LAFCO MEETING
AGENDA
Wednesday, April 4, 2012
1:15 PM
Isaac Newton Senter Auditorium
70 West Hedding Street, First Floor, San Jose, CA 95110

CHAIRPERSON: Pete Constant  •  VICE-CHAIRPERSON: Mike Wasserman
COMMISSIONERS: Margaret Abe-Koga, Liz Kniss, Susan Vicklund-Wilson
ALTERNATES: Al Pinheiro, Sam Liccardo, George Shirakawa, Terry Trumbull

The items marked with an asterisk (*) are included on the Consent Agenda and will be taken in one motion. At the beginning of the meeting, anyone who wants to discuss a consent item should make a request to remove that item from the Consent Agenda.

Disclosure Requirements

1. Disclosure of Campaign Contributions
   If you wish to participate in the following proceedings, you are prohibited from making a campaign contribution of more than $250 to any commissioner or alternate. This prohibition begins on the date you begin to actively support or oppose an application before LAFCO and continues until three months after a final decision is rendered by LAFCO. No commissioner or alternate may solicit or accept a campaign contribution of more than $250 from you or your agent during this period if the commissioner or alternate knows, or has reason to know, that you will participate in the proceedings.
   If you or your agent have made a contribution of more than $250 to any commissioner or alternate during the twelve (12) months preceding the decision, that commissioner or alternate must disqualify himself or herself from the decision. However, disqualification is not required if the commissioner or alternate returns the campaign contribution within thirty (30) days of learning both about the contribution and the fact that you are a participant in the proceedings. For disclosure forms and additional information see:
   http://www.santaclara.lafco.ca.gov/annexations&Reorg/PartyDisclForm.pdf

2. Lobbying Disclosure
   Any person or group lobbying the Commission or the 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. 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. For disclosure forms and additional information see:
   http://www.santaclara.lafco.ca.gov/annexations&Reorg/LobbyDisclForm.pdf

   If the proponents or opponents of a LAFCO proposal spend $1,000 with respect to that proposal, they must report their contributions of $100 or more and all of their expenditures under the rules of the Political Reform Act for local initiative measures to the LAFCO office. For additional information and for disclosure forms see:
   http://www.santaclara.lafco.ca.gov/sclafcopolicies_annex&reorg_home.html

PLEASE NOTE
CHANGE IN VENUE
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 FEBRUARY 8, 2012 LAFCO MEETING**

4. **PUBLIC HEARING**

4. **CAMPBELL URBAN SERVICE AREA (USA) / SPHERE OF INFLUENCE (SOI) AMENDMENT 2012 AND CENTRAL PARK REORGANIZATION**
   A request by the City of Campbell for amendment of its USA/SOI boundaries and detachment of Central Park neighborhood from San Jose and annexation to Campbell.

   **Possible Action:**
   a. Open public hearing and receive public comments.
   b. Close public hearing.
   c. Consider the USA/SOI amendment and reorganization proposal, and the staff recommendation.

5. **PROPOSED LAFCO BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013**
   **Possible Action:**
   a. Open public hearing and receive public comments.
   b. Close public hearing.
   c. Adopt the Proposed LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2012-2013.
   d. Find that the Proposed LAFCO Budget for Fiscal year 2013 is expected to be adequate to allow the Commission to fulfill its statutory responsibilities.
   e. Authorize staff to transmit the Proposed LAFCO Budget adopted by the Commission including the estimated agency costs as well as the notice of public hearing on the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2013 Final LAFCO Budget to each of the cities, to the County and to the Cities Association.
ITEMS FOR ACTION / DISCUSSION

6. PROPOSED WORK PLAN FOR REMAINING SERVICE REVIEWS
   Possible Action:
   a. Approve the proposed Service Review Work Plan for the remaining special districts to be conducted in two phases followed by the Cities Service Review.
   b. Direct staff to prepare a draft RFP for consultants to conduct the Special Districts Service Review and distribute to affected agencies for their review and comment.

7. AGENCY RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE 2011 COUNTYWIDE WATER SERVICE REVIEW REPORT
   Possible Action: Accept staff report and provide direction to staff, as necessary.

8. LAFCO WEBSITE REDESIGN: DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
   Possible Action:
   a. Authorize staff to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a professional service firm to redesign the LAFCO website.
   b. Delegate authority to the LAFCO Executive Officer to enter into an agreement with the most qualified consultant in an amount not to exceed $17,000 and to execute any necessary amendments subject to LAFCO Counsel’s review and approval.

9. UPDATE ON LAFCO’S EFFORTS TO PROMOTE TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY AMONG SPECIAL DISTRICTS
   Possible Action: Accept report and provide direction to staff, as necessary.

10. EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT
   10.1 UPDATE ON 2012 AUDIT AND SERVICE REVIEW OF THE EL CAMINO HOSPITAL DISTRICT
       Possible Action: Accept status report and provide direction to staff, as necessary.
   10.2 LAFCO STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP
       Possible Action: Accept report and provide direction to staff, as necessary.
   10.3 SPECIAL DISTRICTS REPRESENTATION ON LAFCO
       For Information Only.

11. PENDING APPLICATIONS / UPCOMING PROJECTS
12. COMMISSIONER REPORTS

13. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES / NEWSLETTERS
   • CALAFCO Newsletter: The Sphere

14. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

15. ADJOURN
   
   Adjourn to regular LAFCO meeting on Wednesday, May 30, 2012, at 1:15 PM in the Isaac Newton Senter Auditorium, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose.
CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Pete Constant called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

The following Commissioners were present:
- Chairperson Pete Constant
- Commissioner Margaret Abe-Koga
- Commissioner Mike Wasserman
- Chairperson Liz Kniss (arrived at 1:19 p.m.)
- Commissioner Susan Vicklund-Wilson

The following were absent:
- Alternate Commissioner Sam Liccardo
- Alternate Commissioner Al Pinheiro
- Alternate Commissioner George Shirakawa
- Alternate Commissioner Terry Trumbull

The following staff members were present:
- LAFCO Executive Officer Neelima Palacherla
- LAFCO Analyst Dunia Noel
- LAFCO Counsel Mala Subramanian

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

3. APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2011 LAFCO MEETING

The Commission approved the minutes of December 7, 2011 LAFCO meeting, as written.

Motion: Susan Vicklund-Wilson    Second: Margaret Abe-Koga
MOTION PASSED

AYES:  Pete Constant, Margaret Abe-Koga, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund-Wilson
NOES:  None  ABSTAIN:  None  ABSENT: Liz Kniss
4. **CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 7, 2011: SARATOGA URBAN SERVICE AREA AMENDMENT 2011**

Neelima Palacherla, LAFCO Executive Officer, presented the staff report and directed attention to the supplemental report which elaborated on Condition #6 and corrected information on prime agricultural lands.

This being the time and place for the public hearing, **Chairperson Constant** declared the public hearing open.

Chuck Page, Mayor, City of Saratoga, stated that the urban service area (USA) amendment would bring the Garrod Trust properties under the jurisdiction of the City of Saratoga. He stated that Condition #7 is unnecessary because the property owners and the City are committed to keeping the properties under Williamson Act contract. He also noted that Saratoga may not have the resources to comply with Condition #6.

**The Chairperson** determined that there are no members of the public who wished to speak on the item and it was unanimously ordered that the public hearing be closed.

In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Wasserman**, Ms. Palacherla indicated that Condition #7 may be satisfied by an annual letter from the City of Saratoga stating the status of the Williamson Act contract. In response to another inquiry by **Commissioner Wasserman**, Ms. Palacherla indicated that the City could annex STG01, 07 and 02 under the streamlined process and plan for the future annexation of STG05 which does not qualify under the streamlined process. She added that Condition #6 was based on the City’s letter to LAFCO. **Commissioner Wasserman** stated that he is not supportive of forced annexations and of making future USA expansions contingent on island annexations. He added that he would support it if the City is in agreement with the condition. Ms. Palacherla directed attention to the City’s letter outlining its island annexation plan. She added that LAFCO policy encourages cities to annex their islands before adding more lands. At the request of **Chairperson Constant**, Mayor Page stated that the City plans to annex islands; however, it does not have the resources to do so at this time. **Commissioner Kniss** informed that the County has a long-standing policy of encouraging island annexations. At the request of **Chairperson Constant**, Ms. Palacherla read LAFCO’s Island Annexation policy encouraging the cities to annex islands before expanding their boundaries. In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Abe-Koga**, Ms. Palacherla advised that initiating the island annexation process would satisfy Condition #6. **Commissioner Wilson** expressed support for the staff recommendation and stated that LAFCO’s policy requiring annexation of islands prior to approval of a USA expansion had been previously imposed on Morgan Hill. **Commissioner Kniss** expressed support for staff recommendation indicating the consistency between LAFCO policy and the County policy. In response to an inquiry by **Commissioner Wasserman**, Ms. Palacherla stated that Condition #6 would require the City to initiate island annexations prior to seeking USA expansions and that initiation occurs through the City Council adopting annexation resolution. She continued discussion of each of the City’s existing islands. **Commissioner Wasserman** stated that he is not in favor of forcing annexations or of prohibiting USA expansions until islands are annexed.
Chairperson Constant noted that Condition #6 requires the annexation of islands prior to an USA expansion while the Island Annexation policy only encourages annexation of islands and stated that he would not support Condition #6.

At the request of Commissioner Wasserman, Commissioners Wilson and Kniss agreed to separate Condition #6 from the motion. Commissioner Wilson commented on the purpose of streamlined island annexations and discussed the difficulty of providing city services to islands.

In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Constant, Ms. Subramanian advised that the Commission may separate Condition #6; however, the final vote may be 3-2 in favor or against the motion. She added that bifurcating the motion would show in the minutes that the Commission is unanimous in approving the Garrod application but not in requiring Condition #6.

The Commission approved the staff recommendations, without Condition #6.

Motion: Susan Vicklund-Wilson  Second: Liz Kniss
MOTION PASSED
AYES: Pete Constant, Liz Kniss, Margaret Abe-Koga, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund-Wilson
NOES: None   ABSTAIN: None   ABSENT: None

The Commission approved Condition #6. The Commission adopted Resolution No. 2012-01. Said Resolution, by reference hereto, is made part of these minutes.

Motion: Susan Vicklund-Wilson  Second: Liz Kniss
MOTION PASSED
AYES: Liz Kniss, Margaret Abe-Koga, Susan Vicklund-Wilson
NOES: Pete Constant, Mike Wasserman  ABSTAIN: None   ABSENT: None

5. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF LAFCO’S 2011 COUNTYWIDE WATER SERVICE REVIEW REPORT

Dunia Noel, LAFCO Analyst, provided a staff report.

The Commission accepted the staff report.

Motion: Margaret Abe-Koga  Second: Susan Vicklund-Wilson
MOTION PASSED
AYES: Pete Constant, Margaret Abe-Koga, Liz Kniss, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund-Wilson
NOES: None   ABSTAIN: None   ABSENT: None

6. STATUS REPORT ON ISLAND ANNEXATIONS IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY

Ms. Noel presented the staff report stating that the report was revised to correct information on the islands in the City of Saratoga.
In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Kniss, Ms. Noel informed that State law was amended to increase the size of islands eligible for streamlined island annexations from 75 to 150 acres and to extend the sunset date to January 1, 2014. Chairperson Constant announced that he would provide staff with a list of San Jose islands which may have mapping errors. In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Constant, Ms. Noel advised that LAFCO and San Jose staff met to resolve potential mapping errors; however, there still remain some issues that cannot be handled administratively as they involve private properties.

Chairperson Constant determined that there are no members of the public who wished to speak on the item.

The Commission accepted the staff report.

Motion: Mike Wasserman  Second: Susan Vicklund-Wilson
MOTION PASSED
AYES: Pete Constant, Margaret Abe-Koga, Liz Kniss, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund-Wilson
NOES: None  ABSTAIN: None  ABSENT: None

7. EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT

7.1 UPDATE ON 2012 AUDIT AND SERVICE REVIEW OF EL CAMINO HOSPITAL DISTRICT
Ms. Palacherla presented the staff report.

7.2 AD-HOC COMMITTEE FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013 LAFCO BUDGET
Ms. Palacherla presented the staff report.

Chairperson Constant and Commissioner Wasserman expressed interest in serving on the FY2013 Finance Committee. Ms. Subramanian recommended that the budget committee be considered as a standing committee stating that it would therefore require a 24-hour notice and agenda.

The Commission established the Finance Committee composed of Chairperson Constant and Commissioner Wasserman to work with staff to develop and recommend the proposed FY 2013 budget to the full Commission.

Motion: Susan Vicklund-Wilson  Second: Mike Wasserman
MOTION PASSED
AYES: Pete Constant, Margaret Abe-Koga, Liz Kniss, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund-Wilson
NOES: None  ABSTAIN: None  ABSENT: None

7.3 LAFCO STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP
Ms. Palacherla presented the staff report and invited input from Commissioners on topics that they would like to discuss.
The Commission delegated authority to LAFCO Executive Officer to enter into an agreement with Bill Chiat, Alta Mesa Group, in an amount not to exceed $1,500 and to execute any necessary amendments, subject to LAFCO Counsel’s review and approval.

Motion: Mike Wasserman  
Second: Susan Vicklund-Wilson  
MOTION PASSED

AYES: Pete Constant, Margaret Abe-Koga, Liz Kniss, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund-Wilson  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

7.4 LAFCO STAFF’S PARTICIPATION IN GREENBELT ALLIANCE’S “CHANGEMAKER TRAINING”

Ms. Palacherla presented the staff report.

7.5 2012 CALAFCO STAFF WORKSHOP

Ms. Palacherla presented the staff report. Chairperson Constant stated that funds for this purpose are included in the current budget.

The Commission authorized staff to attend the 2012 CALAFCO Staff Workshop and authorized travel expenses funded by the LAFCO budget.

Motion: Susan Vicklund-Wilson  
Second: Mike Wasserman  
MOTION PASSED

AYES: Pete Constant, Margaret Abe-Koga, Liz Kniss, Mike Wasserman, Susan Vicklund-Wilson  
NOES: None  
ABSTAIN: None  
ABSENT: None

7.6 LEGISLATIVE ANALYST’S OFFICE REPORT ON SPECIAL DISTRICTS AND LAFCOs

Ms. Palacherla presented the staff report.

8. PENDING APPLICATIONS/UPCOMING PROJECTS

8.1 CAMPBELL 2012 URBAN SERVICE AREA/SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AMENDMENT AND REORGANIZATION

Lisa Harmer, Treasurer, Campbell Village Neighborhood Association, requested Commission support for the annexation of Cambrian No. 36 and Central Park neighborhoods to the City of Campbell.

9. COMMISSIONER REPORTS

Chairperson Constant and Commissioner Kniss announced that they attended the CALAFCO University course entitled Understanding Health Care Districts and the Role of LAFCOs held in San Jose on February 3, 2012.
10. NEWSPAPER ARTICLES / NEWSLETTERS
None.

11. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE

11.1 LETTER FROM RAYMOND SANCHEZ RELATING TO SOUTH SANTA CLARA VALLEY MEMORIAL DISTRICT
Commissioner Wasserman requested staff to recommend action in response to the letter by Mr. Sanchez. In response to an inquiry by Chairperson Constant, Ms. Subramanian advised that matters on removal from office and Brown Act violation should be referred to the Civil Grand Jury and the District Attorney. In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Wilson, Ms. Palacherla informed that staff will present a work plan for the service review of remaining special districts at the April 4, 2012 meeting. Commissioner Wilson requested that staff report to the Commission at the next meeting on the status of actions that were taken. Commissioner Wasserman requested that the Commission prioritize this matter.

12. ADJOURN
The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m. to the next meeting on Wednesday, April 4, 2012 in Isaac Senter Auditorium, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

Approved:

____________________________________
Pete Constant, Chairperson
Local Agency Formation Commission of Santa Clara County

By: ______________________________________
Emmanuel Abello, LAFCO Clerk
LAFCO MEETING:  April 4, 2012
TO:    LAFCO
FROM:  Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
SUBJECT:  CAMPBELL URBAN SERVICE AREA / SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AMENDMENT 2012 AND CENTRAL PARK REORGANIZATION

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1.  CEQA Action
   a.  As a Responsible Agency under CEQA, determine that the proposal is exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the proposed project has the potential for causing a significant adverse effect on the environment.

2.  Proposal
   a.  Approve the urban service area (USA) and sphere of influence (SOI) amendment between the cities of Campbell and San Jose to include the unincorporated island of Cambrian #36 and the Central Park neighborhood within the City of Campbell’s USA and SOI as depicted in Attachment A.
   b.  The USA/ SOI boundary shall revert to the current location if the following does not occur by December 31, 2012:
      1.  Annexation of the unincorporated island, Cambrian #36, to the City of Campbell
      2.  Detachment of the Central Park neighborhood from the City of San Jose and annexation to the City of Campbell
   c.  Approve the detachment of the Central Park neighborhood from the City of San Jose and approve its concurrent annexation to the City of Campbell as depicted in Exhibit A and Exhibit B of Attachment B, conditioned on the following:
      1.  Annexation of the unincorporated island of Cambrian #36 to the City of Campbell.
      2.  Application by the City of Campbell to LAFCO requesting inclusion of the Central Park neighborhood and Cambrian #36 areas into the sphere of influence of the West Valley Sanitation District and requesting annexation
of the Central Park neighborhood into the West Valley Sanitation District and into the County Library Service Area.

3. Finalization and execution of an agreement between the cities of Campbell and San Jose establishing terms under which the annexation of Cambrian #36 and the reorganization of the Central Park neighborhood would be revenue neutral and would not adversely impact either city.

d. Find that the territory proposed for Central Park reorganization is inhabited, has less than 100% consent of the affected landowners, and direct the LAFCO Executive Officer to conduct protest proceedings in accordance with LAFCO Policies and the Cortese Knox Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act (CKH Act). The Commission, on June 13, 2001, delegated all responsibilities of holding protest proceedings to the LAFCO Executive Officer, as authorized under Government Code Section 57000.

e. The Certificate of Completion for the Central Park reorganization shall be recorded along with the Certificate of Completion for Cambrian #36 to ensure that the effective date of the reorganization shall be the same as the effective date of the annexation of Cambrian #36 to the City of Campbell.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Campbell is seeking an amendment to the urban service area (USA) and sphere of influence (SOI) boundaries between the cities of Campbell and San Jose in order to annex the unincorporated island of Cambrian #36, as requested by the community residents and authorized by the City Councils of San Jose and Campbell. Cambrian #36 is currently located in the USA and SOI of the City of San Jose. In order to avoid illogical boundaries as a result of annexation of Cambrian #36 to the City of Campbell, the City of Campbell is also seeking detachment of the Central Park neighborhood from the City of San Jose and its concurrent annexation to the City of Campbell (designated as Central Park Reorganization) along with a corresponding USA/SOI amendment to include the Central Park neighborhood within the City of Campbell’s USA and SOI. Please see attached map (attachment A) The City of San Jose is supportive of the USA/SOI amendment, annexation of the unincorporated island of Cambrian #36 to the City of Campbell and detachment of the Central Park neighborhood from the City of San Jose and its concurrent annexation to the City of Campbell.

BACKGROUND

Cambrian #36 is a 103-acre unincorporated island, located within the USA and SOI of the City of San Jose. The island is surrounded by the City of San Jose on three sides and abuts the City of Campbell on the west. The City of San Jose initiated annexation of Cambrian #36 in 2010 as part of the City’s third and final phase of its County Island Annexation Program for annexing islands less than 150 acres in size. As the City of San Jose progressed in its annexation efforts, the residents of the Cambrian #36 island
petitioned the cities of Campbell and San Jose to allow them to be annexed into the City of Campbell rather than to the City of San Jose. Such an annexation proposal would require a change in the USA/SOI boundaries and would require the City of San Jose to agree to give up annexation of the island and the City of Campbell to agree to annex Cambrian #36 and provides services.

The City of Campbell expressed support for annexation of Cambrian #36 to Campbell. The City of San Jose approved the annexation of Cambrian #36 on December 7, 2010. However, in response to community support for annexation of Cambrian #36 to the City of Campbell, the San Jose City Council directed its staff to refrain for a period of six months from completing the annexation in order to allow the cities of Campbell and San Jose to study and negotiate an agreement allowing annexation of Cambrian #36 to Campbell and requiring that such an agreement must be revenue neutral to the City of San Jose. In June 2011, the San Jose City Council extended the period for these discussions to September 30, 2011. On August 2, 2011, the San Jose and Campbell City Councils approved the key terms of a revenue neutral agreement which included detachment of the Central Park neighborhood from San Jose and annexation to Campbell and authorized their respective City Managers to finalize and execute the agreement on behalf of the cities. Subsequently, to allow for more time to negotiate the details of the agreement, the San Jose City Council further extended the time period for scheduling the reorganization proposal before LAFCO to November 30, 2011. The City of Campbell submitted its application to LAFCO in February 2012. On March 27, 2012, the San Jose City Council adopted a resolution to reconfirm its support for the proposed Central Park reorganization, Cambrian #36 annexation and USA/SOI amendment and to extend the time for finalizing the agreement with Campbell to August 2012.

**Detachment of Territory from San Jose**

Government Code Section 56751 requires that applications for reorganizations involving detachment of territory from a city be placed on the agenda of the next LAFCO meeting for informational purposes and requires a copy of the proposal to be forwarded to the city from which the detachment is requested. The law provides that if within 60 days of placing the item on the LAFCO agenda, the city adopts and transmits a resolution to LAFCO requesting termination of proceedings, then LAFCO must terminate the proceedings. The proposal for Central Park reorganization was placed the February 8th LAFCO Agenda as an informational item. The San Jose City Council adopted a resolution on March 27, 2012, reconfirming its support for the proposed Central Park reorganization, Cambrian #36 annexation and USA/SOI amendment and to extend the time for finalizing the agreement with Campbell to August 2012.

**Public Hearing Notice**

Government Code Section 56157 requires mailed notice to be provided to all landowners and registered voters within the affected territory and to all landowners and registered voters within 300 feet of the affected territory of the reorganization proposal. However, the statute also provides that if the total number of notices required
to be mailed exceeds 1,000, then notice may instead be provided by publishing a display advertisement of one-eighth page in a newspaper of general circulation. Since the number of required mailed notices in this case exceeded 1,000, notice was published in the Campbell Express and in the San Jose Post Record on March 14, 2012.

EXISTING AND PROPOSED GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

Cambrian #36 is a 103 acre unincorporated island surrounded by the San Jose and Campbell. The majority of the properties in this island are developed with single family residences. There are a few commercial uses along Camden Avenue and a few at the intersection of Bascom and Union Avenues.

The Central Park neighborhood, currently located in San Jose, comprises 15.7 acres and includes 96 parcels. Except for one Santa Clara Valley Water District property, all the properties within the neighborhood are in single family residential use.

The City of Campbell approved General Plan and Pre-Zoning designations for the Central Park neighborhood and for the Cambrian #36 island. The pre-zoning will take effect upon annexation of the areas to Campbell. The following table provides information on the General Plan and Pre-Zoning designations applied by the City of Campbell to the two areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
<th>CITY OF CAMPBELL DESIGNATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GENERAL PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Low Density Residential (less than 6 dwelling units per acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVWD Property along McGlincy Lane</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambrian #36 Unincorporated Island</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Low Density Residential (less than 4.5 dwelling units per acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential along Camden Avenue</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential at Union &amp; Bascom Avenues</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The City of Campbell is the Lead Agency under CEQA for the proposed USA amendment. Per Resolution No. 11346, adopted by the Campbell City Council on November 15, 2011, the City determined that the proposed project is exempt under CEQA Guidelines Sections 15305 and 15319. The proposed General Plan Amendment and Pre-Zoning are exempt per Section 15305 which applies to minor alterations in land.
use limitations in areas with an average slope of less than 20% and which do not result in any change in land use or densities. The City estimates only minor alterations in land use limitations and densities will occur as the City has applied General Plan and Zoning designations commensurate with existing uses. The project is also exempt per Section 15319 whereby CEQA provides that annexations to a city of areas containing existing public or private structures developed to the densities allowed by the current zoning or pre-zoning of either the gaining or losing governmental agency, provided that the extension of utility services to the existing development would have a capacity to serve only the existing development. The existing neighborhoods are predominantly built-out to the maximum permissible densities and are presently served by public utilities.

LAFCO is a Responsible Agency under CEQA for the USA/SOI amendment proposal and for the reorganization proposal that includes detachment from San Jose and annexation to Campbell. LAFCO has determined that LAFCO’s approval of the proposal, which is in part based on the City’s statements in its application that no new development is proposed as part of this project and that there would be no significant change in current uses, would be exempt from the provisions of CEQA pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the proposed project has the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment.

**CONSISTENCY WITH LAFCO POLICIES**

**Conversion of / Impacts to Prime Agricultural Lands and Open Space**

The proposal area does not contain open space or prime agricultural lands as defined in the Cortese Knox Hertzberg Act. Therefore the USA/ SOI amendment and the reorganization proposal will not impact agricultural or open space land.

**Logical, Orderly and Efficient Boundaries**

Cambrian #36 is surrounded by the City of San Jose on three sides and abuts the City of Campbell on the west. Annexation of Cambrian #36 into the City of Campbell would result in the Central Park neighborhood (currently in San Jose) to become completely surrounded by Campbell. The proposed detachment of the Central Park neighborhood from San Jose and annexation to Campbell would address this issue, create logical boundaries and avoid splitting existing residential neighborhoods between different jurisdictions. The County Surveyor has determined that the boundaries of the Central Park reorganization are definite and certain and in compliance with LAFCO’s road annexation policies. The proposal does not split lines of assessment or ownership. The proposal does not create islands or areas in which it would be difficult to provide municipal services. The Central Park reorganization will facilitate the annexation of Cambrian #36 which is an unincorporated island.

**Ability of City to Provide Urban Services**

The USA/ SOI amendment will allow for detachment of Central Park neighborhood from San Jose and annexation to Campbell and for annexation of unincorporated island
of Cambrian #36 to Campbell. Upon annexation to Campbell, the responsibility for providing services will transfer from the County (for Cambrian #36 island) and from the City of San Jose (for Central Park neighborhood) to the City of Campbell. The following table summarizes the changes in service providers that will occur as a result of annexation to Campbell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>CURRENT SERVICE PROVIDER</th>
<th>SERVICE PROVIDER UPON ANNEXATION TO CAMPBELL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMBRIAN #36 UNINCORPORATED ISLAND</td>
<td>CENTRAL PARK NEIGHBORHOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>San Jose Water Company</td>
<td>San Jose Water Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICE/ TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>County Sheriff, California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWER</td>
<td>West Valley Sanitation District</td>
<td>West Valley Sanitation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORM WATER</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>County Library</td>
<td>County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION</td>
<td>Santa Clara County Central Fire Protection District (SCCFPD)</td>
<td>City of Campbell by contract with SCCFPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLID WASTE</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMAL SERVICES</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREET SWEEPING</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLS</td>
<td>School District remains unchanged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Campbell has stated that there would be no significant change in land use upon USA/SOI expansion and annexation to the City. The project areas are currently receiving urban level services from various providers depending upon the jurisdictional location of the area. The City of Campbell indicates that Cambrian #36 residents will likely receive improved traffic enforcement, police and emergency services upon annexation to the City.

The Central Park neighborhood currently receives sewer service from the City of San Jose. West Valley Sanitation District provides sewer service to properties within the City of Campbell. The Central Park neighborhood is not within the West Valley Sanitation District boundaries or its SOI. Preliminary discussion with the WVSD has indicated that the District is willing and able to provide service to the Central Park...
neighborhood. In order for the WVSD to provide service to the area, the City of Campbell must submit a separate application to LAFCO for adding the Central Park neighborhood and Cambrian #36 areas to the WVSD SOI and for annexation of the Central Park neighborhood to the WVSD.

The City of Campbell currently contracts with the Santa Clara County Central Fire Protection District (SCCFPD) for fire protection services. The SCCFPD would provide fire protection to the area upon annexation. The cost of providing service to this additional area will be incorporated into the service contract at the end of fiscal year 2013 when it is up for renewal. It is expected that the cost of the contract would be increased by up to $190,000.

The City of Campbell receives library service from the Santa Clara County Library and is within the County Library Service Area boundary. The Central Park neighborhood currently receives library service from the City of San Jose which is not within the County Library Service Area. Although the County Library Service Area currently does not serve any function since it has not been levying assessments since 2005 when its benefit assessment expired, the County Controller’s Office uses the County Library Service Area to define the boundaries of the County Library’s property taxing authority. The City of Campbell must therefore, submit an application to LAFCO for adding the Central Park neighborhood to the County Library Service Area.

The City of Campbell prepared a financial analysis of the expected revenues and expenses resulting from annexation of the Cambrian #36 and the Central Park neighborhoods. The City determined that the annexation area would generate adequate revenues from property tax, sales tax, transit occupancy tax, vehicle license fees, franchise fees and various other non-general fund assessments to serve the annexed areas, based on existing service and infrastructure maintenance costs in other areas of the city. The City is not proposing to provide any additional or new services to the area and no new development is proposed in the area as part of the USA expansion and annexation.

**Growth Inducing Impacts**

The USA/SOI amendment and reorganization of the Central Park neighborhood will not result in any growth inducing impacts. The area is fully developed and mostly built out. The proposed General Plan and zoning designations for the Central Park neighborhood closely mirror current land uses / development pattern and existing land use regulations.

**Annexation of Unincorporated Islands**

The City of Campbell annexed its islands in 2006 and does not currently have any unincorporated islands within its USA. Cambrian #36, currently located in the City of San Jose’s USA, is proposed for annexation by Campbell upon inclusion of the area within Campbell’s USA and SOI.
Fiscal Impact to the Cities of San Jose and Campbell

The City Councils of San Jose and Campbell have approved the key terms of an agreement to ensure that annexation of Cambrian #36 by Campbell does not adversely affect either of the cities. The initial projected surplus from annexation of the island is estimated at approximately $199,000 (the net proceeds that San Jose would expect to receive annually if it annexed the area) and is due in large part to a gas station and hotel in the annexation area.

This amount is considered as the base payment by Campbell to San Jose for the first five years of the agreement. The agreement allows for adjustment in the payment amount over the remainder of the 40-year agreement term based on changes in revenue or revenue generating uses in the annexation area and taking into account major capital costs that would be incurred by Campbell for street maintenance in the area. The major terms of the agreement as approved by the two city councils on August 2, 2011, are as follows:

1. Campbell will make an initial guaranteed base payment of $199,000 for five years, subject to the provisions below

2. Beginning in Year Six, and every five years thereafter, through the term of this agreement, the cities will determine the actual change in net revenue during the past five year period. This change shall equal the difference between: 1) the percentage increase (decrease) in revenues associated with the Cambrian 36 pocket; and 2) CPI change for All Urban Consumers, for the month of February.

3. After the initial five year term, the net revenue change will be shared 50% to afford each city an equal share in any gains or losses accruing from future changes in net revenues.

4. For years 6-40, payment will be adjusted by the net revenue change since the previous calculation, unless such payment amount is negative, in which case no payment will be made for the next five year period.

5. If at any time between the five year calculation period the hotel, located at 1300 Camden Ave., or gas station, located at 1370 Camden Ave., ceases operations or otherwise stops generating tax revenue, a revised calculation, using actual or estimated revenue, will be performed, no later than the end of the fiscal year in which this event occurred and an adjustment to the base payment will be made accordingly. The revised calculation will be used, effective the following July 1, until the next five year calculation is due. Should a new business replace either of these two businesses, a new calculation will be performed as soon as a full year of tax revenue is known by Campbell and an adjustment to the base payment will be made.

6. If any new business is established, which did not exist at the time of annexation to Campbell, and generates more than $50,000 in tax revenue, a revised
calculation will be performed to adjust the base payment, effective the following July 1, until the next five year calculation is due.

7. Over a period of 40 years, Campbell anticipates it will need to perform at least two street maintenance treatments to maintain the roadway and appurtenances at a level commensurate with their existing pavement condition levels. In today’s dollars, this is estimated to cost $3.3 million. Over the next 40 years, the cost is certain to increase considerably. In order to recognize this significant future expenditure, Campbell will be entitled to a credit in its annual payment to San Jose of $30,000 beginning July 1, 2021; increasing to $40,000 in 2031; and $50,000 in 2041 for the duration of this agreement. These credits will be applied after the five year calculation is performed but cannot reduce the annual payment amount below $0.

8. The term of this agreement will be for a total of 40 years after which time all payments and obligations of the City of Campbell to the City of San Joss will be completed in full.

No significant fiscal impacts are projected for affected agencies as a result of this USA/SOI amendment and annexation.

SOI DETERMINATIONS

Pursuant to Government Code Section 56425, in amending a SOI for an agency, LAFCO is required to make written findings regarding the following:

1. Present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open space lands.

   Present land uses in the area include predominantly single family residential uses with some commercial uses. The area is fully developed with urban uses and services and there are no agricultural or open space lands within the proposal area.

2. Present and probable need for public services and facilities in the area

   The area currently receives public services such as sewer, water, solid waste disposal, storm drainage and police and fire protection services from various providers. There is no expected change in the need for public services or facilities in the area.

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

   The present capacity of public facilities and public services appears to be adequate for the area. No new facilities are required to serve this area. However, the Central Park area should be annexed into the West Valley Sanitation District to receive sewer service and into the County Library Service Area.
4. Existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area, if LAFCO determines they are relevant to the agency

The area is adjacent to the City of Campbell and as represented by the community, there is a social and economic interaction between the City of Campbell and the area.

CONCLUSION

Although Cambrian #36 is currently located within San Jose’s USA/SOI, it borders the City of Campbell. The USA/SOI amendment and Central Park reorganization would facilitate annexation of Cambrian #36, which is an unincorporated island, to the City of Campbell. Annexation of unincorporated islands to cities is a long standing joint policy objective of the cities, county and LAFCO. The residents of Cambrian #36 have requested annexation to Campbell. The City of San Jose supports annexation of Cambrian #36 to Campbell and detachment of the Central Park from San Jose for annexation to Campbell. The two cities are working on finalizing an agreement that would ensure that there is no adverse fiscal impact on either of the cities as a result of this reorganization and annexation proposal. The City of Campbell has indicated that it has the ability to serve the new area without reducing service levels to its existing residents. It is clear that the USA/SOI amendment and Central Park reorganization proposals and the future actions of the Campbell City Council regarding Cambrian #36 are all interrelated. See Attachment D for a flow chart showing the linkage between key steps and decisions in the process. In order to ensure logical boundaries and a clean transition of services, staff recommends conditional approval of the USA/SOI amendment and reorganization proposal.

NEXT STEPS

LAFCO Protest Proceeding for Central Park Reorganization

The Central Park reorganization proposal does not have consent from all property owners in the Central Park neighborhood for detachment of their property from San Jose and annexation to Campbell. State law requires that following LAFCO approval of such proposals, LAFCO must hold protest proceedings pursuant to the provisions in the CKH Act. A date will be set for the protest proceedings and a public notice will be sent out in accordance with the law. See Attachment C for information on protest proceedings. The LAFCO Executive Officer will conduct the protest proceedings.

LAFCO Hearing on Annexation of Central Park Neighborhood to the West Valley Sanitation District and to the County Library Service Area

The City of Campbell will submit an application to LAFCO for annexation of the Central Park neighborhood to the West Valley Sanitation District for provision of sewer service and for annexation of the area to the County Library Service Area. It is expected that the City Council, at its April 3 meeting, will adopt a resolution seeking LAFCO
approval of the annexation. It will likely be heard by LAFCO at its May 30, 2012 meeting.

**Campbell City Council Hearing on Annexation of Cambrian #36**

Upon LAFCO amendment of the USA/SOI, the City of Campbell may proceed with annexation of Cambrian #36 as an unincorporated island under the streamlined island annexation process authorized by Government Code Section 56375.3.

**ATTACHMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment A:</th>
<th>Map of Proposed USA/SOI Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B:</td>
<td>Legal description (Exhibit A) and Map (Exhibit B) of proposed reorganization of Central Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment C:</td>
<td>Overview of LAFCO Protest Proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment D:</td>
<td>Flow Chart showing Key Steps and Decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENTRAL PARK REORGANIZATION
GEOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

All that certain Real Property, situate in the South 1/2 of Section 35, Township 7 South, Range 1 West, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, being all of Tract No. 3401, recorded April 3, 1963 in Book 159 of Maps, at Page 14; all of the lands described in the deed to the Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District recorded August 8, 1958 in Book 4144 of Official Records, Page 362; and all of Tract No. 2663, recorded August 3, 1961 in Book 136 of Maps, at Pages 2 and 3, Records of Santa Clara County, California.

Beginning at the southeast corner of said Tract No. 2663, said corner being on the existing boundary line of the City of San Jose as established by Leigh No. 7 Annexation to the City of San Jose, distant thereon South 00°18’47” East a distance of 330.06 feet from the intersection of the east line of said Tract No. 2663 with the centerline of Cambrian Drive; thence

1. North 89°57’05” West, a distance of 1,056.51 feet to the east line of Campbell Annexation 1958-16 to the City of Campbell; thence along said line
2. North 00°10’41” West, a distance of 35.56 feet; thence
3. South 82°04’53” East, a distance of 25.66 feet to the west line of the lands described in the deed to the Santa Clara Valley Water Conservation District recorded August 8, 1958 in Book 4144 of Official Records, Page 362; thence
4. North 33°53’58” East, a distance of 98.31 feet; thence
5. North 45°36’02” West, a distance of 100.15 feet; thence
6. North 38°20’02” West, a distance of 76.70 feet; thence
7. North 42°27’02” West, a distance of 203.85 feet to the east line of East McGlincey Lane and the south line of Cambrian Annexation 1959-14A to the City of Campbell; thence along said line
8. North 65°52’00” East, a distance of 340.14 feet; thence
9. South 52°51’02” East, a distance of 189.07 feet to the west line of said Tract No. 2663; thence
10. North 29°28’00” East, a distance of 69.75 feet; thence
11. North 70°26’00” East, a distance of 50.85 feet; thence
12. North 55°13’00” East, a distance of 35.06 feet; thence
13. North 39°54’00” East, a distance of 62.41 feet; thence
14. North 52°51’00” West, a distance of 86.00 feet; thence
15. North 63°39’40” East, a distance of 94.99 feet; thence
16. South 52°51’00” East, a distance of 41.29 feet; thence
17. North 35°36’54” East, a distance of 140.40 feet; thence
(18) North 76°41′58″ East, a distance of 498.34 feet to the west line of McGlincey Annexation 1965-4 to the City of Campbell; thence along said line

(19) South 00°18′47″ East, a distance of 135.89 feet to the north line of said Tract No. 3401 and the south line of said McGlincey Annexation 1965-4; thence along said line and the south line of McGlincey Neighborhood Annexation 79-2 to the City of Campbell

(20) North 75°53′09″ East, a distance of 1,507.14 feet to the northwesterly prolongation of the easterly line of Lot 25 of said Tract No. 3401; thence along said line

(21) South 18°48′35″ East, a distance of 126.47 feet to the south line of Leigh No. 4 Annexation to the City of San Jose; thence along said line

(22) South 76°21′09″ West, a distance of 142.98 feet; thence

(23) South 13°38′51″ East, a distance of 106.36 feet; thence

(24) South 75°52′47″ West, a distance of 1,430.49 feet to the east line of said Tract No. 2663; thence

(25) South 00°18′47″ East, a distance of 489.49 feet to the Point of Beginning, containing an area of 24.29 acres, more or less.

For assessment purposes only. This description of land is not a legal property description as defined in the Subdivision Map Act and may not be used as the basis for an offer for sale of the land described.

Andrew S. Chafer, PLS 8005

Date

Rev. Date: March 1, 2012
DESCRIPTION
24.29 ACRES, SITUATE IN THE SOUTH 1/2 OF SECTION 35, TOWNSHIP 7 SOUTH, RANGE 1 WEST, MOUNT DIABLO BASE AND MERIDIAN, BEING ALL OF TRACT NO. 3401, RECORDED APRIL 3, 1963 IN BOOK 159 OF MAPS, AT PAGE 14; ALL OF THE LANDS DESCRIBED IN THE DEED TO THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT RECORDED AUGUST 6, 1955 IN BOOK 4144 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS, PAGE 362; AND ALL OF TRACT NO. 2663, RECORDED AUGUST 3, 1961 IN BOOK 136 OF MAPS, AT PAGES 2 AND 3, RECORDS OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA.

DISCLAIMER
FOR ASSESSMENT PURPOSES ONLY. THIS DESCRIPTION OF LAND IS NOT A LEGAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AS DEFINED IN THE SUBDIVISION MAP ACT AND MAY NOT BE USED AS THE BASIS FOR AN OFFER FOR SALE OF THE LAND DESCRIBED.

SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT
PREPARED BY OR UNDER THE DIRECTION OF

LEGEND
POINT OF BEGINNING
EXISTING CITY BOUNDARY/ANNEXATION LINE
 Parcel Line
 Proposed Annexation Line
 (1) COURSE NUMBER
 (R) TRACT NO. 2663, 136-M-3
 (R1) TRACT NO. 3401, 159-M-14
 (R2) GRANT DEED, 4144-OR-362

MAP OF CENTRAL PARK REORGANIZATION
REV. DATE. MARCH 1, 2012

ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF CAMPBELL AND DETACHMENT FROM THE CITY OF SAN JOSE SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AND URBAN SERVICE AREA

Prepared By:
RUGGERI-JENSEN-AZAR & ASSOCIATES
8055 Camino Arroyo, Gilroy, CA 95020
(408) 840-0290
JOB No. 112000 SHEET 1 OF 3
OVERVIEW OF LAFCO PROTEST PROCEEDINGS PROCEDURES

This application is a Non-100% Consent annexation proposal because it does not have consent from all of the property owners in the proposed annexation area. Therefore, following LAFCO approval of a Non-100% Consent annexation proposal, the LAFCO Executive Officer must hold protest proceedings (Government Code Section 57000(c)) as follows:

1. Within 35 days of the adoption of the resolution by the Commission, and not prior to the 30-day reconsideration period for a Commission decision, the Executive Officer shall notice the proposal for protest hearing (Government Code Section 57002(a)).

2. Notices are required to be posted and published 21 days prior to the hearing. Notices are required to be sent to each affected city, district or county, all landowners owning land within the subject area, all registered voters within the subject area, and to anyone requesting special notice (Government Code Section 57025(b), (c), and (d)). As part of the protest hearing notice, landowners and registered voters in the affected area will receive a written protest form which they may mail or deliver to the LAFCO office. Protest may be filed with LAFCO from the date of the notice until the conclusion of the protest hearing.

3. The hearing date should be between 21 to 60 days from the date of the notice (Government Code Section 57002(a)).

4. At the protest hearing, the Commission’s resolution is summarized and any oral or written protests are heard or received. Protests may be filed with LAFCO from the date of the notice until the conclusion of the protest hearing. Written protests may be withdrawn anytime prior to conclusion of the protest hearing. The law specifies rules for a valid protest. (Government Code Section 57050(b))

5. Within 30 days after the hearing, a finding is made on the value of written protests filed and not withdrawn (Government Code Section 57052), and based on that value ((Government Code Section 57075(a)) a resolution is adopted that:
   a. Terminates proceedings (Government Code Section 57075(a)(1))
   b. Orders the proposal without an election (Government Code Section 57075 (a)(3)), or
   c. Orders the proposal subject to confirmation by the registered voters, i.e., an election must be conducted (Government Code Section 57075 (a)(2)).

6. The finding is based solely on the percentage of valid written protests that were submitted prior to the close of hearing.

7. If an election must be conducted, LAFCO is required to inform the Board of Supervisors of the Commission’s determination and request them to direct the elections official to conduct the election.
PROTEST THRESHOLDS
GC §57075
For change of organizations or reorganizations involving annexations and/or detachments

Inhabited Proposals (GC §57075[a])
*Areas in which 12 or more registered voters reside (GC §56046)

If written protest is submitted by:

- Majority of Voters (GC §57078)
  - Terminate Proceedings

- Less than 25% of Voters
  - OR
  - Less than 25% of number of landowners owning less than 25% of the assessed value of land within the affected territory
  - Order Proposal without Election

- At least 25% but less than 50% of Voters within the affected territory
  - OR
  - At least 25% of number of landowners who also own at least 25% of assessed land value within the affected territory
  - Order Proposal Subject to Voter Election

Uninhabited Proposals (GC §57075[b])

If written protest is submitted by:

- Landowners owning 50% or more of assessed value of total land within the territory (GC §57078)
  - Terminate Proceedings

- Landowners owning less than 50% of total value of land within the affected territory.
  - Order Proposal without Election

LAFCO of Santa Clara County
February 2012
APRIL 4 LAFCO HEARING
LAFCO considers Campbell/San Jose USA and SOI Amendment

APPROVE →

APRIL 4 LAFCO HEARING
LAFCO considers Central Park Reorganization (Detachment from San Jose and Annexation to Campbell)

APPROVE →

LAFCO PROTEST PROCEEDINGS
LAFCO holds Protest Proceedings for Central Park Reorganization

APPROVE →

CAMPBELL CITY COUNCIL HEARING
Campbell City Council considers Cambrian #36 annexation

APPROVE →

FINALIZATION BY LAFCO STAFF
LAFCO records Certificate of Completion for Cambrian #36 & Central Park Reorganization (Change of jurisdiction becomes effective on the date of recordation)

DENY →

USA/SOI boundaries revert

DENY →

San Jose annexes Cambrian #36

DENY →

All further action is terminated
LAFCO MEETING: April 4, 2012

TO: LAFCO

FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer

SUBJECT: PROPOSED LAFCO BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Adopt the Proposed LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2012-2013.

2. Find that the Proposed LAFCO Budget for Fiscal year 2013 is expected to be adequate to allow the Commission to fulfill its statutory responsibilities.

3. Authorize staff to transmit the Proposed LAFCO Budget adopted by the Commission including the estimated agency costs as well as the notice of public hearing on the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2013 Final LAFCO Budget to each of the cities, to the County and to the Cities Association.

BACKGROUND

LAFCO Budget and Adoption Process

The Cortese Knox Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) which became effective on January 1, 2001, requires LAFCO to annually adopt a draft budget by May 1 and a final budget by June 15 at noticed public hearings. Both the draft and the final budgets are required to be transmitted to the cities and the County. Government Code §56381 establishes that at a minimum, the budget must be equal to that of the previous year unless the Commission finds that reduced staffing or program costs will nevertheless allow it to fulfill its statutory responsibilities. Any unspent funds at the end of the year may be rolled over into the next fiscal year budget. After adoption of the final budget by LAFCO, the County Auditor is required to apportion the net operating expenses of the Commission to the agencies represented on LAFCO.

Apportionment of LAFCO Costs

The CKH Act requires LAFCO costs to be split in proportion to the percentage of an agency’s representation (excluding the public member) on the Commission. Since the City of San Jose has permanent membership on LAFCO, Government Code §56381.6 requires costs to be split between the County, the City of San Jose and the remaining cities. Hence the County pays half the LAFCO cost, the City of San Jose a quarter and the remaining cities the other quarter.

The cities’ share (other than San Jose’s) is apportioned in proportion to each city’s total revenue as reported in the most recent edition of the Cities Annual Report published by the Controller, as a percentage of the combined city revenues within the county. Government Code §56381(c) requires the County Auditor to request payment from the
cities and the County no later than July 1 of each year for the amount each agency owes based on the net operating expenses of the Commission and the actual administrative costs incurred by the Auditor in apportioning costs and requesting payment.

**FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013 BUDGET TIMELINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Staff Tasks / LAFCO Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 14 –  April 4</td>
<td>Notice period, draft budget posted on LAFCO web site and available for review and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>Public Hearing and adoption of draft budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5</td>
<td>Draft budget along with draft apportionment amounts transmitted to agencies (cities and County) together with notice of public hearing for the final budget hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30</td>
<td>Public hearing and adoption of final budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30 - July 2</td>
<td>Final budget along with final agency apportionments transmitted to agencies; Auditor requests payment from agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STATUS OF CURRENT YEAR WORK PLAN AND BUDGET (FISCAL YEAR 2012)**

The LAFCO Annual Report which will be published at the end of the current fiscal year will document the types of applications processed and the various activities / projects that LAFCO has completed in fiscal year 2012. Attachment A depicts the current status of the work items/projects in the Fiscal year 2012 Work Plan.

The adopted LAFCO budget for the current year is $739,223. It is projected that there will be a savings of about $173,047 at the end of this Fiscal Year. Please note that this amount excludes the $100,000 currently budgeted as reserves. The $100,000, expected to be unused, will be rolled over to the next year as is and maintained as the reserve and is not included in the calculation.

\[
\text{Projected Year End Savings} = \text{Projected Year End Revenue} - \text{Projected Year End Expenses}
\]

Projected Year End Savings = $837,182 - $664,134

Projected Year End Savings = $173,048

This savings amount will largely be due to having a larger fund balance than anticipated from the previous fiscal year. The actual fund balance from FY 2011 was approximately $97,959 more than projected. ($209,987 - $112,028)
The estimated savings of $173,047 at the end of the current fiscal year 2012 will be
carried over to reduce the proposed FY 2013 costs for the cities and the County. Please
see Attachment B for table showing status of LAFCO Budget for Fiscal year 2012.

**PROPOSED WORK PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013**

LAFCO is mandated by the state to process jurisdictional boundary change applications
in accordance with the provisions in the Cortese Knox Hertzberg Act. Associated with
this mandate, LAFCO has several responsibilities / requirements including but not
limited to adopting written policies and procedures, maintaining a web site, serving as
a conducting authority for protest proceedings and conducting public hearings and
providing adequate public notice. Other state mandates for LAFCO include preparation
of service reviews and the corresponding sphere of influence review and update for
each city and special district within the County. The LAFCO work program for FY 2012-
2013 is presented in Attachment C.

**PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2012-2013 BUDGET**

At its February 8, 2012 LAFCO meeting, the Commission appointed Commissioners
Wasserman and Constant to the LAFCO Finance Committee. The Commission directed
the Committee to develop a draft budget for Commission consideration. The Finance
Committee held a meeting on February 29, 2012 to discuss issues related to the budget
and to formulate the budget for FY 2013. The Finance Committee discussed current and
future budget related issues including the status of the current year budget, the
highlights and progress on the current year work plan, and the proposed work plan for
the upcoming fiscal year and recommended the proposed budget for FY 2013.

Furthermore, the Committee directed staff to:

1. Include “The Role of LAFCO in the Oversight of Special Districts in Santa Clara
   County” as an agenda item for LAFCO’s Strategic Planning Workshop scheduled
   for June 6, 2012. (see Agenda Item 10.2)

2. Provide a report at the April 4 LAFCO meeting on LAFCO’s current efforts to
   promote public accountability and transparency among special districts in Santa
   Clara County. (see Agenda Item 9)

3. Research the potential of and issues related to implementing digital or paperless
   LAFCO agenda packets.

The proposed budget for FY 2012-2013 is $766,607 (see Attachment D). A detailed
itemization of the proposed budget, as recommended by the Finance Committee is
provided below.

**OBJECT 1. SALARIES AND BENEFITS $392,182**

All three LAFCO staff positions are staffed through the County Executive’s Office.
There is no change in the proposed salaries for the LAFCO staff. The cost of benefits is
based on the most current information available from the County. Any changes made to
this item by the County in the next few months will be reflected in the Final LAFCO budget.

OBJECT 2. SERVICES AND SUPPLIES

5258200 INTRA-COUNTY PROFESSIONAL $55,000

This amount remains the same as the current year budget and includes costs for services from the County Surveyor’s Office and the County Assessors’ Office.

LAFCO Surveyor $50,000

The County Surveyor will continue to assist with map review and approval. In addition, the Surveyor’s Office will also assist with research to resolve boundary discrepancies. It is estimated that about 400 hours of service will be required in the next fiscal year. The County Surveyor’s Office charges a rate of $117 per hour for FY 2013.

Miscellaneous Staffing $5,000

This amount pays for the cost of reports prepared by the County Assessor’s Office for LAFCO proposals. Additionally, it allows LAFCO to seek technical assistance from the County Planning Office on GIS/mapping issues. LAFCO accesses data in the County Planning Office’s GIS server. This item includes maintenance and technical assistance for GIS, if necessary.

5255800 LEGAL COUNSEL $55,000

This item covers the cost for general legal services for the fiscal year. In February 2009, the Commission retained the firm of Best Best & Krieger for legal services on a monthly retainer. The contract was amended in 2010 to reduce the number of total hours required to 240 hours per year. The contract sets the hourly rate and allows for an annual automatic adjustment in the rates based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). The monthly retainer for 2013 increases to $4,546 - an increase of $115 based on a 2.6% increase in the Consumer Price Index for the prior calendar year 2011.

5255500 CONSULTANT SERVICES $120,000

This item is allocated for hiring consultants to assist LAFCO with special projects. This year, the amount is allocated for hiring consultants to conduct service reviews and sphere of influence updates for the remaining special districts and for any follow-up special studies that maybe required.

5285700 MEAL CLAIMS $750

This item is being maintained at $750.

5220200 INSURANCE $5,600

This item is for the purpose of purchasing general liability insurance and workers’ compensation coverage for LAFCO. In 2010, LAFCO switched from the County’s coverage to the Special District Risk management Authority (SDRMA), for the provision
of general liability insurance. Additionally, LAFCO also obtains workers’ compensation coverage for its commissioners from SDRMA. Workers’ compensation for LAFCO staff is currently covered by the County and is part of the payroll charge.

5250100   OFFICE EXPENSES $2,000
This item is being maintained at $2,000 and provides for purchase of books, periodicals, small equipment and supplies throughout the year.

5255650   DATA PROCESSING SERVICES $2,700
This item includes $2,700 for support from County Information Services Department (ISD) including for active directory ($426), email support and licenses ($1,082) and 10 hours of LAN support services ($1,126).

5225500   COMMISSIONER’S FEES $7,000
This item includes a $100 per diem amount for LAFCO Commissioners and Alternate Commissioners to attend LAFCO meetings and committee meetings in the Fiscal Year 2013.

5260100   PUBLICATIONS AND LEGAL NOTICES $2,500
This is being maintained at $2,500 and will be used for publication of hearing notices for LAFCO applications and other projects/ studies, as required by state law.

5245100   MEMBERSHIP DUES $7,154
This amount provides for membership dues to CALAFCO - the California Association of LAFCOs. In 2006 the Association amended its Bylaws to include a new dues structure. The new dues were phased in over three years. The Bylaws state that the dues would increase by the state CPI every year after the dues phase in. Beginning with the 2009-10 dues, the Board voted not to implement the CPI increase because of the growing economic crisis. That action was repeated again in 2010 and 2011, and the CPI increase was not implemented and Santa Clara LAFCO’s dues have remained at $7,000. This year the Board voted to apply the CPI increase in order to cover the CALAFCO operating costs. The California Department of Finance estimates the state CPI for FY 2011-12 will be 2.2%. Therefore the 2012-13 CALAFCO dues invoices reflect an increase of 2.2%.

5250750   PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION $1,500
An amount of $1,500 is being budgeted for printing expenses for reports such as service review reports or other studies.

5285800   BUSINESS TRAVEL $11,000
This item is for both staff and commissioners to attend conferences and workshops. It would cover air travel, accommodation, conference registration and other expenses at the conferences. CALAFCO annually holds a Staff Workshop and an Annual Conference that is attended by commissioners as well as staff. In addition, this item
covers the travel expenses for staff/commissioners’ travel to the CALAFCO Legislative Committee meetings. Commissioner Wilson and the Executive Officer serve on the CALAFCO Legislative Committee.

5285300 PRIVATE AUTOMOBILE MILEAGE $2,000
This item provides for travel to conduct site visits, attend meetings and training sessions etc.

5285200 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAVEL (for use of County car) $1,088
This item would allow for the use of a County vehicle for travel to conferences, workshops and meetings.

5281600 OVERHEAD $43,133
This is an amount established by the County Controller’s Office, for service rendered by various County departments that do not directly bill LAFCO for service. The overhead includes LAFCO share of the County’s FY 2013 Cost Allocation Plan which is based on actual overhead costs from FY 2011 – the most recent year for which actual costs are available. This amount totals to $43,133 and includes the following charges from:

- County Executive’s Office: $27,606
- Controller-Treasurer: $8,566
- Employee Services Agency: $2,897
- OBA: $440
- Procurement: $16
- Other Central Services: $113
- ISD Intergovernmental Service: $4,219
- ISD: $1,050

Secondly, a “roll forward” is applied which is calculated by comparing FY 2011 Cost Plan estimates with FY 2011 actuals. Since the FY 2011 cost estimates exceeded the actuals by $1,774, this amount is reduced from the FY 2013 Cost Plan. This is a state requirement.

5275200 COMPUTER HARDWARE $2,000
This item is being maintained at $2,000 and will be used for hardware upgrades / purchases.

5250800 COMPUTER SOFTWARE $2,000
This item is maintained at $2,000 and is designated for computer software purchases.

5250250 POSTAGE $2,000
This amount is budgeted for the cost of mailing notices, agendas, agenda packets and other correspondence and is being maintained at $2,000.

5252100 TRAINING PROGRAMS $2,000
This item provides for attendance at staff development courses and seminars.
5701000 RESERVES $50,000
See discussion below.

3. REVENUES

4103400 APPLICATION FEES $25,000
It is anticipated that LAFCO will earn about $25,000 in fees from processing applications. The actual amount earned from fees is not within LAFCO control and depends entirely on the actual level of application activity.

4301100 INTEREST $5,000
It is estimated that LAFCO will receive an amount of about $5,000 from interest earned on LAFCO funds.

4. RESERVES

3400800 RESERVES $150,000
This item includes reserves for two purposes: litigation reserve – for use if LAFCO is involved with any litigation and contingency reserve - to be used for unexpected expenses. If used during the year, this account will be replenished in the following year. LAFCO has not had to use the reserves and the amount has been rolled over to the following year to offset costs. Since last year, the reserves have been retained in a separate Reserves account if unused at the end of the Fiscal Year, thus eliminating the need for LAFCO to budget each year for this purpose. In anticipation of working on several controversial issues, an additional $50,000 is proposed to be added to the reserve account this year bringing the total in LAFCO reserves to $150,000.

COST APPORTIONMENT TO CITIES AND COUNTY

Calculation of Net Operating Expenses


FY 2013 Net Operating Expenses = $766,607 - $30,000 - $173,047
FY 2013 Net Operating Expenses = $563,560

The proposed net operating expense for FY 2013 is approximately 5% lower than that of the current year. Therefore there is a small reduction in the cost to the cities and the County from the previous year. Please note that the projected operating expenses for FY 2013 are based on projected savings and expenses for the current year and are not actual figures. It is therefore to be expected that there may be revisions to the budget as we get a better indication of current year expenses towards the end of this fiscal year. Additionally, a more accurate projection of costs for the upcoming fiscal year could be made available by the County particularly as they relate to employee benefits. This could result in changes to the proposed net operating expenses for FY 2013 which could in turn impact the costs for each of the agencies. Provided below is the draft
apportionment to the agencies based on the proposed net operating expenses for FY 2013 ($563,560).

Cost to Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>$281,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>$140,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining 14 cities in the County</td>
<td>$140,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apportionment of the costs among the 14 cities will be based on a percentage of the cities’ total revenues and will be calculated by the County Controller’s Office after LAFCO adopts the final budget in June. A draft of the estimated apportionment to the cities is included as Attachment E to provide the cities a general indication of the costs.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Status of Current Year Work Plan (FY 2012)
Attachment B: Status of Current Year Budget (FY 2012)
Attachment C: Proposed Work Program for Fiscal Year 2013
Attachment D: Proposed LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2013
Attachment E: Estimated Costs to Agencies Based on the Proposed Budget
### STATUS OF CURRENT YEAR (FY 2012) WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE REVIEWS &amp; SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Water Service Review and Spheres of Influence Update Report</td>
<td>Completed in December 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Service Review Report recommendations follow up</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td>Not listed in FY 2012 Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Hospital District Audit and Service Review</td>
<td>Underway: May 2012 LAFCO Public hearing</td>
<td>Not listed as a separate review in FY 2012 Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised work plan for remaining Service Reviews</td>
<td>Underway: April 2012 LAFCO Meeting</td>
<td>Not listed in FY 2012 Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Fire Service Review recommendations: • Saratoga Fire District Special Study • Review issues re. Los Altos Hills Fire District reserves</td>
<td>Underway: Draft RFP for May 2012 LAFCO meeting Begin review in May 2012</td>
<td>Not listed in FY 2012 Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISLAND ANNEXATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Annexation letters to cities and review of responses from cities</td>
<td>Completed in February 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on responses including review/research of city limits/ USA boundaries, provide assistance with potential annexations and potential USA amendments</td>
<td>On going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalizing island annexations</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAFCO APPLICATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process applicant initiated LAFCO proposals</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>e.g., Garrod USA, Cambrian 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide comments on potential LAFCO applications and/or related environmental documents</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>e.g., Morgan Hill SEQ, USA amendment proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to public / local agency enquiries re. policies, procedures and filing requirements for LAFCO applications</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC OUTREACH AND COMMUNICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and update maps of cities and special districts in GIS</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish updated wall map of cities</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in CALAFCO conferences / workshops</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>CALAFCO Annual conference &amp; Course on Health Care Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize 40th anniversary of LAFCO-County-Cities Joint Urban Development Policies</td>
<td>Not started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign LAFCO website and Add new information on special districts*</td>
<td>Underway: RFP for April LAFCO meeting</td>
<td>*Recent project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to general public inquiries and info. requests</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct workshops and make presentations re. LAFCO program, policies and procedures</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend and participate in the work of local, regional, statewide organizations</td>
<td>Ongoing: GIS Working Group, SDA, SCCAPO Community workshops, CA Fwd, CALAFCO Leg. Comm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track LAFCO related legislation and participate on CALAFCO Legislative Committee</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain LAFCO database</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain LAFCO’s electronic document management system (archiving)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Strategic Planning Workshop</td>
<td>Scheduled for June 6, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Annual Report</td>
<td>August 2011</td>
<td>Service review, special districts and evaluation of efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update policies and procedures, as necessary</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare budget, work plan, fee schedule revisions</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2012 LAFCO Budget Status

### EXPENDITURES

#### Object 1: Salary and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Year to Date 2/16/2012</th>
<th>Year End Projections 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5258200</td>
<td>Intra-County Professional</td>
<td>$66,085</td>
<td>$57,347</td>
<td>$13,572</td>
<td>$4,532</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$1,238</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5258800</td>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,158</td>
<td>$67,074</td>
<td>$52,440</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$31,017</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5255500</td>
<td>Consultant Services</td>
<td>$19,372</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$76,101</td>
<td>$58,060</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$64,237</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5257700</td>
<td>Meal Claims</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$368</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>$288</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5220200</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>$559</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$4,582</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$4,188</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250100</td>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>$1,056</td>
<td>$354</td>
<td>$716</td>
<td>$639</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5255500</td>
<td>Data Processing Services</td>
<td>$8,361</td>
<td>$3,692</td>
<td>$3,505</td>
<td>$1,633</td>
<td>$22,255</td>
<td>$3,229</td>
<td>$22,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5255500</td>
<td>Commissioners' Fee</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$67,074</td>
<td>$52,440</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$31,017</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5260100</td>
<td>Publications and Legal Notices</td>
<td>$1,151</td>
<td>$563</td>
<td>$1,526</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5245100</td>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250700</td>
<td>Printing and Reproduction</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5285800</td>
<td>Business Travel</td>
<td>$7,238</td>
<td>$8,415</td>
<td>$4,133</td>
<td>$8,309</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$1,533</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5285300</td>
<td>Private Automobile Mileage</td>
<td>$1,016</td>
<td>$704</td>
<td>$832</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$601</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5282000</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Travel (County Car)</td>
<td>$894</td>
<td>$948</td>
<td>$629</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$629</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5261000</td>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>$42,492</td>
<td>$62,391</td>
<td>$49,077</td>
<td>$46,626</td>
<td>$60,647</td>
<td>$30,324</td>
<td>$60,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5275200</td>
<td>Computer Hardware</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$451</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$83</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,934</td>
<td>$2,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250000</td>
<td>Computer Software</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$626</td>
<td>$314</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250250</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$1,160</td>
<td>$416</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$568</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5252100</td>
<td>Staff Training Programs</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>$491</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5701000</td>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$516,530</strong></td>
<td><strong>$633,691</strong></td>
<td><strong>$636,478</strong></td>
<td><strong>$604,238</strong></td>
<td><strong>$739,223</strong></td>
<td><strong>$392,516</strong></td>
<td><strong>$664,134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Year to Date 2/16/2012</th>
<th>Year End Projections 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4103400</td>
<td>Application Fees</td>
<td>$46,559</td>
<td>$41,680</td>
<td>$35,576</td>
<td>$48,697</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$15,036</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4301100</td>
<td>Interest: Deposits and Investments</td>
<td>$24,456</td>
<td>$16,230</td>
<td>$6,688</td>
<td>$4,721</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,672</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings/Fund Balance from previ</strong></td>
<td><strong>$271,033</strong></td>
<td><strong>$368,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>$334,567</strong></td>
<td><strong>$275,605</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>$209,987</strong></td>
<td><strong>$209,987</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$342,048</strong></td>
<td><strong>$426,711</strong></td>
<td><strong>$376,831</strong></td>
<td><strong>$329,023</strong></td>
<td><strong>$142,028</strong></td>
<td><strong>$227,695</strong></td>
<td><strong>$239,987</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NET LAFCO OPERATING EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Year to Date 2/16/2012</th>
<th>Year End Projections 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3400800</td>
<td>RESERVES</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COSTS TO AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>Year to Date 2/16/2012</th>
<th>Year End Projections 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>$271,641</td>
<td>$270,896</td>
<td>$267,657</td>
<td>$292,601</td>
<td>$298,598</td>
<td>$298,598</td>
<td>$298,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>$135,821</td>
<td>$135,448</td>
<td>$133,829</td>
<td>$146,300</td>
<td>$149,299</td>
<td>$149,299</td>
<td>$149,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cities</td>
<td>$135,821</td>
<td>$135,448</td>
<td>$133,829</td>
<td>$146,300</td>
<td>$149,299</td>
<td>$149,299</td>
<td>$149,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Did not allocate reserves in the FY 2012 budget - the unspent $100,000 (reserves) in the FY 2011 budget was kept aside as reserves at end of FY 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE REVIEWS &amp; SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATES</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Special Districts Service Review: Phase I and Phase II</td>
<td>Phase I: July 2012 – February 2013 Phase II: December 2012 – August 2013</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on Water Service Review Report recommendations</td>
<td>Underway - TBD</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete El Camino Hospital District Audit and Service Review Report and follow up on recommendations in Report, as necessary</td>
<td>Report: Underway – August 2012 Follow-Up Actions: TBD</td>
<td>Consultant Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Fire District Special Study: Issue RFP, Select consultant, conduct study</td>
<td>June 2012 – December 2012</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on Fire Service Review Report Recommendations: Review issues re. Los Altos Hills Fire District reserves</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare RFP for Cities Service Review and Spheres of Influence Update</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISLAND ANNEXATIONS</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow up on responses including review/research of city limits/ USA boundaries, provide assistance with potential annexations and potential USA amendments</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalizing island annexations</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAFCO APPLICATIONS</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process applicant initiated LAFCO proposals</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on potential LAFCO applications and/ or related environmental documents</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to public enquiries re. policies, procedures and filing requirements for LAFCO applications</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC OUTREACH / COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and update maps of cities and special districts in GIS</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish updated wall map of cities</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in CALAFCO conferences / workshops</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize 40th anniversary of LAFCO-County-Cities Joint Urban Development Policies</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct workshops and make presentations re. LAFCO program, policies</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in local, regional, statewide organizations SDA, SCCAPO, CA Forward, CALAFCO, GIS Working Grp.</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>PROJECTS</th>
<th>TIME FRAME</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track LAFCO related legislation (CALAFCO Legislative Committee)</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and enhance LAFCO Website</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain LAFCO database</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain LAFCO’s electronic document management system (archiving LAFCO records)</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore digital agenda packets</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Annual Report</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update policies and procedures</td>
<td>After Strategic Planning Workshop</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff performance evaluation</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Staff, LAFCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare budget, work plan, fee schedule revisions</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROPOSED LAFCO BUDGET
### FISCAL YEAR 2012 - 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM #</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>APPROVED FY 2012 BUDGET</th>
<th>ACTUALS Year to Date 2/16/2012</th>
<th>YEAR END PROJECTIONS 2012</th>
<th>PROPOSED FY 2013 BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object 1:</td>
<td>Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>$418,342</td>
<td>$242,014</td>
<td>$403,698</td>
<td>$392,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object 2:</td>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5258200 Intra-County Professional</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$1,238</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5255800 Legal Counsel</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$31,017</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5255500 Consultant Services</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$64,237</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5285700 Meal Claims</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5220200 Insurance</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$4,188</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250100 Office Expenses</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5255650 Data Processing Services</td>
<td>$22,255</td>
<td>$3,229</td>
<td>$22,255</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5225500 Commissioners' Fee</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5260100 Publications and Legal Notices</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5245100 Membership Dues</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250750 Printing and Reproduction</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$126</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5285800 Business Travel</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$1,533</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5285300 Private Automobile Mileage</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$601</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5285200 Transportation&amp;Travel (County Car Usage)</td>
<td>$629</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$1,088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5281600 Overhead</td>
<td>$60,647</td>
<td>$30,324</td>
<td>$60,647</td>
<td>$43,133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5275200 Computer Hardware</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,934</td>
<td>$2,934</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250800 Computer Software</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$579</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250250 Postage</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5252100 Staff/Commissioner Training Programs</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5701000 Reserves</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$739,223</td>
<td>$392,516</td>
<td>$664,134</td>
<td>$766,607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4103400 Application Fees</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$15,036</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4301100 Interest: Deposits and Investments</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$2,672</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Savings/Fund Balance from previous FY</strong></td>
<td>$112,028</td>
<td>$209,987</td>
<td>$209,987</td>
<td>$173,047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$142,028</td>
<td>$227,695</td>
<td>$239,987</td>
<td>$203,047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET LAFCO OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>$597,195</td>
<td>$164,821</td>
<td>$424,147</td>
<td>$563,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESERVES</strong></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COSTS TO AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600100 Cities (San Jose 50% + Other Cities 50%)</td>
<td>$298,597</td>
<td>$298,597</td>
<td>$298,597</td>
<td>$281,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5440200 County</td>
<td>$298,597</td>
<td>$298,597</td>
<td>$298,597</td>
<td>$281,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2012/2013 LAFCO Cost Apportionment

Estimated Costs to Agencies Based on the Proposed LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2013

### LAFCO Net Operating Expenses for 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Revenue per 2009/2010 Report</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Revenue</th>
<th>Allocation Percentages</th>
<th>Allocated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50.0000000%</td>
<td>$281,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>25.0000000%</td>
<td>$140,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>$37,199,184</td>
<td>2.0182051%</td>
<td>0.5045513%</td>
<td>$2,843.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>$51,593,772</td>
<td>2.7991693%</td>
<td>0.6997923%</td>
<td>$3,943.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>$65,499,455</td>
<td>3.5536085%</td>
<td>0.8884021%</td>
<td>$5,006.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>$37,223,642</td>
<td>2.0195321%</td>
<td>0.5048830%</td>
<td>$2,845.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>$10,074,345</td>
<td>0.5465737%</td>
<td>0.1366434%</td>
<td>$770.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>$50,773,160</td>
<td>2.7546478%</td>
<td>0.6886620%</td>
<td>$3,881.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>$94,121,506</td>
<td>5.1064697%</td>
<td>1.2766174%</td>
<td>$7,194.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Sereno</td>
<td>$2,604,662</td>
<td>0.1413134%</td>
<td>0.0353283%</td>
<td>$199.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>$47,513,050</td>
<td>2.5777738%</td>
<td>0.6444434%</td>
<td>$3,631.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>$163,494,125</td>
<td>8.8702129%</td>
<td>2.2175532%</td>
<td>$12,497.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>$491,995,000</td>
<td>26.6927047%</td>
<td>6.6731762%</td>
<td>$37,607.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>$478,854,381</td>
<td>25.9797733%</td>
<td>6.4949433%</td>
<td>$36,602.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>$18,947,298</td>
<td>1.0279670%</td>
<td>0.2569918%</td>
<td>$1,448.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>$293,287,941</td>
<td>15.9120487%</td>
<td>3.9780122%</td>
<td>$22,418.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,843,181,521</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0000000%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0000000%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$563,560.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cities (excluding San Jose)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$140,890.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAFCO Meeting: April 4, 2012

TO: LAFCO

FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
      Dunia Noel, Analyst

SUBJECT: PROPOSED WORK PLAN FOR REMAINING SERVICE REVIEWS

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Approve the proposed Service Review Work Plan for the remaining special districts to be conducted in two phases followed by the Cities Service Review as depicted in Attachment A.
2. Direct staff to prepare a draft RFP for consultants to conduct the Special Districts Service Review and distribute to affected agencies for their review and comment.

PROPOSED WORK PLAN FOR SPECIAL DISTRICTS SERVICE REVIEW

At the February 2012 LAFCO meeting, the Commission directed staff to prioritize the service review for the South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District in light of the recent complaints brought forward by a member of the District Board.

LAFCO’s first round of service reviews which were completed in 2005 and 2006 also raised several issues regarding special districts including discussion of service overlap issues in the case of Rancho Rinconada Recreation and Park District, dissolution of the County Library Services Area, and governance options for the South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District, among others.

In order to prioritize and pursue the identified issues in a timely manner and in order to stagger the workload, staff is proposing that the Special Districts Service Review be conducted in two phases as depicted in Attachment A. The first phase will include seven districts (mostly small districts that provide miscellaneous services in various parts of the County) and will begin in July 2012 and be completed by February 2013. The second phase of the service review including the remaining 9 districts (all of the districts that provide sewer services and the two open space districts) will begin in December 2012 and be completed by August 2013. The phasing of the service review will also give staff the opportunity to follow-up on the recommendations from the first phase of the service review while the second phase is in progress.

---

1 As directed by the Commission, staff forwarded the complaint to the Public Integrity Unit of the District Attorney’s Office. The Office is in the process of researching the issues raised in the letter.
Based on issues raised in the past service reviews for the districts and more current issues, the Special Districts Service Review will address three key areas for each district, as appropriate (in addition to the required service review determinations and sphere of influence review/update and determinations for each district):

1. **Purpose of the district**

   What services is the district currently providing? Is the district currently providing the services for which it was originally created? Is there a change in the mission of the district or in the needs of the community since creation of the district?

2. **Opportunities for consolidation of services**

   Is a separate government agency necessary to perform the current functions of the district or could another existing public agency provide those services more efficiently? Would a consolidation or other change in governance result in cost savings and or in higher service levels?

3. **Opportunities for increased transparency in operations, management and administration and for increased public accountability of districts**

   What measures should the district take to establish transparency in the operation, administration and management of the district and in order to be more accountable to the public / community that it serves?

Furthermore, staff will consider the various changes in Government Code Section 56430 that became effective on January 1, 2012, pertaining to written determinations required for service reviews. Many of the changes concern needs and deficiencies related to sewers, water and fire protection services in disadvantaged unincorporated communities within the county. These issues will be more relevant in the second phase of the Special Districts Service Review and in the Cities Service Review.

**CITIES SERVICE REVIEW**

The process for the Cities Service Review will begin in May 2013. As the Commission is aware, staff is currently working with several cities on island annexations and helping with review of urban service area boundaries, for potential amendment, where the city does not support annexation of an island. Staff will continue to work on and resolve these issues in preparation for the Cities Service Review.

**NEXT STEPS**

Upon approval of this work plan by the Commission, staff will prepare a Draft RFP for consultants to conduct the Special Districts Service Review and distribute it to affected agencies for their review and comment. Staff will consider the comments received and prepare the RFP for commission authorization at its May 2012 meeting.

**ATTACHMENT**

Attachment A: Work Plan for Remaining Service Reviews
# WORK PLAN FOR REMAINING SERVICE REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL DISTRICTS SERVICE REVIEW</th>
<th>PHASE 1</th>
<th>PHASE 2</th>
<th>CITIES SERVICE REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District</td>
<td>1. Burbank Sanitary District</td>
<td>All 15 Cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Saratoga Cemetery District</td>
<td>2. County Sanitation District No. 2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rancho Rinconada Recreation and Park District</td>
<td>3. Cupertino Sanitary District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. County Lighting Services Area</td>
<td>4. West Valley Sanitation District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. County Library Services Area</td>
<td>5. West Bay Sanitary District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Santa Clara County Vector Control District</td>
<td>6. Lake Canyon Community Services District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>7. Lion’s Gate Community Services District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. County Lighting Services Area</td>
<td>8. Santa Clara County Open Space Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District</td>
<td>9. Santa Clara County Open Space Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MAJOR TASKS

### April 2012
- LAFCO approve work plan
- Circulate RFP & Scope of Services for Special Districts Service Review to affected agencies for review and comment

### May 2012
- Prepare RFP for LAFCO authorization to release

### June 2012
- Select consultant to conduct the Special Districts Service Review

### July 2012
- Begin Phase 1 of Service Review

### August 2012
- Circulate draft report for public review and comment

### December 2012
- First public hearing (December 12th)
- Start Phase 2 of Service Review

### January 2013
- Circulate revised draft report for public review and comment

### February 2013
- Second public hearing

### March 2013

### April 2013
- Circulate draft report for public review and comment
- Start Service Review

### June 2013
- First public hearing

### July 2013
- Circulate revised draft report for public review and comment

### August 2013
- Second public hearing

### September 2013

### October 2013

### November 2013

### December 2013
LAFCO MEETING: April 4, 2012
TO: LAFCO
FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
      Emmanuel Abello, LAFCO Clerk
SUBJECT: AGENCY RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE 2011 COUNTYWIDE WATER SERVICE REVIEW REPORT

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Accept staff report and provide direction as necessary.

BACKGROUND
As directed by the Commission at its February 8, 2012 meeting, staff requested a written response from each affected agency on how the agency plans to implement the recommendations presented in LAFCO’s 2011 Countywide Water Service Review Report, along with the time-frame for implementation, and an explanation if the agency does not plan to implement a recommendation. Staff requested that responses be provided by March 14, 2012.

LAFCO has received written responses from Aldercroft Heights County Water District, San Martin County Water District, Guadalupe-Coyote Resource Conservation District, Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District, Purissima Hills Water District and Pacheco Pass County Water District. Please see Attachment A for responses from these agencies. Agency responses will be posted on the LAFCO website. The City of Morgan Hill has not provided a response yet.

Staff will track each agency’s implementation of the recommendations and be available to the agency for consultation and assistance, especially on issues involving potential LAFCO applications. Periodic status reports will be provided to the Commission on the implementation status.

ATTACHMENT
Attachment A: Response letters from:
   Aldercroft Heights County Water District
   Guadalupe-Coyote Resource Conservation District
   San Martin County Water District
   Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District
   Purissima Hills Water District
   Pacheco Pass County Water District
LAFCO  
70 West Hedding Street  
11th Floor East Wing  
San Jose, CA 95110

Response to Implementation of the Recommendations of LAFCO’s 2011 Countywide Water Service Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annex APN 558-22-019</td>
<td>District initially required property owners to annex and provided paperwork at beginning of hookup. District will initiate petition on our side and encourage property owner to carry out their petition to annex.</td>
<td>Will work with property owner to start by Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Business Office includes news of note in monthly bills. Haven’t had requests for website for water issues.</td>
<td>Do not plan to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements need to be more comprehensive</td>
<td>Will pass on to our auditor</td>
<td>By 4/14/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit FY 09-10 audit to County and prepare future audits on time</td>
<td>Have already submitted specified audit and working on FY10-11.</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widely advertise Board vacancies</td>
<td>Will insert notices in monthly bills.</td>
<td>Next Vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish multi-year capital improvement program</td>
<td>Underway. Will do at least 2 years of capital planning.</td>
<td>Next budgeting process. Assumed finish date 7/31/2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,

Kim Gardner  
Business Manager  
AHCWD
Via facsimile and first class mail

Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
LAFCO of Santa Clara County
70 West Hedding Street
11th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 295-1613 (fax)


Dear Ms. Palacherla:

The Guadalupe Coyote Resource Conservation District (GCRCD) has reviewed Chapter 8 of the 2011 Water Service Review Report (Service Report) and begun developing a plan to implement the recommendations presented therein. As requested in your letter dated February 12, 2012, we outline our plans for implementation below.

As stated in our November 23, 2011 comments on the revised, draft Service Report, we support the Water Service Review’s aim of improving the accountability and efficiency of special districts and other agencies providing water-related services in Santa Clara County. We believe that current GCRCD programs and practices provide a range of unique and valuable services. However, the GCRCD is always open to recommendations for enhancing the efficiency of our organization and the benefit of our programs. To this end, we have initiated a search for an Executive Director to coordinate daily operations, and to improve conservation programs by building up the GCRCD’s technical and fundraising capacities.

A. LAFCO Recommendations for Improving Accountability and Transparency

The GCRCD intends to implement the LAFCO’s recommendations for improving accountability and transparency as described below.

1. Continue to populate website with further information and documents

The GCRCD is working to implement this recommendation. We have directed staff to prioritize website management activities and develop a plan to populate the website and maintain the currentness of information posted. More specifically, the GCRCD has directed staff to research the following strategies to determine which would be more efficient:

* Training staff to manage the website;
Seeking out volunteer(s) with appropriate expertise to carry out initial information upload and/or provide ongoing management for the GCRCD website;
• Contracting with a web/IT consultant to populate and/or manage the GCRCD website; and
• Partnering with other resource conservation districts or local non-profits to share resources and expertise necessary to manage the website.

The GCRCD Directors have committed to work with staff to evaluate existing information that should be posted on the website, and to determine what information the GCRCD should develop for its website.

The timeframe for implementation of planned activities is six to nine months, with an ongoing commitment to maintenance and upkeep of the website.

2. **Prepare a plan for services that the District intends to provide that do not overlap with SCVWD efforts or SCVWD’s enabling act**

The GCRCD is identifying and developing proposals for additional projects it can provide that are within the scope of its existing services, but do not overlap with work being done by the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD). These projects include:

• Riparian and watershed restoration projects on private land not meeting SCVWD’s criteria for expenditure of funds (e.g., property which is not owned in fee simple or under easement, and on which action is not necessary to protect SCVWD infrastructure and/or public safety).
• Activities not directly related to water resource management and flood protection, such as sustainable farming programs, small parcel livestock and land management, and wildlife habitat management efforts.

In developing these projects, the GCRCD will try to prioritize those that are eligible for non-competitive Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) funding (such as the Environmental Quality Incentives Program). The GCRCD has begun consulting with the NRCS and other RCDs to learn more about how to create successful proposals for funds. We already have learned that it may be necessary to increase our technical capabilities in order to apply for and carry-out NRCS funded projects, so we intend to pursue one or more of the following strategies:

• Working with the NRCS to secure a summer intern position;
• Partnering with neighboring RCDs to pool technical expertise; and/or
• Hiring additional full or part-time staff to provide technical services.

As stated above, the GCRCD is planning to hire a full or part-time Executive Director to help with day-to-day and long-range, strategic operations. We expect the Executive Director to assure that the GCRCD’s project-load includes a range of services by effectively managing new and existing programs, and actively pursuing appropriate grant opportunities. More generally,
hiring an Executive Director is expected to allow the GCRCD to provide a more consistent and professional level of service across all programs and services.

The GCRCD has been consulting with neighboring RCDs to identify opportunities and funding to implement additional projects, either on its own or in collaboration with others. While the GCRCD is considering opportunities to collaborate with others on projects that may have a broad geographic scope, it is also focused on developing projects within its service area.

As part of its effort to develop and implement new projects, the GCRCD plans to develop specific criteria for selecting future projects. We will also develop criteria for evaluating successful completion of projects as part of the annual work plan, and improve project tracking to better document the extent to which tax payer funds within the GCRCD service area are leveraged through grants and other organizational partnerships for the benefit of GCRCD’s service area.

We expect to have identified specific, new projects, including sources of funding and technical assistance to support such projects, not later than December 2012. We will also have pre-project selection process and a post-project evaluation process in place by that time.

3. **Establish policies and guidelines for reviewing development projects to increase transparency & provide consistency**

The GCRCD intends to revise its long range plan to more clearly articulate the policies and/or standards that will be used in evaluating development projects, including a policy for review and approval of consultant comments to ensure consistency between different reviewers and different projects.

We expect to complete the revision of the long-range plan by December 2012.

4. **Track workload of staff and evaluate staff on a regular basis**

The GCRCD has begun requiring staff to track its time by task/project. Based on our initial review, we have determined that the GCRCD needs an Executive Director to coordinate daily operations and to assist with long-range, strategic planning. The Directors continue to review the allocation of existing staff’s time in order to determine whether it is being used effectively, and to inform decisions regarding the Executive Director position. For example, we have not yet determined whether the GCRCD would be better served by a part-time or full-time Executive Director. We want to assure that staff capacity is adequate to meet existing and planned program needs. The GCRCD is also consulting with the California Association of Resource Conservation Districts and other RCDs regarding appropriate staff management practices.
B. Recommendations for Jurisdictional Boundary Changes to Improve Services or Governance

LAFCO recommended “[r]eevaluation of Guadalupe-Coyote RCD and its SOI considering the District’s plan and application for new or different services.” It outlined a three-step process for the recommended reevaluation:

1. District returns to LAFCO, by the December 2012 LAFCO meeting, with a plan for services that the District intends to provide that do not overlap with SCVWD’s efforts and could not otherwise be provided by SCVWD through its enabling act.
2. District initiates a request for a change in services and SOI amendment by resolution
3. District submits application to LAFCO

As discussed in more detail above (see “Recommendations for Improving Accountability and Transparency”), the GCRCD is developing a plan to emphasize projects that do not overlap with the SCVWD’s efforts. We expect to have identified specific, new projects, including sources of funding and technical assistance to support such projects, not later than December 2012. We will also have a project selection process and a post-project evaluation process in place by that time.

Based on our initial work to identify and develop new projects, we believe that new projects that do not overlap with SCVWD’s efforts may be implemented without changing the GCRCD’s scope of services. The Service Report identifies a range of service types currently provided by the GCRCD, including:

- Watershed management
- Flood plain management
- Waterway protection and restoration
- Scientific studies/education
- Creek cleanup
- Vegetation/habitat preservation
- Farm/range land management
- Native species information/education

See LAFCO Report, pp. 200-201. To evaluate the need, if any, for a change in services or SOI amendment, the GCRCD will review potential projects against this list and our records to identify any projects that do not fall within the categories of existing services. We will consult with LAFCO staff regarding the need to file an application for change in services and/or an SOI amendment if it appears that any of the propose projects may fall outside of these services.

Conclusion

We look forward to working with LAFCO Staff to implement recommendations made in the 2011 Countywide Water Service Review Report to improve our effectiveness in serving the
interests of our constituents and the broader public. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Roger Castillo, President
GUADALUPE Coyote Resource Conservation District
(408) 288-5888
March 13, 2012

Neelima Palacherla
LAFCO Executive Officer
70 West Hedding Street
11th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, CA 95110

Dear Ms. Palacherla:

Listed below are the recommendations of LAFCO’s 2011 Countywide Water Service Review Report and San Martin County Water District Board of Director’s planned implementations and responses.

**LAFCO: WEBSITE** - Establish a website or publish a newsletter
**SMCWD:** The District previously maintained a website which received virtually no visitors. The District currently does not have anyone on the Board or Staff trained to maintain a website and does not feel the cost of hiring outside talent is justified. The District does include significant announcements in their monthly billing and has done special mailings of information when necessary, such as during the perchlorate incident and during construction projects. A regular “newsletter” is not justified at this time since little of significance happens on a month to month time scale. The District does mail an annual “Consumer Confidence Report” to all customers, which details water quality testing and other important information about the district.

**LAFCO: AUDITS** Submit audit for last 5 years to the County & establish audit schedule for future audits
**SMCWD:** The District agrees and will get up to date in the next few months.

**LAFCO: ELECTIONS** Widely advertise to fill extended board vacancies & to ensure contested elections
**SMCWD:** The District announces upcoming elections in their monthly bill and the annual Consumer Confidence Report. In July 2011, the District started paying a small meeting stipend ($100.00) in an attempt to attract candidates. This past election we contacted people who had expressed an interest in the past and delivered a candidate package to one of those people. In the early years of the District, there was much more interest in serving on the Board because of some dissatisfaction with the service provided by the District and a desire to help correct deficiencies. Indeed, there was even a recall of most Board members in the first few years. We hope the current lack of interest in serving on the Board is because our customers are generally satisfied with the service the District provides. Here's what we mailed with the billing in the summer of 2011:

**ATTENTION**

This November, the San Martin County Water District will elect members to the Board of Directors. Three (3) full-term (4-year) positions and one short-term position (2-year) are available. We have candidates for two full-term positions, but none for the one long-term or the short-term position. Therefore, these two positions will be uncontested.
The minimum qualifications to serve as a San Martin County Water District Board Member are:

1. Board members must be registered voters.
2. Board members must live OR own property in the San Martin County Water District. (Either residence or property ownership qualifies.)
3. Board members must be available to attend Board Meetings on the third Tuesday of each month at 5:30 PM.

Meetings seldom last longer than 2 hours and usually are only one hour long. Board members receive a small stipend (payment) for attending meetings. There is no cost to you for filing as a candidate.

If you would be interested in serving your community as a San Martin County Water District Board of Directors member, please call Peter Forest, District Manager (408) 779-4633 and request a candidate package. The DEADLINE for filing nominations is August 12, 2011, so call soon!

**LAFCO: PLANS / PROGRAMS** Prepare master plan & project future water demands and storage needs. Establish multi-year capital improvement program

**SMCWD:** The District will update their master plan and capital improvement plan over the next few months. Note: There is no projected significant increase in future water demands and the District water source currently provides more than 20-times our current water demand.

**LAFCO: OPERATIONAL PRACTICES** Seek LAFCO approval before extending services outside District boundary

**SMCWD:** The District agrees and will seek LAFCO approval for all future connections outside the District boundary.

**LAFCO: MANAGEMENT PRACTICES** Track District & staff workload

For the last 11 years, the Board has received a monthly written “Manager’s Report” detailing the activities of the contracted water treatment operator and manager with dates and time expended. Additionally, the Board receives monthly invoices detailing time expended and materials used. Activities that are the same every month (billing, routine customer contacts) are billed at a fixed monthly rate and therefore not tracked in detail. Extra-ordinary activities, such as customer contacts during the perchlorate incident and delinquent account collection activities are tracked and reported. Additionally, activities related to the Department of Health are recorded on written charts for the Department of Health.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARY CHANGES TO IMPROVE SERVICES OR GOVERNANCE**

**Address Illegal Water Service Connections**

**SMCWD:** The District will address all existing connections requiring authorization from LAFCO in a single application to be submitted with the next out-of-district service request received by the District.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Secretary, SMCWD Board of Directors
March 12, 2012

Neelima Palachera  
LAFCO Executive Officer  
70 West Hedding Street  
11th Floor East Wing  
San Jose, CA 95110

Dear Ms. Palachera:

Per LAFCOs recommendation, on February 15, 2012, the Board of Directors of Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District (LPRCD) passed a resolution (attached) to annex those portions of the Cities of Gilroy and Morgan Hill and the community of San Martin that are served by our outreach but are not currently within LPRCDs boundaries. I have been authorized to complete an online application and to work with you to pursue annexation and revenues. I hope to complete this process by August, 2012.

LPRCDs board also agreed that we will more closely align our Long Rang and One Year Plans and reports to reflect the requirements of these plans and reports in Division 9 Public Resource Code, section 9413. Both reports and Plans will be initiated in June and completed in July, 2012.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Meyer  
Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District, Executive Director
Board Resolution #6i

At the regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District on February 15, 2012, the following resolution was proposed and approved by the board:

Whereas the mission of the Loma Prieta RCD is to facilitate the education of landowners and the general public about creating and promoting sustainability in all human activities that interface with the world of Natural Resources,

Whereas annexing those portions of the Cities of Gilroy and Morgan Hill, and the community of San Martin that are included in our outreach efforts but are not currently within Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District boundaries, will contribute financial support to our outreach goals,

Be it hereby resolved that the action taken on this day passed by the following vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burt Malech</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Petersen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Robledo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnevan Shay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Boll</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted by

[Signature]

Susan Meyer, Executive Director
March 16, 2012

Neelima Palacherla
Executive Officer
LAFCO of Santa Clara County
70 West Hedding Street
11th Floor, East Wing
San Jose, California 95110

Dear Ms. Palacherla:

I am responding to LAFCO’s letter dated February 1, 2012, regarding the implementation of the recommendations of LAFCO’s 2011 Countywide water service review report.

LAFCO’s recommendation for improving accountability and transparency for the Purissima Hills Water District (District) was to enhance water conservation program efforts to address large lots. We believe that, in recent years, we have been successful in our water conservation program, resulting in a 34% decline in water usage due to our customers changing their landscaping, primarily reducing turf. The District will continue to enhance its conservation efforts.

Below is a brief summary of the water conservation activities conducted by the District:

- Dedicated a conservation specialist to help customers understand and troubleshoot their water usage and determine water savings opportunities. Offers information on proper landscape maintenance and informs residents of water conservation rebates offered via the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

- Hosted landscaping seminars:
  - Proper Irrigation Techniques
  - Turf Alternatives
  - Drought Tolerant Plantings
  - California Natives

- Sponsored landscaping seminars:
  - Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency seminar series
  - Los Altos Hills Water Conservation Committee seminars—Turf Talk and Slow the Flow
Information booth at all Town of Los Altos Hills events:
  Town Picnic
  Earth Day
  Other local community events

Lead sponsor of the Los Altos History Museum educational exhibit “Shaped by Water: Past Present and Future”

Publish monthly conservation newsletters

Supports the Town of Los Altos Hills Water Conservation Ordinance

Future programs that we are implementing:
  Developing water usage analytics through our website
  Developing an internet device that will enable customers to view water usage online through a smart phone application.

Unfortunately, the District will always be a target for water conservation due to the fact that approximately 98% of the properties within the District are zoned for minimum one-acre parcels.

We have appreciated the opportunity to work with LAFCO on this Countywide water service review report.

Sincerely,

Patrick Walter
General Manager
LAFCO MEETING: April 4, 2012
TO: LAFCO
FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
       Emmanuel Abello, LAFCO Clerk
SUBJECT: LAFCO WEBSITE REDESIGN: DRAFT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Authorize staff to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a professional service firm to redesign the LAFCO website.

2. Delegate authority to the LAFCO Executive Officer to enter into an agreement with the most qualified consultant in an amount not to exceed $17,000 and to execute any necessary amendments subject to LAFCO Counsel’s review and approval.

BACKGROUND

The current LAFCO website was created in 2000. While the content of the Santa Clara LAFCO website is regularly updated, the website technology and design has not been updated since its creation. The goal of the redesign is to make the website more user-friendly for the public and to make it more efficient for LAFCO staff to manage the content. The redesign will ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, update to content management system technology and improve content organization and visual design.

The LAFCO Budget for Fiscal Year 2012 includes funding for the website redesign. LAFCO staff recommends an allocation of $17,000 for this project. The LAFCO Executive Officer will negotiate the final project cost with the selected firm.

Upon LAFCO authorization, staff will post the RFP on the LAFCO and CALAFCO websites and notify web design firms on LAFCO’s consultant list. Responses to the RFP are due on Tuesday, May 1, 2012. Following selection of the most qualified firm, a final services agreement including budget, schedule, and final scope of services statement will be negotiated before executing the contract. Work is expected to begin in June 2012 and is expected to be completed by October 31, 2012.

ATTACHMENT

Attachment A: Draft RFP
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
Redesign of the Santa Clara LAFCO Website

I. Objective
The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Santa Clara County is seeking proposals from professional firms to redesign its website. The goal of the redesign is to ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), update to content management system (CMS) technology, improve content organization and visual design in order to make the website more user-friendly for the public and efficient for LAFCO staff to manage. The redesign will utilize information on the existing website as well as add new content and features suggested by LAFCO and the selected consultant. The redesign will be implemented using Joomla 2.5.3 or its most current version as the content management system.

II. Background
Government Code §56300(f), requires LAFCO to establish and maintain a website. While the content on the Santa Clara LAFCO website is regularly updated, the website technology and design has not been updated since its creation in 2000. The Santa Clara LAFCO website address is www.santaclara.lafco.ca.gov.

III. Scope of Services
The consultant will redesign the LAFCO website to include:
- An attractive and professional website design with consistent page layout
- User-friendly functionality with quick loading graphics and printer-friendly pages
- Joomla 2.5.3 content management system
- ADA compliance

The redesigned website will include content from the existing LAFCO website as well as new information, including but not limited to the following:

General LAFCO Information
- Mission statement
- Office hours, location and driving directions
- Announcements
- Site search function
• Translation to Spanish
• Registration to receive email notices
• Awards
• Frequently asked questions

**Commission and Staff**
• Commissioners roster
• Staff roster

**LAFCO Meetings**
• Current year agenda with staff reports and minutes
• Archive of agendas with staff reports and minutes
• Schedule of LAFCO meetings

**LAFCO Policies, Forms and Procedures**
• LAFCO policies
• Process flowcharts
• Filing requirements
• Fee schedule
• Application forms

**Island Annexations**
• Island annexation
• Island annexation policies
• Streamlined island annexation flow chart
• Maps of unincorporated islands
• Current status of island annexations

**Service Reviews**
• Service review policies
• Work plan
• Adopted service review reports
• Summary of recommendations
• Implementation of service review recommendations

**Cities**
• List of cities in Santa Clara County hyperlinked to city websites
• Map of Santa Clara County and cities
• Link to Santa Clara County Cities Association

**Special Districts**
• List of special districts in Santa Clara County hyperlinked to district websites
• Profile page for each special district containing information on or links to principal acts/legal mandate, maps of district boundaries, links to service
review reports, summary of service review recommendations, and status of implementation of service review recommendations

- Link to Santa Clara County Special Districts Association

Other

- LAFCO mission
- LAFCO strategic plan
- Annual work plan
- Annual report
- Fiscal year budget

Resources

- Useful external links
- Publications

The new website will include additional features and functions such as the following:

- Hidden login for both back-end and front-end content management system
- “You are leaving our website” page
- Customized “Page Not Found” redirection page
- Visitor tracking
- Google map for LAFCO office
- Compatibility with mobile browsers
- Dynamic site map

A final statement of services to be provided will be negotiated with the firm selected to perform the work prior to reaching agreement and will be included as part of the professional services agreement.

IV. Budget

A final budget amount for this project will be negotiated with the firm selected for the work prior to reaching agreement. The anticipated project cost of the proposal should not exceed $17,000.00.

V. Schedule

It is anticipated that the selected consultant will start work in early June 2012 and be completed by October 31, 2012. The final schedule for this project will be negotiated with the selected firm prior to reaching an agreement.

VI. Proposal Requirements

The response to this Request for Proposals must include the following:

1. Firm Description and Experience

   Provide a description of the firm, including type of business, years in business and office location(s). Summarize the firm’s qualifications for website design,
including its experience in using the Joomla software. Please provide links to at least three (3) websites that the firm has designed.

2. Project Team
Identify the key staff members that would be assigned to the project. Briefly describe each member’s responsibility and relevant work experience as it relates to the project.

3. Proposed Scope of Services
Provide a proposed scope of services for the website redesign. Identify key tasks and indicate any additional software to be used.

4. Schedule
Provide a schedule for completion of the project including a timeline for each of the major tasks.

5. Proposed Cost
Identify a proposed not-to-exceed cost to complete the project. The proposed cost of the project should itemize each major task. All hourly rates and fees should be clearly stated.

6. Optional Services and Costs
Describe optional services and costs relating to hosting (if available) and ongoing maintenance for the website. Hosting and ongoing maintenance may be considered under a separate contract.

7. References
Provide contact information for at least two (2) client references, preferably local government agencies.

VII. Submission Requirements
DUE DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, May 1, 2012 at 5:00 PM. Proposals received after this time and date may be returned unopened.

NUMBER OF COPIES: 3 hard copies and one compact disc

DELIVER TO: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
LAFCO of Santa Clara County
70 West Hedding Street, 11th Floor
San Jose, CA 95110

Note: If delivery is to be in person please first call the LAFCO office at (408) 299-5127 or 299-6415 to arrange delivery time.

VIII. Evaluation Criteria and Selection Process
Firms will be selected for further consideration based on the following criteria:

• relevant work experience
• completeness of the responses
• overall project approaches identified
• proposed project budget

Consultants will be interviewed and the most qualified firm will be selected based on the above evaluation criteria and reference checks. Interviews will be held in early May 2012. Following the selection of the most qualified firm, a final services agreement will be negotiated and executed. The agreement will include a budget, schedule, and final Scope of Services statement.

LAFCO reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, to issue addenda to the RFP, to modify the RFP or to cancel the RFP.

IX. LAFCO Contact

   Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
   LAFCO of Santa Clara County
   Phone: (408) 299-5127
   Fax: (408) 295-1613
   Email: neelima.palacherla@ceo.sccgov.org

X. Attachment

   1. Draft Professional Service Agreement and Insurance Requirements
LAFCO Meeting: April 4, 2012
TO: LAFCO
FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
       Emmanuel Abello, LAFCO Clerk
SUBJECT: UPDATE ON LAFCO’S EFFORTS TO PROMOTE TRANSPARENCY AND
          ACCOUNTABILITY AMONG SPECIAL DISTRICTS

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Accept report and provide direction to staff, as necessary.

UPDATE / DISCUSSION

The LAFCO Finance Committee directed staff to provide a report on LAFCO’s current
efforts to promote public accountability and transparency among special districts in
Santa Clara County.

LAFCO recently completed the Countywide Water Service Review which presents
several recommendations related to improving public accountability and transparency
of agencies. See Agenda Item #7 for information on how the special districts intend to
implement these recommendations. The audit and service review of the El Camino
Hospital District will include information on this topic as well. The upcoming service
reviews of special districts (see Agenda Item #6) will also include information on this
topic.

Besides the work that LAFCO is doing on special districts within the service review
context, staff is preparing summary information on special districts in an effort to make
it more widely available and easily accessible. The following is a summary of the work
in progress:

1. Information on availability of the agency’s policies and financial documents on
   the special district’s website

   Staff has included new information on the LAFCO website regarding whether or
   not special districts maintain websites and whether or not the district’s bylaws/
policies and audits/financial reports are posted on the agency’s website. See
   Attachment A for a table summarizing this information. The LAFCO website
   http://santaclara.lafco.ca.gov/specialdistricts.html includes direct links to the
   special districts websites and the documents listed in the table.

2. Information on special district audit cycles and audit compliance

   Staff has requested information from the County Controllers’ Office on the special
district audit cycles and compliance with audit requirements and whether the
districts submitted a copy of the audit reports to the Controllers’ Office. See Attachment B for a table summarizing the information provided by the Controller’s Office on special district audit cycles and audit compliance.

As noted in Attachment B, five of the districts including Burbank Sanitary District, Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District, Guadalupe Coyote Resource Conservation District, Lake Canyon Community Services District and the South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District are on modified audit schedules rather than on the typical annual schedule. Government Code 26909(b) allows the audit requirements for a special district to be modified, by unanimous approval of the district’s governing body and unanimous approval of the County Board of Supervisors. Permissible modifications include revising the audit schedule from an annual audit to a biennial audit covering a 2-year period or to a five-year period if the special district’s annual revenues do not exceed an amount specified by the Board of Supervisors or to an audit conducted at specific intervals, as recommended by the County Auditor, that shall be completed at least once every five years. The County has established that special districts with annual revenues not exceeding $1,000,000 may be allowed to modify their audit period to a five-year period.

3. Special districts’ legal requirements

Staff is working with legal counsel on an informational matrix showing legal requirements for various types of special districts which are related to ensuring that the districts are accountable to the public and are operated and managed effectively. This information will also be added to the LAFCO website when it is ready.

4. The redesigned LAFCO website will include special district profiles

LAFCO will soon begin the redesign of its website. (See Agenda Item #8) The redesigned LAFCO website will feature a profile page for each special district containing information such as the date of district formation, district area, enabling legislation, authorized services, current services, selection of board members, number of board members, board members terms of office, district funding sources, annual revenues, special taxes and assessments, district reserves, staffing and employees, meeting schedule, meeting location, office location, contact information. In addition, links to a map of the district boundaries, to the service reports discussing the district and to a status of districts’ implementation of the recommendations in the service review report will be included on the website.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Availability of Information on Special District Websites
Attachment B: Special Districts Audit Cycle and Compliance
# Availability of Information on Special District Websites

## Independent Special Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Website?</th>
<th>Online Availability</th>
<th>Audit /Financial Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldercroft Heights County Water District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank Sanitary District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino Sanitary District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Operations Code available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Hospital District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>By-laws available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Coyote Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Canyon Community Services District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion’s Gate Community Services District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Policies available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco Pass Water District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purissima Hills County Water District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Rinconada Recreation and Park District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Martin County Water District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Open Space Authority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Policies available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>District Act available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Cemetery District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bay Sanitary District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Code of General Regulations &amp; Purchasing Policy available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Dependent Special Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Website?</th>
<th>Online Availability</th>
<th>Audit /Financial Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Sanitation District No. 2-3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Library Service Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Lighting Service Area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills County Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Central Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Vector Control District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Clara County Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not available online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Sanitation District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ordinance Code available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*LAFCO website has hyperlinks to special district websites and documents listed.*
## Special Districts Audit Cycle and Compliance

### Independence Special Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Audit Cycle</th>
<th>FY10 Audit?</th>
<th>FY11 Audit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldercroft Heights County Water District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank Sanitary District</td>
<td>2-year Cycle</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino Sanitary District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Hospital District</td>
<td>Unknown Not on list</td>
<td>Yes, Online</td>
<td>Yes, Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Coyote Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>3-year Cycle</td>
<td>Yes, 2008</td>
<td>2011 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Canyon Community Services District</td>
<td>5-year Cycle</td>
<td>Yes, 2006</td>
<td>2011 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion's Gate Community Services District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta Resource Conservation District</td>
<td>3-year Cycle</td>
<td>Yes, 2009 Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco Pass Water District</td>
<td>San Benito County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purissima Hills County Water District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Rinconada Recreation and Park District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, 2009 Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Martin County Water District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>None Received</td>
<td>None Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Open Space Authority</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Cemetery District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District</td>
<td>5-year Cycle</td>
<td>Yes, 2008</td>
<td>2013 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bay Sanitation District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dependent Special Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Name</th>
<th>Audit Cycle</th>
<th>FY10 Audit?</th>
<th>FY11 Audit?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Sanitation District No. 2-3</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Library Service Area</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Lighting Service Area</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, included in County Audit</td>
<td>Yes, included in County Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills County Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Central Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Vector Control District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Clara County Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, sent CD</td>
<td>Yes, sent CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley Sanitation District</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
<td>Yes, Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAFCO Meeting: April 4, 2012
TO: LAFCO
FROM: Neelima Palacherla, Executive Officer
SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT

10.1 UPDATE ON 2012 AUDIT AND SERVICE REVIEW OF THE EL CAMINO HOSPITAL DISTRICT

Recommendation
Accept status report and provide direction to staff, as necessary.

LAFCO’s ad-hoc committee for the El Camino Hospital District Audit and Service Review, consisting of Commissioners Abe-Koga and Wilson and staff met with the consultants on March 14, 2012 to discuss consultant progress on analysis and findings. The consultant has submitted an administrative draft of the Audit and Service Review Report for staff review. Following staff review and comment, the consultants will provide the Report to the El Camino Hospital District by mid April for review and comment and hold an exit conference with the District. The project is proceeding as scheduled and it is expected that the Report will be released for public review and comment in late April 2012. The LAFCO public hearing on the Report will be held on May 30, 2012.

10.2 UPDATE ON LAFCO STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP

Recommendation
Accept report and provide direction to staff, as necessary.

LAFCO’s 2012 strategic planning workshop is tentatively scheduled for the morning of June 6th. The LAFCO Finance Committee has directed that one of the topics at the Strategic Planning Workshop include a discussion of LAFCO’s role in oversight of special districts. Staff will work with the facilitator to prepare an agenda for the workshop. More information on the details of the workshop will be made available soon.

10.3 SPECIAL DISTRICTS REPRESENTATION ON LAFCO

For Information Only

At its meeting on March 5, 2012, the Santa Clara County Special Districts Association considered the issue of special districts having a seat on LAFCO and requested more
information on the cost implications for the individual districts. LAFCO Staff in coordination with the County Controllers’ Office, prepared the requested information on potential costs for each independent special district should districts be represented on LAFCO. See Attachment A for the potential cost allocations. The individual special districts will review this information and consider the issue. A majority of independent special districts must adopt resolutions in support of having a seat on LAFCO before LAFCO can approve special district representation. There are 17 independent special districts in Santa Clara County.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: LAFCO Cost Apportionment: Cities, County, and Special Districts
### LAFCO Cost Apportionment: County, Cities, Special Districts

**Estimated Costs to Agencies Based on the 2012 LAFCO Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Revenue per 2009/2010 Report</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Revenue</th>
<th>Allocation Percentages</th>
<th>Allocated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>33.3333333%</td>
<td>$199,065.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities Total Share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3333333%</td>
<td>$199,065.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50.0000000%</td>
<td>$99,532.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cities share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0000000%</td>
<td>$99,532.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>$37,199,184</td>
<td>2.0182051%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,008.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>$51,593,772</td>
<td>2.7991693%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,786.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>$65,499,455</td>
<td>3.5336085%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,537.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>$37,223,642</td>
<td>2.019321%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,030.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>$10,074,345</td>
<td>0.5465737%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$544.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>$50,773,160</td>
<td>2.7577738%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,741.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>$94,121,506</td>
<td>5.0469797%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,052.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte Sereno</td>
<td>$2,604,662</td>
<td>0.1413134%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$140.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>$47,513,050</td>
<td>2.5777738%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,565.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>$164,494,125</td>
<td>8.702129%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,828.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>$491,995,000</td>
<td>26.6927047%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,567.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>$478,654,361</td>
<td>25.9797733%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,858.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>$18,947,298</td>
<td>1.0279670%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,023.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>$293,287,941</td>
<td>15.9120487%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,837.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cities (excluding San Jose)</td>
<td>$1,843,181,521</td>
<td>100.0000000%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$99,532.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cities (including San Jose)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$199,065.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Districts Total Share**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Districts</th>
<th>Revenue per 2009/2010 Report</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Revenue</th>
<th>Allocation Percentages</th>
<th>Allocated Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alder Creek Heights County Water District</td>
<td>$201,129</td>
<td>0.0545415%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$108.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank Sanitary District</td>
<td>$500,197</td>
<td>0.1364553%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$271.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino Sanitary District</td>
<td>$8,522,957</td>
<td>2.1122966%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,560.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino Hospital District</td>
<td>$15,836,355</td>
<td>4.2944492%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,548.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe Coyote Resource Cons. District</td>
<td>$156,831</td>
<td>0.0423089%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$64.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Canyon Community Services District</td>
<td>$7,103</td>
<td>0.0193086%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion's Gate Community Services District</td>
<td>$71,675</td>
<td>0.1929896%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$384.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Prieta Resource Cons. District</td>
<td>$65,201</td>
<td>0.1768120%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District</td>
<td>$30,831,253</td>
<td>8.3605767%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,643.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purisima Hills County Water District</td>
<td>$4,370,288</td>
<td>1.1651199%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,356.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Rinconada Rec. and Park District</td>
<td>$15,995</td>
<td>0.0399389%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$278.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Martin County Water District [1]</td>
<td>$143,000</td>
<td>0.0387783%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$77.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Open Space District</td>
<td>$37,927,411</td>
<td>10.2650270%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,473.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
<td>$262,814,725</td>
<td>71.2690772%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$141,872.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Cemetery District</td>
<td>$1,035,169</td>
<td>0.2807136%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$558.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Fire Protection District</td>
<td>$4,935,972</td>
<td>1.3382022%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,664.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santa Clara Valley Memorial District</td>
<td>$121,069</td>
<td>0.0328311%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Special Districts</strong></td>
<td>$365,763,360</td>
<td>100.0000000%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$199,065.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allocated Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$597,195.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

PACHECO PASS WATER DISTRICT
P. O. BOX 1382
HOLLISTER, CA 95024

March 26, 2012

TO: LAFCO
FROM: WATER BOARD
SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The President and Secretary reviewed the “recommendations for improving accountability and transparency” and “exploring options for reorganization of the water district.”

Here is a summary of our actions:

1. **Website**: At this time, we do not have the expertise to develop a website. However, the secretary is in the process of contacting a web designer to determine the cost of initial design and ongoing maintenance of a website. Time frame for implementation is within 6 months if funds permit.

2. **Financial records**: Starting with this fiscal year which began July, 2011, the secretary is posting all transactions on Quick Books so that profit and loss and balance sheets will be available in a timely manner and at least monthly.

3. **Audit**: The audit for period 2010 has been submitted to the County. We are working with a CPA firm in Hollister to set up a 5-year schedule.

4. **Elections**: We work with the County Elections office to canvass San Benito County to try and fill the board vacancies. The notice is published in the Freelance and the Pinnacle newspapers.

5. **Plans/Programs**: We have approached the San Benito and Santa Clara counties’ water districts to discuss some type of merger. To date, neither has gotten back to us with a proposal.

6. **Operational Practices**: “NO A” is working with us on installing automatic gates. This will facilitate water movement and flow measurements.

7. **Management Practices**: Currently, the tracking of workload and hours of the staff has not been addressed. This item will be discussed at the next Board meeting.

**Exploring Options for Reorganization**: At this time, we have not received any indication that either the San Benito Water District nor the Santa Clara Valley Water District are interested in consolidating with the Pacheco Pass Water District.