PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 760.924.1800, fax 924.1801 commdev@mono.ca.gov PO Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 760.932.5420, fax 932.5431 www.monocounty.ca.gov

AGENDA

Wednesday, May 1, 2013 – 2:00 p.m. Town/County Conference Room, Minaret Village Mall Mammoth Lakes, California

- 1. CALL TO ORDER
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT
- 3. MINUTES: Review and approve minutes from March 20, 2013
- 4. **PUBLIC HEARING**: Consider adoption of 2013-14 Preliminary Budget
- 5. Municipal Service Review Update: Receive status report
- 6. LAFCO Handbook Fee Schedule Update: Review proposed fee schedule and consider scheduling public hearing
- 7. Mutual Water Company Survey Status Report: Receive update on new requirement and status of implementation
- 8. CALAFCO Update: Receive status report on CALAFCO participation
- 9. INFORMATIONAL:
- **10. ADJOURN** to next meeting: June 5, 2013

PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 760.924.1800, fax 924.1801 commdev@mono.ca.gov PO Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 760.932.5420, fax 932.5431 www.monocounty.ca.gov

DRAFT MINUTES

March 20, 2013

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Byng Hunt & Fred Stump, Mono County; Matthew Lehman & Jo Bacon, Town of Mammoth Lakes; Earl Henderson & Hank Brown, special districts; John Ross, public member.

STAFF PRESENT: Scott Burns, executive officer; Brent Calloway, CDD analyst; C.D. Ritter, secretary

GUESTS PRESENT: Brent Harper, Mammoth Lakes FPD; Vince Maniaci, Long Valley FPD

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Earl Henderson called the meeting to order at the Town/County Conference Room, Minaret Village Mall, Mammoth Lakes at 2:02 p.m.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

3. MINUTES:

<u>MOTION</u>: Approve minutes of June 6, 2012. (Ross/Bacon. Ayes: 5. Absent: Hunt [arrived after vote]. Abstain: Stump.)

4. PUBLIC HEARING: Bridgeport PUD MSR/SOI amendment and annexation #1301 of six parcels totaling 8.3 acres to the Bridgeport Public Utilities District: The BPUD offices, County-owned hospital and school athletic field and three vacant residential parcels along the southern edge of the historic town-site are not part of the district, and it was a logical step to annex them. The annexation fee was waived by the Mono Supervisors. Calloway indicated annexation was studied as part of required periodic review of MSR/SOI and was partially a LAFCO-initiated proposal. Elevated arsenic levels found in Bridgeport's water would require an expensive filtration system that could lead to higher rates. BPUD is working with CA Department of Public Health to resolve issue.

<u>MOTION</u>: Adopt Resolution R13-01 that amends the Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence to the Bridgeport Public Utilities District. (Hunt/Lehman. Ayes: 7.)

<u>MOTION</u>: Adopt Resolution R13-02 approving and ordering an annexation (1301) to the Bridgeport Public Utilities District. (*Bacon/Stump. Ayes: 7.*)

5. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE INITIAL REVIEW: The MSR/SOI reviews were divided into four levels based on complexity: Level 1 involved 11 agencies that needed no changes to the SOI map and recommendation; Level 2 included eight agencies that required minor clarifications and some discussion and/or research; Level 3 involved two agencies that required potentially complex staff research and/or resolution by commission review; and Level 4 was comprised of six agencies that required staff consultation with district staff before scheduling a commission review of the spheres and recommendations. Calloway reviewed levels with commissioners and solicited their direction regarding the SOI maps and recommendations.

Level 1:

- 1) <u>Wheeler Crest CSD</u>: No comment.
- 2) Wheeler Crest FPD: Commissioner Brown noted geographic distance between Wheeler Crest (WC) and Paradise does not lend to combining. The WC board is neutral, and cross coverage is allowed. Scott Burns noted that geographically split White Mountain FPD was based on separate volunteer forces. Now Mono City and Lee Vining FPDs are considering combining. Brown reminded that Mono County does not provide fire protection. Burns stated that volunteerism is entrenched, and Mono LAFCO doesn't meddle. The respective boards must agree and initiate any reorganization. Brown indicated Spheres of Influence (spheres) would have to be redone after a consolidation. Commissioner Stump stated WC is content, but could discuss with Paradise.

Commissioner Henderson suggested LAFCO could initiate and get agreement, but not push an attempt to consolidate. WC and Paradise ought to talk. Burns stated LAFCO is not aggressive unless communities agree, as it would be wasting energy. Commissioner Henderson thought LAFCO could be a liaison.

- 3) <u>Antelope Valley Water District</u>: The district is inactive. Had an irrigation focus, but might be useful in the future as water rights involve the Walker River. Commissioner Stump requested including the Marine Housing facility on the map.
- White Mountain FPD: Its map shows lots of islands within the coterminous sphere, yet detached from the district, created by attempts to avoid property tax when Proposition 13 passed in 1978. Maintain recommendation that the islands be annexed.
- 5) Chalfant FPD/CSD: No comment.
- 6) <u>June Lake FPD</u>: No comment.
- 7) <u>Mammoth Lakes CSD</u>: Commissioner Hunt noted that Old Mammoth was historically separate.
- 8) <u>Southern Mono Healthcare District</u>: The district does not include north of Bridgeport, or Paradise and Swall Meadows to the south.
- 9) <u>Hilton Creek CSD</u>: Commissioner Stump noted the CSD provides sewage only, not water, and that the sewage treatment plant is not within the district or sphere..
- 10) <u>Mammoth Lakes FPD</u>: Scott Burns indicated CD-4 geothermal wells are within the sphere, but some are beyond. Inyo National Forest is looking at it. The FPD covers all of Mammoth Lakes except the airport island, which is covered by Long Valley FPD.
- 11) <u>Birchim CSD</u>: Commissioner Stump noted that the LVFPD station 2 parcel should be in the sphere.

Level 2:

- 1) <u>Mono City FPD</u>: Sphere should include station.
- <u>Bridgeport FPD</u>: District was set up where houses exist. Leave it as is, but talk to district. Commissioner Stump noted that the district is allowed to bill for services to property not located in the district.
- 3) <u>Paradise FPD</u>: Move fire station into sphere.
- 4) <u>Lee Vining FPD</u>: Contact district about sphere, as the FPD has only three board members instead of five.
- 5) <u>June Lake PUD</u>: Look into PUD-owned facilities not within sphere.
- 6) <u>Antelope Valley FPD</u>: Its third fire station is not on the map and is the main facility. Need to clean up conditional spheres.
- 7) Long Valley FPD: Vince Maniaci, fire chief, requested striking obsolete verbiage: The Long Valley FPD has a small auxiliary station at the Hot Creek Fish Hatchery, which is intended to provide additional coverage in response to recent development at the airport until additional facilities can be completed at the airport. Scott Burns clarified that a "minus" sphere is within the district but not within the sphere and should be detached. Burns noted rural LAFCOs struggle with land ownership patterns, mostly federal. Most districts include federal land. Commissioner Stump noted that the Sherwin Fire a few years ago was on federal land, but advantageously was also within the local district.
- 8) <u>Lee Vining PUD</u>: The PUD serves parcels outside its boundary, so the district is not accurate. Talk to PUD about cleanup. Supervisor Stump noted severe capacity issues.

Level 3:

- 1) <u>Bridgeport PUD</u>: The sphere should include everything that is appropriate.
- 2) <u>Mammoth Lakes Mosquito Abatement</u>: District is confined to Old Mammoth, with opportunity to expand to a regional service by contracting with the Owens Valley MAD.

Level 4:

- 1-4) <u>Countywide CSA</u>: Does it include Mammoth Lakes? Originally were set up for television service,CSA services have expanded and are not reflected in MSR/SOIs.
- 5-6) <u>TOML and MCWD</u>: Both MSR/SOIs contain large amount of outdated detail. Scott Burns thought level of detail could be reduced. Commissioner Bacon indicated that it is not a high priority for the Town to dedicate resources to updating the information.

6. MONO LAFCO HANDBOOK: Brent Calloway indicated that the handbook includes some information geared toward urban areas, and staff continues fine tuning to reflect rural Mono County. Commissioner comments will be solicited at the next meeting. Post the draft handbook on the website when ready for distribution to Special Districts.

7. ADJOURN at 3:56 p.m. to preliminary budget hearing May 1, 2013, at 2 p.m.

P.O. Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 (760) 924-1800, fax 924-1801 commdev@mono.ca.gov P.O. Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 (760) 932-5420, fax 932-5431 www.monocounty.ca.gov

STAFF REPORT

May 1, 2013

TO: Mono LAFCO

FROM: Scott Burns, Executive Officer

RE: 2013-14 PRELIMINARY BUDGET

RECOMMENDATION

Following the close of the public hearing, find that reduced staffing and program costs reflected in the proposed budget will still allow Mono LAFCO to fulfill its purposes and requirements, and adopt the attached preliminary budget for fiscal year 2013-14.

BACKGROUND

In accordance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act), a public hearing is scheduled today to adopt the preliminary budget for fiscal year 2013-14. The budget must be at least equal to the budget adopted for the previous fiscal year unless the commission finds that reducing staffing or program costs will still allow the LAFCO to fulfill the purposes and requirements of the Act.

The proposed preliminary budget reflects a slight reduction in costs from the current year budget of \$15,000. This reduction is proposed due to a grant obtained by Mono County that allows LAFCO-related activities, specifically a portion of the update of the Sphere of Influence and Municipal Service Reviews, to be grant funded. This grant is also available for the second half of this fiscal year, so we expect current year expenditures to be several thousand dollars less than the current year budget. The latest Finance Department record of LAFCO expenditures to date will be provided at Wednesday's meeting.

ALTERNATIVE APPORTIONMENT

The CKH Act establishes methods for apportioning LAFCO staffing and program costs among the County, Town and special districts. The law allows alternative apportionment methods which Mono LAFCO has used in the past to avoid impacting financially constrained special districts. Prior to last year, LAFCO costs were fully borne by the Town of Mammoth Lakes and Mono County. This current fiscal year, the commission developed and adopted a new alternative apportionment method to consist of a third from Mono County; a third from the Town of Mammoth Lakes; and a third from special districts, with the special district share provided exclusively from the Southern Mono Healthcare District and the Mammoth Community Water District, rather than from all independent special districts.

This proposed preliminary budget reflects the same alternative budget apportionment method used for the current fiscal year, which consists of a third from Mono County (\$4,045); a third from the Town of Mammoth Lakes (\$4,045); and a third from the special districts (\$4,045). Instead of all independent special districts in Mono County contributing, this alternative apportionment consists of \$2,022.50 from Southern Mono Healthcare District and \$2,022.50 from the Mammoth Community Water District.

FY 13-14 BUDGET

The attached proposed budget for fiscal year 2013-14 calls for maintaining a status-quo funding level. LAFCO staff activity this past year has entailed:

- responding to occasional LAFCO inquiries;
- processing of an annexation and SOI amendment for the Bridgeport Public Utility District;

- responding to new state law requirements concerning mutual water companies and disadvantaged communities;
- conducting reviews of agency Spheres of Influence/Municipal Service Reviews;
- reviewing the accuracy of district maps with the Assessor and GIS Coordinator;
- worked with the Agricultural Commissioner mosquito abatement service options;
- reviewed legislation;
- worked with Mono County and several County Service Areas on capital programming;
- examined potential special district roles in Digital 395;
- participated with CALAFCO;
- reviewed development projects and CEQA documents for potential LAFCO issues;
- facilitated mutual water company annexation consideration of an approved development; and
- secured grant funds for coordination of the SOI/MSR updates with local General Plan updates.

Anticipated work tasks this year include:

- concluding review and update of Sphere of Influence/Municipal Service Reviews, including supporting CEQA documentation;
- responding to application activity, including application processing;
- reflecting LAFCO policies in the Mono County General Plan update;
- concluding the mutual water company inventory;
- providing support in the transition of the mosquito abatement service structure;
- concluding the update of the LAFCO Handbook; and
- updating membership via a special district selection committee election process.

This expected level of activity, which is similar to last year, is reflected in the following recommended FY 2013-14 preliminary budget:

FY 2013-14 PRELIMINARY BUDGET

Salary and Benefits	\$8,733
Memberships (CALAFCO)	\$800
Office Expense	\$200
Travel and Training	\$1,500
Legal Notices	\$300
A-87 Cost Plan Charges	\$602
TOTAL	\$12,135

DISCUSSION DRAFT

RESOLUTION R13-____ A RESOLUTION OF THE MONO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCO) ADOPTING A SCHEDULE OF FEES FOR THE FILING AND PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS WITH THE COMMISSION

WHEREAS, under the provisions of Government Code Section 56383 the Commission is authorized to establish a schedule of fees; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 56484, proper public notice has been given and a public hearing was held regarding the establishment of a fee schedule.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Commission establishes the following schedule of fees:

MONO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION FEE SCHEDULE

Application and processing fees are based on time and materials, and, unless otherwise noted, are deposits toward actual costs incurred by LAFCO staff. Fees in excess of the deposit that accrue during permit processing are billed separately. All services are provided at the hourly rate for staff (currently \$99/hr).

Petition check plus signature check	Actual cost
Application Processing	
Annexation or Detachment	
Under 100 acres	\$495
100 acres & larger	\$495
Dissolution of District for Inactivity	No charge
Extension of District Powers	\$495
Merger of Subsidiary District	\$495
Consolidation	\$495
Incorporation	\$495
Formation of Special District	\$495
Disincorporation	\$495
Reorganization	
Under 100 acres	\$495
100 acres & larger	\$495
Sphere of Influence Amendment	\$495
Environmental Exemption	\$ 99 (actual cost)
Negative Declaration & Tiered Environmental	\$495
Environmental Impact Report	\$495
Copies of reports and papers on file	Actual cost

Exceptions to Required Fees: A fee will not be charged for applications submitted by the County of Mono by resolution, or for applications that result from specific conditions or recommendations made by a Commission resolution, including Spheres of Influence. The Commission may waive any fee if it determines that the imposition of such a fee will be detrimental to the public interest.

APPROVED and ADOPTED this ____ day of _____ 2013, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Earl Henderson, Chair Mono County LAFCO

C.D. Ritter Secretary to LAFCO

APPROVED AS TO FORM

Marshall Rudolph, LAFCO Counsel

PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546 (760) 924-1800, fax 924-1801 commdev@mono.ca.gov PO Box 8 Bridgeport, CA 93517 (760) 932-5420, fax 932-5431 www.monocounty.ca.gov

STAFF REPORT

May 1, 2013

TO: Mono LAFCO

FROM: Brent Calloway, Analyst Scott Burns, Executive Officer

RE: Mutual Water Company Update

Recommendations

Informational only

Project Description/Background

California State Assembly Bill 54 was approved and signed into law in 2011. The legislation focuses on mutual water companies and involves, in part, their provision of information and materials to LAFCOs. The mutual water companies are required to provide LAFCO with a map depicting their service boundaries and, when requested, any information that may be useful for Municipal Service Reviews.

To fulfill state mandates, LAFCO sent a request for a service area map, and offered to create a map if one was not available, along with a short informational survey to the seven mutual water companies operating in Mono County. Responses have been received from three of the seven (Mountain Meadows, Crowley Lake and Lower Rock Creek), and staff will attempt phone contact with the remaining four companies.

LAFCO's interaction with mutual water companies is currently the subject of proposed State legislation.

Attachment

• Mutual Water Company Survey

MUTUAL WATER COMPANY SURVEY

Welcome to the mutual water company survey! This survey is intended to help Mono County's mutual water companies and the Mono Local Agency Formation Commission (Mono LAFCO) to fulfill the new state mandate in Assembly Bill 54.

Please answer each question and return the completed form to our office by *January 25, 2013*. We appreciate your assistance!

1. Name of your mutual water company:

2. Please provide contact information for the mutual water company representative who completes this survey: Name, Phone, Email Address:

3. In what year was your mutual water company formed?

4. Approximately how many people does your company currently serve?

5. How many service connections does your company currently provide?

6. Approximately how many miles of pipeline are owned and/or maintained by your mutual water company?

7. Does your mutual water company own or operate other types of infrastructure (i.e., pumping or lift stations, water purification systems, etc.) in addition to wells?

Yes No

If yes, please list.

- 8. How many members are on your governing board?
- 9. How are board members selected?
- ___ Elected
- ___ Appointed
 - If appointed, by whom?
- 10. What is the term of office of each board member?
- 11. How often do shareholders of your mutual water company meet?
- 12. Where is the shareholders' meeting held?
- 13. If your mutual water company employs staff, please list the position(s).

14. If your mutual water company contracts for services, please indicate contracted services.

15. If your mutual water company has no staff, please explain who handles administrative and operational responsibilities.

16. Which of the following does your mutual water company see as challenge(s) in the next 20 years? Check all that apply.

- Population growth
- ___ Infrastructure
- ___ State regulations and mandates
- ____ Local regulations and mandates
- ___ Financial constraints
- ___ Other: please specify

17. Given the challenges you described in the previous answer, please briefly describe how your mutual water company is preparing for the future.

18. What should or could public agencies do to make it easier for your mutual water company to address your local service challenges?

19. If your mutual water company has a website, please provide the address.

This completes the survey. Thank you very much! Please submit the survey by:

- Email: bcalloway@mono.ca.gov
- Mail: Mono LAFCO Attn: Brent Calloway PO Box 347 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546