

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF YOLO COUNTY

Regular Meeting AGENDA

May 22, 2014 - 9:00 a.m.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CHAMBERS

625 COURT STREET, ROOM 206
WOODLAND, CALIFORNIA 95695

COMMISSIONERS

OLIN WOODS, CHAIR (PUBLIC MEMBER)
MATT REXROAD, VICE CHAIR (COUNTY MEMBER)
BILL KRISTOFF (CITY MEMBER)
DON SAYLOR (COUNTY MEMBER)
CECILIA AGUIAR-CURRY (CITY MEMBER)

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS

ROBERT RAMMING (PUBLIC MEMBER)
JIM PROVENZA (COUNTY MEMBER)
ROCHELLE SWANSON (CITY MEMBER)

CHRISTINE CRAWFORD
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

ROBYN TRUITT DRIVON
COMMISSION COUNSEL

All persons are invited to testify and submit written comments to the Commission. If you challenge a LAFCo action in court, you may be limited to issues raised at the public hearing or submitted as written comments prior to the close of the public hearing. All written materials received by staff 72 hours before the hearing will be distributed to the Commission. If you wish to submit written material at the hearing, please supply 10 copies.

All participants on a matter to be heard by the Commission that have made campaign contributions totaling \$250 or more to any Commissioner in the past 12 months must disclose this fact, either orally or in writing, for the official record as required by Government Code Section 84308.

Any person, or combination of persons, who make expenditures for political purposes of \$1,000 or more in support of, or in opposition to, a matter heard by the Commission must disclose this fact in accordance with the Political Reform Act.

CALL TO ORDER

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Roll Call

3. Public Comment: Opportunity for members of the public to address the Yolo County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) on subjects not otherwise on the agenda relating to LAFCo business. The Commission reserves the right to impose a reasonable limit on time afforded to any topic or to any individual speaker.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Approve LAFCo Meeting Minutes of March 27, 2014
5. Review and file the May 2014 CALAFCO Quarterly
6. Review and file the Spring 2014 CH&W Newsletter by Special Counsel Colantuono, Highsmith & Whatley, PC
7. Review and file CALAFCO legislative updates and letters of position for Assembly Bills 1729, 2156 and 2762
8. Review and file the Fiscal Year (FY) 13-14 3rd Quarter Financial Update
9. Ratify Resolution 2014-02 commending City Member Skip Davies for his tenure with the Yolo LAFCo

REGULAR AGENDA

10. Elect a Chair and Vice-Chair for the Commission to serve a one-year term, which ends May 2015
11. Select Shared Services Subcommittee Member to replace former City Member Skip Davis

PUBLIC HEARINGS

12. Receive the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Final Budget, open the Public Hearing for comments, close the Public Hearing, consider and adopt the Final LAFCo Budget for FY 14/15 (staff recommends budget Option 1)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

13. A report by the Executive Officer on recent events relevant to the Commission and an update of Yolo LAFCo staff activity for the month. The Commission or any individual Commissioner may request that action be taken on any item listed.
 - Shared Services
 - Staff Activity Report - March 24 to May 16, 2014

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

14. Opportunity for any Commissioner to comment on issues not listed on the agenda. No action will be taken on off-agenda items unless authorized by law.
- a. Present Resolution 2014-02 honoring City Member Skip Davies for his tenure on the Yolo LAFCo

ADJOURNMENT

15. Adjourn to reception outside the Board Chambers for former City Member Skip Davies

Next meeting scheduled for: June 26, 2014

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing agenda was posted by 5:00 p.m. May 16, 2014, at the following places:

- On the bulletin board at the east entrance of the Erwin W. Meier Administration Building, 625 Court Street, Woodland, California; and
- On the bulletin board outside the Board of Supervisors Chambers, Room 206 in the Erwin W. Meier Administration Building, 625 Court Street, Woodland, California.
- On the LAFCo website at: www.yololafco.org.

Terri Tuck, Clerk
Yolo County LAFCo

NOTICE

If requested, this agenda can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact the Commission Clerk for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should telephone or otherwise contact the Commission Clerk as soon as possible and at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. The Commission Clerk may be reached at (530) 666-8048 or at the following address:

Yolo County LAFCo
625 Court Street, Room 203
Woodland, CA 95695

Note: Audio for LAFCo meetings will be available directly following conclusion of the meeting at www.yololafco.org.



Consent 4.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Approve LAFCo Meeting Minutes of March 27, 2014

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approve LAFCo Meeting Minutes of March 27, 2014

Attachments

[Item 4-LAFCo Minutes 03/27/14](#)

Form Review

Form Started By: Terri Tuck
Final Approval Date: 04/08/2014

Started On: 04/08/2014 03:42 PM

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION of YOLO COUNTY

MEETING MINUTES

March 27, 2014

The Local Agency Formation Commission of Yolo County met on the 27th day of March 2014, at 9:00 a.m. in the Yolo County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 625 Court Street, Room 206, Woodland CA. Members present were Chair and Public Member Olin Woods, County Members Matt Rexroad and Don Saylor, and City Members Skip Davies and Bill Kristoff. Others present were Alternate Public Member Robert Ramming, Executive Officer Christine Crawford, Analyst Tracey Dickinson, Clerk Terri Tuck and Counsel Robyn Truitt Drivon.

Items No 1 and 2 Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call

Chair Woods called the Meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

City Member Skip Davies led the Pledge of Allegiance

PRESENT: Davies, Kristoff, Rexroad, Saylor, Woods ABSENT: None

Item No 3 Public Comments

None

CONSENT

Item No 4 Approve LAFCo Meeting Minutes of February 27, 2014

Item No 5 Receive and File the March 2014 CALAFCO Quarterly

Minute Order 2014-06: Approves the recommended actions on Consent.

Approved by the following vote:

MOTION: Saylor SECOND: Rexroad

AYES: Davies, Kristoff, Rexroad, Saylor, Woods

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

PUBLIC HEARING**Item No 6** **Consider the Proposed LAFCo Budget for Fiscal Year 2014/15 and Set May 22, 2014 as the Public Hearing Date to Approve the Final Budget**

After a report by staff the Chair opened the Public Hearing. No one came forward and the Hearing was closed.

Minute Order 2014-07: Approves the recommended action setting May 22, 2014 as the Hearing date to approve the Final LAFCo Budget for 2014/15.

The Commission asked that a portion of available fund balance go towards offsetting agency costs for Fiscal Year 2014/15; that the allocation of LAFCo's OPEB liability be definitively determined with the next audit; and, that every year staff combine budget hearing discussions with that of shared services so that the value of what LAFCo is doing can be reassessed through review of the Shared Services Strategic Plan, adopted in December 2012, including but not limited to criteria for cost saving and performance measures, non-monetary benefits and jurisdiction.

Approved by the following vote:

MOTION: Rexroad SECOND: Saylor

AYES: Davies, Kristoff, Rexroad, Saylor, Woods

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

Commissioner Kristoff left the dais at 9:44 a.m. and returned at 9:52 a.m.

Item No 7 **Executive Officer's Report**

The Commission was given a report of the staff's activities for the period of February 24 through March 21, 2014 and was verbally updated on recent events relevant to the Commission.

Staff indicated that after speaking with Chair Woods earlier in the week, it was decided that the April 17, 2014, meeting would be cancelled for lack of items to be put on the Agenda since the meeting was only three (3) weeks away.

Staff commented that, because the April meeting was cancelled, today would be Skip Davies last meeting due to term expiration. Additionally, staff noted that the City Selection Committee would be meeting on April 7, 2014, to appoint a City Alternate Member from the City of Davis. The City of Winters will be moving up from an Alternate Member to a Regular Member.

Staff stated that consultants for the Yolo Broadband Strategic Plan were out for another onsite visit with a variety of businesses from March 19-21, 2014.

Item № 8 Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Woods stated that the memorial held on March 7th for former Public Member H. Peter Faye was well attended and was a nice tribute to Mr. Faye's life.

Item № 9 Adjournment

Minute Order 2014-08: By order of the Chair, the meeting was adjourned at 9:57am to the next scheduled meeting on May 22, 2014.

Olin Woods, Chair
Local Agency Formation Commission
County of Yolo, State of California

ATTEST:

Terri Tuck
Clerk to the Commission



Consent 5.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Review and file the May 2014 CALAFCO Quarterly

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Review and file the May 2014 CALAFCO Quarterly

Attachments

Item 5-CALAFCO Quarterly

Form Review

Form Started By: Terri Tuck
Final Approval Date: 05/12/2014

Started On: 05/12/2014 01:25 PM



News from the Board of Directors **CALAFCO QUARTERLY**

May 2014

2014 Staff Workshop Report

The CALAFCO annual Staff Workshop was held April 23 - 25 in Berkeley at the DoubleTree Berkeley Marina. The theme was *Building Bridges to the Future: Collaboration and Cooperation*. Final workshop financial reports will be available during the final year-end budget report, as invoices and some receivables are still being processed. There were 106 attendees (127 total including speakers), with 42 LAFCoS represented, along with 6 Associate Members. There was a total of \$5,000 in sponsorships, including 5 Supporting Sponsors (\$500 each), and 10 Honorary Sponsors (\$250 each), with one in-kind donation.



From a program perspective, preliminary feedback indicates a highly successful program. Thank you to Steve Lucas (CALAFCO DEO) for taking the lead as program chair, as well as all of the members of the program committee. Thanks also to Alameda LAFCo, Mona Palacios and Sandy Hou for hosting the event, and the Bay area LAFCoS for their support.

A detailed financial and program evaluation report will be provided at the next Board meeting and distributed to the membership.

2014 Annual Conference Update

The 2014 Annual Conference Program Committee has had 3 conference calls over the past several months. A Call for Presentations was done, and on May 6 the Program Committee reviewed a number of presentation proposals. Initial indications are that we will have a very strong and diverse program to offer this year. The theme and logo have been created, with the theme this year being: *LAFCo: The Next 50 Years. Shaping Communities for Tomorrow With Innovative Ideas Today*. Registration for the conference will be made available very soon, and will be posted online at the CALAFCO website.



CALAFCO U Update

The next CALAFCO U is set in Sacramento on June 16 and is *LAFCo Greatest Hits: 2013 Projects of the Year*. This session will feature 5 LAFCo project of the year nominations from the 2013 CALAFCO Achievement Awards, including the recipient of the award. The session is open to all LAFCo staff, commissioners, and associate members. Registration is available through the CALAFCO website.

The remaining 2014 sessions will be held at the CALAFCO offices in Sacramento. Mark your calendars:

- ◆ June 16 - *LAFCo Best Practices*
- ◆ August 11 - *Ag Mitigation*
- ◆ December 8 - *Legal Interpretations of C-K-H*

CALAFCO Board Actions

During their regular meeting on May 2, the Board addressed several administrative issues including:

- ◆ Accepted the 3rd quarter financial reports;
- ◆ Accepted the current FY end-of-year projections;
- ◆ Adopted the Association's 2014/2015 budget;
- ◆ Approved the ongoing trial use of absentee LAFCo ballots for the purposes of run-off elections for the CALAFCO Board of Directors at the upcoming caucuses, along with an action plan to present the information to the membership; and
- ◆ Received a comprehensive legislative update.

Legislative Activities

Bills are moving quickly through committees to meet deadlines. May 9 is the deadline for committees to hear non-fiscal bills, and May 23 for fiscal bills. CALAFCO continues to track a number of bills, and the Leg Committee's next meeting is May 9. CALAFCO tracked bills are all located on the CALAFCO website and the report is updated daily. May 9 is the next CALAFCO Leg meeting date. Top bills being tracked are:

- **AB 1521** - VLF - (Fox) *CALAFCO Support* - This bill addresses inhabited annexations, making whole those addressed currently in SB 69 (Roth) and future annexations. Eventually SB 69 was to be amended to address only incorporations, and at some point both bills will be joined. AB 1521 passed ALGC and is now in Assembly Appropriations awaiting a hearing date.
- **AB 1527** - Drinking Water - (Perea) *CALAFCO Oppose Unless Amended* - This bill has gone through a number of amendments to address CALAFCO concerns. Although we are still working with the author's office on further amendments, the bill has significantly changed since taking this position. CALAFCO will look at its current position at the next Leg. meeting. Passed the ALGC and ESTM and now in Appropriations.
- **AB 1961** - Sustainable Farmland Strategy - (Eggman) *CALAFCO Watch* - this bill requires counties with at least 4% of their land designated as ag land to create a sustainable farmland strategy (SFS), and requires these counties to work with LAFCoS to assure plans/policies are compatible to the SFS. All of CALAFCO's concerns have been removed from the bill, and the Leg committee will reconsider its position. In the Appropriations Suspense File as an unfunded mandate for Counties.
- **AB 2156** - JPAs - (Achadjian) *CALAFCO Support* - This bill would include JPAs among the agencies that LAFCo can obtain information from and include in MSRs. Passed through Assembly and set for hearing in the Senate Gov & Finance committee on 5/14.
- **SB 69** - VLF - (Roth) *CALAFCO Support* - This bill contains the same language as SB 56 which stalled in the Senate in 2013. The bill reinstates VLF (ERAF) funding to cities who have incorporated since 2004, and reinstates that funding for future incorporations. Awaiting committee assignment in the Assembly.
- **AB 1729** (Logue) *CALAFCO Support*. Allocates \$4 million in Williams Act subvention payments. In Appropriations.
- **AB 2762** (C-K-H Omnibus) *CALAFCO Sponsored*. Makes minor and non-substantive changes to C-K-H. Passed ALGC and now set for Appropriations on 5/14.



Consent 6.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Review and file the Spring 2014 CH&W Newsletter by Special Counsel Colantuono, Highsmith & Whatley, PC

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Review and file the Spring 2014 CH&W Newsletter by Special Counsel Colantuono, Highsmith & Whatley, PC

Attachments

[Item 6-CH&W Newsletter](#)

Form Review

Form Started By: Terri Tuck
Final Approval Date: 04/21/2014

Started On: 04/21/2014 01:08 PM

Sisyphus Seeks a Receiver

By Michael R. Cobden

Code enforcement can often feel like pushing a boulder uphill, but when an officially branded “vexatious litigant” occupies the property, the path is littered with obstacles. Fortunately, the Court of Appeal is sympathetic. In *City of Riverside v. Horspool*, the Riverside appellate court affirmed the authority of courts and receivers to remedy nuisance properties. Since 2008, the City of Riverside fought to clean up a nuisance property owned by William and Kelly Horspool but finally obtained an appellate victory nearly six years later. After the administrative citation process failed to obtain the property owners’ cooperation, the City petitioned the court to appoint a receiver to take possession of the property, clean it up, and sell it to recover his costs to do so. The City personally served the petition on William Horspool, but Kelly was served by service on William and by mail. Only William appeared in the case; the City obtained a default judgment against Kelly.

William obstructed the City at every turn, filed multiple lawsuits, including an injunction action and two bankruptcies, which initially stayed the receivership. Ultimately the City obtained appointment of a receiver because code enforcement actions are exempt from the automatic stay that bankruptcy imposes on most lawsuits against a debtor. During the extensive delays caused by the owner’s litigation

tactics, the house was repeatedly vandalized and — by the time the receiver was appointed — the kitchen was gutted; asbestos debris was piled on floors; and there was mold on walls, exposed wiring, and no functioning bathroom.

When the receiver sought approval to sell the house, William reopened his bankruptcy (requiring the City to make a fourth motion for exemption from the automatic stay) and unsuccessfully sought removal of the City’s receivership action to bankruptcy court. As a result, the receiver was unable to obtain financing to repair the house and therefore obtained court approval to sell the house “as-is” for a very small sum.

William appealed, raising 12 issues (rarely a good idea on appeal — someone who raises so many claims likely lacks any good ones). Some of these issues were raised for the first time on appeal (which is not permitted) and many without citation to supporting authority (which allows the appellate court to ignore them). The Court of Appeal rejected all 12 issues. William had no standing to assert the interests of Kelly, the mortgage holder, or the bankruptcy trustee. The Court found William waived his due process challenges to notice and service by appearing at the initial hearing without a lawyer and without limiting his appearance to a challenge of the adequacy of service. In addition, he failed to preserve these issues for appellate review by a timely motion to challenge service.

He also failed to obtain a stay pending appeal, and the property had been sold by the time the Court of Appeal decided the case. Accordingly, the order appointing a receiver was not subject to appellate review after the receiver had settled accounts and had been discharged because the court no longer controlled the property. Nor was approving the low sale price reversible error: courts deferentially review for abuse of discretion orders authorizing a receiver to sell substandard structures that pose health and safety hazards. Furthermore, the trial court had equitable authority to order the sale. Finally, the Court of Appeal found no abuse of discretion in the payment of the receiver’s fees and costs from the proceeds of the house sale. It was William’s relentless delaying tactics which increased those fees and lowered the value of the property.

Code enforcement can be time-consuming and costly. Riverside is to be applauded for its perseverance and it is noteworthy that most of the costs of its efforts to clean up this property — no doubt to the relief of neighbors — were paid from the sale of the house. Code enforcement to preserve communities is possible, although it sometimes requires the patience of Sisyphus.

♦♦♦

For more information on this topic, contact Michael at 530/798-2416 or mcobden@chwlaw.us.

Who's Argument is this, Anyway?

By Holly O. Whatley

The Orange County Court of Appeal recently evaluated limits on a city clerk's power to correct a ballot argument. *Vargas v. Balz* involved the Brea City Council's arguments against two initiatives. At a special meeting the day arguments were due, the Council authorized the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem to write the "no" and rebuttal arguments on behalf of the City Council. Later that day, the two submitted arguments to the Clerk. They also submitted the City's "Form of Statement to be Filed by Authors of Argument." The form had no space for the name of an organization for which an argument was submitted, and the Councilmembers did not list the City Council as the author of the arguments.

The City Clerk sent the arguments to the County Registrar with instructions to print them as those of the "City Council of the City of Brea by the Mayor, attested by the City Clerk." However, the Clerk did not include that change on the argument provided the initiative proponent or posted to the City's website. The Clerk gave the same direction to the County Registrar as to the Councilmembers' rebuttal arguments, but again did provide the corrected versions to the proponent or post them to the City's website.

The proponent sued to compel the Clerk and County Registrar to print the arguments without identifying the City Council as the author. The City argued the Clerk simply corrected a typographical error to "effectuate the intent of the city council." The trial court ordered the Mayor Pro Tem's name added to the signature block, but required the elections officials to omit the reference to the whole Council. The Court of Appeal, however, found that the Clerk had no discretion to correct a clerical error in the signature block even assuming she knew the authors' intent. The Elections Code requires those who submit arguments on behalf of an organization to list the organization on the signature form and the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem did not do so.

The Court of Appeal also found the

Clerk should have provided the same material for submission to the County registrar for the ballot book that she released to the proponent and posted to the City's website. To do otherwise might mislead the public and hamper the rebuttal argument by the proponent by concealing part of what he was to respond to.

The Court of Appeal considered the public interest in fair and transparent elections procedures to outweigh an interest in correcting clerical errors. Moreover, the Court noted that the Elections Code provides two methods for corrections. First, an author has a limited time to correct an argument after submitting it. Also, the Elections Code allows a court to amend ballot measure arguments if a lawsuit is filed.

Thus, elections officials should make no changes to ballot arguments without timely direction by authors or direction from a court.

Elections officials have difficult jobs and are often subject to second-guessing. The best approach is to follow the statutes exactly and to seek legal advice when needed.

♦♦♦

For more information on this topic, contact Holly at 213/542-5704 or hwhatley@chwlaw.us.

C&L Becomes CH&W

After more than a decade of business under the name Colantuono & Levin, PC, our firm has a new name: Colantuono, Highsmith & Whatley, PC. The change marks career milestones for Sandi Levin, Terri Highsmith and Holly Whatley. Our web address changes to www.chwlaw.us and our email addresses change to reflect that URL, too.

The change reflects elevation to shareholder status of Terri and Holly, and Sandi's departure from the prac-

tice of law to become the full-time Executive Director of the Los Angeles County Law Library — the second largest public law library in the United States.

"I'm pleased to have both Terri and Holly as my fellow shareholders. This reflects their significant contributions to the practice of municipal law and our firm," said managing shareholder Michael G. Colantuono. "We are very pleased for Sandi on her transition from law practice to a new role as Executive Director of the Los Angeles County Library. While we will miss her contributions to our firm, everyone in the legal community will benefit from Sandi's contributions in her new job."

Terri has been a local government lawyer for more than two decades, representing cities in both Northern and Southern California. Terri started her career as a litigator, successfully defending the Cities of Lafayette, Orinda, Livermore, Livingston and Fremont in land use, elections and redevelopment matters, including drafting and defending a groundbreaking firearm sales ordinance for Lafayette which became a model for similar ordinances around California, garnering her recognition from the Legal Community United Against Violence. Terri currently serves as City Attorney of Barstow and Sierra Madre and served as City Attorney to Alameda from 2006 to 2011 before joining the firm. In addition, Terri is an expert in post-redevelopment matters and represents several Successor Agencies and Oversight Boards. She also leads the firm's labor and employment practice.

Holly heads our Los Angeles litigation team. Her practice focuses on public law disputes, including post-redevelopment and other municipal finance issues, matters involving

(Continued on page 3)

Supreme Docket of Tax and Fee Cases

By Michael G. Colantuono

The California Supreme Court has an unusually heavy docket of local government finance cases just now. Two cases are pending and four more are at the petition for review stage. Review of these cases provides a good summary of current developments in the law of local government revenues.

Loeffler v. Target Corporation was argued February 4th, and decision is due any day. This consumer class action under California's unfair competition laws seeks a refund of sales taxes on hot coffee which — unlike coffee beans — is not subject to sales tax. Target argues article XIII, section 32 of the state Constitution and the sales tax statute limit tax refund actions to the Board of Equalization's administrative process. While local governments rarely collect sales taxes (although they pay them because the tax is on selling, not buying), they are protected by article XIII, section 32 and other limits on actions for refund of their local taxes.

California Building Industry Association v. San Jose challenges the City's inclusionary housing fee, which requires housing developers to fund affordable housing in the City on the theory that market-rate development creates more need for affordable housing by generating low-wage jobs. The Court of Appeal ruled such fees benefit from a rebuttable presumption they are reasonably related to a city's housing goals. The Supreme Court's grant of review took that helpful precedent off the books. Amicus curiae ("friend of the court") briefs have been filed on both sides of the case and the parties are now responding to them. Decision is likely in late 2014 or early 2015.

Unlike lower courts, the Supreme Court decides what to decide; apart from death penalty cases and a few other exceptions, the Court has discretion to decide what cases to review and takes only a small percentage of cases in which review is sought. Review is pending in four water rate and local tax cases.

First, the fee cases. *Vagim v. Fresno* involves an initiative to repeal the City's

2013 water rates, rolling back rates to 2008 levels. The City Attorney refused to provide a title and summary for the measure and Michael Colantuono of CH&W sued for declaratory relief, arguing the measure was plainly illegal because it would set rates too low to honor bond covenants (promises to bondholders to set rates high enough to make debt payments and maintain utility infrastructure). The proponents sued to compel the City Attorney to provide a title and summary. The trial court refused to test the measure's legality pre-election, as a recent decision of the Riverside Court of Appeals requires. The Court of Appeal ordered the City to comply with the writ pending appeal and then dismissed the appeal as moot when the City did so, suggesting the City should pursue its declaratory relief claim in the trial court. The City petitioned the Supreme Court for review and is pursuing declaratory relief in the trial court, too. The Supreme Court's decision whether to take the case is due by early June.

Morgan v. Imperial Irrigation District involves farmers' claims Proposition 218 entitles them to a majority protest separate from other water customers. The San Diego Court of Appeal concluded that it would be nearly impossible to impose rates if each customer class had a separate veto. Local governments obtained publication of the decision, but a depublishment request is pending in the Supreme Court, as is the farmers' petition for review. The case is a helpful for local government, but contains inconsistent and confusing language regarding the standard of appellate review of Proposition 218 cases. The Supreme Court should decide whether to take the case or depublish it by early May.

The tax cases are *Sipple v. Hayward* and *San Diego v. Priceline.Com, Inc.* *Sipple* involved standing and claiming defenses to refunds of allegedly excessive telephone taxes by 134 California cities and counties. Holly Whatley of CH&W and other local government lawyers persuaded the trial court the claimants lacked standing to sue and failed to

comply with claiming rules. The Los Angeles Court of Appeal recently reversed and the local governments will seek Supreme Court review by mid-May, with a decision whether to grant review due mid-summer.

Priceline is the latest effort to collect bed taxes from on-line resellers of hotel rooms. San Diego lost in the Los Angeles Court of Appeal and will seek Supreme Court review by late April; the Supreme Court will decide whether to take the case by late June. Interestingly, Air BnB recently announced it will collect bed taxes for San Francisco and Portland, suggesting industry opposition to bed taxes may be breaking down.

Plainly, it will be a busy year for local government finance litigation. As always, we will keep you posted!

♦♦♦

For more information on this subject, contact Michael at 530/432-7357 or mcolantuono@chwlaw.us.

(Continued from page 2)

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs), land use, CEQA, election, public works, employment law, and groundwater disputes. She has represented cities in complex municipal finance litigation, including writ actions involving multi-million-dollar claims and class action tax refund suits. Holly was named one of California's top 20 Municipal Lawyers of 2013 by the **Los Angeles Daily Journal** for her defense of telephone taxes. In addition, Holly serves as counsel to cities and local agencies, having served as City Attorney to the City of La Habra Heights. She currently serves as Planning Commission Counsel in Sierra Madre.

Congratulations, Sandi, Terri and Holly!

Colantuono, Highsmith & Whatley, PC
11364 Pleasant Valley Road
Penn Valley, CA 95946

PRESORTED
FIRST-CLASS MAIL
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
MAIL MASTERS

Are you on our list? To subscribe to our newsletter or to update your information, complete the form below and fax it to 530/432-7356. You can also call Marta Farmer at 530/432-7357 or subscribe via our Web site at WWW.CHWLAW.US.

Name: _____ Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Our newsletter is available as a printed document sent by US Mail and as a PDF file sent by e-mail. Please let us know how you would like to receive your copy.

Mail E-Mail Both

The contents of this newsletter do not constitute legal advice. You should seek the opinion of qualified counsel regarding your specific situation before acting on the information provided here.

Copyright © 2014 Colantuono, Highsmith & Whatley, PC. All rights reserved.



LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Review and file CALAFCO legislative updates and letters of position for Assembly Bills 1729, 2156 and 2762

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Review and file CALAFCO legislative updates and letters of position for Assembly Bills 1729, 2156 and 2762, approved by Legislative Subcommittee Members Matt Rexroad and Cecilia Aguiar-Curry.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

Commissioners Rexroad and Aguiar-Curry were appointed to a LAFCo Legislative Subcommittee on June 25, 2012, to review summary of legislation CALAFCO is tracking and file letters of support for Assembly Bills 1729, 2156 and 2762.

BACKGROUND

When the CALAFCO Legislative Committee met on March 21, 2014 they took positions regarding several bills moving through the legislative process. CALAFCO Executive Director Pamela Miller asked that LAFCo's send letters of position on three of those bills which are listed below.

Yolo LAFCo's legislative subcommittee members Matt Rexroad and Cecilia Aguiar-Curry reviewed the bills and the draft letters of support. The subcommittee approved the letters of position for Assembly Bills 1729, 2156 and 2762 and those are attached for your review.

For more information on these bills and several others that CALAFCO is currently tracking, please see the May 2014 CALAFCO Quarterly in your Agenda packet.

AB 1729 (*Logue*) – *CALAFCO Support – Williamson Act*. As amended, appropriates \$40M from General Fund in FY 14/15 for subvention payments to counties for Williamson Act contracts.

Support letters were sent to the Chair of the Assembly Local Government Commission (ALGC), Assembly member Mike Gatto, with a copy to the ALGC and Logue.

AB 2156 (*Achadjian*) – *CALAFCO Support - LAFCo and JPAs*. As amended, the bill introduces JPAs into C-K-H by naming JPAs as one of the entities LAFCo can request information from for studies, and includes JPA agreements as an item LAFCo may request from JPAs.

A support letter was sent to Assembly member Achadjian.

AB 2762 (*ALGC*) - *CALAFCO Sponsor – C-K-H Omnibus bill*. This bill contains a number of clean-up items to C-K-H, with several others approved by the leg committee to be added via an amendment prior to its scheduled hearing at the end of this month.

A support letter was sent to the ALGC.

Attachments

[Item 7-Support AB1729](#)

[Item 7-Support AB2156](#)

[Item 7-Support AB2762](#)

Form Review

Inbox

Christine Crawford

Christine Crawford

Form Started By: Terri Tuck

Final Approval Date: 05/08/2014

Reviewed By

Christine Crawford

Christine Crawford

Date

05/06/2014 02:39 PM

05/08/2014 10:29 AM

Started On: 04/10/2014 02:22 PM

LOCAL
AGENCY
FORMATION
COMMISSION OF
YOLO COUNTY



April 2, 2014

Honorable Mike Gatto, Chair
Assembly Appropriations Committee
State Capitol, Room 2114
Sacramento CA 95814

Subject: AB 1729 (Logue) – Williamson Act - SUPPORT

Dear Assembly Member Gatto:

On behalf of the Local Agency Formation Commission of Yolo County (Yolo LAFCo), I write to express our support for AB 1729 by Assembly Member Logue. This bill would reinstate the Williamson Act alternative funding mechanism.

The Williamson Act was intended to be a partnership between the state, counties and landowners to preserve agricultural resources. Counties, in exchange for implementing the State goal of farm and ranch land preservation, were to receive a partial replacement of their foregone property tax from the land enrolled in the program. State subventions have not been paid since 2009, and counties are struggling to meet their responsibilities under the Williamson Act and as a result, farmland protection may be compromised.

AB 1729 would reinstate the program, providing counties subvention funding from the state.

Since 1963 Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCo) have worked within each county to meet their legislative mandate of balancing growth and development with discouraging sprawl and protecting California's important agricultural lands. The Williamson Act and its role in LAFCo law, has proven an effective tool for many LAFCos to reduce sprawl and protect prime agricultural lands. The ramification of the elimination of State subventions and not providing an alternative funding mechanism causes us great concern. Without financial incentives to maintain contracts we believe the ability of LAFCos to meet the Legislative intent to preserve agricultural and open-space lands is compromised.

CHAIR
OLIN WOODS
Public Member

VICE CHAIR
MATT REXROAD
Supervisor – 3rd District

SKIP DAVIES
Mayor
City of Woodland

DON SAYLOR
Supervisor – 2nd District

BILL KRISTOFF
Councilmember
City of West Sacramento

ALTERNATE
ROBERT RAMMING
Public Member

ALTERNATE
JIM PROVENZA
Supervisor – 4th District

ALTERNATE
CECILIA AGUIAR-CURRY
Mayor
City of Winters

Staff
CHRISTINE M. CRAWFORD, AICP
Executive Officer

TRACEY DICKINSON, MPPA
Associate Management Analyst

TERRI TUCK
Commission Clerk

ROBYN TRUITT DRIVON
Commission Counsel

625 Court Street, Suite 203
Woodland CA 95695


(530) 666-8048
lafco@yolocounty.org

www.yololafco.org

April 2, 2014

For these reasons, the Yolo LAFCo respectfully urges your Committee's support of the Williamson Act and requests an "Aye" vote on AB 1729 when it is heard in your committee.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt Rexroad". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Matt Rexroad
Vice Chair

cc: Members, Assembly Local Government Committee
Honorable Dan Logue, California State Assembly

LOCAL
AGENCY
FORMATION
COMMISSION OF
YOLO COUNTY



April 2, 2014

Honorable Katcho Achadjian, Chair
Assembly Local Government Committee
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 4098
Sacramento CA 95814

**Subject: SUPPORT of AB 2156: Local Agency Formation
Commissions: Studies**

Dear Assembly Member Achadjian:

On behalf of the Local Agency Formation Commission of Yolo County (Yolo LAFCo), I write to express our support for AB 2156, as amended, authored by you. This bill would specifically define "joint powers agency" and "joint powers authority" for purposes of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (C-K-H), and include joint powers agencies and joint powers authorities (JPAs) among the entities from which a local agency formation commission (LAFCo) is authorized to request information in order to conduct studies considered relevant by each commission.

Pursuant to C-K-H, LAFCos are charged with evaluating the provision of municipal services and to conduct studies of existing governmental agencies including their service area and service capacities. As many local agencies across the state are providing municipal services through JPAs, having access to the information that outlines service areas and specific services being delivered by these entities is critical to conducting comprehensive studies that support LAFCos core missions of encouraging the efficient delivery of local services and evaluating local agency boundaries.

The bill is substantively informed by and consistent with the earlier work of CalForward (2011) and the Legislative Analyst Office Report of October 21, 2011, the latter of which specifically addressed the relationship between LAFCo and joint powers authorities and joint powers agencies.

CHAIR
OLIN WOODS
Public Member

VICE CHAIR
MATT REXROAD
Supervisor – 3rd District

SKIP DAVIES
Mayor
City of Woodland

DON SAYLOR
Supervisor – 2nd District

BILL KRISTOFF
Councilmember
City of West Sacramento

ALTERNATE
ROBERT RAMMING
Public Member

ALTERNATE
JIM PROVENZA
Supervisor – 4th District

ALTERNATE
CECILIA AGUIAR-CURRY
Mayor
City of Winters

Staff
CHRISTINE M. CRAWFORD, AICP
Executive Officer

TRACEY DICKINSON, MPPA
Associate Management Analyst

TERRI TUCK
Commission Clerk

ROBYN TRUITT DRIVON
Commission Counsel

625 Court Street, Suite 203
Woodland CA 95695

(530) 666-8048
lafco@yolocounty.org

www.yololafco.org

April 2, 2014

The California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions (CALAFCO) would appreciate the opportunity to work on legislation that creates an even stronger association between these entities. Many LAFCo's are seeing JPAs being formed as a way to extend services without oversight thus circumventing the LAFCo review and approval process. Such actions inhibit the ability of LAFCo to fulfill the part of their mission that relates to assuring efficient and accountable government services.

AB 2156 is consistent with the CALAFCO legislative policy of assuring LAFCo's ability to review and act to determine the efficient and sustainable delivery of local services to meet current and future needs, and is an important first step in the development of the relationship between LAFCo's and JPAs. For these reasons, the Yolo LAFCo supports AB 2156 as amended and we thank you for authoring this important piece of legislation.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt Rexroad". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Matt Rexroad
Vice Chair

LOCAL
AGENCY
FORMATION
COMMISSION OF
YOLO COUNTY



April 2, 2014

Honorable Katcho Achadjian, Chair
Assembly Local Government Committee
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 4098
Sacramento CA 95814

Subject: **SUPPORT of AB 2762: Local Government Committee
Omnibus Bill**

Dear Assembly Member Achadjian:

The Local Agency Formation Commission of Yolo County (Yolo LAFCo) is pleased to support a bill sponsored by the California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions (CALAFCO); Assembly Local Government Committee Bill AB 2762, which makes technical, non-substantive changes to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000.

This annual bill includes technical changes to the Act which governs the work of local agency formation commissions. These changes are necessary as commissions implement the Act and small inconsistencies are found or clarifications are needed to make the law as unambiguous as possible. AB 2762 makes several minor technical changes, corrects obsolete and incorrect code references, and makes minor updates to outdated sections. We are very grateful to the Commission staff and counsel, and your Committee staff who worked diligently on this language to ensure there is no substantive change, yet creates a significant increase in the clarity of the Act for all stakeholders.

This legislation helps insure the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act remains a vital and practical law that is consistently applied around the state. We

CHAIR
OLIN WOODS
Public Member

VICE CHAIR
MATT REXROAD
Supervisor – 3rd District

SKIP DAVIES
Mayor
City of Woodland

DON SAYLOR
Supervisor – 2nd District

BILL KRISTOFF
Councilmember
City of West Sacramento

ALTERNATE
ROBERT RAMMING
Public Member

ALTERNATE
JIM PROVENZA
Supervisor – 4th District

ALTERNATE
CECILIA AGUIAR-CURRY
Mayor
City of Winters

Staff
CHRISTINE M. CRAWFORD, AICP
Executive Officer

TRACEY DICKINSON, MPPA
Associate Management Analyst

TERRI TUCK
Commission Clerk

ROBYN TRUITT DRIVON
Commission Counsel

625 Court Street, Suite 203
Woodland CA 95695

(530) 666-8048
lafco@yolocounty.org

www.yololafco.org

April 2, 2014

appreciate your Committee's authorship and support of this bill, and your support of the mission of local agency formation commissions.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Matt Rexroad". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Matt Rexroad
Vice Chair



Consent 8.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Review and file the Fiscal Year (FY) 13-14 3rd Quarter Financial Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Review and file the Fiscal Year (FY) 13-14 3rd Quarter Financial Update.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

The intent of the quarterly financial report is to provide the Commission with an update on how LAFCo performed financially in the previous quarter as compared to the adopted budget and to discuss any issues as appropriate. The practice was recommended during our most recent audit as an additional safeguard to ensure sound financial management, given the small size of the LAFCo staff.

BACKGROUND

The LAFCo FY 2013/14 budget was adopted on May 23, 2013, and during the third quarter LAFCo remained on target with regards to both revenues and expenditures.

LAFCo has received 98.2 percent of its expected revenues for FY 13/14, largely through payments from government agencies. The portion of LAFCo's expected revenues that have not yet been collected are attributed to investment earnings and fees for service, which may still be collected in the final quarter of FY 13/14.

In the first three quarters of the year LAFCo has expended less than expected, and has only reached 58.8 percent of its annual budgeted costs for FY 13/14, however it should be noted that this figure includes our unused contingency of \$40,829.

LAFCo has expended 71.6 percent of the Salary and Benefits appropriation, 57.3 percent of the Services and Supplies appropriation, and 38.8 percent of its Shared Services Initiative appropriation. Although the Shared Services expenses are at only 38.8 percent, the Broadband Strategic Plan is currently expending most of the consultant costs per our contract and so staff expects this percentage to increase significantly during the fourth quarter.

In the final quarter of FY 13/14 staff expects that LAFCo's spending will remain on (or under) target, and staff is not recommending any adjustments to the adopted budget at this time.

Attachments

Item 8-ATTs A-E

Form Review

Inbox

Christine Crawford
Tracey Dickinson LAFCO
Form Started By: Tracey Dickinson
Final Approval Date: 05/06/2014

Reviewed By

Christine Crawford
Tracey Dickinson

Date

05/06/2014 02:36 PM
05/06/2014 03:20 PM
Started On: 05/03/2014 12:31 PM

					Budget Status through 03/31/2014					
Fund	BU	CC	Acct	Account Name	Adopted Appropriation	Adjusted Appropriation	Expenditures	Outstanding Encumbrance	Unencumbered Balance	Percent Approp Used
368	3681		861101	REGULAR EMPLOYEES	\$155,826.00	\$189,325.00	\$122,091.90	\$0.00	\$67,233.10	64%
368	3681		861102	EXTRA HELP	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,753.00	\$0.00	(\$3,753.00)	0%
368	3681		861201	RETIREMENT	\$29,705.00	\$29,705.00	\$23,274.44	\$0.00	\$6,430.56	78%
368	3681		861202	O A S D I	\$11,044.00	\$11,044.00	\$9,609.02	\$0.00	\$1,434.98	87%
368	3681		861203	FICA/MEDICARE	\$2,682.00	\$2,682.00	\$2,247.25	\$0.00	\$434.75	84%
368	3681		861400	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,500.00	0%
368	3681		861500	WORKERS COMPENSATION INSURANCE	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	33%
368	3681		861600	CO CONT-OTHER FRINGE BENEFITS	\$39,576.00	\$39,576.00	\$39,393.00	\$0.00	\$183.00	100%
368	3681		861999	SALARIES ALLOC/ADJ	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$3,807.36)	\$0.00	\$3,807.36	0%
368	3681	8610		Total SALARIES AND EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	\$241,833.00	\$275,332.00	\$197,061.25	\$0.00	\$78,270.75	71.6%
368	3681		862090	COMMUNICATIONS	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$1,542.29	\$0.00	\$1,457.71	51%
368	3681		862130	FOOD	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$175.11	\$0.00	\$324.89	35%
368	3681		862202	INSURANCE-PUBLIC LIABILITY	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$500.00	50%
368	3681		862271	MAINT-EQUIPMENT	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$254.49	\$145.51	\$100.00	80%
368	3681		862330	MEMBERSHIPS	\$2,900.00	\$2,900.00	\$2,300.00	\$0.00	\$600.00	79%
368	3681		862360	MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSE	\$500.00	\$500.00	\$183.64	\$0.00	\$316.36	37%
368	3681		862390	OFFICE EXPENSE	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$529.20	\$31.00	\$439.80	56%
368	3681		862391	OFFICE EXP-POSTAGE (OPTIONAL)	\$750.00	\$750.00	\$44.52	\$0.00	\$705.48	6%
368	3681		862392	OFFICE EXP-PRINTING (OPTIONAL)	\$750.00	\$750.00	\$686.17	\$0.00	\$63.83	91%
368	3681		862417	IT SERVICES-DPT SYS MAINT	\$970.00	\$970.00	\$208.00	\$0.00	\$762.00	21%
368	3681		862418	IT SERVICES-ERP	\$1,242.00	\$1,242.00	\$621.00	\$0.00	\$621.00	50%
368	3681		862419	IT SERVICES-CONNECTIVITY	\$2,696.00	\$2,696.00	\$1,348.00	\$0.00	\$1,348.00	50%
368	3681		862421	AUDITING & FISCAL SERVICES	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00	0%
368	3681		862422	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICE	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$400.00	0%
368	3681		862423	LEGAL SERVICES	\$10,500.00	\$10,500.00	\$2,497.50	\$0.00	\$8,002.50	24%
368	3681		862429	PROFESSIONAL & SPECIALIZED SRV	\$80,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$24,048.84	\$0.00	\$5,951.16	80%
368	3681		862460	PUBLICATIONS & LEGAL NOTICES	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$540.09	\$0.00	\$959.91	36%
368	3681		862491	RENTS & LEASES-EQUIPMENT	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$994.05	\$470.95	\$35.00	98%
368	3681		862495	RECORDS STORAGE "ARCHIVES"	\$400.00	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$400.00	0%
368	3681		862520	SMALL TOOLS & MINOR EQUIPMENT	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$18.39	\$0.00	(\$18.39)	0%
368	3681		862548	TRAINING EXPENSE	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00	\$6,190.88	\$0.00	\$3,809.12	62%
368	3681		862610	TRANSPORTATION & TRAVEL	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,143.20	\$0.00	\$356.80	76%
368	3681	8620		Total SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$127,608.00	\$77,608.00	\$43,825.37	\$647.46	\$33,135.17	57.3%
368	3681		863102	PAYMENTS TO OTH GOVT INSTT	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,309.35	\$0.00	(\$309.35)	131%
368	3681	8630		Total OTHER CHARGES	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$1,309.35	\$0.00	(\$309.35)	130.9%
368	3681		866110	OPER TRANS OUT-EQUIP PRE-FUND	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00	0%
368	3681	8660		Total OPERATING TRANSFERS OUT	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00	0%
368	3681		869900	APPROP FOR CONTINGENCY	\$74,328.00	\$40,829.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$40,829.00	0%
368	3681	8690		Total PROVISIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	\$74,328.00	\$40,829.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$40,829.00	0%
368	3681			CC Total NONE	\$445,969.00	\$395,969.00	\$242,195.97	\$647.46	\$153,125.57	61.3%
368	3681	SSP	862423	LEGAL SERVICES	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$506.25	\$0.00	(\$506.25)	0%
368	3681	SSP	862429	PROFESSIONAL & SPECIALIZED SRV	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$18,907.00	\$0.00	\$31,093.00	38%
368	3681	SSP	8620	Total SERVICES AND SUPPLIES	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$19,413.25	\$0.00	\$30,586.75	38.8%
368	3681	SSP		CC Total SHARED SERVICES INITIATIVE	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$19,413.25	\$0.00	\$30,586.75	38.8%
368	3681			F/BU Total LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMM	\$445,969.00	\$445,969.00	\$261,609.22	\$647.46	\$183,712.32	58.8%

					Budget Status through 03/31/2014				
Fund	BU	CC	Account	Account Name	Adopted Estimated Revenue	Adjusted Estimated Revenue	Revenue Realized	Unrealized	Percent Revenues Realized
368	3681		824100	INVESTMENT EARNINGS	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	(\$641.23)	\$858.77	43%
368	3681		8240	Total REVENUE FR USE OF MONEY & PROP	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00	(\$641.23)	\$858.77	42.7%
368	3681		825820	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-OTH CO- CITYS	\$182,070.00	\$182,070.00	(\$182,070.00)	\$0.00	100%
368	3681		825821	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WEST SAC	\$59,589.00	\$59,589.00	(\$59,589.00)	\$0.00	100%
368	3681		825822	OTHER GOVT AGCY-WOODLAND	\$54,488.00	\$54,488.00	(\$54,488.00)	\$0.00	100%
368	3681		825823	OTHER GOVT AGCY-WINTERS	\$5,874.00	\$5,874.00	(\$5,874.00)	\$0.00	100%
368	3681		825824	OTHER GOVT AGCY-DAVIS	\$62,120.00	\$62,120.00	(\$62,120.00)	\$0.00	100%
368	3681		8252	Total INTERGOVT REV-OTHER	\$364,141.00	\$364,141.00	(\$364,141.00)	\$0.00	100.0%
368	3681		826225	LAFCO FEES	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00	0%
368	3681		8260	Total CHARGES FOR SERVICES	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00	0.0%
368	3681			CC Total NONE	\$371,641.00	\$371,641.00	(\$364,782.23)	\$6,858.77	98.2%
368	3681			BU Total LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMM	\$371,641.00	\$371,641.00	(\$364,782.23)	\$6,858.77	98.2%
368				FD Total LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMM	\$371,641.00	\$371,641.00	(\$364,782.23)	\$6,858.77	98.2%

General Ledger January 1 - 31, 2014							
Account	Date	Program	Description	Document	Debit	Credit	Balance
01-0000	01/01/2014	*****	CASH IN TREASURY		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$460,903.55
01-0000	01/01/2014		ITD 1ST QTR-GIS PROJECT	IB140434	\$0.00	\$71.50	\$460,832.05
01-0000	01/01/2014		185-1 11/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	JE003180	\$0.00	\$6.64	\$460,825.41
01-0000	01/01/2014		185-1 12/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	JE003189	\$0.00	\$130.53	\$460,694.88
01-0000	01/01/2014		185-1 12/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	JE003626	\$0.00	\$6.64	\$460,688.24
01-0000	01/03/2014		12/28/13 Payroll	PR000122	\$0.00	\$11,376.76	\$449,311.48
01-0000	01/06/2014		12/13 CAL CARD LAFCO-TTUCK	JE003156	\$0.00	\$20.00	\$449,291.48
01-0000	01/06/2014		12/13 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	JE003156	\$0.00	\$32.25	\$449,259.23
01-0000	01/07/2014		2ND QUARTER FY 13/14 COPIES	JE003194	\$0.00	\$151.00	\$449,108.23
01-0000	01/08/2014		WARRANTS	WA010814	\$0.00	\$5,003.54	\$444,104.69
01-0000	01/15/2014		WARRANTS	WA011514	\$0.00	\$675.09	\$443,429.60
01-0000	01/17/2014		01/11/14 Payroll	PR000125	\$0.00	\$11,931.19	\$431,498.41
01-0000	01/22/2014		WARRANTS	WA012214	\$0.00	\$105.45	\$431,392.96
01-0000	01/24/2014		PPE 11/2/13 T DICKINSON	JE003524	\$412.25	\$0.00	\$431,805.21
01-0000	01/24/2014		PPE 11/16/13 T DICKINSON	JE003524	\$412.25	\$0.00	\$432,217.46
01-0000	01/24/2014		PPE 12/14/13 T DICKINSON	JE003524	\$426.12	\$0.00	\$432,643.58
01-0000	01/24/2014		PPE 12/28/13 T DICKINSON	JE003524	\$426.12	\$0.00	\$433,069.70
01-0000	01/24/2014		PPE 1/11/14 T DICKINSON	JE003524	\$426.13	\$0.00	\$433,495.83
01-0000	01/30/2014		2ND QTR INV-GIS PROJECTS	IB140958	\$0.00	\$136.50	\$433,359.33
01-0000	01/31/2014		01/25/14 Payroll	PR000133	\$0.00	\$11,554.38	\$421,804.95
			Ending Balance:		\$2,102.87	\$41,201.47	\$421,804.95
40-0500	01/01/2014	*****	FUTURE LONG TERM DEBT REQUIRE		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,131.00
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,131.00
60-0600	01/01/2014	*****	ACCRUED COMPENSATION ABSENCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$7,131.00)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$7,131.00)
71-0000	01/31/2014	*****	RESERVE FOR ENCUMBRANCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$967.94)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$967.94)
75-0000	01/01/2014	*****	FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$183,405.06)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$183,405.06)
82-0000	01/31/2014	*****	REVENUE		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$364,648.10)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$364,648.10)
86-0000	01/31/2014	*****	EXPENDITURES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$200,576.21
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$200,576.21
91-0000	01/31/2014	*****	ESTIMATED REVENUES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$371,641.00
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$371,641.00
93-0000	01/31/2014	*****	APPROPRIATIONS		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$445,969.00)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$445,969.00)
95-0000	01/31/2014	*****	ENCUMBRANCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$967.94
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$967.94

General Ledger February 1 - 28, 2014							
Account	Date	Program	Description	Document	Debit	Credit	Balance
01-0000	02/01/2014	*****	CASH IN TREASURY		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$421,804.95
01-0000	02/01/2014		PPE 1/25/13 T DICKINSON	JE003701	\$426.13	\$0.00	\$422,231.08
01-0000	02/01/2014		185-1 01/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	JE003740	\$0.00	\$131.06	\$422,100.02
01-0000	02/01/2014		OCT-DEC INTEREST APPORT	JE004003	\$134.13	\$0.00	\$422,234.15
01-0000	02/01/2014		185-1 01/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	JE004192	\$0.00	\$8.50	\$422,225.65
01-0000	02/05/2014		WARRANTS	WA020514	\$0.00	\$123.98	\$422,101.67
01-0000	02/12/2014		WARRANTS	WA021214	\$0.00	\$7,061.04	\$415,040.63
01-0000	02/14/2014		02/08/14 Payroll	PR000136	\$0.00	\$11,570.86	\$403,469.77
01-0000	02/19/2014		WARRANTS	WA021914	\$0.00	\$1,171.75	\$402,298.02
01-0000	02/26/2014		WARRANTS	WA022614	\$0.00	\$59.45	\$402,238.57
01-0000	02/28/2014		02/22/14 Payroll	PR000145	\$0.00	\$11,441.68	\$390,796.89
			Ending Balance:		\$560.26	\$31,568.32	\$390,796.89
40-0500	02/01/2014	*****	FUTURE LONG TERM DEBT REQUIRE		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,131.00
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,131.00
60-0600	02/01/2014	*****	ACCRUED COMPENSATION ABSENCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$7,131.00)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$7,131.00)
71-0000	02/28/2014	*****	RESERVE FOR ENCUMBRANCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$738.51)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$738.51)
75-0000	02/01/2014	*****	FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$183,405.06)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$183,405.06)
82-0000	02/28/2014	*****	REVENUE		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$364,782.23)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$364,782.23)
86-0000	02/28/2014	*****	EXPENDITURES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$231,718.40
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$231,718.40
91-0000	02/28/2014	*****	ESTIMATED REVENUES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$371,641.00
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$371,641.00
93-0000	02/28/2014	*****	APPROPRIATIONS		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$445,969.00)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$445,969.00)
95-0000	02/28/2014	*****	ENCUMBRANCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$738.51
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$738.51

General Ledger March 1 - 31, 2014							
Account	Date	Program	Description	Document	Debit	Credit	Balance
01-0000	03/01/2014	*****	CASH IN TREASURY		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$390,796.89
01-0000	03/01/2014		NOE-YZWD DISSOLUTION #916	IB141175	\$0.00	\$50.00	\$390,746.89
01-0000	03/01/2014		PPE 2/8/13 T DICKINSON	JE003872	\$426.12	\$0.00	\$391,173.01
01-0000	03/01/2014		185-1 02/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	JE004292	\$0.00	\$128.16	\$391,044.85
01-0000	03/01/2014		185-1 02/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	JE004748	\$0.00	\$15.15	\$391,029.70
01-0000	03/05/2014		WARRANTS	WA030514	\$0.00	\$6,201.20	\$384,828.50
01-0000	03/06/2014		02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-TTUCK	JE004333	\$0.00	\$18.39	\$384,810.11
01-0000	03/06/2014		02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	JE004333	\$0.00	\$200.67	\$384,609.44
01-0000	03/10/2014		LEGAL SRVCS 10/01-12/31/13	IB141188	\$0.00	\$1,485.00	\$383,124.44
01-0000	03/11/2014		PPE 2/22/13 T DICKINSON	JE004385	\$426.12	\$0.00	\$383,550.56
01-0000	03/11/2014		PPE 3/8/13 T DICKINSON	JE004386	\$426.12	\$0.00	\$383,976.68
01-0000	03/14/2014		03/08/14 Payroll	PR000151	\$0.00	\$11,443.18	\$372,533.50
01-0000	03/19/2014		WARRANTS	WA031914	\$0.00	\$184.27	\$372,349.23
01-0000	03/27/2014		OPEB SET-ASIDE MO 2013-38	JE004712	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$322,349.23
01-0000	03/28/2014		03/22/14 Payroll	PR000158	\$0.00	\$11,443.16	\$310,906.07
			Ending Balance:		\$1,278.36	\$81,169.18	\$310,906.07
04-0000	03/01/2014	*****	RESTR CASH-OPEB		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
04-0000	03/27/2014		OPEB SET-ASIDE MO 2013-38	JE004712	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00
			Ending Balance:		\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$50,000.00
40-0500	03/01/2014	*****	FUTURE LONG TERM DEBT REQUIRE		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,131.00
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,131.00
60-0600	03/01/2014	*****	ACCRUED COMPENSATION ABSENCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$7,131.00)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$7,131.00)
71-0000	03/31/2014	*****	RESERVE FOR ENCUMBRANCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$621.86)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$621.86)
74-0001	03/01/2014	*****	COMMITTED-OPEB		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
74-0001	03/27/2014		OPEB SET-ASIDE MO 2013-38	JE004712	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	(\$50,000.00)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$50,000.00	(\$50,000.00)
75-0000	03/01/2014	*****	FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$183,405.06)
75-0000	03/27/2014		OPEB SET-ASIDE MO 2013-38	JE004712	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	(\$133,405.06)
			Ending Balance:		\$50,000.00	\$0.00	(\$133,405.06)
82-0000	03/31/2014	*****	REVENUE		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$364,782.23)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$364,782.23)
86-0000	03/31/2014	*****	EXPENDITURES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$261,609.22
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$261,609.22
91-0000	03/31/2014	*****	ESTIMATED REVENUES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$371,641.00
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$371,641.00
93-0000	03/31/2014	*****	APPROPRIATIONS		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$445,969.00)
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$445,969.00)
95-0000	03/31/2014	*****	ENCUMBRANCES		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$621.86
			Ending Balance:		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$621.86

						Revenue Detail January 1 - March 31, 2014					
Date	FD	B/U	C/C	Account	Program	Vendor	Vendor Name	Description	Warrant Number	DOC #	Amount
02/01/2014	368	3681		824100		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	OCT-DEC INTEREST APPORT		JE004003	(\$134.13)
											(\$134.13)

							Expenditure Detail by Date January 1 - March 31, 2014					
Date	FD	BU	CC	ACCT	PROG	Agreement	Vendor	Vendor Name	Description	WT #	DOC #	Amount
01/03/14	368	3681		861101			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$6,829.76
01/17/14	368	3681		861101			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$6,829.76
01/31/14	368	3681		861101			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$6,829.76
02/14/14	368	3681		861101			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$6,880.98
02/28/14	368	3681		861101			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$6,880.99
03/14/14	368	3681		861101			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$6,880.98
03/28/14	368	3681		861101			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$6,880.98
01/03/14	368	3681		861201			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$1,301.96
01/17/14	368	3681		861201			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$1,301.97
01/31/14	368	3681		861201			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$1,301.97
02/14/14	368	3681		861201			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$1,311.73
02/28/14	368	3681		861201			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$1,311.72
03/14/14	368	3681		861201			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$1,311.73
03/28/14	368	3681		861201			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$1,311.73
01/03/14	368	3681		861202			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$537.58
01/17/14	368	3681		861202			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$569.51
01/31/14	368	3681		861202			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$547.79
02/14/14	368	3681		861202			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$548.19
02/28/14	368	3681		861202			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$540.75
03/14/14	368	3681		861202			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$541.98
03/28/14	368	3681		861202			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$541.95
01/03/14	368	3681		861203			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$125.71
01/17/14	368	3681		861203			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$133.20
01/31/14	368	3681		861203			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$128.11
02/14/14	368	3681		861203			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$128.21
02/28/14	368	3681		861203			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$126.47
03/14/14	368	3681		861203			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$126.74
03/28/14	368	3681		861203			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$126.75
01/03/14	368	3681		861600			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$2,556.75
01/17/14	368	3681		861600			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$3,071.75
01/31/14	368	3681		861600			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$2,721.75
02/14/14	368	3681		861600			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$2,676.75
02/28/14	368	3681		861600			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$2,556.75
03/14/14	368	3681		861600			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$2,556.75
03/28/14	368	3681		861600			99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$2,556.75
01/24/14	368	3681		861999			0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 1/11/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$426.13)

							Expenditure Detail by Date January 1 - March 31, 2014				
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 11/16/13 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$412.25)
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 11/2/13 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$412.25)
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 12/14/13 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$426.12)
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 12/28/13 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$426.12)
02/01/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 1/25/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003701	(\$426.13)
03/01/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 2/8/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003872	(\$426.12)
03/11/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 2/22/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE004385	(\$426.12)
03/11/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 3/8/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE004386	(\$426.12)
01/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 11/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE003180	\$6.64
01/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 12/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE003189	\$130.53
01/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 12/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE003626	\$6.64
01/03/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$25.00
01/17/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$25.00
01/31/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$25.00
02/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 01/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE003740	\$131.06
02/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 01/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE004192	\$8.50
02/14/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$25.00
02/28/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$25.00
03/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 02/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE004292	\$128.16
03/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 02/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE004748	\$15.15
03/14/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$25.00
03/28/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$25.00
03/06/14	368	3681		862130		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE004333	\$62.63
02/05/14	368	3681		862271		3351	INLAND BUSINESS SYSTEMS INC	INV 05S5931 01/29/14 PO140124	09417922	PO140124	\$112.78
03/06/14	368	3681		862360		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE004333	\$135.04
02/05/14	368	3681		862390		29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 012314 01/23/14 PO	09417918	PO140083	\$6.20
02/12/14	368	3681		862390		33557	STAPLES CONTRACT & COMMERCIAL	INV 8028553311 01/31/14	09418347	CL086285	\$61.04
03/05/14	368	3681		862390		29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 022014 02/20/14 PO	09419789	PO140083	\$6.20
03/05/14	368	3681		862390		99998	SAN DIEGO LAFCO	2013 LAFCO PROCEDURES GUIDE	09419633	CL087639	\$30.00
01/07/14	368	3681		862392		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	2ND QUARTER FY 13/14 COPIES	00000001	JE003194	\$151.00
02/26/14	368	3681		862392		34136	REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY CA	INV#YC97796 02/11/14	09419212	CL086960	\$59.45
01/01/14	368	3681		862417		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	ITD 1ST QTR-GIS PROJECT	00000001	IB140434	\$71.50
01/30/14	368	3681		862417		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	2ND QTR INV-GIS PROJECTS	00000001	IB140958	\$136.50
03/10/14	368	3681		862423		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	LEGAL SRVCS 10/01-12/31/13	00000001	IB141188	\$1,248.75

Item 8
ATT D - Expense Detail by Date

							Expenditure Detail by Date January 1 - March 31, 2014				
03/18/14	368	3681		862423		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	CRRCT IB140703 12/10/13	00000001	JE004539	(\$1,518.75)
03/18/14	368	3681		862423		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	CRRCT IB140703 12/10/13	00000001	JE004539	\$1,248.75
01/15/14	368	3681		862429		27214	ROSENOW SPEVACEK GROUP INC	INV 0029546 10/31/13	09416491	CL084693	\$675.09
02/19/14	368	3681		862460		2213	THE DAVIS ENTERPRISE INC	AD 03545404-001 02/05/14	09418827	CL086849	\$241.30
03/19/14	368	3681		862460		2213	THE DAVIS ENTERPRISE INC	AD#03545853-001 03/05/14	09420558	CL088198	\$78.82
01/08/14	368	3681		862491		29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 122613 PO140083	09415969	PO140083	\$5.00
01/22/14	368	3681		862491		33922	LYON FINANCIAL SVC UNDERWRITER	INV 245008149 01/13/14 PO14025	09417061	PO140255	\$105.45
02/05/14	368	3681		862491		29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 012314 01/23/14 PO	09417918	PO140083	\$5.00
02/19/14	368	3681		862491		33922	LYON FINANCIAL SVC UNDERWRITER	INV 247114168 02/10/14 PO14025	09418874	PO140255	\$105.45
03/05/14	368	3681		862491		29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 022014 02/20/14 PO	09419789	PO140083	\$5.00
03/19/14	368	3681		862491		33922	LYON FINANCIAL SVC UNDERWRITER	INV 249236621 03/13/14 PO14025	09420653	PO140255	\$105.45
03/06/14	368	3681		862520		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-TTUCK	00000001	JE004333	\$18.39
01/06/14	368	3681		862548		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	12/13 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE003156	\$20.00
01/06/14	368	3681		862548		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	12/13 CAL CARD LAFCO-TTUCK	00000001	JE003156	\$20.00
01/08/14	368	3681		862548		27645	TERRI TUCK	2ND QTR MILEAGE FY 13/14	09415912	CL083936	\$45.31
02/19/14	368	3681		862548		6029	CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION FOR	CALAFCO STAFF WORKSHOP	09418826	CL086656	\$825.00
01/06/14	368	3681		862610		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	12/13 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE003156	\$12.25
01/08/14	368	3681		862610		35585	CHRISTINE CRAWFORD	2ND QTR MILEAGE FY 13/14	09415909	CL083978	\$172.33
01/08/14	368	3681		862610		38204	TRACEY DICKINSON	2ND QTR MILEAGE FY 13/14	09415910	CL083938	\$20.90
03/06/14	368	3681		862610		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE004333	\$3.00
03/01/14	368	3681		863102		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	NOE-YZWD DISSOLUTION #916	00000001	IB141175	\$50.00
03/10/14	368	3681	SSP	862423		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	LEGAL SRVCS 10/01-12/31/13	00000001	IB141188	\$236.25
03/18/14	368	3681	SSP	862423		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	CRRCT IB140703 12/10/13	00000001	JE004539	\$270.00
01/08/14	368	3681	SSP	862429		38211	MAGELLAN ADVISORS, LLC	INV MA12311305 12/31/13	09415911	CL084293	\$4,760.00
02/12/14	368	3681	SSP	862429		38211	MAGELLAN ADVISORS, LLC	INV MA02061402 02/06/13	09418346	CL086251	\$7,000.00
03/05/14	368	3681	SSP	862429		38211	MAGELLAN ADVISORS, LLC	INV MA03041408 03/04/14	09419632	CL087641	\$6,160.00
								Total Budget Year Expenditures:			\$100,131.61
								Grand Total:			\$100,131.61

Expenditure Detail by Account January 1 - March 31, 2014											
Date	FD	BU	CC	Acct	Prog	Vendor	Vendor Name	Description	WT #	DOC #	Amount
01/03/14	368	3681		861101		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$6,829.76
01/17/14	368	3681		861101		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$6,829.76
01/31/14	368	3681		861101		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$6,829.76
02/14/14	368	3681		861101		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$6,880.98
02/28/14	368	3681		861101		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$6,880.99
03/14/14	368	3681		861101		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$6,880.98
03/28/14	368	3681		861101		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$6,880.98
								Account 3683681 861101		Total:	\$48,013.21
01/03/14	368	3681		861201		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$1,301.96
01/17/14	368	3681		861201		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$1,301.97
01/31/14	368	3681		861201		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$1,301.97
02/14/14	368	3681		861201		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$1,311.73
02/28/14	368	3681		861201		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$1,311.72
03/14/14	368	3681		861201		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$1,311.73
03/28/14	368	3681		861201		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$1,311.73
								Account 3683681 861201		Total:	\$9,152.81
01/03/14	368	3681		861202		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$537.58
01/17/14	368	3681		861202		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$569.51
01/31/14	368	3681		861202		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$547.79
02/14/14	368	3681		861202		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$548.19
02/28/14	368	3681		861202		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$540.75
03/14/14	368	3681		861202		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$541.98
03/28/14	368	3681		861202		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$541.95
								Account 3683681 861202		Total:	\$3,827.75
01/03/14	368	3681		861203		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$125.71
01/17/14	368	3681		861203		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$133.20
01/31/14	368	3681		861203		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$128.11
02/14/14	368	3681		861203		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$128.21
02/28/14	368	3681		861203		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$126.47
03/14/14	368	3681		861203		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$126.74
03/28/14	368	3681		861203		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$126.75
								Account 3683681 861203		Total:	\$895.19
01/03/14	368	3681		861600		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$2,556.75
01/17/14	368	3681		861600		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$3,071.75
01/31/14	368	3681		861600		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$2,721.75
02/14/14	368	3681		861600		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$2,676.75
02/28/14	368	3681		861600		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$2,556.75
03/14/14	368	3681		861600		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$2,556.75
03/28/14	368	3681		861600		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$2,556.75
								Account 3683681 861600		Total:	\$18,697.25

Expenditure Detail by Account January 1 - March 31, 2014											
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 1/11/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$426.13)
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 11/16/13 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$412.25)
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 11/2/13 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$412.25)
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 12/14/13 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$426.12)
01/24/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 12/28/13 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003524	(\$426.12)
02/01/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 1/25/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003701	(\$426.13)
03/01/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 2/8/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE003872	(\$426.12)
03/11/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 2/22/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE004385	(\$426.12)
03/11/14	368	3681		861999		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	PPE 3/8/14 T DICKINSON	00000001	JE004386	(\$426.12)
								Account 3683681 861999		Total:	(\$3,807.36)
01/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 11/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE003180	\$6.64
01/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 12/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE003189	\$130.53
01/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 12/13 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE003626	\$6.64
01/03/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	12/28/13 Payroll	00000003	PR000122	\$25.00
01/17/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/11/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000125	\$25.00
01/31/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	01/25/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000133	\$25.00
02/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 01/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE003740	\$131.06
02/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 01/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE004192	\$8.50
02/14/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000136	\$25.00
02/28/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	02/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000145	\$25.00
03/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 02/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE004292	\$128.16
03/01/14	368	3681		862090		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	185-1 02/14 INTERNAL TELEPHONE	00000001	JE004748	\$15.15
03/14/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/08/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000151	\$25.00
03/28/14	368	3681		862090		99999	VARIOUS VENDORS	03/22/14 Payroll	00000003	PR000158	\$25.00
								Account 3683681 862090		Total:	\$601.68
03/06/14	368	3681		862130		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE004333	\$62.63
								Account 3683681 862130		Total:	\$62.63
02/05/14	368	3681		862271		3351	INLAND BUSINESS SYSTEMS INC	INV 05S5931 01/29/14 PO140124	09417922	PO140124	\$112.78
								Account 3683681 862271		Total:	\$112.78
03/06/14	368	3681		862360		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE004333	\$135.04
								Account 3683681 862360		Total:	\$135.04
02/05/14	368	3681		862390		29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 012314 01/23/14 PO	09417918	PO140083	\$6.20
02/12/14	368	3681		862390		33557	STAPLES CONTRACT & COMMERCIAL	INV 8028553311 01/31/14	09418347	CL086285	\$61.04
03/05/14	368	3681		862390		29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 022014 02/20/14 PO	09419789	PO140083	\$6.20
03/05/14	368	3681		862390		99998	SAN DIEGO LAFCO	2013 LAFCO PROCEDURES GUIDE	09419633	CL087639	\$30.00
								Account 3683681 862390		Total:	\$103.44
01/07/14	368	3681		862392		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	2ND QUARTER FY 13/14 COPIES	00000001	JE003194	\$151.00
02/26/14	368	3681		862392		34136	REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY CA	INV#YC97796 02/11/14	09419212	CL086960	\$59.45
								Account 3683681 862392		Total:	\$210.45
01/01/14	368	3681		862417		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	ITD 1ST QTR-GIS PROJECT	00000001	IB140434	\$71.50
01/30/14	368	3681		862417		0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	2ND QTR INV-GIS PROJECTS	00000001	IB140958	\$136.50
								Account 3683681 862417		Total:	\$208.00

Expenditure Detail by Account January 1 - March 31, 2014										
03/10/14	368	3681		862423	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	LEGAL SRVCS 10/01-12/31/13	00000001	IB141188	\$1,248.75
03/18/14	368	3681		862423	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	CRRCT IB140703 12/10/13	00000001	JE004539	(\$1,518.75)
03/18/14	368	3681		862423	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	CRRCT IB140703 12/10/13	00000001	JE004539	\$1,248.75
							Account 3683681 862423		Total:	\$978.75
01/15/14	368	3681		862429	27214	ROSENOW SPEVACEK GROUP INC	INV 0029546 10/31/13	09416491	CL084693	\$675.09
							Account 3683681 862429		Total:	\$675.09
02/19/14	368	3681		862460	2213	THE DAVIS ENTERPRISE INC	AD 03545404-001 02/05/14	09418827	CL086849	\$241.30
03/19/14	368	3681		862460	2213	THE DAVIS ENTERPRISE INC	AD#03545853-001 03/05/14	09420558	CL088198	\$78.82
							Account 3683681 862460		Total:	\$320.12
01/08/14	368	3681		862491	29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 122613 PO140083	09415969	PO140083	\$5.00
01/22/14	368	3681		862491	33922	LYON FINANCIAL SVC UNDERWRITER	INV 245008149 01/13/14 PO14025	09417061	PO140255	\$105.45
02/05/14	368	3681		862491	29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 012314 01/23/14 PO	09417918	PO140083	\$5.00
02/19/14	368	3681		862491	33922	LYON FINANCIAL SVC UNDERWRITER	INV 247114168 02/10/14 PO14025	09418874	PO140255	\$105.45
03/05/14	368	3681		862491	29920	DSW HOLDINGS INC	INV 9951047 022014 02/20/14 PO	09419789	PO140083	\$5.00
03/19/14	368	3681		862491	33922	LYON FINANCIAL SVC UNDERWRITER	INV 249236621 03/13/14 PO14025	09420653	PO140255	\$105.45
							Account 3683681 862491		Total:	\$331.35
03/06/14	368	3681		862520	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-TTUCK	00000001	JE004333	\$18.39
							Account 3683681 862520		Total:	\$18.39
01/06/14	368	3681		862548	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	12/13 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE003156	\$20.00
01/06/14	368	3681		862548	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	12/13 CAL CARD LAFCO-TTUCK	00000001	JE003156	\$20.00
01/08/14	368	3681		862548	27645	TERRI TUCK	2ND QTR MILEAGE FY 13/14	09415912	CL083936	\$45.31
02/19/14	368	3681		862548	6029	CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION FOR	CALAFCO STAFF WORKSHOP	09418826	CL086656	\$825.00
							Account 3683681 862548		Total:	\$910.31
01/06/14	368	3681		862610	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	12/13 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE003156	\$12.25
01/08/14	368	3681		862610	35585	CHRISTINE CRAWFORD	2ND QTR MILEAGE FY 13/14	09415909	CL083978	\$172.33
01/08/14	368	3681		862610	38204	TRACEY DICKINSON	2ND QTR MILEAGE FY 13/14	09415910	CL083938	\$20.90
03/06/14	368	3681		862610	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	02/14 CAL CARD LAFCO-CCRAWFORD	00000001	JE004333	\$3.00
							Account 3683681 862610		Total:	\$208.48
03/01/14	368	3681		863102	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	NOE-YZWD DISSOLUTION #916	00000001	IB141175	\$50.00
							Account 3683681 863102		Total:	\$50.00
03/10/14	368	3681	SSP	862423	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	LEGAL SRVCS 10/01-12/31/13	00000001	IB141188	\$236.25
03/18/14	368	3681	SSP	862423	0	UNASSIGNED VENDOR	CRRCT IB140703 12/10/13	00000001	JE004539	\$270.00
							Account 3683681SSP 862423		Total:	\$506.25
01/08/14	368	3681	SSP	862429	38211	MAGELLAN ADVISORS, LLC	INV MA12311305 12/31/13	09415911	CL084293	\$4,760.00
02/12/14	368	3681	SSP	862429	38211	MAGELLAN ADVISORS, LLC	INV MA02061402 02/06/13	09418346	CL086251	\$7,000.00
03/05/14	368	3681	SSP	862429	38211	MAGELLAN ADVISORS, LLC	INV MA03041408 03/04/14	09419632	CL087641	\$6,160.00
							Account 3683681SSP 862429		Total:	\$17,920.00
Total Budget Year Expenditures:										\$100,131.61
Grand Total:										\$100,131.61



Consent 9.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Ratify Resolution 2014-02 commending City Member Skip Davies for his tenure with the Yolo LAFCo

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Ratify Resolution

Attachments

[Item 9-SDavies Resolution](#)

Form Review

Form Started By: Terri Tuck
Final Approval Date: 05/05/2014

Started On: 05/05/2014 12:37 PM

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF YOLO COUNTY

**Resolution of Commendation
Marlin H. "Skip" Davies**

RESOLUTION № 2014 - 02

WHEREAS, Marlin H. "Skip" Davies was first elected to the Woodland City Council in 2006 and reelected in 2010; and

WHEREAS, on May 12, 2008, Mr. Davies was sworn in as an Alternate City Member to the Local Agency Formation Commission of Yolo County; and

WHEREAS, during his tenure as an Alternate City Member, Skip took his LAFCo responsibilities seriously, attending most LAFCo meetings; and

WHEREAS, Commissioner Davies served from May 2010 through May 2014 as a Regular City Member of LAFCo; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Davies had a practical approach to problem solving, kept a sharp eye on the budget and was continually a strong voice for Woodland and the other cities within the County; and

WHEREAS, Commissioner Davies was always prepared to discuss the issues of the day, ask pertinent questions and provide valuable insight to the process; and

WHEREAS, during his six (6) years as a Commissioner, Skip considered and deliberated on a range of municipal service reviews and sphere of influence studies and approximately eleven (11) proposals which consisted of one (1) failed incorporation, two (2) dissolutions, two (2) reorganizations, four (4) annexations, and two (2) out of agency agreements; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Davies participated actively in the selection of the current Executive Officer and provided useful guidance and support during her ongoing appointment; and

WHEREAS, Commissioner Davies showed his genuine interest in LAFCo and dedication above and beyond by participating on LAFCo sub-committees for shared services and as an alternate for an ad hoc legislative sub-committee; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Davies was integral to discussions implementing and adopting the Yolo LAFCo Shared Services Strategic Plan, a county-wide Shared Services Initiative led by LAFCo in conjunction with the County and its four (4) cities; and

WHEREAS, Skip had a good sense of humor, not taking himself or others overly seriously, was personable, conscientious, thoughtful, and pragmatic in his approach during his tenure with Yolo LAFCo; and

WHEREAS, this year, at the end of his term as Mayor of the City of Woodland, Mr. Davies will be retiring from city government to spend more time with his family; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Local Agency Formation Commission of Yolo County commends Marlin H. "Skip" Davies for his steadfast efforts and valuable contribution as a Yolo LAFCo Commissioner and warmly wishes him the best in all his future endeavors.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 22nd day of May 2014, by the following vote:

AYES: Aguiar-Curry, Kristoff, Rexroad, Saylor, Woods

Olin Woods, Chair
Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission



Regular 10.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Elect a Chair and Vice-Chair for the Commission to serve a one-year term, which ends May 2015

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Elect a Chair and Vice-Chair for the Commission to serve a one-year term, which ends May 2015.

BACKGROUND

At the regular meeting of the Commission held in May of each year, the members of the Commission elect a Chair and Vice-Chair for a one-year term as stated in the Yolo LAFCo Administrative Policies and Procedures and consistent with state law.

The current Chair is Public Member **Olin Woods**. The current Vice-Chair is County Member **Matt Rexroad**.

Attachments

No file(s) attached.

Form Review

Inbox

Christine Crawford

Form Started By: Terri Tuck

Final Approval Date: 04/09/2014

Reviewed By

Christine Crawford

Date

04/09/2014 09:32 AM

Started On: 04/08/2014 03:22 PM



Regular 11.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Select Shared Services Subcommittee Member to replace former City Member Skip Davis

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Select Shared Services Subcommittee Member to replace former City Member Skip Davis

FISCAL IMPACT

None

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

To fill vacant city member position on Shared Service Subcommittee so that members and staff can meet periodically to discuss any integration issues that may arise.

BACKGROUND

In April 2012, a subcommittee of Commissioners Saylor and Davies, in conjunction with the Executive Officer, was formed to look at LAFCo's role with shared services and how to integrate the many strands of activity already underway on shared services efforts, such as the Yolo Leaders Group and the City/County Managers Group, etcetera. This initial focused effort resulted in LAFCo's Shared Services Strategic Plan adopted by the Commission in December 2012 and last updated in June 2013. The subcommittee has not met since that time, but the need may arise and staff would recommend continuing the subcommittee on an ad hoc basis.

Attachments

No file(s) attached.

Form Review

Inbox

Christine Crawford
Form Started By: Terri Tuck
Final Approval Date: 05/06/2014

Reviewed By

Christine Crawford

Date

05/06/2014 02:10 PM
Started On: 04/14/2014 12:49 PM



LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Receive the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Final Budget, open the Public Hearing for comments, close the Public Hearing, consider and adopt the Final LAFCo Budget for FY 14/15 (staff recommends budget Option 1)

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. Receive staff presentation on the Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2014/15.
2. Open the Public Hearing for public comments on the item.
3. Close the Public Hearing.
4. Consider and adopt Option 1 as the Final LAFCo budget for Fiscal Year 2014/15.

FISCAL IMPACT

The attached LAFCo budget includes proposed revenues and expenditures for LAFCo for the 2014/15 fiscal year (FY). This budget maintains adequate support for the Commission to meet its responsibilities under the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg (CKH) Act and the Shared Services Program for FY 14/15. Adopting a final budget will ensure LAFCo is adequately funded to meet its legal obligations and maintain the shared services program.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

Each year Yolo County LAFCo adopts an annual budget with notice to the four cities and Yolo County. In accordance with the CKH Act, a proposed budget must be adopted by May 1 and final budget by June 15 of each year. Following approval of the final budget and no later than July 1, the auditor requests payment from each agency.

In accordance with the CKH Act, the cities and County split the cost of LAFCo funding 50/50. A formula for the split of the cities' share is outlined in Government Code Section 56381 (b)(1); which would be in proportion to a city's tax revenue or an alternative method approved by a majority of the cities. Beginning in FY 2007-08, the cities of Yolo County developed an alternative formula to apportion their 50% of LAFCo funding by averaging a city's general tax revenue (less grant monies) and population.

In summary, each agency's portion of the overall LAFCo budget is listed below. Please note the percentages have adjusted slightly since the draft budget was considered in March due to the recent release of the latest State Controller's Annual Cities Report (which lists cities' general tax revenue).

City of Davis: 16.95% (was 17.05%)
City of West Sacramento: 16.70% (was 16.37%)
City of Winters: 1.61% (no change)
City of Woodland: 14.74% (was 14.96%)
County of Yolo: 50.00%

BACKGROUND

The draft budget was heard and discussed at the March 27, 2014 meeting (the staff report is attached for reference). Following much discussion, the Commission directed staff to do the following:

1. Apply the \$43,405 of "extra" current fund balance to offset agency costs for Fiscal Year 2014/15; and
2. Determine LAFCo's estimated OPEB liability with the next audit which is planned for July 2015 (we currently have a \$50,000 estimated liability that we expect to reduce significantly since we successfully negotiated a MOU with the County to share the previous Executive Officer's retirement costs per time served at each agency); and
3. In the future, combine budget hearing discussions with a discussion of shared services so that the value of LAFCo's work on shared services can be assessed along with the costs. These discussion will include a review of the Shared Services Strategic Plan (adopted in December 2012) including but not limited to criteria for selecting shared services projects based

on the opportunity for cost saving, non-monetary benefits, measurement of performance, and jurisdictions benefited by the project.

Expenditures

The LAFCo expenditures have not changed since the Commission reviewed the budget in March. Overall, the total salary and benefits is projected to increase 10% from the current year's adjusted budget. This is due to a County 2% cost of living adjustment, 5% annual step salary increases for two positions (which are discretionary), and hiring a new half time Associate Management Analyst (which the Commission approved on September, 26 2013 with the fiscal impact of \$43,795 noted).

LAFCo's expenditures in services and supplies are projected to increase by 15% in the next fiscal year. This increase is primarily due to two Municipal Service Reviews coming up next year per the FY 14/15 Work Plan (adopted at the February 27, 2014 meeting), which identified that staff would likely need to contract out the MSR's for (1) the fire protection districts and (2) the City of Davis and the County Service Areas it provides services to.

Revenues

The Revenues in the FY 14/15 budget include anticipated income from other agencies, interest, and fees. Additionally, following the March 27, 2014 meeting, staff added the \$43,405 fund to the revenues, as directed by the Commission. Applying the "extra" fund balance to the revenues reduces the agency costs from what was reviewed in March by roughly half. However, if the Commission wishes to entirely mitigate those increased costs it may choose to also include the remaining contingency appropriation from this current year's budget as detailed below.

Option 1: Apply "Extra" Fund Balance per Commission Direction

The list below describes the budget cost to each agency after the \$43,405 fund balance is applied (also showing net change as compared to FY 13/14 and compared to what was shown for the draft budget in March). This option would require increases in the payments from each local agency (but roughly half of the increase proposed at the March meeting) to ensure that LAFCo has adequate funding for its expected activities in FY 14/15.

City of Davis: \$68,737 (increase of \$6,617 - draft budget in March showed increase of \$14,120)
City of West Sacramento: \$67,728 (increase of \$8,139 - draft budget in March showed increase of \$13,608)
City of Winters: \$6,509 (increase of \$635 - draft budget in March showed increase of \$1,326)
City of Woodland: \$59,792 (increase of \$5,304 - draft budget in March showed increase of \$12,405)
County of Yolo: \$202,767 (increase of \$20,697 - draft budget in March showed increase of \$41,469)

Option 2: Apply "Extra" Fund Balance Plus Existing FY 13/14 Unused Contingency

The Commission's second option is to use the remaining contingency fund from the current FY to ensure adequate funding for LAFCo activities. The FY 13/14 budget has an unused contingency appropriation of \$40,829, which could be "rolled over" into next year's budget if it remains unspent. Staff does not expect that the contingency funds will be spent, as the agency budget is on target with expected expenditures and no significant unplanned expenditures are foreseen in the remainder of the fiscal year. If the Commission selects this option the agency costs will remain relatively flat as compared to FY 13/14. The list below describes the cost to each agency if Option 2 is selected:

City of Davis: \$61,816 (decrease of \$304 from FY 13/14)
City of West Sacramento: \$60,909 (increase of \$1,320 from FY 13/14)*
City of Winters: \$5,854 (decrease of \$20 from FY 13/14)
City of Woodland: \$53,772 (decrease of \$716 from FY 13/14)
County of Yolo: \$182,352 (increase of \$282 from FY 13/14)

* West Sacramento's relatively higher cost increase is due to the increase in apportionment percentage (which is due to their increased tax revenues).

Although the Commission currently has budgetary options that would either partially or completely offset what is anticipated to be a one-time bump in agency costs, the fact remains that the LAFCo budget has increased (due to the expenditures detailed above) and any offset is only temporary. The first option, which would apply/use roughly half of our "extra" fund balance would effectively phase-in or step the increase in agency costs over two years, as well as maintaining a more conservative fund balance. Under Option 2, most of our "extra" fund balance would be used to offset agency costs for FY 14/15, meaning that little would remain next year to offset agency costs for FY 15/16. While Option 2 would keep agency costs relatively flat this year, it may be only deferring the increases until next year. Additionally, without any remaining fund balance the budget would not have as much of a buffer to allow LAFCo to take on unexpected shared services projects or contracts (as was the case with the Yolo Broadband Strategic Plan) without having to return to the agencies to request additional funds midyear.

Cost Control Options

When LAFCo considers the annual work program each February, staff and the Commission can study more closely which agencies require Municipal Services Reviews and which may not. Under CKH, some LAFCo's take the position that MSR's are only required prior to considering an amendment to an agency's sphere of influence. Although staff's understanding is that the Commission would like to be proactive in Yolo County with agency streamlining and efficiency, there may be some cases where a complete MSR is not necessary. Staff has recently developed a MSR checklist tool (attached) that will assist in the evaluation of whether a MSR is warranted at all, and if so what scope is needed. Being more strategic with MSR's going forward can help

to reduce professional services costs for any potential contracts and save staff resources for other priorities.

Another option to reduce costs would be to reduce the contingency amount in the LAFCo budget. The Commission adopted more recent policy that LAFCo should "strive to maintain" a contingency equal to 20% of the overall budget. Although that percentage may seem high, for the FY 14/15 budget that equals approximately \$90,000. There is no prescribed rule of thumb for how much contingency is necessary, but considering that LAFCo's highest organizational risk is probably a lawsuit, the Commission may determine that LAFCo's contingency need not be so high.

When the Commission considered the draft budget in March, there was discussion regarding the cost and value of LAFCo's shared services program. Scaling back or eliminating LAFCo's Shared Services Program is another option in the Commission's toolbox of controlling costs, which is discussed in more detail below.

Shared Services

In 2011, when the Executive Officer position was in transition, the Commission considered whether to reduce or contract out the position and decided in closed session that it wanted a more dynamic organization. Subsequently an "in-house" Executive Officer was hired with the intention of being more proactive with shared services and agency consolidations.

Since that time, LAFCo's has adopted a Shared Services Strategic Plan (attached) and the Shared Services Initiative has evolved in the following areas:

- **Yolo Leaders** - Fostering a culture of collaboration and providing an opportunity to discuss issues of shared interest among local leaders.
- **Animal Services** - LAFCo has completed two studies and is currently working on an RFP for services with the goal of reducing agency costs and providing more control over those costs.
- **Human Resource Training** - The County has a robust training program and already barter with Yolo County Housing (YCH) for training classes. LAFCo has provided training course listings to the city managers, although, staff is not currently able to measure whether any cities are utilizing the program to save money.
- **Housing/CDBG (Community Development Block Grant)** - LAFCo facilitated conversations between Lisa Baker and the city managers and county administrator regarding Yolo County Housing's capacity to consolidate housing services for what is typically a 1/4 or 1/2 time position at a city. Staff is aware of subsequent contracts with the City of Winters and Yolo County to consolidate these services with YCH. The remaining cities have not elected to take advantage of this option to our knowledge.
- **Broadband** - LAFCo is currently preparing a Yolo Broadband Strategic Plan for the cities and County. Broadband has the potential to increase economic development opportunities within all of our communities, but success on this project will be difficult to measure in terms of increased revenues or cost savings.
- **Purchasing** - This topics is currently being studied by graduate students at CSU, Sacramento's Masters of Public Policy and Administration program (for free) to determine the feasibility of taking on purchasing as a shared services project.

In addition to these county wide efforts, LAFCo staff facilitated conversations between the City of Woodland and Yolo County to potentially consolidate building and facility maintenance services and corporation yard facilities. However, the City of Woodland did not appear receptive and those discussions have not continued.

In staff's opinion, LAFCo has been proactive in shared services, but the agencies are receptive and engaged in varying degrees. LAFCo can't impose shared services on agencies, and agencies will derive value out of shared services according to how engaged they are with the potential opportunities. The challenge for the Commission with regard to the budget is to ensure that agency costs are reasonably aligned with the perceived value of the Shared Services Program. The Commission should also be reminded that shared services is a voluntary program that is not required of LAFCo to perform. The Commission can reduce the scope of or eliminate the program at any time.

Attachments

[Item 12-ATT A Option 1](#)

[Item 12-ATT B Option 2](#)

[Item 12-ATT C Shared Services Strategic Plan](#)

[Item 12-ATT D MSR/SOI Checklist Template](#)

[Item 12-ATT E 03/27/14 Draft Budget Staff Report](#)

Form Review

Inbox	Reviewed By	Date
Tracey Dickinson LAFCO	Terri Tuck	05/14/2014 02:00 PM
Christine Crawford	Christine Crawford	05/15/2014 12:40 PM
Tracey Dickinson LAFCO	Terri Tuck	05/15/2014 12:47 PM
Christine Crawford	Christine Crawford	05/15/2014 12:55 PM
Tracey Dickinson LAFCO	Tracey Dickinson	05/15/2014 12:55 PM
Christine Crawford	Christine Crawford	05/15/2014 12:56 PM
Form Started By: Christine Crawford		Started On: 05/08/2014 11:40 AM
Final Approval Date: 05/15/2014		

Option 1 - Does NOT Program Unused Contingency from FY 13/14

Account #	Account Name	FY 13/14 Revenue Budgeted	FY 14/15 Proposed Revenue	Net Change	Agency Apportionment FY 14/15
REVENUES					
82-4100	INTEREST	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
82-5820	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-COUNTY	\$ 182,070	\$ 202,767	\$ 20,697	50.00%
82-5821	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WEST SACRAMENTO	\$ 59,589	\$ 67,728	\$ 8,139	16.70%
82-5822	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WOODLAND	\$ 54,488	\$ 59,792	\$ 5,304	14.74%
82-5823	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WINTERS	\$ 5,874	\$ 6,509	\$ 635	1.61%
82-5824	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-DAVIS	\$ 62,120	\$ 68,737	\$ 6,617	16.95%
82-6225	LAFCO FEES	\$ 6,000	\$ 3,000	\$ (3,000)	
82-7600	OTHER SALES				
	FUND BALANCE & CONTINGENCY OFFSET	\$ 74,328	\$ 133,405	\$ 59,077	
					\$ 405,533.00
	TOTAL AGENCY FY 14/15 COST	\$ 364,141	\$ 405,533	\$ 41,392	
	TOTAL OTHER SOURCES	\$ 81,828	\$ 137,905	\$ 56,077	
	TOTAL FINANCING SOURCES	\$ 445,969	\$ 543,438	\$ 97,469	
FUND BALANCE					
	CURRENT FUND BALANCE	\$ 183,405			
	OPEB LIABILITY	\$ (50,000)			Per FY 11/12 Audit
	CONTINGENCY	\$ (90,000)			Contingency 20% per Admin Policy
	OFFSET APPLIED TO 14/15	\$ (43,405)			
	REMAINING FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE	\$ -			

FINAL LAFCO BUDGET - FINANCING USES - SCHEDULE B
FISCAL YEAR 2014/15
FUND NO: 368

Account #	Account Name	FY 2013/14 Adjusted Budget	FY 14/15 Proposed Budget	Net Change	Explanation of Change
SALARIES AND BENEFITS					
86-1101	REGULAR EMPLOYEES	\$ 175,377	\$ 193,000	\$ 17,623	EO Step D to E 5% increase 6/2015*
86-1102	EXTRA HELP			\$ -	Assoc. Mgmt Analyst Step B to C 5% increase 4/2015*
86-1103	OVERTIME			\$ -	* Discretionary annual merit steps
86-1201	RETIREMENT	\$ 33,432	\$ 39,677	\$ 6,245	employees pay full 8% towards retirement
86-1202	OASDI	\$ 12,765	\$ 13,871	\$ 1,106	
86-1203	MEDICARE TAX	\$ 3,085	\$ 3,403	\$ 318	
86-1400	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-1500	WORKER'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-1600	CAFETERIA PLAN BENEFITS	\$ 55,769	\$ 61,362	\$ 5,593	includes health, dental, vision, life insurance
86-1999	SALARY ALLOCATION/ADJUSTMENT	\$ (8,096)	\$ (10,227)	\$ (2,131)	reimbursement from County for 1/2 analyst benefits
	TOTAL SALARY & BENEFITS	\$ 275,332	\$ 304,086	\$ 28,754	new 1/2 time analyst
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES					
86-2090	COMMUNICATIONS	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ -	
86-2130	FOOD	\$ 500	\$ 350	\$ (150)	
86-2202	INSURANCE - PUBLIC LIABILITY	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ -	LAFCo's liability insurance through YCPARMA
86-2271	MAINTENANCE - EQUIPMENT	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ -	
86-2330	MEMBERSHIPS	\$ 2,900	\$ 3,100	\$ 200	CALAFCO/APA dues increase
86-2360	MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 500	\$ 250	\$ (250)	
86-2390	OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 1,000	\$ 750	\$ (250)	
86-2391	OFFICE EXPENSE - POSTAGE	\$ 750	\$ 500	\$ (250)	
86-2392	OFFICE EXPENSE - PRINTING	\$ 750	\$ 1,000	\$ 250	
86-2417	IT SERVICES - Dept System Maintenance	\$ 970	\$ 1,048	\$ 78	
86-2418	IT SERVICES - Enterprise/Resource/Planning	\$ 1,242	\$ 1,354	\$ 112	
86-2419	IT SERVICES - Connectivity	\$ 2,696	\$ 3,000	\$ 304	Cost to be finalized before final budget
86-2421	AUDITING & FISCAL SERVICES	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ -	Set aside for audit per 3 yr cycle
86-2422	INFORMATION TECH SERVICES	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ -	GIS Software License
86-2423	LEGAL SERVICES	\$ 10,500	\$ 7,500	\$ (3,000)	
86-2429	PROFESSIONAL & SPECIALIZED SERVICES	\$ 30,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 50,000	Assumes contracting out 2 MSRs @ \$40k each
	PROF SERVICES - SHARED SERVICES (SSP)	\$ 50,000	\$ 20,000	\$ (30,000)	Placeholder - future shared services studies unknown
86-2460	PUBLICATIONS & LEGAL NOTICES	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-2491	RENTS & LEASES - EQUIPMENT	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-2495	RECORDS STORAGE "ARCHIVES"	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ -	
86-2548	TRAINING EXPENSE	\$ 10,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 2,000	New staff + air travel for conferences
86-2610	TRANSPORTATION & TRAVEL	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,000	\$ 500	
86-3102	PAYMENTS TO OTHER GOVT INSTITUTIONS	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ -	Costs are charged back to applicants
	TOTAL SERVICES & SUPPLIES	\$ 128,608	\$ 148,152	\$ 19,544	
OTHER FINANCING USES					
86-6110	PC EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT FUND	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ -	Set aside to upgrade 3 computers every 4 yrs
86-9900	APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINGENCY	\$ 40,829	\$ 90,000	\$ 49,171	Last FY contingency \$74,328 (budget adjustment)
	TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	\$ 445,969	\$ 543,438	\$ 97,469	

Option 2 - Programs Unused Contingency from FY 13/14

Account #	Account Name	FY 13/14 Revenue Budgeted	FY 14/15 Proposed Revenue	Net Change	Agency Apportionment FY 14/15
REVENUES					
82-4100	INTEREST	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
82-5820	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-COUNTY	\$ 182,070	\$ 182,352	\$ 282	50.00%
82-5821	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WEST SACRAMENTO	\$ 59,589	\$ 60,909	\$ 1,320	16.70%
82-5822	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WOODLAND	\$ 54,488	\$ 53,772	\$ (716)	14.74%
82-5823	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WINTERS	\$ 5,874	\$ 5,854	\$ (20)	1.61%
82-5824	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-DAVIS	\$ 62,120	\$ 61,816	\$ (304)	16.95%
82-6225	LAFCO FEES	\$ 6,000	\$ 3,000	\$ (3,000)	
82-7600	OTHER SALES				
	FUND BALANCE & CONTINGENCY OFFSET	\$ 74,328	\$ 174,234	\$ 99,906	
					\$ 364,704.00
	TOTAL AGENCY FY 14/15 COST	\$ 364,141	\$ 364,704	\$ 563	
	TOTAL OTHER SOURCES	\$ 81,828	\$ 178,734	\$ 96,906	
	TOTAL FINANCING SOURCES	\$ 445,969	\$ 543,438	\$ 97,469	
FUND BALANCE					
	CURRENT FUND BALANCE	\$ 183,405			
	OPEB LIABILITY	\$ (50,000)			Per FY 11/12 Audit
	CONTINGENCY	\$ (90,000)			Contingency 20% per Admin Policy
	OFFSET APPLIED TO 14/15	\$ (43,405)			
	REMAINING FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE	\$ -			

FINAL LAFCO BUDGET - FINANCING USES - SCHEDULE B
FISCAL YEAR 2014/15
FUND NO: 368

Account #	Account Name	FY 2013/14 Adjusted Budget	FY 14/15 Proposed Budget	Net Change	Explanation of Change
SALARIES AND BENEFITS					
86-1101	REGULAR EMPLOYEES	\$ 175,377	\$ 193,000	\$ 17,623	EO Step D to E 5% increase 6/2015*
86-1102	EXTRA HELP			\$ -	Assoc. Mgmt Analyst Step B to C 5% increase 4/2015*
86-1103	OVERTIME			\$ -	* Discretionary annual merit steps
86-1201	RETIREMENT	\$ 33,432	\$ 39,677	\$ 6,245	employees pay full 8% towards retirement
86-1202	OASDI	\$ 12,765	\$ 13,871	\$ 1,106	
86-1203	MEDICARE TAX	\$ 3,085	\$ 3,403	\$ 318	
86-1400	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-1500	WORKER'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-1600	CAFETERIA PLAN BENEFITS	\$ 55,769	\$ 61,362	\$ 5,593	includes health, dental, vision, life insurance
86-1999	SALARY ALLOCATION/ADJUSTMENT	\$ (8,096)	\$ (10,227)	\$ (2,131)	reimbursement from County for 1/2 analyst benefits
	TOTAL SALARY & BENEFITS	\$ 275,332	\$ 304,086	\$ 28,754	new 1/2 time analyst
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES					
86-2090	COMMUNICATIONS	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ -	
86-2130	FOOD	\$ 500	\$ 350	\$ (150)	
86-2202	INSURANCE - PUBLIC LIABILITY	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ -	LAFCo's liability insurance through YCPARMA
86-2271	MAINTENANCE - EQUIPMENT	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ -	
86-2330	MEMBERSHIPS	\$ 2,900	\$ 3,100	\$ 200	CALAFCO/APA dues increase
86-2360	MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 500	\$ 250	\$ (250)	
86-2390	OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 1,000	\$ 750	\$ (250)	
86-2391	OFFICE EXPENSE - POSTAGE	\$ 750	\$ 500	\$ (250)	
86-2392	OFFICE EXPENSE - PRINTING	\$ 750	\$ 1,000	\$ 250	
86-2417	IT SERVICES - Dept System Maintenance	\$ 970	\$ 1,048	\$ 78	
86-2418	IT SERVICES - Enterprise/Resource/Planning	\$ 1,242	\$ 1,354	\$ 112	
86-2419	IT SERVICES - Connectivity	\$ 2,696	\$ 3,000	\$ 304	Cost to be finalized before final budget
86-2421	AUDITING & FISCAL SERVICES	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ -	Set aside for audit per 3 yr cycle
86-2422	INFORMATION TECH SERVICES	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ -	GIS Software License
86-2423	LEGAL SERVICES	\$ 10,500	\$ 7,500	\$ (3,000)	
86-2429	PROFESSIONAL & SPECIALIZED SERVICES	\$ 30,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 50,000	Assumes contracting out 2 MSRs @ \$40k each
	PROF SERVICES - SHARED SERVICES (SSP)	\$ 50,000	\$ 20,000	\$ (30,000)	Placeholder - future shared services studies unknown
86-2460	PUBLICATIONS & LEGAL NOTICES	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-2491	RENTS & LEASES - EQUIPMENT	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-2495	RECORDS STORAGE "ARCHIVES"	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ -	
86-2548	TRAINING EXPENSE	\$ 10,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 2,000	New staff + air travel for conferences
86-2610	TRANSPORTATION & TRAVEL	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,000	\$ 500	
86-3102	PAYMENTS TO OTHER GOVT INSTITUTIONS	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ -	Costs are charged back to applicants
	TOTAL SERVICES & SUPPLIES	\$ 128,608	\$ 148,152	\$ 19,544	
OTHER FINANCING USES					
86-6110	PC EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT FUND	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ -	Set aside to upgrade 3 computers every 4 yrs
86-9900	APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINGENCY	\$ 40,829	\$ 90,000	\$ 49,171	Last FY contingency \$74,328 (budget adjustment)
	TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	\$ 445,969	\$ 543,438	\$ 97,469	



Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission Shared Services Strategic Plan December 2012, Updated June 2013

This Shared Services Strategic Plan was adopted by the Yolo LAFCo Commission on December 3, 2012. The Commission directed that this Plan be periodically reviewed and updated as needed or at least every two years.

Shared Services Vision

Yolo LAFCo is a valued, county-wide regional agency, aggressively promoting efficient high-quality government services through collaboration and sharing of resources as illustrated in the attached radial diagram.

Shared Services Values

1. Yolo LAFCo has been requested to lead the Shared Services Initiative by Yolo County and the four cities and will continue to develop shared service improvements with this collective support.
2. A “culture of collaboration” is key to fostering the trust required for shared services to be successful. It is worthwhile for LAFCo to invest its resources in fostering collaboration among our partner agencies.
3. Shared Services is a voluntary effort. LAFCo recognizes that each agency will determine what level of commitment and implementation is appropriate for them.
4. Staff will consult and collaborate with the executive managers of other agencies on shared service issues while ultimate authority and direction regarding LAFCo activities will come from the Commission.
5. LAFCo will assist other agencies in “teeing-up” shared service opportunities; however detailed implementation must be handed off to individual agencies. LAFCo can best assist agencies by keeping its eye on the big picture by analyzing new opportunities without getting over-involved in detailed implementation.
6. LAFCo participation in the review of oversight issues of joint powers agencies is needed in order to maintain quality performance and public trust.
7. LAFCo will utilize its existing tools and processes to evaluate new opportunities for shared services and improved government efficiencies such as the municipal service review (MSR).
8. LAFCo will proactively exercise its statutory mission and authority to initiate agency consolidations and/or dissolutions where appropriate and understands that such change will bring adaptive challenges that must be delicately handled.
9. Effective government service delivery will involve partnerships with agencies at numerous levels: the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), school districts, UC Davis, the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, special districts, non-profits and potentially agencies in other counties.

Shared Services Goals and Action Items

Goal 1 - LAFCo promotes the most effective forms of government for the common good.

Action 1.1 LAFCo is proactive with its Municipal Service Review process to review an agency's financial ability to provide services and opportunities for shared services and facilities, including possible consolidation of government agencies.

Action 1.2 LAFCo will use the Municipal Service Review process to identify government efficiencies and initiate agency consolidations and/or dissolutions where necessary to "right size" public agencies.

Action 1.3 Following completion of the MSR process, staff aggressively follows up with agencies requiring status updates as necessary regarding their implementation of/compliance with LAFCo recommendations.

Goal 2 - LAFCo actively works to promote shared services that will save agencies money and allow them to either maintain services levels during difficult financial times or even improve service delivery.

Action 2.1 LAFCo evaluates new shared service areas for their potential to maintain or improve services at a reduced cost in order to determine the value of implementation.

Action 2.2 LAFCo leverages its independent status to assist agencies to provide third-party independent analysis in evaluating existing conditions and studying new shared opportunities, such as discussions between the City of Woodland and Yolo County regarding potentially sharing building maintenance and other services.

Action 2.3 Staff facilitates next steps as determined by the Commission to implement shared service opportunities, such as contracting for a transition plan to improve the Yolo County Animal Services program at the most efficient cost to partner agencies.

Goal 3 – LAFCo assists the agencies in providing a framework and/or platform to facilitate shared services.

Action 3.1 – Staff creates agreement framework(s) (JPA, MOU, contract templates, etc.) as appropriate to facilitate shared services among government agencies.

Action 3.2 – LAFCo promotes the creation of a web-based platform to foster information sharing, communication and a clearinghouse for shared services activities.

Goal 4 - Yolo LAFCo fosters and promotes agency collaboration at all levels.

Action 4.1 Yolo LAFCo organizes and promotes regular Yolo Leaders forums with agenda topics/speakers that are of interest and value to elected leaders in all geographic areas of the county and at all agency levels.

Action 4.2 LAFCo promotes shared services at any and all levels, speaking at and coordinating with CALAFCO, the SACOG shared services ad hoc committee, Yolo Non-

Profit Leaders, and others to coordinate and compliment each others' shared service efforts.

Goal 5 - LAFCo acts as a facilitator/convener as requested for appropriate Yolo intra-agency issues.

Action 5.1 Yolo LAFCo acts as a convener for multi-agency joint projects in a coordinating role as appropriate such as the potential agricultural distribution hub project with the City of Winters and Yolo County.

Goal 6 – LAFCo participates in the oversight of existing shared service partnerships implemented through joint powers agreements (JPAs) as needed.

Action 6.1 A draft Shared Services JPA for agency consideration will be structured to allow for consolidation and oversight of existing JPAs as deemed appropriate by the member agencies.

Action 6.2 Training should be provided to newly appointed JPA board members regarding their oversight role and responsibilities.



2014

Attachment D

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE STUDY

FOR THE

[insert]





Project Name: MSR/SOI for

LAFCo Project No. S-

Conducted By: Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission
625 Court Street, Suite 203
Woodland, CA 95695

Date:

Subject Agency:

Agency Address:

Agency Contact Person:

Phone Number:

**Date of Last MSR/SOI
Adopted by LAFCo**

Contents

MSR/SOI BACKGROUND 1

 ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF LAFCO 1

 PURPOSE OF A MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW 1

 PURPOSE OF A SPHERE OF INFLUENCE 2

 DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES 3

 ORGANIZATION OF MSR/SOI STUDY 3

AGENCY PROFILE 4

 AFFECTED AGENCIES 4

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW 6

 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT MSR DETERMINATIONS 6

 1. GROWTH AND POPULATION 6

 2. DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES 7

 3. CAPACITY AND ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES 9

 4. FINANCIAL ABILITY 10

 5. SHARED SERVICES AND FACILITIES 13

 6. ACCOUNTABILITY, STRUCTURE AND EFFICIENCIES 14

 7. OTHER ISSUES 16

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE STUDY 17

 SPHERE OF INFLUENCE MAPS 17

 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT SOI DETERMINATIONS 17

 1. PRESENT AND PLANNED LAND USES 18

 2. NEED FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES 19

 3. CAPACITY AND ADEQUACY OF PROVIDED SERVICES 20

 4. SOCIAL OR ECONOMIC COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST 21

 5. DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES 21

REFERENCES 22

ATTACHMENTS 22

MSR/SOI BACKGROUND

ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF LAFCO

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, as amended (“CKH Act”) (California Government Code §§56000 et seq.), is LAFCo’s governing law and outlines the requirements for preparing Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) for periodic Sphere of Influence (SOI) updates. MSRs and SOIs are tools created to empower LAFCo to satisfy its legislative charge of “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 (§56301). CKH Act Section 56301 further establishes that “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.”

Based on that legislative charge, LAFCo serves as an arm of the State; preparing and reviewing studies and analyzing independent data to make informed, quasi-legislative decisions that guide the physical and economic development of the state (including agricultural uses) and the efficient, cost-effective, and reliable delivery of services to residents, landowners, and businesses. While SOIs are required to be updated every five years, they are not time-bound as planning tools by the statute, but are meant to address the “probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency” (§56076). SOIs therefore guide both the near-term and long-term physical and economic development of local agencies their broader county area, and MSRs provide the near-term and long-term time-relevant data to inform LAFCo’s SOI determinations.

PURPOSE OF A MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

As described above, MSRs are designed to equip LAFCo with relevant information and data necessary for the Commission to make informed decisions on SOIs. The CKH Act, however, gives LAFCo broad discretion in deciding how to conduct MSRs, including geographic focus, scope of study, and the identification of alternatives for improving the efficiency, cost-effectiveness, accountability, and reliability of public services. The purpose of a Municipal Services Review (MSR) in general is to provide a comprehensive inventory and analysis of the services provided by local municipalities, service areas, and special districts. A MSR evaluates the structure and operation of the local municipalities, service areas, and special districts and discusses possible areas for improvement and coordination. The MSR is intended to provide information and analysis to support a sphere of influence update. A written statement of the study’s determinations must be made in the following areas:

1. Growth and population projections for the affected area;
2. The location and characteristics of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence;

3. Present and planned capacity of public facilities, adequacy of public services, and infrastructure needs or deficiencies including needs or deficiencies related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, and structural fire protection in any disadvantaged, unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence;
4. Financial ability of agencies to provide services;
5. Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities;
6. Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies; and
7. Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy.

The MSR is organized according to these determinations listed above. Information regarding each of the above issue areas is provided in this document.

PURPOSE OF A SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

In 1972, LAFCos were given the power to establish SOIs for all local agencies under their jurisdiction. As defined by the CKH Act, "'sphere of influence' means a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the commission" (§56076). SOIs are designed to both proactively guide and respond to the need for the extension of infrastructure and delivery of municipal services to areas of emerging growth and development. Likewise, they are also designed to discourage urban sprawl and the premature conversion of agricultural and open space resources to urbanized uses.

The role of SOIs in guiding the State's growth and development was validated and strengthened in 2000 when the Legislature passed Assembly Bill ("AB") 2838 (Chapter 761, Statutes of 2000), which was the result of two years of labor by the Commission on Local Governance for the 21st Century, which traveled up and down the State taking testimony from a variety of local government stakeholders and assembled an extensive set of recommendations to the Legislature to strengthen the powers and tools of LAFCos to promote logical and orderly growth and development, and the efficient, cost-effective, and reliable delivery of public services to California's residents, businesses, landowners, and visitors. The requirement for LAFCos to conduct MSRs was established by AB 2838 as an acknowledgment of the importance of SOIs and recognition that regular periodic updates of SOIs should be conducted on a five-year basis (§56425(g)) with the benefit of better information and data through MSRs (§56430(a)).

Pursuant to Yolo County LAFCO policy an SOI includes an area adjacent to a jurisdiction where development might be reasonably expected to occur in the next 20 years. A MSR is conducted prior to, or in conjunction with, the update of a SOI and provides the foundation for updating it. In Yolo County, a SOI generally has two planning lines. One is the 10-year boundary which includes the area that may likely be annexed within 10 years, while the 20-year boundary is anticipated to accommodate boundary expansions over a 20-year horizon.

LAFCo is required to make five written determinations when establishing, amending, or updating an SOI for any local agency that address the following (§56425(c)):

1. The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.
2. The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.
3. The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide.
4. The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.
5. For an update of an SOI of a city or special district that provides public facilities or services related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, or structural fire protection, the present and probable need for those public facilities and services of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within the existing sphere of influence.

DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES

SB 244 (Chapter 513, Statutes of 2011) made changes to the CKH Act related to "disadvantaged unincorporated communities," including the addition of SOI determination #5 listed above. Disadvantaged unincorporated communities, or "DUCs," are inhabited territories (containing 12 or more registered voters) where the annual median household income is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income.

On March 26, 2012, LAFCo adopted a "Policy for the Definition of 'Inhabited Territory' for the Implementation of SB 244 Regarding Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities", which identified 21 inhabited unincorporated communities for purposes of implementing SB 244.

CKH Act Section 56375(a)(8)(A) prohibits LAFCo from approving a city annexation of more than 10 acres if a DUC is contiguous to the annexation territory but not included in the proposal, unless an application to annex the DUC has been filed with LAFCo. The legislative intent is to prohibit "cherry picking" by cities of tax-generating land uses while leaving out under-served, inhabited areas with infrastructure deficiencies and lack of access to reliable potable water and wastewater services. DUCs are recognized as social and economic communities of interest for purposes of recommending SOI determinations pursuant to Section 56425(c).

ORGANIZATION OF MSR/SOI STUDY

This report has been organized in a checklist format to focus the information and discussion on key issues that may be particularly relevant to the subject agency while providing required LAFCo's MSR and SOI determinations. The checklist questions are based on the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act, the LAFCo MSR Guidelines prepared by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and adopted Yolo LAFCo local policies and procedures. This report provides the following:

- Provides a description of the subject agency;

- Provides any new information since the last MSR and a determination regarding the need to update the SOI;
- Provides MSR and SOI draft determinations for public and Commission review; and
- Identifies any other issues that the Commission should consider in the MSR/SOI.

AGENCY PROFILE

Describe the agency, its location, history, number of employees, structure, services it provides, etc.. Use points and reference roads, (for example ... north of the City of Davis between CR 27 and CR 31....). Include a map of the existing agency boundary (including SOI boundary)

[Insert Figure 1 – Location Map]

AFFECTED AGENCIES

Per Government Code Section 56427, a public hearing is required to adopt, amend, or revise a sphere of influence. Notice shall be provided at least 21 days in advance and mailed notice shall be provided to each affected local agency or affected County, and to any interested party who has filed a written request for notice with the executive officer. Per Government Code Section 56014, an affected local agency means any local agency that overlaps with any portion of the subject agency boundary or SOI (included proposed changes to the SOI).

The affected local agencies for this MSR/SOI are:

County/Cities:

- City of Davis
- City of West Sacramento
- City of Winters
- City of Woodland
- County of Yolo

County Service Areas (CSAs)

- Dunnigan, El Macero, Garcia Bend, Madison-Esparto Regional CSA (MERCASA), North Davis Meadows, Snowball, Wild Wings, and Willowbank

School Districts:

- Davis Joint Unified.
- Esparto Unified
- River Delta Unified
- Washington Unified
- Winters Joint Unified

Woodland Joint Unified

Special Districts:

- Cemetery District – Capay, Cottonwood, Davis, Knight’s Landing, Mary’s, Winters
- Community Service District – Cacheville, Esparto, Knight’s Landing, Madison
- Fire Protection District – Capay, Clarksburg, Dunnigan, East Davis, Elkhorn, Esparto, Knights Landing, Madison, No Man’s Land, Springlake, West Plainfield, Willow Oak, Winters, Yolo, Zamora
- Sacramento-Yolo Port District
- Reclamation District – 150, 307, 537, 730, 765, 785, 787, 827, 900, 999, 1600, 2035, 2076, 2120
- Yolo County Resource Conservation District
- Water District – Dunnigan, Knight’s Landing Ridge Drainage, YCFCWCD, Yolo-Zamora

Multi-County Districts:

- Reclamation District – 108 (Colusa), 2068 (Solano), 2093 (Solano)
- Water District – Colusa Basin Drainage
- Sacramento-Yolo Mosquito Vector Control District

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT MSR DETERMINATIONS

The MSR determinations checked below are potentially significant, as indicated by “yes” or “maybe” answers to the key policy questions in the checklist and corresponding discussion on the following pages. If most or all of the determinations are not significant, as indicated by “no” answers, the Commission may find that a MSR update is not warranted.

- Growth and Population
- Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities
- Capacity, Adequacy & Infrastructure to Provide Services
- Financial Ability
- Shared Services
- Accountability
- Other

1. GROWTH AND POPULATION

Growth and population projections for the affected area.	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Is the agency’s territory or surrounding area expected to experience any significant population change or development over the next 5-10 years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Will population changes have an impact on the subject agency’s service needs and demands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Will projected growth require a change in the agency’s service boundary?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) Describe the current and projected population.

Describe any reasonably foreseeable development projects in the territory or surrounding area over the next 5-10 years.

b)

c)

Growth and Population MSR Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

SUGGESTED REFERENCES:

- U.S. Census Bureau- Current Population
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html>
- U.S Department of Finance- Population Projections
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/view.php#objCollapsiblePanelProjectionsAnchor>
- SACOG Projections
- City and/or County General Plans
- City and/or County planning departments

2. DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES

The location and characteristics of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Does the subject agency provide public services related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, or structural fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Are there any "inhabited unincorporated communities" (per adopted Commission policy) within or adjacent to the subject agency's sphere of influence that are considered "disadvantaged" (80% or less of the statewide median household income)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) If "yes" to both a) and b), it is feasible for the agency to be reorganized such that it can extend service to the disadvantaged unincorporated community (if "no" to either a) or b), this question may be skipped)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a) Please see agency profile. A "yes" response indicates that the agency provides a service that may trigger the provisions of SB 244 and a LAFCo determination regarding any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the agency's sphere of influence is required. A "no" response indicates that the provisions of SB 244 would not apply to a SOI update, if applicable.

b) The term "Inhabited Unincorporated Communities" is defined per Commission adopted policy as those areas on the County of Yolo 2030 General Plan Land Use Map (see Figures LU-1B through LU-1H) that contain land use designations that are categorized as Residential by Table LU-6. The communities of Rumsey and West Kentucky are also included in this definition (even though the current land use designations are Agriculture (AG) and Commercial Local (CL) respectively) because their existing uses are residential. These communities are as follows:

Binning Farms	Guinda	Rumsey
Capay	Knights Landing	West Kentucky
Clarksburg	Madison	West Plainfield
Dunnigan	Monument Hills	Willow Oak
El Macero	North Davis Meadows	Willowbank
El Rio Villa	Patwin Road	Yolo
Esparto	Royal Oak	Zamora

If any of the above listed communities are located within the agency's territory or surrounding area:

- Describe the current statewide median household income. Define what 80% of that would be, in order to determine the median household income threshold for being defined as a disadvantaged unincorporated community.
- Provide median household income data on the inhabited unincorporated community, If applicable, and determine if they are considered "disadvantaged unincorporated communities" according to SB 244.
- Describe the location and characteristics of the DUC.

If none of these communities are located within or surrounding the agency's territory, just say so and income information is not needed.

c) Is there any way to extend services to the DUC? Is it feasible?

Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities MSR Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

SUGGESTED REFERENCES:

- U.S. Census Bureau- Median Household Incomes
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06000.html>
<http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>

3. CAPACITY AND ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Present and planned capacity of public facilities, adequacy of public services, and infrastructure needs or deficiencies including needs or deficiencies related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, and structural fire protection in any disadvantaged, unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Are there any deficiencies in agency capacity to meet service needs of existing development within its existing territory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Are there any issues regarding the agency's capacity to meet the service demand of reasonably foreseeable future growth?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Are there any concerns regarding public services provided by the agency being considered adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Are there any significant infrastructure needs or deficiencies to be addressed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Are there changes in state regulations on the horizon that will require significant facility and/or infrastructure upgrades?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Are there any service needs or deficiencies for disadvantaged unincorporated communities related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, and structural fire protection within or contiguous to the agency's sphere of influence?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: (responses can be combined if appropriate)

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)
- e)
- f)

Capacity and Adequacy of Public Facilities and Services MSR Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

For “NO” responses: Be brief but clearly demonstrate why the answer is no.

For “YES” or “MAYBE” responses: Discuss the reasoning for your response in detail.

Responses may require discussion of the following issues:

- Describe the organization’s service delivery system, including any infrastructure or facilities.
- Discuss any complaints filed by community members or neighboring organizations.
- Discuss any compliance issues with State regulations.
- Describe the potential for future population growth or development, and discuss the organization’s ability to meet the expanding service delivery demands that will accompany that growth. In particular, consider infrastructure or staffing expansions that will be required to meet the additional demand for services.
- Describe both near-term and long-term infrastructure needs and deficiencies.
- Discuss the organization’s plan for dealing with upcoming infrastructure needs and deficiencies.
- If the agency provides sewer, municipal and industrial water, or structural fire protection services, describe any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the organization’s sphere of influence. Describe the level and adequacy of services that these communities are receiving and identify any service deficiencies that should be addressed.

SUGGESTED REFERENCES:

- Yolo County General Plan
<http://www.yolocounty.org/Index.aspx?page=1514>
- Agency General Plan, Facility Master Plan or Capital Improvement Plan

4. FINANCIAL ABILITY

Financial ability of agencies to provide services.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Does the organization routinely engage in budgeting practices that may indicate poor financial management, such as overspending its revenues, failing to commission independent audits, or adopting its budget late?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the organization lacking adequate reserve to protect against unexpected events or upcoming significant costs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

c) Is the organization's rate/fee schedule insufficient to fund an adequate level of service, and/or is the fee inconsistent with the schedules of similar service organizations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Is the organization unable to fund necessary infrastructure maintenance, replacement and/or any needed expansion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Is the organization lacking financial policies that ensure its continued financial accountability and stability?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Is the organization's debt at an unmanageable level?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) **Budget:**

Describe the organization's budget cycle, who is responsible for approving the organization's budget, and whether budgets are passed regularly and on-time.

Discuss whether the organization has regular independent audits.

Describe the organization's major expenditure categories (Include a 5-year trend chart).

Discuss how the expenditures have changes since the previous MSR/SOI.

Discuss any opportunities to reduce expenditures.

Describe the organization's major revenue sources (Include a 5-year trend chart).

Describe any grants or donations the organization has received since the previous MSR/SOI.

Discuss how revenues have changed since the previous MSR/SOI.

Discuss the stability of the revenue sources.

Discuss any opportunities to increase revenues.

Describe the organization's "revenues less expenditures" and end of year fund balances (Include a 5-year trend chart).

b) **Reserves:**

Describe the organization's reserve and contingency fund balances (Include a 5-year trend chart).

Describe the organization's reserve and/or contingency fund policies.

Discuss whether the organization regularly contributes to the reserve, and if so, how much.

Discuss whether the organization has used its reserve or contingency fund recently.

Discuss whether the organization's level of reserve is adequate to protect against unexpected events or upcoming significant costs.

c) **Rate/Fee Schedule:**

Describe the organization's rate/fee schedule.

Discuss when the rate/fee schedule was adopted, and describe any recent efforts to alter the rate/fees schedule.

Compare the organization's rate/fee schedule to other organization's providing similar services in the region.

Describe the relationship between the rate/fee structure and level of service.

d) **Infrastructure Maintenance and Replacement:**

Describe the organization's capital improvement plan and/or infrastructure maintenance and replacement schedule.

Discuss whether the organization is on track with the timeline outlined in its infrastructure plan.

Discuss the organization's plans for funding upcoming maintenance and replacements.

e) **Financial Policies:**

Describe the organization's financial policies.

Discuss whether the policies are in keeping with best practices.

Discuss when the policies were adopted, and if they are appropriately updated.

f) **Debt:**

Describe any debt that the organization is currently repaying, including the total original amount and remaining balance, type of debt, interest rate, use of debt, and payment schedule.

Describe any debt that has been paid off by the organization since the most recent MSR/SOI.

Discuss any debt the organization expects to incur in the near future.

Describe the organization's debt management policy.

Financial Ability MSR Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

For "NO" responses: Be brief but clearly demonstrate why the answer is no, cite sources, etc.

For "YES" or "MAYBE" responses: Discuss the reasoning for your response in detail.

SUGGESTED RESOURCES:

- Budget Reports/Financial Statements
 - Independent Audits/ Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR)
 - Grant Donation History
 - Rate/Fee Schedule
 - California State Controller's Office- Special District Annual Financial Reports
 - Reports include revenues, expenditures, and long-term debt information for every California special district
- http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard_locarep_districts.html
- Government Finance Officers Association- Best Practices
- http://www.gfoa.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=118&Itemid=130

5. SHARED SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Is the agency currently sharing services or facilities with other organizations? If so, describe the status of such efforts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Are there any opportunities for the organization to share services or facilities with neighboring or overlapping organizations that are not currently being utilized?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Are there any governance options that may produce economies of scale and/or improve buying power in order to reduce costs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Are there governance options to allow appropriate facilities and/or resources to be shared, or making excess capacity available to others, and avoid construction of extra or unnecessary infrastructure or eliminate duplicative resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: (responses can be combined if appropriate)

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)

Shared Services MSR Determination

Yolo LAFCo

MSR/SOI for xxxxxxxx
Date

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

For "NO" responses: Be brief but clearly demonstrate why the answer is no.

For "YES" or "MAYBE" responses: Discuss the reasoning for your response in detail.

Responses may require discussion of the following issues:

- Describe organizations within proximity to the organization that offer similar services.
- Discuss shared services or use of facilities that are currently being implemented.
- Discuss opportunities for shared services or facilities that are not currently being utilized.
- Discuss what actions would be required to implement those opportunities and the potential benefit of such efficiencies.

SUGGESTED RESOURCES:

- Agency interviews
- Review of any service agreements, i.e. MOUs or JPAs...

6. ACCOUNTABILITY, STRUCTURE AND EFFICIENCIES

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Are there any issues with meetings being accessible and well publicized? Any failures to comply with disclosure laws and the Brown Act?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Are there any issues with filling board vacancies and maintaining board members?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Are there any issues with staff turnover or operational efficiencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Is there a lack of regular audits, adopted budgets and public access to these documents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Are there any recommended changes to the organization's governance structure that will increase accountability and efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Are there any governance restructure options to enhance services and/or eliminate deficiencies or redundancies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- g) Are there any opportunities to eliminate overlapping boundaries that confuse the public, cause service inefficiencies, unnecessarily increase the cost of infrastructure, exacerbate rate issues and/or undermine good planning practices?
-

Discussion: (responses can be combined if appropriate)

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)
- e)
- f)
- g)

Accountability, Structure and Efficiencies MSR Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

For "NO" responses: Be brief but clearly demonstrate why the answer is no.

For "YES" or "MAYBE" responses: Discuss the reasoning for your response in detail.

Responses may require discussion of the following issues:

- Describe the organizations governance structure and meeting schedule.
- Describe efforts the organization has made to ensure accountability including, regularity of governance meetings, compliance with the Brown Act, and public outreach efforts.
- Describe the organizations staffing level and service delivery system.
- Describe how the organization processes complaints or service delivery issues.
- Describe any potential opportunities for consolidation with neighboring organizations that might increase accountability or efficiency.

SUGGESTED RESOURCES:

- Organization's website
- Agency Interviews
- Customer feedback

7. OTHER ISSUES

Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Are there any other service delivery issues that can be resolved by the MSR/SOI process?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

- a) Describe the additional issue.
 Discuss opportunities for resolution

Other Issues MSR Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

SUGGESTED RESOURCES:

- Organization’s website
- Agency interviews or discussion with Supervisorial District staff.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE STUDY

On the basis of the Municipal Service Review:

- Staff has reviewed the agency’s Sphere of Influence and recommends that a SOI Update is NOT NECESSARY in accordance with Government Code Section 56425(g). Therefore, NO CHANGE to the agency’s SOI is recommended and SOI determinations HAVE NOT been made.
- Staff has reviewed the agency’s Sphere of Influence and recommends that a SOI Update IS NECESSARY in accordance with Government Code Section 56425(g). Therefore, A CHANGE to the agency’s SOI is recommended and SOI determinations HAVE been made and are included in this MSR/SOI study.

SPHERE OF INFLUENCE MAP(S)

Insert Figure(s) of existing SOI (and proposed SOI if applicable)

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT SOI DETERMINATIONS

If no SOI is recommended, the following determinations sections should be deleted from the study.

The SOI determinations below are potentially significant, as indicated by “yes” or “maybe” answers to the key policy questions in the checklist and corresponding discussion on the following pages.

- Present and Planned Land Uses
- Need for Public Facilities and Services
- Capacity and Adequacy of Provide Services
- Social or Economic Communities of Interest
- Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

1. PRESENT AND PLANNED LAND USES

The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Are there any present or planned land uses in the area that would create the need for an expanded service area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the SOI conflict with planned, orderly and efficient patterns of urban development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Is there a conflict with the adopted SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Would the SOI result in the loss of prime agricultural land or open space?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Would the SOI impact the identity of any existing communities; e.g. would it conflict with existing postal zones, school, library, sewer, water census, fire, parks and recreation boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Are there any natural or made-made obstructions that would impact where services can reasonably be extended or should otherwise be used as a logical SOI boundary?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Would the proposed SOI conflict with a Census boundary, such that it would compromise the ability to obtain discrete data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: (responses can be combined if appropriate)

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)
- e)
- f)
- g)

Present and Planned Land Uses SOI Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

2. NEED FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Would the SOI conflict with the Commission’s goal to increase efficiency and conservation of resources by providing essential services within a framework of controlled growth?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Would the SOI expand services that could be better provided by a city or another agency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the SOI represent premature inducement of growth or facilitate conversion of agriculture or open space lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Does the SOI conflict with the Regional Housing Needs Analysis (RHNA) or other SACOG growth projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Are there any areas that should be removed from the SOI because existing circumstances make development unlikely, there is not sufficient demand to support it or important open space/prime agricultural land should be removed from urbanization?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Have any agency commitments been predicated on expanding the agency’s SOI such as roadway projects, shopping centers, educational facilities, economic development or acquisition of parks and open space?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: (responses can be combined if appropriate)

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)
- e)
- f)

Need for Public Facilities and Services SOI Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

SUGGESTED RESOURCES:

- SAGOC SCS land use map
- County General Plan
- Agency Capital Improvement Plans

3. CAPACITY AND ADEQUACY OF PROVIDED SERVICES

The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Are there any issues regarding water availability and sewer capacity for the proposed SOI territory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Are there any issues regarding the agency's willingness and ability to extend services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Are there any issues with the agency's ability to maintain an adequate level of service currently and/or with future extension of services per the proposed SOI?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: (responses can be combined if appropriate)

- a)
- b)
- c)

Capacity and Adequacy of Provided Services SOI Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

4. SOCIAL OR ECONOMIC COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST

The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Are there any "inhabited unincorporated communities" (per adopted Commission policy) within or adjacent to the subject agency's sphere of influence that are considered "disadvantaged" (same as MSR checklist question 2b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) Please see response to MSR checklist question 2b.

Social or Economic Communities of Interest SOI Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

5. DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES

For an update of an SOI of a city or special district that provides public facilities or services related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, or structural fire protection, the present and probable need for those public facilities and services of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within the existing sphere of influence.

	YES	MAYBE	NO
a) Does the subject agency provide public services related to sewers, municipal and industrial water or structural fire protection (same as MSR checklist question 2a)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) If yes, does the proposed SOI exclude any disadvantaged unincorporated community (per MSR checklist question 2b) where it either may be feasible to extend services or it is required under SB 244 to be included?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

a) Please see response to MSR checklist question 2a.

b)

Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities SOI Determination

Summary/concluding statement regarding the determination as a whole for use in staff reports, resolutions, findings, etc.

REFERENCES

ATTACHMENTS



Public Hearings 6.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 03/27/2014

Information

SUBJECT

Consider the Proposed LAFCo Budget for Fiscal Year 2014/15 and Set May 22, 2014 as the Public Hearing Date to Approve the Final Budget.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. Receive staff presentation on the Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 2014/15.
2. Open the Public Hearing for public comments on the item.
3. Close the Public Hearing.
4. Consider the information presented in the staff report and during the Public Hearing. Discuss and direct staff to make any changes deemed appropriate.
5. Set May 22, 2014 as the Public Hearing to consider approving the Final LAFCo Budget for Fiscal Year 2014/15.

FISCAL IMPACT

The attached LAFCo budget includes proposed revenues and expenditures for LAFCo for the 2014/15 fiscal year (FY). This proposed budget maintains adequate support for the Commission to meet its responsibilities under the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg (CKH) Act and the Shared Services Program for FY 14/15. Adopting a final budget in May will ensure LAFCo is adequately funded to meet its legal obligations and maintain the shared services program.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

Yolo County LAFCo adopts an annual budget with notice to the four cities and Yolo County. In accordance with the CKH Act, a proposed budget must be adopted by May 1 and final budget by June 15 of each year. Following approval of the final budget and no later than July 1, the auditor requests payment from each agency. In order to meet these time lines, the final budget is scheduled to be adopted at the May 22, 2014 LAFCo Commission meeting and invoices will go out thereafter.

In accordance with the CKH Act, the cities and County split the cost of LAFCo funding 50/50. A formula for the split of the cities' share is outlined in Government Code Section 56381 (b)(1); which would be in proportion to a city's tax revenue or an alternative method approved by a majority of the cities. Beginning in FY 2007-08, the cities of Yolo County developed an alternative formula to apportion their 50% of LAFCo funding by averaging a city's general tax revenue (less grant monies) and population.

A more detailed table detailing the formula is attached for review (this agenda software program does not

handle tables well). In summary, the breakdown of agency apportionment of the LAFCo budget is as follows:

City of Davis 17.05%
City of West Sacramento 16.37%
City of Winters 1.61%
City of Woodland 14.96%
County of Yolo 50.00%

BACKGROUND

Revenues

The Revenues include anticipated income from other agencies, interest, and fees. The following lists the draft budget cost to each agency and increase amount from the last fiscal year.

City of Davis \$76,557 (increase of \$14,120)
City of West Sacramento \$73,501 (increase of \$13,608)
City of Winters \$7,230 (increase of \$1,326)
City of Woodland \$67,181 (increase of \$12,405)
County of Yolo \$224,469 (increase of \$41,469)

The draft budget would result in an 22.6% increase in agency costs, which is explained in detail below. However there is a Fund Balance available of \$43,405 which, if applied, would reduce the increase to 10.7%.

Fund Balance

There is currently \$183,405 in LAFCo's fund balance that is not currently appropriated. However, based on our last audit we have an estimated liability of \$50,000 for other post-employment benefits (OPEB) for the previous retired Executive Officer. At the February 2014 meeting the Commission approved moving these funds into a restricted cash account. Staff recently finalized an agreement with the County to share in these OPEB costs since the majority of the previous Executive Officer's employment was with Yolo County, but LAFCo will still need to have the liability recalculated by an actuary, presumably when LAFCo contracts for the next audit in FY 15/16. Per LAFCo's Administrative Policies and Procedures the Commission should strive to include a contingency budget equal to or greater than 20% of the overall budget. With the OPEB and contingency set aside, \$43,405 of the fund balance remains that could be used to offset agency costs.

Staff will have an opportunity to review the proposed budget and the available fund balance with the city and county managers on Friday, March 21, 2014 and staff will provide any updated recommendations if requested.

Expenditures

Salaries and Benefits

Overall, the total salary and benefits is projected to increase 10% from the current year's adjusted budget. This is due to:

- A projected 5% step increase for the Executive Officer
- Hiring a new half time Associate Management Analyst in the fall of 2013 who would also have a projected 5% step increase
- A 2% cost of living adjustment for all three LAFCo employees that was negotiated with the County

bargaining unit in which LAFCo staff is included

These salary increases have been assumed to provide a conservative budget estimate for the Commission, however please note that these increases are discretionary.

Services and Supplies

Overall, LAFCo related expenditures in services and supplies are projected to increase by 15% in the next fiscal year. Staff maintained or trimmed the proposed budget in individual accounts as much as reasonable to reflect actual costs to ensure there is no "fluff" in the budget.

The primary reason for a increase in services and supplies is due an increase in professional services. As discussed in last month's work plan, staff anticipates contracting out two relatively significant Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) next fiscal year, one for all the fire protection districts and the other for the City of Davis including its associated County Service Areas (CSAs). The MSR we contracted for this year was \$42,000 so staff assumed 2 x \$40,000 = \$80,000 for the estimate. With the current workload in shared services, its unrealistic to complete these studies in house in addition to catching up on the MSRs staff is already behind on. LAFCo's commitment to shared services is a worthwhile effort, but it does require staff time and resources. Hopefully, the cities and County will concur that the value obtained is worth the cost.

Conclusion

The proposed budget maintains adequate support for the Commission to meet the responsibilities of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg (CKH) Act and the Shared Services Program. Overall, the expenditures have grown as the scale and scope of the shared services program continues to increase. The shared services program is LAFCo value-added but it does come at a cost. Ultimately, the Commission representing the cities and the County need to determine if the value is worth the additional cost.

Attachments

Item 6-ATTs A/B 2014/15 Proposed Budget

Item 6-ATT C City Apportionment

Item 6-ATT D 2014/15 MSR/SOI Schedule

Form Review

Inbox

Tracey Dickinson LAFCO
Christine Crawford
Form Started By: Christine Crawford
Final Approval Date: 03/20/2014

Reviewed By

Tracey Dickinson
Christine Crawford

Date

03/19/2014 03:17 PM
03/20/2014 10:08 AM
Started On: 03/18/2014 08:33 PM

PROPOSED LAFCO BUDGET - FINANCING SOURCES - SCHEDULE A
 FISCAL YEAR 2014/15
 FUND NO: 368

Attachment A

Account #	Account Name	FY 13/14 Revenue Budgeted	FY 14/15 Proposed Revenue	Net Change	Agency Apportionment FY 14/15
REVENUES					
82-4100	INTEREST	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
82-5820	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-COUNTY	\$ 183,000	\$ 224,469	\$ 41,469	50.00%
82-5821	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WEST SACRAMENTO	\$ 59,893	\$ 73,501	\$ 13,608	16.37%
82-5822	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WOODLAND	\$ 54,776	\$ 67,181	\$ 12,405	14.96%
82-5823	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-WINTERS	\$ 5,904	\$ 7,230	\$ 1,326	1.61%
82-5824	OTHER GOVT AGENCY-DAVIS	\$ 62,437	\$ 76,557	\$ 14,120	17.05%
82-6225	LAFCO FEES	\$ 6,000	\$ 3,000	\$ (3,000)	
82-7600	OTHER SALES				
	FUND BALANCE CONTINGENCY OFFSET	\$ 74,328	\$ 90,000	\$ 15,672	
					\$ 448,938.00
	TOTAL AGENCY FY 14/15 COST	\$ 366,010	\$ 448,938	\$ 82,928	
	TOTAL OTHER SOURCES	\$ 81,828	\$ 94,500	\$ 12,672	
	TOTAL FINANCING SOURCES	\$ 447,838	\$ 543,438	\$ 95,600	
FUND BALANCE					
	CURRENT FUND BALANCE	\$ 183,405			
	OPEB LIABILITY	\$ (50,000)			Per FY 11/12 Audit
	CONTINGENCY	\$ (90,000)			Contingency 20% per Admin Policy
	REMAINING FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE	\$ 43,405			

PROPOSED LAFCO BUDGET - FINANCING USES - SCHEDULE B
 FISCAL YEAR 2014/15
 FUND NO: 368

Attachment B

Account #	Account Name	FY 2013/14 Adjusted Budget	FY 14/15 Proposed Budget	Net Change	Explanation of Change
SALARIES AND BENEFITS					
86-1101	REGULAR EMPLOYEES	\$ 175,377	\$ 193,000	\$ 17,623	EO Step D to E 5% increase 6/2015*
86-1102	EXTRA HELP			\$ -	Assoc. Mgmt Analyst Step B to C 5% increase 4/2015*
86-1103	OVERTIME			\$ -	* Discretionary annual merit steps
86-1201	RETIREMENT	\$ 33,432	\$ 39,677	\$ 6,245	employees pay full 8% towards retirement
86-1202	OASDI	\$ 12,765	\$ 13,871	\$ 1,106	
86-1203	MEDICARE TAX	\$ 3,085	\$ 3,403	\$ 318	
86-1400	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-1500	WORKER'S COMPENSATION INSURANCE	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-1600	CAFETERIA PLAN BENEFITS	\$ 55,769	\$ 61,362	\$ 5,593	includes health, dental, vision, life insurance
86-1999	SALARY ALLOCATION/ADJUSTMENT	\$ (8,096)	\$ (10,227)	\$ (2,131)	reimbursement from County for 1/2 analyst benefits
	TOTAL SALARY & BENEFITS	\$ 275,332	\$ 304,086	\$ 28,754	new 1/2 time analyst
SERVICES AND SUPPLIES					
86-2090	COMMUNICATIONS	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ -	
86-2130	FOOD	\$ 500	\$ 350	\$ (150)	
86-2202	INSURANCE - PUBLIC LIABILITY	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ -	LAFCo's liability insurance through YCPARMA
86-2271	MAINTENANCE - EQUIPMENT	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ -	
86-2330	MEMBERSHIPS	\$ 2,900	\$ 3,100	\$ 200	CALAFCO/APA dues increase
86-2360	MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 500	\$ 250	\$ (250)	
86-2390	OFFICE EXPENSE	\$ 1,000	\$ 750	\$ (250)	
86-2391	OFFICE EXPENSE - POSTAGE	\$ 750	\$ 500	\$ (250)	
86-2392	OFFICE EXPENSE - PRINTING	\$ 750	\$ 1,000	\$ 250	
86-2417	IT SERVICES - Dept System Maintenance	\$ 970	\$ 1,048	\$ 78	
86-2418	IT SERVICES - Enterprise/Resource/Planning	\$ 1,242	\$ 1,354	\$ 112	
86-2419	IT SERVICES - Connectivity	\$ 2,696	\$ 3,000	\$ 304	Cost to be finalized before final budget
86-2421	AUDITING & FISCAL SERVICES	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ -	Set aside for audit per 3 yr cycle
86-2422	INFORMATION TECH SERVICES	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ -	GIS Software License
86-2423	LEGAL SERVICES	\$ 10,500	\$ 7,500	\$ (3,000)	
86-2429	PROFESSIONAL & SPECIALIZED SERVICES	\$ 30,000	\$ 80,000	\$ 50,000	Assumes contracting out 2 MSRs @ \$40k each
	PROF SERVICES - SHARED SERVICES (SSP)	\$ 50,000	\$ 20,000	\$ (30,000)	Placeholder - future shared services studies unknown
86-2460	PUBLICATIONS & LEGAL NOTICES	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-2491	RENTS & LEASES - EQUIPMENT	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$ -	
86-2495	RECORDS STORAGE "ARCHIVES"	\$ 400	\$ 400	\$ -	
86-2548	TRAINING EXPENSE	\$ 10,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 2,000	New staff + air travel for conferences
86-2610	TRANSPORTATION & TRAVEL	\$ 1,500	\$ 2,000	\$ 500	
86-3102	PAYMENTS TO OTHER GOVT INSTITUTIONS	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ -	Costs are charged back to applicants
	TOTAL SERVICES & SUPPLIES	\$ 128,608	\$ 148,152	\$ 19,544	
OTHER FINANCING USES					
86-6110	PC EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT FUND	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,200	\$ -	Set aside to upgrade 3 computers every 4 yrs
86-9900	APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINGENCY	\$ 40,829	\$ 90,000	\$ 49,171	Last FY contingency \$74,328 (budget adjustment)
	TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	\$ 445,969	\$ 543,438	\$ 97,469	

Agency Apportionment

In accordance with the CKH Act, the cities and County split the cost of LAFCo funding 50/50. A formula for the split of the cities' share is outlined in Government Code Section 56381 (b)(1); which would be in proportion to a city's tax revenue or an alternative method approved by a majority of the cities. Beginning in FY 2007-08, the cities of Yolo County have developed an alternative formula to apportion their 50% of LAFCo funding by averaging a city's general tax revenue (less grant monies) and population.

The table below illustrates the formula and percentage apportionment of the Yolo LAFCo budget for this fiscal year. The percentages fluctuate slightly from year to year but overall remain relatively consistent. The latest Department of Finance population estimates are for January 1, 2013 and the latest report from the State Controller's Cities Annual Report is for FY 10/11. The Cities Annual Report for FY 11/12 is typically posted by now and if it becomes available before the May meeting, we will adjust the numbers below (but it only shifts the percentage one point or less typically).

Apportionment Formula and % Share of FY 2014-15 LAFCo Budget

Agency	% City Share of Tax Revenue	% City Share of Population	% Average of Revenue and Population	% of LAFCo Budget
Davis	31%	37%	34.11%	17.05%
West Sacramento	38%	28%	32.74%	16.37%
Winters	3%	4%	3.22%	1.61%
Woodland	28%	31%	29.93%	14.96%
Yolo County	n/a	n/a	n/a	50.0%
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%

MSR/SOI Update Schedule - Adopted February 27, 2014

Approved
02/27/14

FY Scheduled	City/District	LAFCO №	Last Updated	Resolution #	5 Yr Update Due (FY)
2012/13	Wild Wings County Service Area #14	S-035			
2013/14	Esparto Community Services District	S-039	3/24/2003	2003-04	2007/08
	Madison-Esparto Regional County Service Area (MERCESA)	S-039	3/28/2005	2005-10	2009/10
	Madison Community Services District	S-039	6/23/2008	2008-04	2012/13
2013/14	Dunnigan County Service Area	S-019	2/27/2006	2006-01	2010/11
2013/14	Cacheville Community Services District	S-023	10/23/2006	2006-05	2011/12
2013/14	Knights Landing Community Services District	S-021	9/25/2006	2006-04	2011/12
	Knights Landing Cemetery District (Consider Combined Study)				
2014/15	Knights Landing Ridge Drainage District	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Snowball County Service Area	S-021	3/27/2006	2006-02	2010/11
	Reclamation District 108 (Colusa)	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 150	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 307	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 537	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 730	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 765	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 785	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 787	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 827	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 900	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 999	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 1600	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	Reclamation District 2035	S-001	3/28/2005	2005-05	2009/10
	2014/15	Capay Fire Protection District	S-008	12/2/2004	2004-11
Clarksburg Fire Protection District		S-025	6/25/2007	2007-06	2011/12
Dunnigan Fire Protection District		S-015	9/19/2005	2005-14	2009/10
East Davis Fire Protection District		S-026	12/10/2007	2007-08	2012/13
Elkhorn Fire Protection District		S-024	3/26/2007	2007-01	2011/12
Esparto Fire Protection District		S-009	10/25/2004	2004-08	2009/10
Knights Landing Fire Protection District		S-016	12/5/2005	2005-18	2010/11
Madison Fire Protection District		S-013	12/2/2004	2004-12	2009/10
No Man's Land Fire Protection District		S-026	12/10/2007	2007-08	2012/13
Springlake Fire Protection District		S-004	1/17/2003	2003-01	2007/08
West Plainfield Fire Protection District		S-028	12/10/2007	2007-09	2012/13
Willow Oak Fire Protection District		S-007	12/2/2004	2004-10	2009/10
Winters Fire Protection District	S-029	9/22/2008	2008-08	2013/14	
Yolo Fire Protection District	S-017	9/19/2005	2005-15	2010/11	
Zamora Fire Protection District	S-018	9/19/2005	2005-16	2010/11	
2014/15	Yolo County Resource Conservation District	S-030	5/12/2008	2008-03	2012/13
2014/15	City of Davis	S-027	6/23/2008	2008-05	2012/13
	El Macero County Service Area	S-027	6/23/2008	2008-05	2012/13
	Willowbank County Service Area	S-027	6/23/2008	2008-05	2012/13
	North Davis Meadows County Service Area	S-022	10/23/2006	2006-06	2011/12
2015/16	City of Winters	S-029	9/22/2008	2008-08	2013/14
2015/16	City of West Sacramento	S-031	1/26/2009	2009-01	2013/14
	Garcia Bend County Service Area	S-031	1/26/2009	2009-01	2013/14
2015/16	Sac - Yolo Port District	S-033	6/22/2009	2009-03	2013/14
2016/17	City of Woodland	S-034	3/28/2011	2011-02	2015/16
2016/17	Capay Cemetery District	S-036	5/16/2011	2011-03	2015/16
	Cottonwood Cemetery District	S-036	5/16/2011	2011-03	2015/16
	Davis Cemetery District	S-037	7/26/2012	2012-05	2017/18
	Knights Landing Cemetery District	S-036	5/16/2011	2011-03	2015/16
	Mary's Cemetery District	S-036	5/16/2011	2011-03	2015/16
	Winters Cemetery District	S-036	5/16/2011	2011-03	2015/16
2018/19	Dunnigan Water District	S-038	10/24/2013	2013-04	2018/19
	Yolo County Flood Control & Water Conservation District	S-038	10/24/2013	2013-04	2018/19



Executive Officer Report 13.

LAFCO

Meeting Date: 05/22/2014

Information

SUBJECT

A report by the Executive Officer on recent events relevant to the Commission and an update of Yolo LAFCo staff activity for the month. The Commission or any individual Commissioner may request that action be taken on any item listed.

- Shared Services
 - Staff Activity Report - March 24 to May 16, 2014
-

Attachments

Item 13-Staff Activity Report

Form Review

Form Started By: Terri Tuck
Final Approval Date: 05/15/2014

Started On: 05/15/2014 09:22 AM

LAFCo Staff Activity Report

March 24 through May 16, 2014

Date	Meeting/Milestone	Comments
03/24-03/26	Vacation	Spring Break
03/27/2014	CA Emerging Technology Fund (CETF) Awards Event in SF w/Cecilia Aguiar-Curry	Attended
04/02/2014	Shared Services – Conference Call w/Magellan Advisors	Broadband
04/03/2014	Meeting with Pamela Miller, CALAFCO	Networking
04/04/2014	Shared Services – Yolo Broadband Workgroup Meeting	Attended
04/10/2014	Meeting w/County PPW (Ed Smith, Regina Espinoza, Panos Kokkas, Robyn Drivon)	MSR for Madison-Esparto Regional CSA (MERCSEA) and Dunnigan CSA
04/11/2014	Meeting w/UCD Government & Community Relations	Discussion on Springlake FPD and West Village: the ability of the campus to provide fire service to the residents of West Village, both current and future.
04/11/2014	Conference call w/Don Saylor	Yolo Leaders
04/16/2014	Shared Services – Conference Call w/Magellan Advisors	Broadband
04/16/2014	Meeting w/Wild Wings CSA Advisory Committee	MSR/SOI
04/17/2014	Shared Services – SACOG Shared Services Task Force Meeting	Attended
04/18/2014	Shared Services – Yolo Manager's Meeting	Attended
04/18/2014	University Downtown Gateway District (Nishi) Meeting	Attended
04/21/2014	Lunch Meeting w/Cindy Tuttle (CAO)	Update Re SACOG Shared Services Initiatives
04/23-04/25	CALAFCO Staff Workshop-Berkeley	Attended / Panelist Speaker
04/28/2014	Yolo-Zamora Water District Board Meeting	Attended
04/29/2014	Monthly Meeting w/Cecilia Aguiar-Curry	Agenda Review - Budget

Date	Meeting/Milestone	Comments
04/29/2014	Shared Services – Meeting w/Animal Advocates	Review RFP draft for animal services
04/30/2014	Shared Services – Conference Call w/Magellan Advisors	Broadband
05/01/2014	Davis/County 2x2	Attended
05/01/2014	Meeting w/Sue Heitman & Trini Campbell	LAFCo MSR for Western Yolo Districts
	Meeting with Olin Woods	Agenda Review - budget
05/02/2014	Cannery Groundbreaking	Attended
05/02/2014	University Downtown Gateway District planning meeting	Attended
05/13/2014	Shared Services – CSUS MPPA Partnership Presentations	Attended – Grad student study on purchasing
05/14/2014	Meeting w/City of Davis (Mike Webb and Rob White)	City of Davis SOI – timing of LAFCo MSR/SOI update
05/14/2014	Shared Services – Meeting w/Cecilia Aguiar-Curry & Sunne McPeak (CETF)	Attended/Participated in City of Winters Broadband Meeting-CA Emerging Technology Fund (CETF)
05/14/2014	CSAC Legislative Session	On panel session regarding broadband
05/15/2014	Shared Services – Conference Call w/Magellan Advisors	Broadband
05/16/2014	Shared Services – Yolo Managers Meeting	Attended
05/16/2014	Shared Services – Yolo Broadband Working Group Meeting	Magellan to present community profiles & potential strategies for each community
05/16/2014	University Downtown Gateway District planning meeting	Attended