Grand Jury Report

RESPONSE FORM

Grand Jury Report Title: ***FORMING AND REFORMING A COMMUNITY***
Report Dated: ***MAY 1, 2013***

Response Form Submitted By:

Dan Hamburg, Chair, Board of Supervisors
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
501 Low Gap Rd, Room 1010
Ukiah, CA 95482

FINDINGS

☐ I (we) agree with the Findings numbered: _____

☒ I (we) disagree wholly or partially with the Findings numbered: F3, F4

Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefore.)

RECOMMENDATIONS

☒ Recommendation(s) numbered R4 have been implemented. (Attach a summary describing the implemented actions.)

☐ Recommendation(s) numbered _____ have not yet been implemented, but will Be implemented in the future (Attach a timeframe for the implementation.)

☐ Recommendation(s) numbered _____ require further analysis. (Attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of the planned analysis, and a time frame for the matter to be prepared, discussed and approved by the officer and/or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed. This time frame shall not exceed six (6) months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury Report.)

☒ Recommendations numbered R3 will NOT be implemented because they are not warranted and/or are not deemed reasonable. (Attach an explanation.)

I have completed the above responses, and have attached, as required the following number of pages to this response form:

Number of Pages attached: 2

I understand that responses to Grand Jury Reports are public records. They will be posted on the Grand Jury website: www.co.mendocino.ca.us/grandjury. The clerk of the responding agency is required to maintain a copy of the response.

I understand that I must submit this signed response form and any attachments as follows:

First Step: E-mail (word documents or scanned pdf file format) to:

- The Grand Jury Foreperson at: grandjury@co.mendocino.ca.us
- The Presiding Judge: grandjury@mendocino.courts.ca.gov

Second Step: Mail all originals to:

Mendocino County Grand Jury
P.O. Box 939
Ukiah, CA 95482

Printed Name: Dan Hamburg

Title: Chair, Mendocino County Board of Supervisors

Signed: _____ Date: _____

FINDINGS:

Finding 3: The Board of Supervisors partially disagrees with this finding. The Local Agency Formation Commission ("LAFCO") is statutorily authorized to address water and sewer service issues only in the context of the statutorily authorized actions and applications placed before it. These actions and applications include municipal service reviews ("MSRs"), spheres of influence establishments and amendments ("SOIs"), consolidation proposals brought by local agencies, annexations and the like. LAFCO will address water and sewer service issues through the considerations of these applications as needed.

Finding 4: The Board of Supervisors disagrees with this finding. The Board first disagrees with the use of the term "proliferation" as a descriptive term for the current circumstances of existing local government agencies. There have been no additional formations of agencies since 1990. It is a matter of opinion in the view of the Board, whether or not there are too many local agencies. The number of local agencies providing services to local residents reflects an existing and historical policy regarding district creation and delivery of services. The Board also notes for the record, the 1990 Valley Wide Task Force Report, containing policy recommendations which were not carried out by local government agencies at that time.

***RECOMMENDATIONS*:**

Recommendation 3: The Board of Supervisors notes that LAFCO is authorized to act on specific applications and carry out specified actions such as SOIs and MSRs. In addition, LAFCO is authorized to identify opportunities for changes in the structure of local government agencies and the delivery of services. The Board also notes, in the context of LAFCO's powers, that there are two districts (Redwood Valley County Water District and the Russian River Flood and Water Conservation Control District) that are discussing actual and formal consolidation on their own. Discussions regarding "functional consolidation" of district resources and shared administration, short of formal LAFCO-approved consolidation, have been, and continue to occur, between Redwood Valley County Water District, Millview County Water District, Willow County Water District, Hopland Public Utility District, Calpella County Water District and the Russian River Estates. These actions and discussions are intended to share administration costs, create savings for the districts and increase district efficiency.

Recommendation 4: The Board of Supervisors agrees that LAFCO should be more visibly consistent with the statutory mandates and powers given to it by the State Legislature. Please see the specific measures cited by LAFCO in its response to the Grand Jury regarding Recommendation 4.