



## LAFCO MEETING AGENDA

Board Meeting Chambers, 70 West Hedding Street, First Floor

San Jose, CA 95110

December 2, 2015

1:00 PM

**CHAIRPERSON: Linda J. LeZotte • VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Cat Tucker**

**COMMISSIONERS: Cindy Chavez, Sequoia Hall, Johnny Khamis, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund Wilson**

**ALTERNATES: Ash Kalra, Yoriko Kishimoto, Tara Martin-Milius, Terry Trumbull, Ken Yeager**

---

### NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

---

1. Pursuant to Government Code §84308, no LAFCO commissioner shall accept, solicit, or direct a contribution of more than \$250 from any party, or his/her agent; or any participant or his /or her agent, while a LAFCO proceeding is pending, and for three months following the date a final decision is rendered by LAFCO. Prior to rendering a decision on a LAFCO proceeding, any LAFCO commissioner who received a contribution of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months from a party or participant shall disclose that fact on the record of the proceeding. If a commissioner receives a contribution which would otherwise require disqualification returns the contribution within 30 days of knowing about the contribution and the proceeding, the commissioner shall be permitted to participate in the proceeding. A party to a LAFCO proceeding shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contribution of more than \$250 within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to a LAFCO commissioner. For forms, visit the LAFCO website at [www.santaclaralafco.org](http://www.santaclaralafco.org). No party, or his or her agent and no participant, or his or her agent, shall make a contribution of more than \$250 to any LAFCO commissioner during the proceeding or for 3 months following the date a final decision is rendered by LAFCO.
2. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 56100.1, 56300, 56700.1, 57009 and 81000 et seq., any person or combination of persons who directly or indirectly contribute(s) a total of \$1,000 or more or expend(s) a total of \$1,000 or more in support of or in opposition to specified LAFCO proposals or proceedings, which generally include proposed reorganizations or changes of organization, may be required to comply with the disclosure requirements of the Political Reform Act (See also, Section 84250 et seq.). These requirements contain provisions for making disclosures of contributions and expenditures at specified intervals. More information on the scope of the required disclosures is available at the web site of the FPPC: [www.fppc.ca.gov](http://www.fppc.ca.gov). Questions regarding FPPC material, including FPPC forms, should be directed to the FPPC's advice line at 1-866-ASK-FPPC (1-866-275-3772).
3. Pursuant to Government Code §56300(c), LAFCO adopted lobbying disclosure requirements which require that any person or entity lobbying the Commission or Executive Officer in regard to an application before LAFCO must file a declaration prior to the hearing on the LAFCO application or at the time of the hearing if that is the initial contact. In addition to submitting a declaration, any lobbyist speaking at the LAFCO hearing must so identify themselves as lobbyists and identify on the record the name of the person or entity making payment to them. Additionally every applicant shall file a declaration under penalty of perjury listing all lobbyists that they have hired to influence the action taken by LAFCO on their application. For forms, visit the LAFCO website at [www.santaclaralafco.org](http://www.santaclaralafco.org).
4. Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on the agenda and distributed to all or a majority of the Commissioners less than 72 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at the LAFCO Office, 70 W. Hedding Street, 11th Floor, San Jose, California, during normal business hours. (Government Code §54957.5.)
5. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, those requiring accommodation for this meeting should notify the LAFCO Clerk 24 hours prior to the meeting at (408)299-6415.

---

70 West Hedding Street • 8th Floor, East Wing • San Jose, CA 95110 • (408) 299-5127 • [www.santaclaralafco.org](http://www.santaclaralafco.org)

COMMISSIONERS: Cindy Chavez, Sequoia Hall, Johnny Khamis, Linda J. LeZotte, Cat Tucker, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund Wilson

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONERS: Ash Kalra, Yoriko Kishimoto, Tara Martin-Milius, Terry Trumbull, Ken Yeager

EXECUTIVE OFFICER: Neelima Palacherla

**1. ROLL CALL**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Commission on any matter not on this agenda. Speakers are limited to THREE minutes. All statements that require a response will be referred to staff for reply in writing.

**3. APPROVE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 7, 2015 LAFCO MEETING**

---

**PUBLIC HEARING**

---

**4. CITIES SERVICE REVIEW REVISED DRAFT REPORT**

**Recommended Action:**

**CEQA Action**

1. Determine that the Cities Service Review Report which includes sphere of influence updates for fifteen cities and the recommendations of this staff report are exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the State CEQA Guidelines: §15306 Class 6; §15061(b)(3) General Rule; §15378(b)(5); and §15320 Class 20.

**Project Action**

2. Accept comments and consider any further revisions to the Cities Service Review Revised Draft Report.
3. Adopt the Cities Service Review Report (Service Review Report) including revisions presented in Attachment C, and other revisions, as necessary.
4. Adopt service review determinations for each of the fifteen cities as included in the Service Review Report.
5. Adopt sphere of influence (SOI) updates along with sphere of influence determinations for each of the fifteen cities and as included in the Service Review Report:
  - a. Reaffirm the existing SOI for each of the fifteen cities as recommended in the Service Review Report.
6. Direct staff to prepare the Final Report for the Cities Service Review and distribute the Final Report to all affected agencies.

---

**ITEMS FOR ACTION / INFORMATION**

---

**5. SPECIAL PRESENTATION BY DON WEDEN: FOOD AND FARMLANDS IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY**

**For information only.**

**6. 2016 SCHEDULE OF LAFCO MEETINGS**

**Recommended Action:** Adopt the schedule of LAFCO meetings and application filing deadlines for 2016.

**7. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON FOR 2016**

**Recommended Action:** Appoint the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for 2016.

**8. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

**8.1 LAFCO WORKSHOP ON SERVICE EXTENSIONS OUTSIDE OF JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES**

For information only.

**8.2 MEETINGS WITH SANTA CLARA COUNTY STAFF**

For information only.

**8.3 MEETING WITH MORGAN HILL BIBLE CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES ON MORGAN HILL 2015 URBAN SERVICE AREA AMENDMENT APPLICATION**

For information only.

**8.4 MEETING WITH THE COMMITTEE FOR GREEN FOOTHILLS ON MORGAN HILL 2015 URBAN SERVICE AREA AMENDMENT APPLICATION**

For information only.

**8.5 BAY AREA LAFCOs MEETING**

For information only.

**8.6 SANTA CLARA COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF PLANNING OFFICIALS (SCCAPO) MEETING**

For information only.

**8.7 CALAFCO LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

For information only.

**8.8 INTER-JURISDICTIONAL GIS WORKING GROUP MEETING**

For information only.

**9. PENDING APPLICATIONS / UPCOMING PROJECTS**

9.1 Cupertino Sanitary District 2015-02

9.2 Morgan Hill Urban Service Area Amendment 2015

**10. COMMISSIONER REPORTS**

**11. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES / NEWSLETTERS**

- CALAFCO Quarterly Report, November 2015

**12. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

- 12.1 Letter from the El Camino Hospital re. El Camino Hospital Corporation - Notice of Intent to Purchase Real Property (dated November 19, 2015)

**13. ADJOURN**

Adjourn to the regular LAFCO meeting on Wednesday, February 3, 2016, at 1:00 PM in the Board Meeting Chambers, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose.

**LAFCO MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2015****CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL**

The following commissioners were present:

- **Vice Chairperson Cat Tucker**
- **Commissioner Cindy Chavez**
- **Commissioner Sequoia Hall**
- **Commissioner Johnny Khamis** (left at 1:43 p.m.)
- **Commissioner Mike Wasserman**
- **Commissioner Susan Vicklund Wilson**
- **Alternate Commissioner Tara Martin-Milius**
- **Alternate Commissioner Terry Trumbull**

The following staff members were present:

- **LAFCO Executive Officer Neelima Palacherla**
- **LAFCO Assistant Executive Officer Dunia Noel**
- **LAFCO Counsel Malathy Subramanian**

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**3. MINUTES OF JUNE 3, 2015 LAFCO MEETING**

**Commissioner Wilson** noted that the minutes incorrectly indicate that she had abstained on item numbers 6, 7, 8.1, 8.3, 9.1, and 10.1, while also showing that she voted on the same items. She requested that the minutes be corrected to show that she did not abstain.

The Commission approved the minutes of June 3, 2015 LAFCO meeting, as corrected.

Motion: Wasserman Second: Hall

AYES: Hall, Chavez, Khamis, Tucker, Wasserman, Wilson

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: LeZotte

**MOTION PASSED**

4. **CONSENT ITEM: WEST VALLEY SANITATION DISTRICT 2015-01**

The Commission adopted **LAFCO Resolution No. 2015-02**, approving the annexation of two parcels with a total area of approximately 2.68 acres located at 18660 and 18650 Overlook Road in Saratoga.

Motion: Chavez

Second: Wasserman

AYES: Hall, Chavez, Khamis, Tucker, Wasserman, Wilson

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: LeZotte

**MOTION PASSED**

5. **CITIES SERVICE REVIEW DRAFT REPORT**

Dunia Noel, LAFCO Analyst, presented the staff report and expressed appreciation to Chairperson LeZotte and Alternate Commissioner Kishimoto for their service on the Technical Advisory Committee. Dan Marks and Steve Toler, with Management Partners, provided a brief PowerPoint presentation on the Draft Report.

In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Wasserman**, Mr. Toler stated that while the recession is over, some Santa Clara cities are still concerned about the sustainability of their revenue sources. In response to a follow-up inquiry by **Commissioner Wasserman**, Mr. Toler observed that while the level of revenues has returned to pre-recession levels, some cities have experienced increases in costs. He informed that some cities continue to make conservative projections; for instance, Mountain View's 10-year forecast anticipates an economic downturn within the next five years.

In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Chavez**, Ms. Palacherla indicated that LAFCO is required to update spheres of influence (SOIs) every five years and conduct a service review prior to that. She stated that service reviews inform LAFCO decisions on SOIs and other jurisdictional boundary changes. **Commissioner Chavez** observed that the Report appears to be non-judgmental and inquired if service reviews make recommendations. Ms. Palacherla confirmed that some service reviews include specific recommendations and provided an example of the special districts service review which included recommendations for improvements related to transparency and public accountability of some districts.

In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Chavez**, Mr. Toler informed that the primary source for the financial data in the report were the Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports, and that other information was obtained from various public documents and through interviews with public works, planning and community development staff.

In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Chavez**, Mr. Marks stated that the farmland data was sourced from the State Farmland Mapping Program.

In response to another inquiry by **Commissioner Chavez**, Ms. Palacherla informed that LAFCO's service reviews have played a role in improving service efficiencies and provided an example of the Countywide Fire Service Review which identified areas in

the unincorporated county that were not served by a city or a fire protection district. She stated that as a result of the service review report highlighting this issue, two such large areas were consequently annexed by adjacent fire districts.

**Commissioner Wilson** provided historical background and stated that service reviews have progressed from cursory studies in the first round to more detailed reviews in the current versions. She noted that recent reports have brought to light many special district issues. She indicated that how the service reviews are utilized continue to be a work in progress.

In response to an inquiry by, **Commissioner Chavez**, Mr. Toler clarified that the table only shows the general fund reserves.

In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Hall**, Mr. Toler informed that enterprise and general funds are maintained and accounted for separately. In response to another inquiry by **Commissioner Hall**, Mr. Toler informed that the Report includes statistics on park lands per capita for each city.

This being the time and place for the public hearing, **Vice Chairperson Tucker** declared the public hearing open, determined that there are no members of the public who wished to speak on the item, and declared the public hearing closed.

The Commission:

1. Considered the Draft Report for the Cities Service review.
2. Accepted public comments.
3. Authorized staff to revise the Report as necessary to address comments received through October 7<sup>th</sup> and set December 2, 2015 as the date for the public hearing to consider adoption of the Final Report.

Motion: Wilson

Second: Hall

AYES: Hall, Chavez, Tucker, Wasserman, Wilson

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Khamis, LeZotte

**MOTION PASSED**

**6. ANNUAL REPORT**

The Commission noted the report.

**7. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

**7.1 RELOCATION OF THE LAFCO OFFICE TO 8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR OF COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER**

The Commission noted the report.

**7.2 COUNTY'S MEETING ON URBAN AGRICULTURE INCENTIVE ZONES ACT**

The Commission noted the report.

- 7.3 **UPDATE ON PACHECO PASS WATER DISTRICT**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.4 **DISCUSSION WITH CITY OF SUNNYVALE CONCERNING PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF BUTCHER'S CORNER**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.5 **MEETING WITH COUNTY CONTROLLER'S OFFICE REGARDING LAFCO FEES METHODOLOGY**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.6 **MEETING WITH SAN JOSE PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF CONCERNING SEWER SERVICE EXTENSION AND BOUNDARY CHANGE INQUIRIES**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.7 **MEETINGS WITH PROPERTY OWNERS AND CITIES CONCERNING DETACHMENT FROM MOUNTAIN VIEW AND ANNEXATION TO LOS ALTOS**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.8 **MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF CASTRO VALLEY RANCH CONCERNING LAFCO'S POLICIES**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.9 **MEETING WITH COUNTY STAFF ON SEWER AND WATER SERVICE EXTENSIONS TO UNINCORPORATED LANDS**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.10 **MEETING WITH CITY OF GILROY ON PROPOSED NORTH GILROY URBAN SERVICES AREA AMENDMENT APPLICATION**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.11 **PUBLIC INQUIRIES ABOUT SERVICE EXTENSIONS TO UNINCORPORATED LANDS**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.12 **LAFCO ORIENTATION SESSION FOR COMMISSIONER KHAMIS' STAFF MEMBER**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.13 **SANTA CLARA COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF PLANNING OFFICIALS (SCCAPO)**  
The Commission noted the report.
- 7.14 **SANTA CLARA COUNTY SPECIAL DISTRICT ASSOCIATION MEETING**  
The Commission noted the report.



**7.15 INTER-JURISDICTIONAL GIS WORKING GROUP MEETINGS**

The Commission noted the report.

**Commissioner Wilson** expressed appreciation on the format of the Executive Officer's Report as it informs the Commission about staff's activities and outreach to the community.

Doug Muirwood, resident of Morgan Hill, suggested that the planned workshop on service extensions be open to the public. He informed that the public attend LAFCO meetings to learn how the agency works and recalled that the 2012 Strategic Planning Workshop was very informative. He proposed that another workshop be held for the benefit of new commissioners.

**8. CALAFCO RELATED ACTIVITIES**

**8.1 REPORT ON THE 2015 CALAFCO ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

**Vice Chairperson Tucker** reported that she and Alternate Commissioner Milius attended the 2015 CALAFCO Annual Conference and she noted that it was well-attended and informative.

**8.2 REPORT ON CALAFCO CHANGES**

The Commission noted the report.

**8.3 CALAFCO PUBLICATIONS**

The Commission noted the report.

**9. LETTERS FROM THE SPECIAL DISTRICT RISK MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY REGARDING PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AWARD**

The Commission noted the report.

**10. PENDING APPLICATIONS / UPCOMING PROJECTS**

Ms. Palacherla informed that staff received an application from property owners for annexation to Cupertino Sanitary District, and another application from the City of Morgan Hill for amendment of its urban service area boundary.

**11. COMMISSIONER REPORTS**

There were none.

**12. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES / NEWSLETTERS**

There were none.

**13. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

The Commission noted an email from Charmel Perrier, dated August 4, 2015, regarding Morgan Hill Southeast Quadrant Annexation & Agricultural Mitigation Preservation Plan.

**14. ADJOURN**

Wendy Tran, a San Jose State University student, inquired about what members like about LAFCO and what the Commission does. **Vice Chairperson Tucker**, and **Commissioners Wasserman, Hall, Chavez** and **Wilson** responded to her inquiry.

The Commission adjourned at 2:00 p.m., to the next regular meeting on December 2, 2015 at 1:00 p.m., in the Board Meeting Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cat Tucker, Vice Chairperson  
Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Emmanuel Abello, LAFCO Clerk

**LAFCO MEETING: December 2, 2015**  
**TO: LAFCO**  
**FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer**  
**Dunia Noel, Analyst**  
**SUBJECT: CITIES SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATES**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

---

**CEQA Action**

1. Determine that the Cities Service Review Report which includes sphere of influence updates for fifteen cities and the recommendations of this staff report are exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under the State CEQA Guidelines: §15306 Class 6; §15061(b)(3) General Rule; §15378(b)(5); and §15320 Class 20.

**SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATES**

2. Accept comments and consider any further revisions to the Cities Service Review Revised Draft Report.
3. Adopt the Cities Service Review Report (Service Review Report) including revisions presented in **Attachment C**, and other revisions, as necessary.
4. Adopt service review determinations for each of the fifteen cities as included in the Service Review Report.
5. Adopt sphere of influence (SOI) updates along with sphere of influence determinations for each of the fifteen cities and as included in the Service Review Report:
  - a. Reaffirm the existing SOI for each of the fifteen cities as recommended in the Service Review Report.
6. Direct staff to prepare the Final Report for the Cities Service Review and distribute the Final Report to all affected agencies.

## **BACKGROUND**

---

### **SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REQUIREMENTS**

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (California Government Code §56000 et seq.) requires that each LAFCO conduct service reviews prior to or in conjunction with the 5-year mandated sphere of influence (SOI) updates. A service review is a comprehensive review of municipal services in a designated geographic area in order to obtain information about services, evaluate provision of services, and recommend actions when necessary, to promote the efficient provision of those services.

As part of the service review, LAFCO must prepare an analysis and written statement of determinations regarding each of the following categories:

- Growth and population projections for the affected area
- Location and characteristics of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence
- Present and planned capacity of public facilities and 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)
- Financial ability of agencies to provide services Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities
- Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies
- Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy

As part of the sphere of influence update, LAFCO must prepare an analysis and written statement of determinations for each agency regarding each of the following categories:

- Present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open space lands
- Present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area
- Present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide
- Existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency
- Present and probable need for water, wastewater, and structural fire protection facilities and services of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within the existing sphere of influence

The Cities Service Review Draft Report reviews the fifteen cities within Santa Clara County, as well as certain unincorporated areas (i.e. Moffett Field, San Martin, and Stanford University). The Report reviews current practices and potential opportunities for collaboration amongst cities and other local agencies or organization to achieve common goals and efficient delivery of services. Special areas of focus include shared services, sprawl prevention/infill development, and agricultural land preservation. The Report also includes service review determinations and sphere of influence recommendations and determinations for the fifteen cities.

### **SERVICE REVIEW PROCESS**

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) consisting of LAFCO commissioners LeZotte and Kishimoto, appointed by LAFCO; Los Altos Hills Town Manager Carl Cahill, appointed by the Santa Clara County/Cities Managers' Association; Morgan Hill Community Development Director Andrew Crabtree and Los Altos Planning Services Manager David Kornfield, both appointed by the Santa Clara County Association of Planning Officials; and Assistant City Manager Kent Steffens, appointed by the Santa Clara County Municipal Public Works Officials Association; provided input and guidance during the service review process. Three TAC meetings were held during the service review process.

LAFCO retained Management Partners to conduct the Cities Service Review who began by first collecting publicly available information on the affected agencies. In spring of 2015, Management Partners, with LAFCO staff in attendance, interviewed key staff of the affected agencies in order to collect additional information.

Draft profiles of the agencies were developed and provided to each agency or organization for internal review and comment in order to ensure factual accuracy prior to release of the Public Review Draft Report. The data was analyzed and an administrative draft of the Cities Service Review Report was developed for LAFCO staff's review. The County Planning Department prepared GIS maps of cities, unincorporated islands, and disadvantaged unincorporated communities for the Draft Report.

A Public Review Draft (dated September 1, 2015), which included determinations and recommendation for cities, was developed and posted on the LAFCO website for public review and comment. LAFCO sent a Notice of Availability/Notice of LAFCO's October 7, 2015 Public Hearing to all affected agencies, organizations, and other interested parties announcing the release of the Cities Service Review Draft Report for public review and comment.

### **Release of the Revised Draft Report**

LAFCO held a public hearing on October 7, 2015, to accept public comments on the Cities Service Review Draft Report. LAFCO received comments / corrections from the Cities of Morgan Hill, Palo Alto, San Jose, and Sunnyvale, prior to the October 7<sup>th</sup> LAFCO Public Hearing. LAFCO also received a comment letter from Doug Muirhead (resident of Morgan Hill). Following the public hearing, LAFCO received corrections

from the Cities of Los Altos and Mountain View; and Stanford University. LAFCO also received a comment letter from Allan Epstein (resident of Los Altos Hills). The Draft Report was revised to address these comments, as appropriate. A redline version of the Revised Draft Report dated October 19, 2015 (**See Attachment B**) was released on the LAFCO website and a Notice of Availability for the Revised Draft Report/Notice of December 2, 2015 Public Hearing (**Attachment A**) was provided to all affected agencies and interested parties on October 21, 2015.

Management Partners and Executive Officer Palacherla, with Commissioner Tucker in attendance, presented the Cities Service Review Report to the Santa Clara County Cities Association on October 8, 2015.

### **Comments on the Revised Draft Report**

As of the date of this staff report, LAFCO has received additional data corrections from the Cities of Mountain View, Morgan Hill, Gilroy and Sunnyvale. LAFCO also received an additional comment letter from Allen Epstein (resident of Los Altos Hills) clarifying comments raised in his previous letter.

Please see **Attachment "C"** for a table summarizing all of the comments received since the October 7, 2015 Staff Report and consultant responses including proposed revisions to the report that have been reflected in the Revised Draft Report or that will be reflected in the Final Report.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

---

The Cities Service Review Report is intended to serve as an information gathering tool to help LAFCO, the public and other agencies better understand how services are provided within Santa Clara County and to update the sphere of influence of the fifteen cities.

The Cities Service Review Report consist of the following items:

- Profiles of the fifteen cities and information on certain unincorporated areas,
- A review of current practices and potential opportunities for collaboration amongst cities and other local agencies and organization to achieve common goals and efficient delivery of services,
- A review of the fifteen cities efforts in sprawl prevention/infill/agricultural preservation and shared services,
- Service review determinations for the fifteen cities, and
- Sphere of Influence recommendations and determinations for the fifteen cities.

LAFCO is not required to initiate boundary changes based on this service review. LAFCO, local agencies or the public may subsequently use the service review together with additional research and analysis where necessary, to pursue changes in jurisdictional boundaries. Any future changes in jurisdictional boundaries will be subject to CEQA review.

The Service Review Report recommends that the existing sphere of influence for each of the fifteen cities be reaffirmed and retained.

Therefore, the Cities Service Review Report is exempt from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under §15306 Class 6; §15061(b)(3) General Rule; §15378(b)(5); and §15320 Class 20 of the State CEQA Guidelines as described below.

Class 6 consists of basic data collection, research, experimental management, and resource evaluation activities that do not result in a serious or major disturbance to an environmental resource. According to the CEQA Guidelines, these may be strictly for information gathering purposes, or as part of a study leading to an action that a public agency has not yet approved, adopted, or funded.

Section 15061(b)(3) states that the activity is covered by the general rule that CEQA applies only to projects, which have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment. Where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA. Furthermore, Section 15378(b)(5) states that a project does not include organizational or administrative activities of governments that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment.

Class 20 consists of changes in the organization or reorganization of local governmental agencies where the changes do not change the geographical area in which previously existing powers are exercised.

## **NEXT STEPS**

---

Staff will make the proposed and / or directed changes to the Report. Upon adoption of the Final Service Review Report by the Commission, staff will post the Final Service Review Report on the LAFCO website and notify affected agencies and interested parties that the adopted Final Report is now available.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

---

- Attachment A: Notice of Availability for the Cities Service Review Revised Draft Report dated October 21, 2015/Notice of December 2, 2015 LAFCO Public Hearing
- Attachment B: Redlined version of Cities Service Review Revised Draft Report dated October 19, 2015 is available on the LAFCO website ([www.santaclaralafco.org](http://www.santaclaralafco.org))
- Attachment C: Comments Received on the Draft Report / Revised Draft Report (exclusive of the comments included in Attachment C to Agenda Item #5 of the October 7, 2015 LAFCO Meeting) and Consultant Responses







AGENDA ITEM # 4  
Attachment A

VIA E-MAIL

**DATE:** October 21, 2015

**TO:** City Managers and County Executive  
City Community Development/Planning Directors and County Planning Director  
City Public Works Directors  
City Council Members and County Board of Supervisors  
NASA's Ames Research Center/Moffett Field  
Stanford University  
LAFCO Members  
Interested Parties

**FROM:** Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer

**SUBJECT: CITIES SERVICE REVIEW REVISED DRAFT REPORT**

---

**Notice of Availability & Public Hearing**

The [Cities Service Review Revised Draft Report](#) (with tracked changes) is now available for public review and comment on the LAFCO website at [www.santaclaralafco.org](http://www.santaclaralafco.org). The Revised Draft Report reviews the 15 incorporated cities within Santa Clara County, as well as certain unincorporated areas (i.e. Moffett Field, San Martin, and Stanford University). The Report includes a service review and sphere of influence update for each of the cities and a review of current practices and potential opportunities for collaboration amongst cities and other local agencies or organizations to achieve common goals and efficient delivery of services. Special areas of focus include shared services, sprawl prevention/infill development, and agricultural land preservation.

LAFCO will hold a public hearing in order to accept comments and consider adoption of the Revised Draft Report.

**LAFCO Public Hearing:** December 2, 2015  
**Time:** 1:15 P.M. or soon thereafter  
**Location:** Board Meeting Chambers  
70 W. Hedding Street, San Jose, CA 95110

You may provide written comments on the Revised Draft Report by mail to: LAFCO of Santa Clara County, 70 West Hedding Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor, East Wing, San Jose, CA 95110 OR you may email your comments to: [dunia.noel@ceo.sccgov.org](mailto:dunia.noel@ceo.sccgov.org).

Written comments received by November 10<sup>th</sup> will be included and addressed in the staff report that will be provided to the LAFCO Commission in advance of the December 2, 2015 Public Hearing. Written comments received after November 10<sup>th</sup> will be provided to the LAFCO Commission at the December 2, 2015 Public Hearing.

Please contact me at (408) 299-5127 or Dunia Noel, LAFCO Analyst, at (408) 299-5148 if you have any questions. Thank you.



**AGENDA ITEM # 4**  
**Attachment B**

Redlined version of Cities Service Review Revised Draft Report dated October 19, 2015 is available on the LAFCO website at:

<http://santaclaralafco.org/cities-service-review>



Santa Clara County LAFCO  
2015 Cities Service Review

Additional Comments Received on Public Draft Report (exclusive of the comments included in Attachment C to Agenda Item #5 of the October 7, 2015 LAFCO Meeting)

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
<b>COMMENTER: CITY OF MORGAN HILL</b>				
9	Section 1.5, Table 4	11/3/2015	Should Figure 4 have a companion Figure that adds Fire District revenues to GF revenues, since this is a major GF expenditure for all cities, but many County cities are served in whole or in part with Fire Districts that have significant revenues? Expenditures in Fig. 5 are assumed to include City Fire Department costs, where applicable.	Comment noted. As indicated in Section 2.3.1 of the report, this cities services review did not include a review of fire services as LAFCO completed a countywide fire services review in December 2010. No changes will be made to the report.
13	Section 1.6	11/3/2015	Add a sentence to the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Paragraph: "Conversely, research could determine that the above objectives may not be influenced by public policies if explanations for the lack of active farming are due to external economic conditions or individual decisions unrelated to agency policies (e.g. lack of interest in farming by landowners, disputes among multiple landowners)."	Comment noted. State law mandates that LAFCO preserve agricultural land. No change will be made to the report.
169	Section 11.3.2	9/25/2015	Revise discussion of island MH01 to read " <b>Because the residents concluded that it would be cost prohibitive, at the time of the City Services Review, the City has no plans to annex MH01.</b> "	See further addition to comments received from City on 11/3/2015 as indicated below.
169	Section 11.3.2	11/3/2015	Revise change indicated previously to " <b>Because the residents concluded that it would be cost prohibitive, at the time of the City Services Review, the City has no plans to annex MH01. However, if the residents of that area decided it was in their best interest to annex into the City and pay the associated costs for connecting to the City's sewer system, the City would be open to pursuing this option. The full impact of the annexation (above and beyond sewer) would need to be studied.</b> "	The following revisions will appear in the final version of the report as follows: "Because it did not appear that there was sufficient support for an assessment, the City has no plans to annex MH01. However, if the residents of that area decided it was in their best interest to annex into the City and pay the associated costs for connecting to the

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
172	Section 11.4, Table 118	9/25/2015	Make "Non-profit partners" plural; add " <b>Morgan Hill Youth Sports Alliance</b> " under Parks and Recreation.	City's sewer system, the City would be open to annexation and studying its full impact." Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
172	Section 11.4, Table 118	9/25/2015	Replace paragraph under Table 118 to read, "In the past five years the City has not stopped providing any municipal services. In January 2013, the City re-established a municipal Fire Department in partnership with Cal Fire. Prior to this, the City had contracted with Central Fire Protection District. Under the current service delivery model, the City owns two fire stations and accompanying fire-suppression and emergency response apparatus. CAL FIRE provides contract staffing and operate under a full boundary drop with South Santa Clara County Fire Protection District. Fire is not a service area covered by this report. Given the expected population growth for the City of Morgan Hill, City staff does not anticipate any difficulty providing municipal services to its community." Change the City's PCI index to 70.	Comment noted. This cities services review did not include a review of fire services as LAFCO completed a countywide fire services review in December 2010. The 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence under Table 118 will be revised to read as follows: "In the past five years, the City has not stopped providing any municipal services." This revision will appear in the final version of the report.
174	Section 11.4.7	9/25/2015		Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
N/A	General	11/3/2015	Generally, many of the statistics presented for each city should also be presented on a per capita basis, and then those data should be presented graphically for all agencies along with the mean, median or County-wide figure, for comparison purposes. Figure 4 is a good example of presenting data this way	Comment noted. No changes will be made to the report.
N/A	General	11/3/2015	In charts of FTEs, normalization by citing FTE/1,000 population would be helpful, along with aggregate chart for all cities in County. Other data should be similarly presented (e.g. calls per service/1,000 pop).	Comment noted. No changes will be made to the report.
178	Section 11.6, Determination #1	11/3/2015	Add a sentence to the end of the 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph: "The City has experienced a population growth rate of 24.5% from 2000 to 2015."	Comment noted. Based upon the criteria for determinations as presented in Table 6, determinations are based upon future projected population growth. No changes will be made.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
179	Section 11.6, Determination #3	11/3/2015	Add a sentence at the end of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph: "The City completed a Safe and Sustainable Study, and Mitigating Plan to address its comprehensive infrastructure needs."	<p>Based upon the comment provided, the Safe and Sustainable Study published in May 2013 was reviewed, as was as the related City's Public Infrastructure Financing Report (April 2015) and the City's most recently adopted FY 2016 budget. This further research indicated that the City has identified a \$5.8 million annual gap in funding various capital improvement expenditures and is pursuing various funding strategies to address the funding gap. The City has increased the funding of capital improvements from its General Fund to \$1.1 million annually, in which it intends to draw down reserves through FY 2020 to its minimum reserve level of 25% established by City Council policy. In light of this additional research, changes will be made to the following sections:</p> <p>The two paragraphs following Figure 27 in Section 11.5.4 (page 177) will be revised as follows: "The City's adopted FY 2016 General Fund budget includes a five-year financial plan that anticipates drawing down its reserves to the minimum 25% reserve threshold by FY 2020 to invest in its street infrastructure by setting aside \$1.1 million per year. The City prepared a Public Infrastructure Financing Report, adopted by the City Council in April 2015, indicating an annual \$5.8 million gap in its capital improvement funding based on an overall Capital Improvement Program budget of \$94 million. The City has generally been</p>

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
				<p>conservative in its budget estimations and actual performance typically exceeds budgeted forecasts.</p> <p>The City is currently conducting a revenue enhancement study, including a Community Needs survey to determine community perspective and to develop recommendations including a potential ballot measure to finance the public infrastructure funding gap indicated earlier.</p> <p>Table 123 shows the City's General Fund Fiscal Indicators. The City's long-term fiscal health is positive as the City continues to address its long-term financial needs as mentioned above. The City's liquidity ratio indicates the necessary cash to fund its liabilities. General Fund reserves of 41.8% greatly exceed the GFOA-recommended minimum reserve of 17% (or two months) of annual operating expenditures."</p> <p>The first two paragraphs in Determination #4, Section 11.6 (Page 179-180) will also be revised as follows: "Morgan Hill's General Fund operated at a deficit for each year from FY 2010 to FY 2013, but operated at a surplus in FY 2014 in light of economic recovery from the Great Recession and expenditure reductions implemented. The City expects to draw down its General Fund reserves to the minimum 25% reserve threshold established by City Council policy by FY 2020 unless an alternative funding</p>



Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
				<p>source is identified to meet its public infrastructure funding needs. Morgan Hill's General Fund reserves of 41.8% exceed the minimum reserve threshold of two months of operating expenditures (17%) as recommended by the GFOA, indicative of the City's ability to meet future service needs in the event of an economic downturn. In addition, the City's liquidity ratio of 7:1 indicates the necessary cash to fund its short-term obligations with sufficient cash flow.</p> <p>The City of Morgan Hill has sufficient financial resources to accommodate its basic infrastructure needs in the next five years as it addresses sustainable funding strategies for its long-term public infrastructure needs. One area of additional potential concern is stormwater, as discussed under Determination Three."</p> <p>These revisions will appear in the final version of the report.</p>
<b>COMMENTS: CITY OF LOS ALTOS</b>				
82	Section 6.1	10/7/2015	Add: Cupertino to "Bordered by the cities of ..."	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
84	Section 6.1.1	10/7/2015	Last sentence, revised to read "... provide select services (e.g., animal control, <b>fire protection</b> )...."	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
86	Section 6.2.2	10/7/2015	This section should be corrected to Los Altos has a Certified Housing Element as of May 2015.	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015 to replace the last sentence of the third

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
87	Section 6.2.4	10/7/2015	This section should clarify that the El Camino Real PDA is no longer resting with the VTA and was recently adopted as a City PDA.	<p>paragraph to read: "The city's Housing Element was certified by the State of California's Housing and Community Development Department in May 2015."</p> <p>Based upon the City's request, and a review of the staff report adopting the El Camino Real Corridor PDA on June 23, 2015, the paragraph was revised in the draft of the report published on October 19, 2015 as follows: "The City has one priority development area: the El Camino Real Corridor PDA, an area consisting of commercial and residential properties, along El Camino Real and on North San Antonio Road within the Commercial Thoroughfare District."</p>
88	Section 6.4, Table 53	10/7/2015	Add: Fire Protection services provided through contract with Santa Clara County Fire Department.	<p>Comment noted. As indicated in Section 2.3.1 of the report, fire protection services were outside of the scope of services reviewed in this cities services review as LAFCO completed a countywide fire services review in December 2010. No changes will be made to the table.</p>
90	Section 6.4.9	10/7/2015	Add: California Water Service Company supplies water to Los Altos Suburban Water District and includes all of Los Altos.	<p>Comment noted. As indicated in Section 2.3.1 of the report, water services were outside of the scope of services reviewed in this cities services review as LAFCO completed a countywide water services review in December 2011. No changes will be made to this section.</p>
95	Section 6.6.3	10/7/2015	Revise third paragraph as follows: "The City's Priority One Police response rate...."	<p>Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.</p>

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
95	Section 6.6.5, Table 60	10/7/2015	Add Fire Protection	Comment noted. As indicated in Section 2.3.1 of the report, fire protection services were outside of the scope of services reviewed in this cities services review as LAFCO completed a countywide fire services review in December 2010. No changes will be made to the table.
333	Section 22.1.6	10/7/2015	This section makes the point that if annexed, island areas won't significantly impact a city's ability to meet development needs. The City disagrees with this conclusion. The County Island for Los Altos encompasses 627 acres and it would be a significant impact to the City of Los Altos to provide service and maintain roads for this area with only a minor increase in associated property tax revenue.	Comment noted. Second paragraph, third sentence will be revised in the draft of the report published on October 19, 2015 as follows: "Many of the larger remaining County islands are already developed. Annexing them into a city would not have a significant impact on the city's abilities to meet development needs, however the fiscal impacts of such annexation would need to be addressed by the city to ensure the adequate provision of services and infrastructure."
335	Section 22.1.7, Table 217	10/7/2015	This table should be corrected to show that Los Altos has 1 Planned Priority Development Areas and no Potential Priority Development Areas	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
336	Section 22.2	10/7/2015	The first paragraph of this section should clarify that Los Altos has a PDA on El Camino Real	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
<b>COMMENTS: STANFORD UNIVERSITY</b>				
302	Section 20.1, Figure 45	10/8/2015	Replace map with a more recent version depicting University property within unincorporated Santa Clara County	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
303	Section 20.1.1	10/8/2015	Update population as 26,581. Delete last two sentences as information was an estimate provided by staff not based on empirical data research.	Population figure in Table 208 as updated below was used, which totals 28,139. Last two sentences were deleted in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
303	Section 20.1.1	10/8/2015	Update table to indicate 9,885 for Staff (not including Stanford Linear Accelerator staff), revising total to 28,139.	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
303	Section 20.1.1	10/8/2015	Revise paragraph below the table to read "The University has implemented a comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program, intended to shift commuter behavior away from single-occupancy vehicles to alternate modes. The TDM Program was established as part of Stanford's General Use Permit, which is described in Section 6.1.2. One of the TDM program's key goals is to keep peak-hour (defined as the two-hour period between 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. with the highest volume of traffic) commute trips less than or equal to a baseline number established in 2001. To accomplish this, Stanford offers numerous alternative transportation options, including an extensive, free shuttle system called the Marguerite, a commute club for employees who use non-drive-alone commute modes including ridesharing, a platinum level bike program, and free public transit passes for eligible employees."	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
303	Section 20.1.2	10/8/2015	Revise paragraph to read "Stanford's development is regulated by a General Use Permit (GUP) administered by the County of Santa Clara. The GUP provides the University rights to grow and develop. Stanford's GUP is mindful of population growth and its impacts on the University and surrounding communities (e.g., traffic, housing, biological resources). The most recent GUP was issued in 2000. Over the past 15 years, Stanford developed approximately 1.5 million square feet of new academic space, out of a total of 2.035 million square feet permitted under the GUP."	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
303	Section 20.1.3	10/8/2015	Delete reference to staff (housing is not provided to staff).	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
304	Section 20.1.3, Table 209	10/8/2015	Total undergraduate beds is 6,503; graduate beds is 5,037. Update source to delete reference to staff interviews and instead replace with "Stanford Facts 2015, Stanford Budget Plan 2015/16: Schedule 11"	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
304	Section 20.1.3	10/8/2015	Paragraph below Table 209, second sentence, indicated "While Stanford's <b>central campus</b> ..."	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
304	Section 20.2	10/8/2015	Second sentence revise to read "... a 1985 <del>policy</del> land use <b>policy</b> agreement...." Last sentence, add phrase "... managing its own <b>roads, water, sanitary sewer and storm water system.</b> "	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
304	Section 20.2.1	10/8/2015	Second sentence delete phrase "...and was most recently revised...." Third sentence add phrase "... remain open space <b>with limited development</b> ...."	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
305	Section 20.2.2, Table 210	10/8/2015	Change major service function to read " <b>Law and Parking Enforcement</b> "	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
305	Section 20.2.2, Table 210	10/8/2015	Add "Water: provided by University Water Resources & Civil Infrastructure Group, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission contract"	Comment noted. As indicated in Section 2.3.1 of the report, water services were outside of the scope of services reviewed in this cities services review as LAFCO completed a countywide water services review in December 2011. No changes will be made to this table.
305	Section 20.2.2, Table 210	10/8/2015	For Wastewater services, replace Primary Service Provider to read "University Water Resources & Civil Infrastructure Group"; replace the Non-University Service Provider as "Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant"; delete footnote reference to the Partnership Agreement with Palo Alto; delete Available Measures of "15,000 gallons of recycled water produced per day."	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015, however the footnote reference to Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant will remain to be consistent with other agency profiles that are included in the Partnership Agreement.
306	Section 20.2.3	10/8/2015	Change last sentence as follows: "In addition, the University leases land to the City of Palo Alto for <del>several fields</del> a <b>Community Playing Field located at the corner of El Camino Real and Page Mill Road, the El Camino Ballpark and the Palo Alto transit center, and the Bol Park starting at Arastradero Road and Foothill Expressway. Stanford also has easements to the County of Santa Clara for the S1-Matadero Trail and the C2-Adobe Creek Trail.</b> "	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
<b>COMMITTEE: CITY OF MOUNTAIN VIEW</b>				
185	Section 12.1.1.3, Table 127	11/23/2015	<p>Mountain View is a member of six JPA's. Please review the paragraph to Table 127, and revise the table to incorporate the additional four JPAs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education Enhancement Reserve JPA – contribute and enhance the overall strength and viability of the public schools, in cooperation with Shoreline Regional Park Community, the Mountain View Los Altos Union High School District, and the Mountain View Whisman School District</li> <li>• Community Health Awareness Council –counseling and other mental health services to children, teens and families who reside or attend school in Mountain View, Los Altos, or Los Altos Hills.</li> <li>• Pacific Library Partnership – Provides greater access to state grants, sharing of resources among public libraries and provides other important services for public libraries in Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Monterey, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Santa Clara counties.</li> <li>• Congestion Management Agency – administration of the traffic congestion management program in Santa Clara County, administered by the Valley Transportation Authority.</li> </ul>	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
186	Section 12.1.4, Table 128	10/8/2015	Add "North Bayshore Precise Plan; American Planning Association – California; 2015"	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
186	Section 12.1.4, Table 128	11/23/2015	Add "Award for Distinguished Budget Presentation, GFOA, 2010-2015"	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
186	Section 12.1.4, Table 128	11/23/2015	Revise the timeline for the Award for Excellence in Public Communications from CSMFO to "2010-12"	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
187	Section 12.2.1, Table 129	10/8/2015	2009 data are incorrect. 2009 Population should be 73,860 and 2009 Jobs should be 60,460.	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
187	Section 12.2.1, Table 129	10/8/2015	The 2030 (population) projections are correct from Table 3.1 in the old adopted GP, but they don't include new residential in North Bayshore, which we updated the table to include. Based on the revised Table 3.1, the new 2030 population total should be 88,570.	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
187	Section 12.2.1, Table 129	10/8/2015	The 2030 jobs projection does not include the SEIRs. We decided not to include those numbers in the revised Table 3.1, but it is odd that our existing jobs (79,239) is so close to our 2030 jobs (80,820). We may want to consider providing the SEIR number in light of this (87,570).	Total jobs for 2030 were revised to 87,570 in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
188	Section 12.2.4	11/13/2015	First paragraph, last sentence. ".....will be developed <del>in late-2015</del> <b>beginning in 2016</b> ".	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
190	Section 12.3.2	10/8/2015	Second paragraph, fourth sentence, revise to read "There are no <b>immediate</b> plans to annex either island."	Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
190	Section 12.3.2	11/13/2015	Second paragraph, 3rd sentence. "... as a potential future site for <b>affordable</b> housing."	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
191	Section 12.4.3	11/23/2015	Revise the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence as follows. "There is one facility located within the City, <b>and one mobile library</b> ."	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
193	Section 12.5	11/18/2015	The second paragraph references "citywide expenditures exceeded \$149.0 M". But city-wide expenditures are \$196.0 M, governmental expenditures are \$149.0 M	Revision as provided (including the recalculation of the percentage of General Fund expenditures to total expenditures) will appear in the final version of the report.
193	Section 12.5.1	10/8/2015	The city's redevelopment agency was dissolved by the State in 2014, not 2012.	ABx1 26 was enacted to dissolve redevelopment agencies effective February 1, 2012. The California Department of Finance may not have issued its Finding of Completion to the Successor Agency until 2014, however the effective date of the dissolution was 2012. No changes will be made to the report.
196	Section 12.6, Determination #1	11/13/2015	Second paragraph, add the following: " <b>However, the City is aware that the US Government has plans to surplus a parcel (USARC</b>	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
197	Section 12.6, Determination #4	11/23/2015	<p>site) that is outside of the City's USA. The City and US Government will continue to discuss this and any potential annexation or expansion of the City's USA boundaries."</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence, revise reserves to read 36.1% to match Table 136</p>	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
<b>COMMENTS: ALLAN EPSTEIN (RESIDENT OF LOS ALTOS HILLS)</b>				
N/A	General Comment	10/11/2015	From a big picture standpoint the service reports fail to address the future potential adverse impact on city services resulting from the need to fund growing employee benefit costs. In FY 2016, for the first time, unfunded pension liabilities will be reported on the balance sheet of city CAFR's.	Comment noted. The fiscal health of agencies was assessed and took into consideration the agencies' plans for funding long-term post-retirement liabilities. The growing pension liability obligations were addressed in the Executive Summary (Sections 1.2 and 1.5). For those agencies that indicated difficulties in addressing those post-employment benefit obligations (e.g., San Jose), that information was disclosed in the agency's respective profile section. No changes will be made to the report.
N/A	General Comments	10/11/2015	Procedurally, if the report intends to include 2015 results it would be advantageous to prepare them in late 2015 or early 2016 when FY 2015 CAFR reports typically become available and not rely on budget information which can vary significantly from actual.	Comment noted. No changes will be made to the report.
N/A	General Comments	10/11/2015	I also note that Fire Protection- Emergency Services and Potable Water are not mentioned in the reviews.	Comment noted. As indicated in Section 2.3.2, fire and water services the subject of separate municipal services reviews conducted in 2010 and 2011, respectively. No changes will be made to the report.
98	Section 7.1	10/11/2015	A large portion of LAH is adjacent to unincorporated open space and therefore LAH is not "surrounded" by LA and PA. See description in 7.7. It is very difficult to discern the boundaries of LAH's USA and SOI on the map provided	The second sentence was revised to read, "Los Altos Hills is located in the foothills of the Santa Cruz Mountains, approximately five miles south of Stanford University, surrounded by the cities of Los Altos and Palo Alto, unincorporated County areas as



Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
				well as open space preserves and parklands." These revisions appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
100	Section 7.1.4, Table 63	10/11/2015	In May 2015 the Town received a GFOA award for its 2013-14 CAFR	These revisions appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
101-102	Section 7.2.2	10/11/2015	ABAG's estimates for in-Town employment seem unusually high considering the extremely small number of enterprise employers. Other than self employed people working at home, the vast majority of jobs in Town are held by commuters and not Town residents.	Comment noted. Interviews with agency staff confirmed their reliance on the ABAG population figures for growth projections. No changes will be made to the report.
103	Section 7.3.2	10/11/2015	LAH05-01 includes a large number of substandard properties that do not meet the customary 1 acre requirement of Los Altos Hills. Annexation of this area hinges on more than simply "development of road maintenance agreements with the County." The Town and County have successfully annexed at least three substantial areas that formerly were included in this island. Each annexation required the County to bring roads up to current Town standards or provide sufficient funds to do so. The large number of non-standard properties contained in this area is likely to require substantial modifications to Town development policies and necessitate increased staffing.	Comment noted. The last sentence of the second paragraph was revised in the draft of the report published on October 19, 2015 to read as follows: "Annexation of this island hinges on several issues, including road maintenance, parcel size and other factors."
104	Section 7.4, Table 66	10/11/2015	Wastewater collection- The Town contracts with West Bay Sanitary District to maintenance and operating services including pipe cleaning, emergency SSO response and imaging services	Comment noted. The table was updated to reflect that WBSD is providing maintenance and operating services under contract to the Town. These revisions appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.
104	Section 7.4, Table 66	10/11/2015	Wastewater conveyance- The Town has two collection basins and wastewater is conveyed to the RWQCP through both LA and PA. LAH has separate contracts with each agency for conveyance.	Comment noted. The table was updated to reflect conveyance agreements with Los Altos and Palo Alto. These revisions appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
104	Section 7.4, Table 66	10/11/2015	High speed internet service is not available in all areas due to lack of service buildout.	Comment noted. No changes will be made to the report.
104	Section 7.4.2	10/11/2015	According to Carl Cahill, LAH City Manager, the Priority 1 response time target is 9 minutes. According to the Sheriff's office the average priority 1 response time for 2014 was 8 minutes.	Comment noted. Contractual obligation between the Sheriff's office and the Town is 10 minutes, which is what was indicated in the report. The Sheriff's Office did not directly provided response time figures, however response times are available in the weekly City Manager's report available on the Town's website. Average Priority One response time as reported by the Sheriff was 8:00 minutes for 2014. Revision will appear in the final version of the report.
104	Section 7.4.2	11/3/2015	Sheriff's Office response times. The Sheriff's Office provides the Town a response time chart each month, so the information is readily available for the asking. Carl Cahill posts the information in his weekly report	See response as indicated above.
105	Section 7.4.7	10/11/2015	The Town has over 100 private roads totaling ___ miles that are used by the public which are not maintained by the Town and vary widely in paving condition	Comment noted. The scope of this report included public roads that are maintained by the Town. No changes will be made to the report.
106	Section 7.4.9	10/11/2015	"Los Altos Hills indicated that the approximately 15% of residents not served by Comcast are <b>primarily resigned to not having service due to extremely high cost imposed by Comcast</b> to build out infrastructure, not availability."	Comment noted. No changes will be made to the report.
106	Section 7.4.10	10/11/2015	The Town operates the Wastewater collection system as a separate business unit and charges connection and use fees. In areas without sewer mains the Town requires homeowners to build and fund sewer main extensions where required by development policies or preference.  The conveyance contract with LA is close to 90% capacity and may impact future LAH sewer buildout in the LA wastewater basin (half the town). In the future the Town may need to secure more plant	Comment noted. The details provided are beyond the details that have been included in the report for all other agencies. The report already indicates that that sewer capacity could potentially become an issue, although not likely during the next five years. No changes will be made to the report.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
107	Section 7.5.1, Table 68	10/11/2015	<p>treatment capacity or transfer existing contracted capacity to LA. The RWQCP has substantial excess capacity and can easily meet the small additional demand the Town may require. Additionally, PA recently approved a 25-year master plan for upgrades and expansion of the RWQCP, which will result in substantial increase in user fees.</p> <p>FY 2014 Total General Fund Revenue typographical error. Correct total is \$8,045,795</p>	<p>Revision as provided appeared in the revised draft of the report published on October 19, 2015</p>
107	Section 7.5.1	10/11/2015	<p>The principal reason for a decline in administrative expense was due to the implementation of a CAP allocation model in 2013-2014. Under the CAP allocation methodology, costs for the Town's administrative departments are allocated directly to operating departments, and special and enterprise funds. The reported \$276,162 administrative expenditures in FY 2014 are net of CAP allocations (see page 17 FY 2014 CAFR).</p>	<p>Comment noted. Based on further review and analysis, the paragraph before Table 68 will be revised to read as follows: "A summary of the Town's General Fund revenue and expenditures is shown in Table 68. In FY 2014, the Town implemented a cost allocation plan that allocated the costs of the Town's administrative departments (e.g., City Manager, City Clerk, Finance) to the operating departments. The implementation reallocated costs from Administration to the departments of Community Development, Public Safety and Parks and Recreation." These revisions will appear in the final version of the report.</p>
107	Section 7.5.1	11/3/2015	<p>You did not adopt the changes I proposed, which is the explanation contained in the Town CAFR report on page 17 as I noted. The existing language that follows is not factually correct and does not represent the primary cause of the decline. "Prior to FY 2012, costs associated with parks and recreation and community development activities were included within the Administration category of expenditures. In FY 2012, this procedure was changed and costs were allocated in their respective departments, thereby causing the decrease in Administration expenditures since FY 2009." The primary cause</p>	<p>See discussion of this comment above.</p>

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
108	Section 7.5.2, Table 69	10/11/2015	for the reduction was the allocation of overhead expense out of administration to the operating departments and other funds Ratio of Combined Debt to Net Assessed Valuation. The report shows 2.4%. The Town's property valuation in 2014 was \$5,840,155,830. 2.4% is over \$140 million. The report shows no General Bonded Debt. The Town's only long term debt is \$180,449. 2.4% is incorrect.	Comment noted. The ratio referred to in the comments was taken directly from the Town's FY 2013-14 CAFR, Page 89, and includes overlapping debt issued by other agencies. No changes will be made to report.
108	Section 7.5.2, Table 69	10/11/2015	Unfunded Pension Liability. The report incorrectly shows \$280,000. Page 5 of the FY 2014 CAFR shows the unfunded pension to be \$2,279,632	Comment noted. Based on further review and analysis and review with the Town, the unfunded pension liability figure in Table 69 will be changed to \$2,017,000, which represents the Town's portion of the unfunded pension liability based on the November 2014 CalPERS actuarial evaluation.
108	Section 7.5.2, Table 69	11/3/2015	Unfunded pension liability figure was not revised in the latest draft.	See discussion of comment above.
109	Section 7.5.4, Figure 18	10/11/2015	As I understand the terms listed this entire section does not tie to the financial statements. General Fund Balance and Revenue from each year's CAFR except for Estimated FY 2015 which is from the FY 2016 Budget. (NOTE: Table was provided)	Comment noted. Operating surplus/deficit figures were obtained based on final audited financial statements as reconciled by the Town's finance staff. No changes will be made to the report.
109	Section 7.5.4, Table 71	10/11/2015	General Fund Net Operating Surplus- based on the above table 6.3% not 22.9%; but "Net operating surplus" is an undefined term.	Comment noted. Operating surplus/deficit figures were obtained based on final audited financial statements as reconciled by the Town's finance staff. No changes will be made to the report.
109	Section 7.5.4, Table 71	10/11/2015	FY 2014 Liquidity Ratio – Excluding Refundable Deposits \$7,538,922/299,592=25.2 not 33.4	Comment noted. Liquidity ratio calculation was performed based on final audited financial statements as reconciled by the Town's finance staff. No changes will be made to the report.
109	Section 7.5.4, Table 71	10/11/2015	FY 2014 Fund Balance as a percent of Expenditures- \$5,705,162/(4,753,905+863,161)=101.6% not 114.0%	Comment noted. Fund balance as a percent of expenditures was based on final audited

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
109	Section 7.5.4, Table 71	11/3/2015	Your comments state that the figures were "based on the final audited financial statements as reconciled by the Town's finance staff". The figures I provided were also from the Town's audited financial statements. So either the Town or I don't understand the definition of the financial terms used or one of us can't do arithmetic. Guess you've made your choice as to which.	financial statements as reconciled by the Town's finance staff. No changes will be made to the report. See comments indicated above. The Town prepared an analysis of the figures as presented in the CAFR to reconcile to the definitions of the related items used within the cities services report.
113	Section 7.7, Determination 3	10/11/2015	As stated above the critical issue is not really wastewater treatment capacity but conveyance capacity through LA.	Comment noted.
<b>COMMENTS: CITY OF SUNNYVALE</b>				
275	Section 17.1	11/10/2015	We would like to include some kind of statement about the City providing water and fire services; we propose: "Although these services have been identified as outside the scope of this review, it should be noted that the City of Sunnyvale provides both Fire Services and Water Services. The Department of Public Safety provides integrated police, fire and emergency medical services under one department, and sworn public safety officers are cross-trained in all three areas. The City's water service area includes all water service customers (29,257) within the City limits."	Comment noted. As indicated in Section 2.3.1 of the report, this cities services review did not include a review of fire or water services as LAFCO completed a countywide fire services review in December 2010, and a countywide water services review in December 2011. Section 17.4.2 of the report already indicates that the City's Public Safety Department provides integrated police, fire and emergency medical services under one department, and the officers are cross-trained in all three disciplines. No changes will be made to the report.
277	Section 17.1.1	11/10/2015	The City provides library, recreation and arts services; we suggest using "Cultural (Library, Community Services)" to encompass all.	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
277	Section 17.1.1	11/10/2015	This is not a comprehensive list of the City's major service functions, nor is it necessarily a list of the top three.	Listing will be revised to reflect the top three functions within the City based on the City's FY 2014 CAFR: Public Safety, 319; Planning and Management, 130; and Community Development, 105. These revisions will appear in the final version of the report.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
277	Section 17.1.1	11/10/2015	Source is City Budget and/or Department of Human Resources	Comment noted. The source for the revised FTE information above will be from the City's FY 2014 CAFR to be consistent with the source of other cities within this report.
277	Section 17.1.3	11/10/2015	The City belongs to the California Joint Powers Risk Management Association, a member-directed excess liability risk retention pool that is dedicated to protecting its members from catastrophic losses and meeting the needs of its members.	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
277	Section 17.1.4, Table 19	11/10/2015	The City received the Northern California Chapter International Public Management Association-Human Resources Award for Excellence in 2013.	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
279	Section 17.2.1	11/10/2015	Complying with ADA standards and accommodating various modes of transportation is not the City's greatest challenge.	Paragraph following Table 196 will be deleted in the final version of the report.
283	Section 17.4.2	11/10/2015	Total is 201 sworn public safety officers (note – revising the number provided in our last comments); Attachment A will also need to be updated	Revision as provided will appear in the final version of the report.
283	Section 17.4.5	11/10/2015	FY2014 total expenditures for cultural services include library, recreation and arts.	Revision will be made to 4 <sup>th</sup> sentence of the 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph as follows: "FY 2014 total expenditures for cultural services (including library, recreation and arts) were approximately \$16 million." These revisions will be appear in the final version of the report.
283	Section 17.4.5	11/10/2015	The City operates a community center complex (recreation center, creative arts center, indoor sports center, the Sunnysvale Theatre and a senior center), a neighborhood center, two community centers, one senior center, two golf courses, and four swimming pools, an indoor sports center, a creative arts center, the Sunnysvale Theatre and acres of sports fields.	Last paragraph in the section will be revised as provided in the final version of the report.
283	Section 17.4.5	11/10/2015	The City has an extensive Public Art program, including an Art in Private Development and Art in Public Places component.	Comment noted. The details provide are beyond the type of information included for all other agencies within this report. No changes will be made to the report.

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
286	Section 17.5.1, Tables 199 and 200	11/10/2015	The tables reference two different sales tax figures. Recommend being consistent, or noting the exclusion of public safety sales tax from Table 199.	A footnote will be added to Table 199 as follows: "Note: Sales tax figures above exclude public safety sales taxes." This revision will appear in the final version of the report.
287	Section 17.5.3, Table 202	11/10/2015	The Unassigned General Fund Reserve Levels is the City's economic uncertainty reserve; it is the City's Budget Stabilization Reserve Fund. What is referred to in the table as the Economic Uncertainty Reserve Fund is actually the City's contingency reserve for significant unplanned events like natural disasters and non-fiscal emergencies; it is specifically not for economic uncertainty.	The amounts reported as unassigned General Fund Reserve Levels is consistent with the reporting of unassigned General Fund reserves in the City's FY 2014 CAFR. Those amounts will remain unchanged. The amounts reported as Economic Uncertainty Reserve Funds will be reported as 0 in both years. These revisions will appear in the final version of the report.
322	Section 21.1.4.7	11/10/2015	Sunnyvale (lead), Cupertino, Mountain View, and the County (unincorporated area) are beyond "earnest discussions" and have approved the agreement to move forward on CCA. The four agencies are sharing the funding of the current phase. The technical feasibility study is in progress as of November 2015.	The 5 <sup>th</sup> sentence in the section will be revised as follows: "Sunnyvale (lead agency), Cupertino, Mountain View, Monte Sereno and the County <del>are all in earnest discussions; and other communities are in various stages to gain the commitment of their city councils to explore the opportunity further</del> have approved an agreement to move forward on the CCA and are sharing funding of a technical feasibility study." These revisions will appear in the final version of the report.
322	Section 21.1.3.2, Table 212	11/10/2015	Not currently appropriate to include CCA in this table.	All references to the CCA will be deleted in Table 212. These revisions will appear in the final version of the report.
<b>COMMENTS: CITY OF GILROY</b>				
73	Section 5.4.2	11/17/2015	In Gilroy we use a priority classification that may be different than other agencies. Specifically, our highest priority dispatch calls are labeled "Priority E". So, while it is true that Gilroy's average response time to those calls labeled as "Priority 1" in 2014 was 12 minutes, 14 seconds, that does NOT represent our average	The last 2 sentences in the 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph will be changed to read as follows: "The City reports that the average response time for Priority One calls is 12 minutes 14 seconds. However, the average response time for the

Page	Section/Table	Date Comment Received	Comment	Response
			<p>response times for our highest level of priority calls. You will note that for "Priority E" our average response time was 6 minutes, 38 seconds.</p>	<p>City's highest priority calls where there is reason to believe an immediate threat to life exists, known as their "Priority E" calls, averaged 6 minutes and 38 seconds. The City's goal for response time for these Priority E calls is 4 minutes and 30 seconds." These revisions will be reflected in the final version of the report.</p>



**LAFCO MEETING: December 2, 2015**  
**TO: LAFCO**  
**FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer**  
**Dunia Noel, Analyst**  
**SUBJECT: SPECIAL PRESENTATION BY DON WEDEN:**  
**FOOD AND FARMLANDS IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY**

**FOR INFORMATION ONLY**

---

As indicated in Agenda Item # 8.2, at a November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting with staff from LAFCO and the County, Don Weden, retired Santa Clara County Planner, offered to make a presentation on the “Santa Clara County Food and Farmlands Resolution” to LAFCO and the County Planning Commission.

Mr. Weden prepared the “Santa Clara County Food and Farmlands Resolution” to call attention to the array of food and farmlands challenges Santa Clara County faces and to demonstrate widespread support for actions to address them. The content of the resolution is based on information / policies from the recently adopted Health Element in the County General Plan, and the “Food System Assessment” report that was completed a couple of years ago by the Food System Alliance (FSA).

The Resolution has now been endorsed by nearly 25 organizations. Please see attachment A for the Resolution and Attachment B for the Don Weden’s editorial published in the Mercury News.

Presentations such as this will further one of the objectives that the Commission established in August 2012, which is to further strengthen and implement LAFCO’s agricultural preservation policies by partnering with others to develop programs and materials to improve the community’s understanding of the importance of agriculture in creating sustainable communities.

**Speaker Bio**

Don Weden was the Principal Planner for the Comprehensive Planning Section of the Santa Clara County Planning Office for many years prior to his retirement. During his 34 years with Santa Clara County Planning, he managed a wide array of planning studies, including the last comprehensive revision of the County’s General Plan. Since his

retirement, he has taken on the role of an unpaid community advisor and educator. Through his various PowerPoint presentations he has encouraged local communities to prepare for the significant changes and challenges that will be coming our way in the years ahead – and that will greatly impact our lives and those of our children and future generations. In 2013, he was inducted into the Planner Emeritus Network of the California Chapter of the American Planning Association.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

---

- Attachment A: Santa Clara County Food and Farmlands Resolution
- Attachment B: Special to the San Jose Mercury News: Don Weden: Santa Clara County must prevent remaining farmlands from being developed



A Resolution in Support of Efforts to Meet  
 Santa Clara County's Current and Future  
 Food and Farmlands Needs

November 2015

**INTRODUCTION**

**The Need for Innovative Leadership in Meeting Our Food and Farmlands Needs**

We, the undersigned organizations, are each involved with or concerned about various aspects of food and/or farmlands issues in Santa Clara County.

In addition to the important work we are doing individually, we are working together to call greater attention to the bigger, overall picture.

The considerable cumulative significance of the issues we are currently addressing and those we are likely to face in the future require that we make larger strides to meet these challenges.

For that reason, we are endorsing this Santa Clara County Food and Farmlands Resolution.

Santa Clara County has a worldwide reputation for leadership in technological innovation. We believe that it can and must work toward having a similar reputation for the ways in which we address current and future food and farmlands challenges in our county.

It is our hope that it will focus more resources and productive efforts on meeting these challenges.

The actions we take today can help meet not only our county's current needs, but also provide social, economic, and environmental benefits for future generations.

### OVERVIEW

#### **Our Responsibilities**

WHEREAS, We have responsibilities to current and future generations to assure that:

- All residents of our community have access to healthy, affordable food, and
- Our remaining farmlands will be available for productive use to meet current and future needs

#### **Access to Fresh, Local Produce**

WHEREAS, Healthy diets contribute to our personal health and the overall health of our communities

WHEREAS, Access to fresh, locally-grown produce can contribute to healthier diets and the enjoyment of more flavorful meals

#### **Food Availability**

WHEREAS, Healthy, affordable foods are not available in some of our neighborhoods

#### **Food Insecurity and Hunger**

WHEREAS, Many of our county's low-income residents face difficulties in meeting their basic food and nutrition needs

#### **Potential for Higher Future Food Prices**

WHEREAS, Future food prices may increase significantly due to world population growth, climate change and extreme weather events, water supply challenges, the increased ability of other nations to compete with us for food supplies in world markets, changes in the diets of other nations toward more resource intensive foods (e.g. meat), and conversion of productive farmlands to non-farming uses

#### **Aging of Our Population**

WHEREAS, As the Baby Boom Generation enters its senior years and our population becomes significantly older – with many more retirees living on modest retirement incomes – more of our residents will become vulnerable to the effects of rising food prices on their household budgets, which are already being stressed by high housing and medicine costs

#### **Farmlands Protection**

WHEREAS, Our currently remaining farmlands in Santa Clara County will become ever more important in meeting our future food needs

#### **Farmlands and Our Environment**

WHEREAS, Farmlands contribute to the health of our environment and protect open space resources

#### **Farmlands and Our Economy**

WHEREAS, Farming and related activities contribute to the strength and diversity of our local economy

#### **Farmlands and Urban Development Policy**

WHEREAS, Protection of farmlands helps implement our county's longstanding, countywide urban development policies that favor accommodating growth within existing urban areas, rather than expanding into farmlands and other open space lands

#### **Urban Farming**

WHEREAS, There are many opportunities for increasing food production, as well as educational and recreational farming, within our urban areas

WHEREAS, Urban farming activities help connect urban residents with the sources of our food and the importance of having places to grow it

### Supporting Local Agriculture

WHEREAS, We can help support local agriculture by:

- Purchasing locally-grown produce and encouraging local restaurants, businesses, and institutions to do so also
- Encouraging our local officials to support policies and actions that will responsibly address our current and future food and farmlands needs

### Challenges Facing Local Farmers

WHEREAS, Farmers in Santa Clara County face a number of challenges, including agricultural worker housing shortages, potential conflicts with adjacent land uses, and difficulties obtaining financing

### Regulatory Barriers to Food Production and Distribution

WHEREAS, Efforts to increase production and improve distribution of locally-grown produce are sometimes hindered by government regulations

### Healthy, Sustainable Farming Practices

WHEREAS, Farming operations should be undertaken in ways that are sustainable and protect the health of agricultural workers, as well as the land and our environment

### Leading by Example

WHEREAS, Although the future availability and price of food will be impacted by many different forces, most of which are beyond our local control, we nonetheless have an opportunity and an obligation to provide leadership in calling attention to current and future food challenges and the actions necessary to address them, and thereby promote similar actions in counties throughout the region, state, and nation

## POLICIES

THEREFORE, We endorse the following general policy directions to help assure that all Santa Clara County residents will have access to healthy, affordable food, now and in the future:

- Inform our county's residents, leaders, and businesses about important current and future food and farmlands challenges and opportunities
- Promote healthy eating
- Increase the availability of healthy, affordable food throughout the county
- Protect our remaining farmlands and ranchlands
- Encourage urban agriculture
- Support sustainable local agriculture
- Remove unnecessary regulatory barriers to local food production and distribution
- Make Santa Clara County an innovative model for responsibly addressing current and future food and farmlands issues

### RESOURCES

The policies supported in this resolution are based on policies and recommendations of the recently-adopted “Health Element of the Santa Clara County General Plan” and the “Food System Assessment” prepared by the Santa Clara County Food System Alliance.

The complete versions of these documents can be viewed and downloaded at the following websites:

#### Health Element of the Santa Clara County General Plan

[https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/HealthElement\\_20150825\\_Adopted\\_Final.pdf](https://www.sccgov.org/sites/dpd/DocsForms/Documents/HealthElement_20150825_Adopted_Final.pdf)

#### Santa Clara County Food System Assessment

<http://fsa-scc.squarespace.com>

The process of gathering organization endorsements for this Resolution is ongoing.

To add your organization’s endorsement of this Resolution to this list of endorsers, please notify:  
Santa Clara County Food System Alliance  
[scc.alliance@gmail.com](mailto:scc.alliance@gmail.com)

### ENDORISING ORGANIZATIONS

(As of 11/14/16)

- Food System Alliance, Santa Clara County
- The Health Trust
- Sacred Heart Community Services
- Veggielution
- Full Circle Farm
- Garden to Table
- Hidden Villa
- Kitchen Table Advisors
- Common Ground Garden, a project of Ecology Action
- Fresh Approach
- Slow Food South Bay
- League of Women Voters of San Jose / Santa Clara
- American Farmland Trust (AFT)
- Community Alliance with Family Farmers (CAFF)
- Sustainable Agriculture Education (SAGE)
- Hispanic Chamber of Commerce
- Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG)
- San Jose Silicon Valley Chamber of Commerce
- Seniors’ Agenda, Santa Clara County
- Kids in Common, a program of Planned Parenthood Mar Monte
- Committee for Green Foothills
- SPUR
- Greenbelt Alliance
- Living Classroom

## Don Weden: Santa Clara County must prevent remaining farmlands from being developed

By Don Weden Special to the Mercury News  
Updated: 11/16/2015 11:07:42 AM PST

MercuryNews.com

Although agriculture is no longer the county's primary industry, food and farmlands issues remain as important today as they were back when most of our residents derived their livelihoods from farming and related industries.

The situation today is a classic good news/bad news story. The good news includes greater public awareness of the need to eat healthier foods, and our increased access to fresh, healthy produce and meals. The bad news is that hunger and food insecurity persist; that fresh, healthy, affordable foods are not available in all of our neighborhoods; and that some of our remaining farmlands are threatened by development.

Buying fresh and buying local: The popularity of farmers markets shows that many of our residents value the flavors of fresh, locally-grown produce. That preference is mirrored in the increasing number of restaurants that feature locally-sourced ingredients.

Nutrition, hunger and food insecurity: Most of us take convenient access to food for granted. But, many here struggle to meet their daily food needs -- including families whose children go to school hungry. In addition, some of our neighborhoods remain food deserts where convenience stores and fast food restaurants predominate. Residents there have little or no access to fresh, healthy, and affordable foods.

Urban farming: While farming is generally a rural activity, small scale urban agriculture will become more common. Backyard produce gardens, community gardens, nonprofit gardens to help feed the poor, subscription gardens, schoolyard gardens, and other forms of urban farming will help meet the demand for fresh, nutritious, affordable produce.

Higher future food prices: The greatest food-related challenge we may face in the coming years is a significant rise in food prices. World population growth, climate change, droughts, water shortages, and growing middle classes in emerging economies may combine to push food prices higher. Higher food prices, growth in the number of retirees living on fixed incomes, and lower and middle class households faced with high housing costs in this area may create the conditions for a "perfect storm" of increased food insecurity and hunger.

Farmers face challenges: Although local farm income has risen recently, farmers face many challenges, like farmworker shortages and conflicts with adjacent land uses.

Farmland losses: Despite its population of almost 2 million people, our county still has productive farmland in Coyote Valley and South County. Some of that land, however, may soon be lost to development. The Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission will soon be making important decisions about city boundary expansion requests in the southern part of our county. If approved, these expansions will result in the loss of almost 1,000 acres of farmland -- the largest loss of farmland in our county in many decades. This could set dangerous precedents for further future additional losses.

New focus on food and farmlands: We are fortunate to have an increasing number of organizations, businesses, government programs, and farmers working to make fresh, healthy, affordable foods more widely available throughout our county.

[http://www.mercurynews.com/opinion/ci\\_29124191/don-weden-county-must-prevent-remaining-farmlands-from](http://www.mercurynews.com/opinion/ci_29124191/don-weden-county-must-prevent-remaining-farmlands-from)

To call attention to our county's various food and farmlands needs -- current and future -- a diverse array of organizations has recently endorsed a "Santa Clara County Food and Farmlands Resolution" supporting a series of general policies for addressing our food and farmland needs. It can be viewed and downloaded from <http://fsa-scc.squarespace.com/>

Don Weden is a retired Santa Clara County planner. He wrote this for this newspaper.



**AGENDA ITEM # 6**

**2016 SCHEDULE OF LAFCO MEETINGS AND  
APPLICATION FILING DEADLINES**

<b>LAFCO MEETING</b>	<b>DEADLINE TO FILE APPLICATION</b>
Wednesday February 3, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	December 3, 2015
Wednesday April 13, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	February 4, 2016
Wednesday June 1, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	April 7, 2016
Wednesday August 3, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	June 2, 2016
Wednesday October 5, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	August 4, 2016
Wednesday December 7, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	September 29, 2016

**TIME OF MEETINGS:** 1:00 PM

**LOCATION OF MEETINGS:** Board Meeting Chambers  
70 West Hedding Street  
San Jose, CA 95110

**FILING LOCATION:** LAFCO Office  
70 West Hedding Street, 8th Floor  
San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 299-6415

**AGENDA ITEM # 6**  
**Supplemental Information**  
**(11/30/2015)**

**2016 SCHEDULE OF LAFCO MEETINGS AND  
APPLICATION FILING DEADLINES**

<b>LAFCO MEETING</b>	<b>DEADLINE TO FILE APPLICATION</b>
Wednesday February 3, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	December 3, 2015
Wednesday <del>April 13, 2016</del> <u>April 6, 2016</u> Board Meeting Chambers	February 4, 2016
Wednesday June 1, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	April 7, 2016
Wednesday August 3, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	June 2, 2016
Wednesday October 5, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	August 4, 2016
Wednesday December 7, 2016 Board Meeting Chambers	September 29, 2016

TIME OF MEETINGS: 1:00 PM

LOCATION OF MEETINGS: Board Meeting Chambers  
70 West Hedding Street  
San Jose, CA 95110

FILING LOCATION: LAFCO Office  
70 West Hedding Street, 8th Floor  
San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 299-6415

**LAFCO MEETING:** December 2, 2015  
**TO:** LAFCO  
**FROM:** Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer  
Dunia Noel, Analyst  
**SUBJECT:** APPOINTMENT OF 2016 LAFCO CHAIRPERSON AND VICE-CHAIRPERSON

### **RECOMMENDATION**

---

Per the rotation schedule, appoint Commissioner Cat Tucker, the Cities member, as Chairperson for 2016; and Commissioner Cindy Chavez, the County member, as Vice-Chairperson for 2016.

### **BACKGROUND**

---

Appointment of the Chair and Vice-Chair is made on a calendar year basis, usually at the December LAFCO Meeting. Pursuant to the LAFCO bylaws, the rotation schedule is as follows:

- Cities member
- County member
- San Jose member
- Special Districts member
- County member
- Public member
- Special Districts member

The Chairperson for 2015 calendar year is Commissioner Linda J. LeZotte, Special Districts member; and the Vice-Chairperson is Commissioner Cat Tucker, Cities member. In accordance with the rotation schedule, the Cities member is appointed as 2016 Chairperson and County member as the 2016 Vice-Chairperson.



**LAFCO MEETING:** December 2, 2015  
**TO:** LAFCO  
**FROM:** Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer  
Dunia Noel, Analyst  
**SUBJECT:** EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

## **8.1 LAFCO WORKSHOP ON SERVICE EXTENSIONS OUTSIDE OF JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES**

---

### **For Information Only.**

On October 29<sup>th</sup>, LAFCO staff conducted a workshop for county, cities, and special districts staff on the topic of service extensions outside of jurisdictional boundaries. The purpose of the workshop was to facilitate better understanding of LAFCO policies on this issue amongst the various agencies and to discuss how to improve inter-jurisdictional communication and coordination when responding to public inquiries on this issue.

In addition to a PowerPoint presentation (now available on the LAFCO website) explaining LAFCO policies and process, LAFCO staff created a variety of scenarios representing typical public inquiries that we receive on this topic. Through an interactive discussion, attendees were given an opportunity to walk through the process of applying policies to address each scenario and guide the inquirer to the appropriate agency and process.

Over thirty people, including staff from six cities and Stanford (planning directors, planners, and public works engineers); the County (environmental health specialists, planners, and a transportation planner); and special districts (administrators, engineers, and board members) attended the workshop. Staff from Commissioners Wasserman, Yeager and Khamis' offices were in attendance at the workshop.

The workshop was well received and attendees indicated that other staff from their agency could benefit from such a workshop and expressed interest in having LAFCO staff conduct a mini-workshop for each interested agency.

Following the workshop, staff sent an email to all of the participants thanking them for their attendance; and providing them with a copy of the PowerPoint presentation. Staff

also provided participants with links to additional resources, including a map of Santa Clara County and Cities Boundaries, a list of special districts in the County, and to the interactive mapping tool for cities and special districts boundaries on the LAFCO website.

Lastly, in an effort to improve inter-jurisdictional communication and coordination on this issue, LAFCO staff is working with attendees to identify a specific contact person at each agency or to clarify each agency's preferred method of contact for addressing inquiries on /requests for service extensions outside of jurisdictional boundaries.

## **8.2 MEETINGS WITH SANTA CLARA COUNTY STAFF**

---

### **For Information Only.**

On October 15<sup>th</sup>, Executive Officer Palacherla met with Kirk Girard, County Planning and Development Director, to discuss various issues and projects of common interest to LAFCO and the County Planning Office including the pending urban service area (USA) amendment application from Morgan Hill; a potential USA amendment application from Gilroy; the Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation grant; and regarding an increase in the number of inquiries regarding service extensions to unincorporated areas.

At the invitation of the Deputy County Executive Sylvia Gallegos, Executive Officer Palacherla attended a meeting with her and Kirk Girard on November 3<sup>rd</sup>, to discuss long range planning issues and agricultural land preservation in the south county region.

On November 17<sup>th</sup>, Executive Officer Palacherla attended another meeting with Sylvia Gallegos, Kirk Girard and Don Weden, retired Santa Clara County planner, for a presentation of the Santa Clara County Food and Farmlands Resolution. Mr. Weden prepared the resolution to call attention to the array of food and farmlands challenges Santa Clara County faces and to demonstrate widespread support for actions to address them. The content of the resolution is based on information / policies from the recently adopted Health Element in the County General Plan, and the "Food System Assessment" report that was completed a couple of years ago by the Food System Alliance (FSA).

The resolution has now been endorsed by nearly 25 organizations and Mr. Weden offered to make a presentation about it to LAFCO and the County Planning Commission. Please see Agenda Item # 5 for more information.

## **8.3 MEETING WITH MORGAN HILL BIBLE CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES ON MORGAN HILL 2015 URBAN SERVICE AREA AMENDMENT APPLICATION**

---

### **For Information Only.**

On October 22<sup>nd</sup>, LAFCO staff met with representatives of the Morgan Hill Bible Church to discuss the City of Morgan Hill's 2015 Urban Service Area Amendment application, which includes lands owned by the Bible Church. The representatives requested the

meeting in order to provide LAFCO staff with information on the history of the church, the services it provides to the community, its reasons for seeking annexation to the city, and its interest in expanding its facilities in order to better serve its congregation. The representatives also requested clarification on the LAFCO urban service area amendment application review and consideration process, particularly when multiple areas are part of a single application and stated that they believe the City is addressing the concerns that LAFCO raised previously.

#### **8.4 MEETING WITH THE COMMITTEE FOR GREEN FOOTHILLS ON MORGAN HILL 2015 URBAN SERVICE AREA AMENDMENT APPLICATION**

---

On November 23<sup>rd</sup>, Executive Officer Palacherla met with Julie Hutchison, Legislative Advocate, Committee for Green Foothills, to discuss the City of Morgan Hill's 2015 Urban Service Area Amendment application. Ms. Hutchison requested the meeting to discuss various concerns with the application and with the City's Agricultural Mitigation program. She raised an additional concern that the Morgan Hill process seems to have set a poor precedent for the City of Gilroy as it too is considering its urban service area expansion outside of its General Plan update process.

#### **8.5 BAY AREA LAFCOs MEETING**

---

##### **For Information Only.**

LAFCO staff attended the Bay Area LAFCOs meeting that was hosted by Napa LAFCO on October 8<sup>th</sup>. Staff from several of the Bay Area LAFCOs were in attendance. The group discussed various current and upcoming projects at each LAFCO. Pamela Miller, CALAFCO's Executive Director, attended the meeting and provided an update on CALAFCO activities, including the various changes in the operations of the association. Ms. Miller also discussed proposed legislation that CALAFCO is monitoring.

#### **8.6 SANTA CLARA COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF PLANNING OFFICIALS (SCCAPO) MEETING**

---

##### **For Information Only.**

LAFCO staff attended the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SCCAPO that was hosted by the City of Morgan Hill. The meeting was held at a pop-up park project in downtown Morgan Hill and featured a presentation from City of Morgan Hill staff on the City's plans and efforts to revitalize its downtown and included a walking tour of the area. Morgan Hill staff discussed how they are implementing various placemaking projects in the downtown and the results of their Monterey Street Trail Lane Reduction Project.

#### **8.7 CALAFCO LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

---

##### **For Information only.**

Executive Officer Palacherla participated in the CALAFCO Legislative Committee's first meeting for the 2016 session which was held as a conference call on November 6<sup>th</sup>. The

Committee discussed some of the issues and priorities for the upcoming year including LAFCO's relationship with / authority over JPAs, clean up of protest provisions in the CKH Act, the need for an annual CALAFCO sponsored omnibus bill, and potential policy refinements to SB 88 which authorizes the State Water Resources Control Board (rather than LAFCO) to consolidate failing local water systems. The Committee approved the 2016 Calendar of meetings as follows:

December 11, 2015, Sacramento  
January 22, 2016 – San Diego  
February 26, 2016 – Sacramento  
March 18, 2016 – Conference call  
April 22, 2016 – Ontario  
May 20, 2016 – conference call  
June 24, 2016 – conference call  
August 5, 2016 – conference call

## **8.8 INTER-JURISDICTIONAL GIS WORKING GROUP MEETING**

---

### **For Information Only.**

Analyst Noel attended the November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Inter-Jurisdictional GIS Working Group that includes staff from various county departments that use and maintain GIS data, particularly LAFCO related data. At the meeting, participants shared updates on current GIS and boundary change activities within their department or agency.



**LAFCO MEETING:** December 2, 2015  
**TO:** LAFCO  
**FROM:** Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer  
Dunia Noel, Analyst  
**SUBJECT:** PENDING APPLICATION: MORGAN HILL URBAN SERVICE AREA  
AMENDMENT 2015

**FOR INFORMATION ONLY**

---

In October 2015, LAFCO received an application from the City of Morgan Hill for expansion of its urban service area (USA) in two areas. The City has submitted all the filing requirements and LAFCO staff has notified the City that the application will be heard at the February 2016 LAFCO meeting. Please see Attachment A for LAFCO's notice to the City.

The application contains two areas and due to the complexity and scope of the proposal, it was not possible to prepare the staff report in time for the December meeting.

While the City has complied with the filing requirements and LAFCO staff has reviewed what has already been submitted, there are many gaps in the information that was submitted and there are several aspects of the application where LAFCO staff has requested clarification and / or additional information from the City. Since receiving the application, LAFCO staff has been working closely (through multiple email and telephone conversations) with Andrew Crabtree, Morgan Hill Community Development Director, and is currently waiting for his response to staff's various questions regarding among other things, the City's vacant lands information, plan for services, agricultural mitigation plan, pre-zoning designations, etc. Once we receive this information, we can continue to work on the staff report.

**ATTACHMENT**

---

Attachment A: Certificate of Filing: Morgan Hill Urban Service Area Amendment 2015



## CERTIFICATE OF FILING

I, Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer of the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) for Santa Clara County, do hereby certify that an application by resolution was filed with me in October 2015 by the City of Morgan Hill for expansion of its urban service area (USA) in the following two areas:

**AREA 1: Tennant – Murphy**

Includes approximately 215 acres and comprises 21 parcels located south of San Pedro Avenue and east of US 101, in the vicinity of Tennant Avenue and Murphy Avenue. This areas is commonly referred to as the South East Quadrant.

**AREA 2: Monterey - Watsonville**

Includes approximately 64.49 acres and comprises 17 parcels located in the vicinity of Watsonville Road and Monterey Road. Seven of the 17 parcels are within the city limits but outside the USA.

The application contains all the information required by this Commission and State law and is being certified for filing on the date below. This Certificate of Filing is being issued pursuant to Section 56658 of the California Government Code. The application is designated **Morgan Hill Urban Service Area Amendment 2015**.

**The application will be considered at the February 2016 LAFCO Meeting which is tentatively scheduled for February 3, 2016.** A public hearing notice will be provided pursuant to state law, at least 21 days prior to the scheduled hearing.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'N Palacherla', is written over a horizontal line.

Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer

Dated: November 6, 2015

Original: Applicant (Section 56658)

Cc: Clerk of Subject Agency

# News from the Board of Directors **AGENDA ITEM # 11**

## CALAFCO QUARTERLY



November 2015

### **CALAFCO Board 2016 Committees**

At their November 13 meeting, the CALAFCO Board appointed members to the 2016 standing committees as follows:

#### **Legislative Committee**

Jim Curatalo (South)  
Shiva Frentzen (Central)  
William Kirby (At-Large)  
John Leopold (Coastal)  
Mike McGill (At-Large)  
Ricky Samayoa (North)

#### **Nominations Committee**

Bill Connelly  
James Curatalo (Chair)  
John Marchand  
Anita Paque

#### **Awards Committee**

Cheryl Brothers  
Larry Duncan (Chair)  
Michael Kelley  
William Kirby  
John Leopold

Gay Jones (a) (Central)  
Michael Kelley (a) (South)  
Anita Paque (a) (At-Large)  
Sblend Sblendorio (a) (Coastal)  
Josh Susman (a) (North)

#### **2016 Annual Conference**

Gay Jones  
Gerard McCallum  
Sblend Sblendorio (Chair)  
Josh Susman

### **Conferences and Workshops Update**

#### **2015 ANNUAL CONFERENCE A SUCCESS**



A final Conference report was provided to the Board on November 13. Participant evaluations rated the overall experience a 5.2 out of 6.0, and there was an evaluation return rate of approximately 38%, which is the highest ever received. Financially,

the Conference was successful in that revenues slightly exceeded budget and expenses were lower than budgeted. Overall, it appears a net profit of approximately 34% was earned, which exceeds the Association's policy of 15%. This year, \$18,738 was received in Conference Sponsorships.

Total attendance was 252 registrants with 11 guests and 17 guest speakers, for a total of 280. CALAFCO wishes to once again thank our Conference host, **Sacramento LAFCo**, and program committee chair **David Church**, along with everyone who helped to plan and execute this year's Annual Conference. All Conference materials are posted on the CALAFCO website.

#### **2016 STAFF WORKSHOP**

Plans are underway for the 2016 Staff Workshop. Our host this year is **Los Angeles LAFCo** and we will be at the Hilton Universal City. The Workshop is set for March 30 - April 1. The theme is **JEOPARDY: What is the Evolving Role of LAFCo?** A special Mobile Workshop panel and tour is planned at Universal Studios to learn about the NBC Universal Evolution Plan, Alt. No. 10: No Residential Alternative, and the program planning committee and host LAFCo are planning a fun

surprise for our luncheon and dinner entertainment! Look for program and registration details coming soon.

#### **2016 ANNUAL CONFERENCE**

The program planning committee is being formed to begin planning the program for the next Annual Conference. The dates are **October 26 - 28, 2016**. We will be hosted by the **Santa Barbara LAFCo** and will be at the Fess Parker DoubleTree by Hilton. Planning for this conference will get underway shortly.

#### **CALAFCO U Update**

The final CALAFCO U for 2015 was held in Sacramento on November 9. The topic was **Implementing SB 88 - Water System Consolidations: What Does It Mean For LAFCo?** Panelists included staff from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). After hearing about the functions of the SWRCB, an overview of SB 88 and how the SWRCB plans to implement the legislation, attendees had an opportunity, in small group discussions, to provide the panel feedback on potential issues, how we see LAFCo involved in the implementation, and what would be needed in order to make that work. This information is being collated and will be presented back to the SWRCB and OPR, and used by CALAFCO to work on clean-up legislation this coming year. There were a total of 34 people in attendance. Initial evaluation results indicate the session was very well received.



#### **CALAFCO Board Actions**

The Board met on November 13 and took the following administrative actions:



- ◆ Made Board Committee appointments as noted above;
- ◆ Received and filed the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter financial reports indicating the Association continues to be in strong fiscal health;
- ◆ Renewed the contract of CALAFCO's Administrator Jeni Tickler for another three years;
- ◆ Renewed the Executive Director's contract for three years, and approved the change in compensation to account for an average of 32/hrs. week as part of that contract renewal (as previously approved by the Board and reported to the membership);
- ◆ Adopted a revised FY 2015-16 budget based on all of the Board's organizational changes made at their July 31 meeting;
- ◆ Approved the recommended 2016 Legislative Committee staff appointments;
- ◆ Reviewed the Association's current Legislative Policies, which resulted in no recommendations for potential changes; and



- Received the request for consideration of a CALAFCO Code of Ethics Policy, and supported the idea of a subcommittee creating a draft policy for the Board's review and consideration at their February 2016 meeting.

### CALAFCO Legislative Update

2016 will be the second year of the two-year legislative cycle. The Legislative Committee (Committee) held its first meeting via conference call November 6 with the first in-person meeting set for December 11 in Sacramento. While the legislature is currently out of session, there is a lot of work going on behind the scenes.



During the legislative recess, CALAFCO's work with OPR and the SWRCB continues. OPR has been holding a series of land use and water workshops along with rural communities workshops, planning six across the state over the past two months or so. While attendance to these workshops is by OPR invitation only, CALAFCO has ensured at least one LAFCo has been present at each one.

CALAFCO conducted a two-part series of LAFCO 101 in the Capitol for legislative staff the first two weeks of November. While attendance was lower than anticipated, those that did attend took away an enlightened understanding of LAFCo authority.

During their November meeting, the Board took a great deal of time deliberating the Legislative Committee's feedback of potential legislative priorities for 2016 during their November 13 meeting. The outcome of those deliberations was a general consensus of the priorities for 2016 which will be reported back to the Legislative Committee during their December 11 meeting. Those priorities include maintaining a focus on potential legislation to strengthen the relations between LAFCos and JPAs, limiting the number of items that are contained within the 2016 annual Omnibus bill, and focusing efforts in participating in (but not sponsoring) legislation to clean up SB 88. The Board further restated their intention to sponsor legislation on amending Protest Provisions, with the focus as a priority for the 2017-2018 legislative session (rather than in 2016). The Board acknowledged other priorities are not able to be considered at this time due to CALAFCO's resource limitations.

A full detailed legislative tracking report can be found on the CALAFCO website in the Members Only section.



### CALAFCO Associate Members' Corner

This section highlights our Associate Members. The information below is provided to CALAFCO by the Associate member upon joining the Association. All Associate member information can be found in the CALAFCO Member Directory.



Earlier this year CALAFCO highlighted three of our Gold Associate Members. In this edition we highlight the rest of our current Gold Associate Members.



#### Meyers Nave

**Meyers Nave** is a law firm dedicated to providing California's public agencies both general counsel and specialized services in matters involving land use, annexations, incorporations, labor and employment, Brown Act, telecommunications, eminent domain and other critical areas. **Meyers Nave** has been a Gold Associate Member since February 2006. Learn more about **Meyers Nave** at [www.meyersnave.com](http://www.meyersnave.com).



#### Project Resource Specialists

**Project Resource Specialists** provides management and legislative support to all levels of local government including LAFCo for Municipal Service reviews, agency organization and project management support. Beginning as a Silver Associate Member in May 2007, they became a Gold Associate Member in July 2014. Learn more about Project Resource Specialists by emailing them at [ehrichprs@gmail.com](mailto:ehrichprs@gmail.com).



CALAFCO wishes to thank all of our Associate Members for your support and partnership. We look forward to continuing to highlight our Associate Members in each Quarterly Report.

### Mark Your Calendars For These Upcoming CALAFCO Events

- CALAFCO Legislative Committee meeting, December 11, 2015, Sacramento
- CALAFCO Legislative Committee meeting, January 22, 2016, San Diego
- CALAFCO Board of Directors meeting, February 5, 2016, Irvine

Look for a 2016 calendar of events coming in December.





**El Camino Hospital**  
THE HOSPITAL OF SILICON VALLEY

**AGENDA ITEM # 12.1**

2500 Grant Road  
Mountain View, CA 94040-4378  
Phone: 650-940-7000  
[www.elcaminohospital.org](http://www.elcaminohospital.org)

November 19, 2015

**VIA E-MAIL (NEELIMA.PALACHERLA@CEO.SCCGOV.ORG)  
AND U.S. MAIL**

Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer  
Santa Clara County Local Agency Formation Commission  
70 West Hedding Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Jose, CA 95110

Re: El Camino Hospital Corporation – Notice of Intent to Purchase of Real Property

Dear Ms. Palacherla:

In the interest of transparency, accountability and full disclosure, we are writing to inform the Santa Clara County LAFCO that El Camino Hospital, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation (“El Camino Hospital”) intends to purchase property in San Jose, California. The property is currently under contract and the transaction is pending internal and Board approvals. The property is approximately fifteen (15) acres of undeveloped land, generally described as APN 702-02-55 and 702-02-56 located at the intersection of Great Oaks Boulevard and Santa Teresa Boulevard.

We also want to reassure the Santa Clara County LAFCO that the El Camino Healthcare District will not fund the purchase, operation or maintenance of this property (which is located outside the Healthcare District’s existing service area boundaries). Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Ken King  
Chief Administrative Services Officer

Cc: (by email)  
Emmanuel Abello, LAFCO Clerk ([Emmanuel.Abello@ceo.sccgov.org](mailto:Emmanuel.Abello@ceo.sccgov.org))  
Tomi Ryba, CEO, El Camino Hospital ([Tomi.Ryba@elcaminohospital.org](mailto:Tomi.Ryba@elcaminohospital.org))  
Gregory B. Caligari, Esq., Cox Castle Nicholson ([gcaligari@coxcastle.com](mailto:gcaligari@coxcastle.com))

