantive technical corrections to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act.
- AB 979 (CALAFCO co-sponsored with the California Special Districts Association.) This bill proposes to streamline the process to seat special districts on LAFCos and also includes language requiring LAFCos to assist independent special district selection committees with the consolidated countywide redevelopment agency oversight board appointment process.

Other Bills of Interest to LAFCos

- SB 448 (Wieckowski) provides a mechanism to identify inactive special districts and requires LAFCos to dissolve the inactive districts via an expedited process. The bill contains other provisions requiring the State Controller to publish a list of all independent special districts and a list of all inactive special districts. Since its introduction, the bill has been amended to remove all requirements regarding idle special districts.

COMMISSIONERS: DON HORSLEY, CHAIR, County ▪ MIKE O'NEILL, VICE CHAIR, City ▪ JOSHUA COSGROVE, Special District ▪ ANN DRAPER, Public
RICH GARBARINO, City ▪ JOE SHERIDAN, Special District ▪ WARREN SLOCUM, County

ALTERNATES: VACANT, Special District ▪ HARVEY RARBACK, City ▪ SEPI RICHARDSON, Public ▪ DAVE PINE, County

STAFF: MARTHA POYATOS, EXECUTIVE OFFICER ▪ REBECCA ARCHER, LEGAL COUNSEL ▪ JEAN BROOK, COMMISSION CLERK

- AB 1728 (Assembly Local Government Committee) would require health care districts to adopt annual budgets, establish and maintain a website with certain required content, and adopt policies for grant-making activities.

In addition, CALAFCO Executive Director Pamela Miller reports that the healthcare district enabling act (Health and Safety Code Sections 32000-32499.4) will be the subject of a complete review and update next year. A subcommittee formed by the CALAFCO Legislative Committee will continue to meet so that CALAFCO can provide input into that process.

Lastly, Ms. Miller has provided updates on the activities of the Little Hoover Commission's (LHC) study on special districts. Attached is the agenda and report from the LHC meeting of June 22, 2017 at which the LHC reviewed draft staff recommendations focusing on governance, transparency, climate change adaptation, and health care districts. At its August 24, 2017 meeting, the LHC will consider a final report from staff. Ms. Miller reports that CALAFCO will participate and provide a comment letter on the draft recommendations prior to the August 24 LHC meeting.

Attachments: LAFCo Support Letter for AB 464
Text of AB 464
Legislative Daily Report
Little Hoover Commission Agenda and Report

Assembly Bill No. 464

Passed the Assembly May 11, 2017

Chief Clerk of the Assembly

Passed the Senate June 22, 2017

Secretary of the Senate

This bill was received by the Governor this _____ day
of _____, 2017, at _____ o'clock ____M.

Private Secretary of the Governor

CHAPTER _____

An act to amend Sections 56653 and 56857 of the Government Code, relating to local government.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 464, Gallagher. Local government reorganization.

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, among other things, establishes procedures for consideration of a proposal for change of organization or reorganization, as defined. Existing law requires that an applicant seeking a change of organization or reorganization submit a plan for providing services within the affected territory that includes, among other requirements, an enumeration and description of the services to be extended to the affected territory and an indication of when those services can feasibly be extended.

This bill would specify that the plan is required to also include specific information regarding services currently provided to the affected territory, as applicable, and make related changes.

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 authorizes any district to which annexation of territory is proposed to adopt and transmit to the local agency formation commission a resolution requesting termination of proceedings, as specified, and requires the resolution to be based upon written findings supported by substantial evidence in the record that the request is justified by a financial or service-related concern.

This bill would require the resolution to be based upon written findings supported by substantial evidence in the record that the request is justified as described above or because the territory is already receiving electrical service under a service area agreement approved by the Public Utilities Commission, as specified. The bill would require findings related to existing provision of electrical service by an irrigation district pursuant to a service area agreement approved under a specified provision to be based on the records of the district and the Public Utilities Commission, as provided.

that shall be responsible for the delivery and maintenance of the services identified in the application.

(B) An estimated timeframe for constructing and delivering the services identified in the application.

(C) The governance, oversight, and long-term maintenance of the services identified in the application after the initial costs are recouped and the tax increment financing terminates.

(3) If a local agency includes an annexation development plan pursuant to this subdivision, a local agency formation commission may approve the proposal for a change of organization or reorganization to include the formation of a special district or reorganization of a special district with the special district's consent, including, but not limited to, a community services district, municipal water district, or sanitary district, to provide financing to improve or upgrade structures, roads, sewer or water facilities, or other infrastructure to serve the disadvantaged, unincorporated community, in conformity with the requirements of the principal act of the district proposed to be formed and all required formation proceedings.

(4) Pursuant to Section 56881, the commission shall include in its resolution making determinations a description of the annexation development plan, including, but not limited to, an explanation of the proposed financing mechanism adopted pursuant to Section 99.3 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, including, but not limited to, any planned debt issuance associated with that annexation development plan.

(d) This section shall not preclude a local agency formation commission from considering any other options or exercising its powers under Section 56375.

(e) This section shall remain in effect only until January 1, 2025, and as of that date is repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 56653 of the Government Code, as added by Section 3 of Chapter 784 of the Statutes of 2014, is amended to read:

56653. (a) If a proposal for a change of organization or reorganization is submitted pursuant to this part, the applicant shall submit a plan for providing services within the affected territory.

(b) The plan for providing services shall include all of the following information and any additional information required by the commission or the executive officer:

(1) An enumeration and description of the services currently provided or to be extended to the affected territory.

(2) The level and range of those services.

(3) An indication of when those services can feasibly be extended to the affected territory, if new services are proposed.

(4) An indication of any improvement or upgrading of structures, roads, sewer or water facilities, or other conditions the local agency would impose or require within the affected territory if the change of organization or reorganization is completed.

(5) Information with respect to how those services will be financed.

(c) This section shall become operative on January 1, 2025.

SEC. 3. Section 56857 of the Government Code is amended to read:

56857. (a) Upon receipt by the commission of a proposed change of organization or reorganization that includes the annexation of territory to any district, if the proposal is not filed by the district to which annexation of territory is proposed, the executive officer shall place the proposal on the agenda for the next commission meeting for information purposes only and shall transmit a copy of the proposal to any district to which an annexation of territory is requested.

(b) No later than 60 days after the date that the proposal is on the commission's meeting agenda in accordance with subdivision (a), any district to which annexation of territory is proposed may adopt and transmit to the commission a resolution requesting termination of the proceedings. The resolution requesting termination of the proceedings shall be based upon written findings supported by substantial evidence in the record that the request is justified by a financial or service related concern or because the territory is already receiving electrical service under a service area agreement approved by the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Section 9608 of the Public Utilities Code. Prior to the commission's termination of proceedings pursuant to subdivision (c), the resolution is subject to judicial review.

(c) If any district to which annexation of territory is proposed has adopted and transmitted to the commission a resolution requesting termination of proceedings within the time period prescribed by, and in accordance with, subdivision (b), and if the commission has not been served with notice that judicial review

of that resolution is being sought pursuant to subdivision (b), then the commission shall terminate the proceedings no sooner than 30 days from receipt of the resolution from the district.

(d) For purposes of an annexation to a district pursuant to this section or Section 56668.3:

(1) “Financial concerns” means that the proposed uses within the territory proposed to be annexed do not have the capacity to provide sufficient taxes, fees, and charges, including connection fees, if any, to pay for the full cost of providing services, including capital costs. Cost allocation shall be based on generally accepted accounting principles and shall be subject to all constitutional and statutory limitations on the amount of the tax, fee, or charge.

(2) “Service concerns” means that a district will not have the ability to provide the services that are the subject of the application to the territory proposed to be annexed without imposing level of service reductions on existing and planned future uses in the district’s current service area. “Service concerns” does not include a situation when a district has the ability to provide the services or the services will be available prior to the time that services will be required.

(3) “Territory already receiving electrical service under a service area agreement approved by the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Section 9608 of the Public Utilities Code” means territory that is outside the boundaries of an irrigation district but is currently receiving electrical services from the irrigation district pursuant to a service area agreement between the district and a public utility approved by the Public Utilities Commission as authorized by Sections 8101 to 8108, inclusive, and 9608 of the Public Utilities Code.

(4) A district may make findings regarding financial or service concerns based on information provided in the application and any additional information provided to the district by the commission or the applicant that is relevant to determining the adequacy of existing and planned future services to meet the probable future needs of the territory. Findings related to service or financial concerns may be based on an urban water management plan, capital improvement plan, financial statement, comprehensive annual financial report, integrated resource management plan, or other information related to the ability of a district to provide services. Findings related to existing provision of electrical service by an

irrigation district pursuant to a service area agreement approved under Section 9608 of the Public Utilities Code shall be based on the records of the district and the Public Utilities Commission evidencing approval of such a service area agreement by the Public Utilities Commission.

(5) Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a right or entitlement to water service or any specific level of water service.

(6) Nothing in this section is intended to change existing law concerning a district's obligation to provide water service to its existing customers or to any potential future customers.

(e) This section shall not apply if all districts to which annexation of territory is proposed have adopted and transmitted to the commission a resolution supporting the proposed change of organization or reorganization.

Approved _____, 2017

Governor



LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION

AGENDA

Roundtable Discussion on Special Districts

Thursday, June 22, 2016

1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

BMG Conference Room

Lower Level, 925 L Street

Sacramento, CA 95814

Pedro Nava
Chairman

Sean Varner
Vice Chairman

David Beier

Iveta Brigis

Anthony Cannella
Senator

Chad Mayes
Assemblymember

Don Perata

Sebastian Ridley-Thomas
Assemblymember

Richard Roth
Senator

Janna Sidley

Helen Torres

Carole D'Elia
Executive Director

Meeting Goals: To understand the feasibility of potential recommendations being considered for the Little Hoover Commission's special districts study.

1:30 – 1:40 p.m. Welcome & Introductions

Pedro Nava, Chair, Little Hoover Commission

Study Process and Purpose of the Roundtable

Carole D'Elia, Executive Director, Little Hoover Commission

1:40 – 3:30 p.m. Discussion: Meeting participants will discuss potential recommendations developed by the Little Hoover Commission over the course of its special districts study process. These include recommendations on governance, specifically opportunities to bolster existing oversight and recommendations to improve transparency.

There will be an opportunity for public comment at the end of the roundtable discussion. Public comments will be limited to three minutes per person. Please notify Commission staff if you would like to make a comment.



State of California

LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION

Witnesses at Little Hoover Commission's August and October 2016 public hearings and participants at the November 2016 advisory committee proposed numerous recommendations for consideration. At various business meetings in 2017, the Commission discussed these and other potential recommendations. A summary of potential recommendations currently under consideration follows.

The June 22 roundtable discussion has been convened to consider if these recommendations are helpful, can be implemented or might have unintended consequences. The Commission also welcomes discussion on alternative suggestions. The primary focus of the roundtable meeting discussion will be on the recommendations related to governance and transparency, although potential recommendations focusing on climate change adaptation and healthcare districts also are included in this summary.

GOVERNANCE - POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Legislature, in committee hearings and floor votes, as well as the Governor in bill signings, should curtail a growing practice of introducing bills to override LAFCO deliberative processes and decide local issues regarding special district boundaries and operations.
- The Legislature should provide one-time grant funding to pay for specified LAFCO activities, particularly to fund certain critical Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) and to incentivize LAFCOs or smaller special districts to develop and implement dissolution or consolidation plans with timelines for expected outcomes. This grant process potentially could be overseen by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Funding should be tied to process completion and results, including enforcement authority for corrective action and consolidation.
- Alternatively or additionally, augment the existing LAFCO funding formula by allocating a certain percentage of local property taxes to fund LAFCOs as suggested in testimony from the California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions (CALAFCO).
- After conducting a Municipal Service Review and finding dissolution or consolidation of special districts is warranted, provide LAFCOs the authority to initiate dissolutions or consolidations with a higher threshold for a public vote.
- Require special districts to hold a public hearing on findings and recommendations after the completion of a Municipal Service Review.
- The Legislature should provide LAFCOs the statutory authority to do reviews of inactive districts throughout California and dissolve them without the action being subject to protest and a costly election process. SB 448 (Wiekowski) would implement this recommendation. The bill was unanimously adopted by the Senate in May 2017, and currently is under consideration by the Assembly. As currently written, the bill also would require each county tax bill to list special district taxes and would require the State Controller, by 2019, to annually publish a list of all special districts in California.
- The Legislature should strengthen LAFCOs by easing a process to add special district representatives to the 28 county LAFCOs where districts have no voice.
- The Legislature should adopt legislation to give LAFCO members fixed terms, to ease political pressures in controversial votes and enhance the independence of LAFCOs.

TRANSPARENCY – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- Every LAFCO website should provide basic information and links to all of the special districts within each county service area, including a standardized dashboard reflecting revenues from property taxes and user fees, debt service and fund balance changes.
- Every special district should have a published policy for reserve funds, including the size and purpose of reserves and how they are invested.
- Every special district should have a website that provides the following information in an easy-to-understand format:
 - ✓ Name, location, contact data
 - ✓ Services provided
 - ✓ Governing body, including election information and the process for constituents to run for board positions
 - ✓ Compensation details – total staff compensation, including salary, pensions and benefits
 - ✓ Compensation details for the five staff with highest compensation (including salary, benefits, pensions, loans, annual leave balances, annual travel expenses)
 - ✓ Budget (including revenues and expenditures, bond debt and the source of revenues, including fees, property taxes and other assessments, as well as other revenue)
 - ✓ Reserve fund policy
 - ✓ An explanation of how the revenue sources are consistent with state law and do not constitute a permissible tax
 - ✓ Geographic area served and demographic data based on available census data
 - ✓ Average and median customer fees and other customer charges
 - ✓ Description of relationship and coordination with other local government agencies
 - ✓ Copy of most recent Municipal Service Review
 - ✓ Copy of most recent annual report provided to the State Controller's Office
 - ✓ State and local agencies providing oversight of operations, compliance with state laws and financial reporting and audits and frequency of such reviews and links to the oversight bodies websites
- The California Special Districts Association, working with experts in public outreach and engagement, should develop best practices for independent special district outreach to the public on opportunities to serve on boards and special district elections including election results and voter participation data.
- The State Controller's Office should disaggregate information provided by independent special districts from dependent districts, nonprofits and joint powers authorities on its By the Numbers and Employee Compensation websites. (SB 448 would require the State Controller to list all special districts on its website by 2019.)
- The State Controller's Office should standardize definitions of special district financial reserves for state reporting purposes.
- The Secretary of State, working with county, city and special district representatives and the State Controller, should streamline or consolidate its public agency reporting requirements.

CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Legislature should place a requirement in statute that special districts formally include climate adaptation and climate mitigation as key operational considerations within their governing documents and missions.
- The California Special Districts Association (CSDA), in conjunction with its member districts, should document and share climate adaptation experiences with the Integrated Climate Adaptation and Resilience Program's adaptation information clearinghouse being established within the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). Similarly, CSDA and member districts should step up engagement in the state's current Fourth Assessment of climate threats, a \$5 million state research project designed to support the implementation of local adaptation activities. The CSDA also should promote climate adaptation information sharing among its members to help districts with fewer resources plan for climate impacts and take actions.
- The Legislature should replicate statewide a program established by Oakland-based East Bay Municipal Utility District, in which real estate transactions trigger an inspection of sewer lines on the property and require repairs if broken. Or, as an alternative, it should commission a study of costs versus benefits – possibly by a university or the appropriate state department. Such a study would build long-term support, if feasible, for legislation.
- State regulatory agencies should explore the beginnings of a new regulatory framework and adaptive approach that incorporates moveable baselines when defining a status quo as climate impacts mount.
- The California Special Districts Association, and special districts, as some of the closest-to-the-ground local governments in California, should step up public engagement on climate adaptation, and inform and support people and businesses to take actions that increase their individual and community-wide defenses.
- The California Special Districts Association and special districts should lead efforts to seek and form regional partnerships to maximize climate adaptation resources and benefits.

HEALTHCARE DISTRICTS – POTENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Legislature should work with the Association of California Healthcare Districts to enact proposals the association developed in 2016 to accomplish these two objectives:
 - ✓ Update the 1945 legislative "practice acts" that enabled voters to create local hospital districts, renamed healthcare districts in the early 1990s. Experts widely agree that statutory language in the acts no longer reflects rapid changes in healthcare during the past half century, especially regarding roles of healthcare districts without hospitals.
 - ✓ Make healthcare districts directly respond to local healthcare needs by conducting needs assessments every three years and demonstrate annually how they are addressing those needs. This information will be shared with the local LAFCO that oversees the district.

- The Legislature, which has been increasingly inclined to override local LAFCO processes to press changes on healthcare districts, should defer these decisions to LAFCOs, which in statute already have that responsibility.
- The Association of California Healthcare Districts and its member districts should step up efforts to define and share best practices among themselves.