

EL DORADO LAFCO

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

AGENDA OF APRIL 28, 2010

REGULAR MEETING

TO: Ken Humphreys, Chair, and
Members of the El Dorado County Local Agency Formation
Commission

FROM: José C. Henríquez, Executive Officer

AGENDA ITEM #6: **CONSIDER CHANGES TO THE POLICIES AND WORKPLAN
FOR THE MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEWS AND SPHERE OF
INFLUENCE UPDATES**

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission

1. Amend the Policies & Guidelines Sections so that they conform to current State Law (Attachment L); and
2. Evaluate the current schedule for the completion of the municipal service reviews and sphere of influence updates for all agencies.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

At the March 24, 2010 meeting, the Commission directed staff to return with the municipal service reviews and sphere of influence updates schedule so that it can evaluate, and possibly adjust, the work plan.

BACKGROUND

Between October 2007 and January 2008, the Commission established its work schedule for the second cycle of municipal service reviews and sphere of influence updates (MSR/SOIs). During these discussions, the Commission established the following:

1. It opted to conduct MSRs on a per-agency basis;
2. It rejected to fund the completion of MSR/SOIs either by establishing a fund or charging a processing fee on its fee schedule. Instead, MSR/SOIs would be funded on a case-by-case basis during the budgetary process; and

3. It adopted a project plan schedule based on the following methodology:
 - a) It will always review agencies that provide vital services to residents of the county and/or have high annexation activity (Cameron Park CSD, City of Placerville, City of South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado Hills CSD, El Dorado Irrigation District, Georgetown Divide PUD, Grizzly Flat CSD, South Tahoe PUD)
 - b) It will not review agencies that were organized only to levy assessments, do not directly provide services, have no staff, and no staff salaries are dependent on these revenues (County Service Areas Numbers 5, 7 and 10); and
 - c) All other agencies were ranked and scored based on “activity level” and “number of issues that were found in the current set of MSRs.” All agencies with a combined score of 3 or higher would be studied.

Based on this methodology, the workplan in Attachment A was generated. For the Commission’s convenience, copies of the staff reports from these discussions are included as Attachments B through D. At last month’s meeting and as part of the Commission’s budget discussion, the Commission held a workshop on MSRs/SOIs. After the staff presentation and receiving comments from Mr. Peter Detwiler, Lead Consultant for the Senate Local Government Committee, the Commission directed staff to return with the MSR workplan so that it can be re-evaluated and possibly be adjusted. An additional request was for staff to include a history of recent activity by the agencies. Attachments E through K include the non-study, non-incorporation activity by agency for the past 10 years. The term “Completed” is used if a project was annexed into the pertinent agency. The term “Closed” is used on any project that failed to gain Commission approval or because the applicant failed to provide all of the documents to deem the project complete and ready for Commission consideration.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Current MSR/SOI Workplan for 2008-2013 (as revised December 17, 2008)
- Attachment B: October 27, 2007 Staff Memo and Attachment
- Attachment C: December 5, 2007 Staff Memo and Attachments
- Attachment D: January 30, 2008 Staff Memo and Attachments
- Attachment E: EID Annexations I 2000-2010
- Attachment F: EID Annexations II 2000-2010
- Attachment G: City of Placerville Annexations 2000-2010
- Attachment H: El Dorado Hills CSD Annexations 2000-2010
- Attachment I: Cameron Park CSD Annexations 2000-2010
- Attachment J: El Dorado Hills CWD Annexations 2000-2010
- Attachment K: Other Annexations 2000-2010
- Attachment L: Recommended Changes to Policies & Guidelines Section 5