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# 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 (MERCSA), 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 SIGNFICANT 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 | *[ ]*  | Shared Services |
| *[ ]*  | Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities | *[ ]*  | Accountability |
| *[ ]*  | Capacity, Adequacy & Infrastructure to Provide Services | *[ ]*  | Other |
| *[ ]*  | Financial Ability |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. GROWTH AND POPULATIONGrowth and population projections for the affected area. | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. Is the agency’s territory or surrounding area expected to experience any significant population change or development over the next 5-10 years?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Will population changes have an impact on the subject agency’s service needs and demands?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Will projected growth require a change in the agency’s service boundary?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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 COMMUNITIESThe location and characteristics of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence. |
|  | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. Does the subject agency provide public services related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, or structural fire protection?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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)?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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)?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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

Capay

Clarksburg

Dunnigan

El Macero

El Rio Villa

Esparto

Guinda

Knights Landing

Madison

Monument Hills

North Davis Meadows

Patwin Road

Royal Oak

Rumsey

West Kentucky

West Plainfield

Willow Oak

Willowbank

Yolo

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 SERVICESPresent 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** |
| 1. Are there any deficiencies in agency capacity to meet service needs of existing development within its existing territory?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any issues regarding the agency’s capacity to meet the service demand of reasonably foreseeable future growth?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any concerns regarding public services provided by the agency being considered adequate?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any significant infrastructure needs or deficiencies to be addressed?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there changes in state regulations on the horizon that will require significant facility and/or infrastructure upgrades?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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 ABILITYFinancial ability of agencies to provide services. |
|  | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Is the organization lacking adequate reserve to protect against unexpected events or upcoming significant costs?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Is the organization unable to fund necessary infrastructure maintenance, replacement and/or any needed expansion?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Is the organization lacking financial policies that ensure its continued financial accountability and stability?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Is the organization’s debt at an unmanageable level?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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 FACILITIESStatus of, and opportunities for, shared facilities. |
|  | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. Is the agency currently sharing services or facilities with other organizations? If so, describe the status of such efforts.
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any opportunities for the organization to share services or facilities with neighboring or overlapping organizations that are not currently being utilized?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any governance options that may produce economies of scale and/or improve buying power in order to reduce costs?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**Discussion:** (responses can be combined if appropriate)

a)

b)

c)

d)

**Shared 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 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 EFFICIENCIESAccountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies. |
|  | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. Are there any issues with meetings being accessible and well publicized? Any failures to comply with disclosure laws and the Brown Act?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any issues with filling board vacancies and maintaining board members?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any issues with staff turnover or operational efficiencies?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Is there a lack of regular audits, adopted budgets and public access to these documents?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any recommended changes to the organization’s governance structure that will increase accountability and efficiency?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any governance restructure options to enhance services and/or eliminate deficiencies or redundancies?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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 ISSUESAny other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy. |
|  | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. Are there any other service delivery issues that can be resolved by the MSR/SOI process?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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 recommends that the Municipal Service Review DOES NOT identify and support the need to change the agency’s Sphere of Influence. Therefore, NO CHANGE to the agency’s SOI is recommended and SOI determinations HAVE NOT been made.

*[ ]*  Staff recommends that the Municipal Service Review DOES identify and support the need to change the agency’s Sphere of Influence. Therefore, A CHANGE to the agency’s SOI is recommended and SOI determinations HAVE been made and are included in this MSR/SOI study.

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

## SPHERE OF INFLUENCE MAPS

Insert Figure(s) of existing and proposed SOI

## POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT SOI DETERMINATIONS

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 USESThe present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands. |
|  | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. Are there any present or planned land uses in the area that would create the need for an expanded service area?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Would the SOI conflict with planned, orderly and efficient patterns of urban development?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Is there a conflict with the adopted SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Would the SOI result in the loss of prime agricultural land or open space?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Would the proposed SOI conflict with a Census boundary, such that it would compromise the ability to obtain discrete data?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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 SERVICESThe present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area. |
|  | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Would the SOI expand services that could be better provided by a city or another agency?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Does the SOI represent premature inducement of growth or facilitate conversion of agriculture or open space lands?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Does the SOI conflict with the Regional Housing Needs Analysis (RHNA) or other SACOG growth projections?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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 SERVICESThe present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide. |
|  | **YES** | **MAYBE** | **NO** |
| 1. Are there any issues regarding water availability and sewer capacity for the proposed SOI territory?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. Are there any issues regarding the agency’s willingness and ability to extend services?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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 INTERESTThe 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** |
| 1. 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)?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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 COMMUNITIESFor 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** |
| 1. Does the subject agency provide public services related to sewers, municipal and industrial water or structural fire protection (same as MSR checklist question 2a)?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |
| 1. 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?
 | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  | *[ ]*  |

**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.
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