

| PROPOSED FRESNO LAFCo FY20-21 BUDGET SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|---|
| Updated 4-9-20 | | | | |
| REVENUE SUMMARY | Approved FY 19-20 Budget | Actual To Date | Estimate to Close FY 19-20 | Proposed FY 20-21 Budget |
| ALLOCATION COUNTY | 198,912 | 198,912 | 198,912 | 181,624 |
| ALLOCATION CITIES | 198,912 | 198,912 | 198,912 | 181,624 |
| APPLICATION FEES | 70,000 | 123,210 | 161,810 | 65,000 |
| MISC. RECEIPTS | 0 | 362 | 362 | 0 |
| AUTH. FUND BALANCE CONTRIBUTION | 120,155 | 0 | 15,273 | 163,986 |
| Total | 587,979 | 521,396 | 575,269 | 592,234 |
| EXPENDITURE SUMMARY | | | | |
| EXPENDITURE - OFFICE OPERATIONS | 98,481 | 61,341 | 93,419 | 100,401 |
| EXPENDITURE - PERSONNEL | 413,623 | 264,912 | 415,307 | 433,183 |
| EXPENDITURE - CONSULTING SERVICES | 75,874 | 34,299 | 66,543 | 58,650 |
| Total | 587,978 | 360,552 | 575,269 | 592,234 |

PROPOSED FRESNO LAFCo FY20-21 BUDGET SUMMARY
Net Operating Expense/City/County Contribution Calculation

Note: These figures are proposed estimates only. Actual figures will be developed by the County Auditor/Controller upon adoption of the Final LAFCo budget

| | Preliminary FY 20-21 Budget |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Proposed Gross Operating Expenses | 592,234 |
| Adjustments | |
| Estimated fee revenue | 65,000 |
| Proposed fund balance contribution | 163,986 |
| Net Operating Budget | 363,248 |
| Estimated Adjusted County/Cities Contribution (The final amount to be determined by the County Auditor) | |
| Estimated Net County Contribution | 181,624 |
| Estimated Net Cities' Contribution | 181,624 |

PROPOSED LAFCo LOCAL AGENCY ALLOCATION TABLE

| CITY | Proposed FY 20-21 Allocation |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| CLOVIS | \$ 25,212 |
| COALINGA | \$ 3,566 |
| FIREBAUGH | \$ 1,350 |
| FOWLER | \$ 1,088 |
| FRESNO | \$ 124,091 |
| HURON | \$ 1,120 |
| KERMAN | \$ 2,170 |
| KINGSBURG | \$ 2,232 |
| MENDOTA | \$ 1,346 |
| ORANGE COVE | \$ 1,925 |
| PARLIER | \$ 2,070 |
| REEDLEY | \$ 5,232 |
| SAN JOAQUIN | \$ 628 |
| SANGER | \$ 5,235 |
| SELMA | \$ 4,360 |
| COUNTY | \$ 181,624 |
| TOTAL | \$ 363,248 |

**Proposed FY 2020-2021 Work Program
March 18, 2020**

Based on the Commission's March 2019 discussion, 'core services' are noted.

1. PROCESS APPLICATIONS: REORGANIZATIONS, SOI AMENDMENTS, ETC.

Application processing is a *core service* in that staff evaluates applications for consistency with CKH and adopted policies to promote orderly growth. The Commission, in taking action on an application, will be balancing the proposal with its other interests.

In the event of a conflict of staff resources between application and programmatic activities application processing will take priority.

2. CONTINUE FRESNO LAFCO'S MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW PROGRAM

The MSR program is a *core service* in that it is the foundation for the update of a sphere of influence. A MSR is the analysis of the service or services to be provided by a local agency and consists of a written statement of its determinations. MSRs conclude with recommendations that encourage order, logic, and efficient service delivery by local agencies.

First priority MSRs are those held over from FY 2019-20:

- Coalinga-Huron Mosquito Abatement District
- Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District
- Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District
- Central Valley Pest Control District
- West Fresno County Red Scale Protective District
- Tri-County Hospital (formerly Kingsburg Hospital District)

Second priority MSRs, as resources are available, are the California Water Districts with 2007 MSRs:

- Broadview Water District
- Farmers Water District
- Fresno Slough Water District
- International Water District
- Westlands Water District
- Liberty Water District

Third priority are the irrigation districts with 2007 MSRs

- Consolidated Irrigation District
- Fresno Irrigation District
- Hills Valley Irrigation District
- James Irrigation District
- Riverdale Irrigation District
- Tranquillity Irrigation District

- Laguna Irrigation District

Fourth priority MSR are for other Special Districts with 2007 MSRs

- Malaga County Water District
- Big Creek CSD
- Del Rey CSD
- Lanare CSD
- Lower San Joaquin Levee District
- Westside RCD

3. PROGRAMMATIC SUPPORT OF CITIES' SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

Commissioners will recall that the SOI is a “plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the commission.” This programmatic activity is a *core service* as it supports cities’ implementation of the SOI determined by the Commission.

Based on staff’s experiences this fiscal year with the Cities’ of Huron and Reedley MSRs, as well as consultation with other cities regarding their SOIs, staff proposes a more focused and extensive outreach to each of the 15 cities as follows:

- *Phase I: Information gathering and assessment.*
LAFCo staff will establish the acreage of land within each city’s SOI that remains to be annexed; identify islands and peninsulas; identify potential land use conflicts that may result in irregular boundaries; and the city’s respective growth rates to estimate when that city will likely seek an amendment of its SOI. This information will be provided to the cities for their review and comment.
- *Phase II: Outreach*
If a city expresses an interest in staging its resources for an update of its SOI, staff will coordinate with city staff for additional outreach including presentations to city councils, planning commission’s or other organizations in support and preparation of the SOI amendment.
- *Phase III: Preparation for MSR*
Staff will work with city managers on anticipated SOI amendments to facilitate MSR update process and orient these managers on the information that is necessary for a MSR and how to best organize these data for efficient and timely analysis.

4. CONTINUE SUPPORT TO LOCAL AGENCIES AND THE PUBLIC

This is a *core service*. LAFCo exercises a unique authority over the growth and services of local agencies; so unique, in fact, that unless local agency staff are continuously engaged in annexations, SOI updates, or other LAFCo activities, the skill sets, and experiences learned are quickly replaced with other more pressing matters. It is clear to LAFCo staff that in order for the 15 cities and 112 special districts in Fresno County to interact effectively and efficiently with LAFCo it is necessary to be available to provide information, context, regulatory guidance, and other supporting services throughout the year.

BACKGROUND ON FRESNO LAFCO'S WORK PLAN

Fresno LAFCo's Financial and Accounting Procedures specify that before July 1, the LAFCo Executive Officer shall prepare for the Commission's review and approval of an annual work plan. The work plan is prepared in conjunction with the annual budget. The work plan identifies the purposes and plans of state law and local policy, including requirements for service reviews, sphere of influence updates, and other mandated functions. The budget supports the work program.

This work plan reflects the Fresno LAFCo's Policies and Procedures and the current and the dynamic needs of the local agencies in Fresno County. The work plan is composed of projects to be undertaken directly by LAFCo staff during the year.

The work plan is developed to advance the goals and mission of Fresno LAFCo, consistent with state law.

I. SCOPE OF WORK PLAN

The scope of the work plan is consistent with the legislature's findings and declarations:

- It is the policy of the state to encourage orderly growth and development, which are essential to the social, fiscal, and economic well-being of the state.
- The logical formation and determination of local agency boundaries is an important factor in promoting orderly development and in balancing that development with sometimes competing state interests of discouraging urban sprawl, preserving open-space and prime agricultural lands, and efficiently extending government services.
- Providing housing for persons and families of all incomes is an important factor in promoting orderly development.
- This policy should be effected by the logical formation and modification of the boundaries of local agencies, with a preference granted to accommodating additional growth within, or through the expansion of, the boundaries of those local agencies which can best accommodate and provide necessary governmental services and housing for persons and families of all incomes in the most efficient manner feasible.
- The Legislature also finds that, whether governmental services are proposed to be provided by a single-purpose agency, several agencies, or a multipurpose agency, responsibility should be given to the agency or agencies that can best provide government services.

II. PROJECTS OF THE WORK PLAN

The projects are identified to address important issues identified by the Commission in its initial Policies, Standards, and Procedures Document, adopted in 1986 or as revised. Fresno LAFCo identified the following list of problems and needs locally, which pertain to the Commission's responsibilities, and developed policies, standards and procedures in this

document in order to help resolve the problems and meet needs within the Commission's jurisdiction:

1. Proliferation of overlapping and competing local agencies.
2. Need for more cooperation/coordination among local agencies.
3. Inadequate level or range of services in county/community.
4. Inadequate revenue base or adverse fiscal impacts for local agencies.
5. Illogical, gerrymandered agency boundaries, islands, surrounded areas.
6. Illogical agency service areas.
7. Conflicts between urban and rural/agricultural land uses.
8. Premature proposals and lack of development proposals.
9. Phasing of agency expansion/growth.
10. Determining environmental effects of proposals.
11. Determining consistency with city or county general plans.
12. Urban sprawl and leapfrog urban development.
13. Guiding urban growth away from prime agricultural lands.
14. Defining agricultural lands and open space lands.
15. Opposition of proposals by residents and popularity of proposals by landowners/developers.
16. Provision of adequate noticing of LAFCO hearing and conducting authority hearing.

On February 18, 2015, the following Special District issues were presented to the Commission:

1. No adopted annual budget, by-laws, or procedures.
2. No services.
3. District board nonfeasance.
4. Special district is the subject of a Grand Jury reports.
5. Lack of staff or staff lacks technological/managerial/financial (T/M/F) expertise.
6. Board members fulfill both policy and operational functions.
7. Lack of coordination of similar services between and among different special districts.
8. Lack of transparency and/or Brown Act compliance.
9. Changing demographics, antiquated mission.
10. The special district does not cooperate with LAFCo on the MSR.

Other special district issues have since emerged:

11. The district board frequently lacks a quorum.
12. Board members lack technical, managerial, and/or financial expertise.
13. Board members continue to serve after terms expire (though frequently permitted by the district's principal act).
14. District does not file annual financial statements with County Auditor Controller Treasurer Tax Collector.

III. WORK PLAN CONFORMITY WITH FRESNO LAFCo GOALS

The work plan is refined annually to conform to Commission's adopted goals:

1. Encouraging orderly formation and development of agencies;

2. Encouraging consistency with spheres of influence and recommended reorganization of agencies;
3. Encouraging orderly urban development and preservation of open space patterns;
4. Encouraging conservation of prime agricultural lands and open space areas;
5. Providing public access to the Commission via the internet; and
6. LAFCo disadvantaged communities' policy.