

---

**FRESNO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION (LAFCo)  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

---

**AGENDA ITEM No. 8**

**DATE:** April 18, 2007

**TO:** Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission

**FROM:** Rick Ballantyne, Executive Officer  
Darrel Schmidt, Deputy Executive Officer  
Bob Braitman, Braitman & Associates

**SUBJECT:** **Consider Adoption** – Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence Updates prepared for the following Districts:

1. Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District
2. Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District
3. Fresno-Westside Mosquito Abatement District
4. Central Valley Pest Control District.

**Summary / Background**

On December 13, 2006, the Commission directed staff to enter into a contract with Braitman & Associates to prepare Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) and Sphere of Influence (SOI) Updates for numerous cities and special districts. The attached MSRs represent studies prepared for four of the six Mosquito Abatement/Pest Control Districts operating within Fresno County. The two outstanding studies will be prepared and presented upon receipt of survey information that was previously requested, but has yet to be received.

Municipal Service Reviews provide a comprehensive review of the services provided by a city or district and present recommendations with regard to the condition and adequacy of these services and whether or not any modifications to a city or district's SOI is necessary. MSRs can be used as information tools by LAFCo and local agencies in evaluating the efficiencies of current district operations and may suggest changes in order to better serve the public.

SOI updates may involve an affirmation of the existing SOI boundaries or recommend modifications to the SOI boundary. LAFCo is not required to initiate changes to an SOI based on findings and recommendations of the service review, although it does have the power to do so. Such updates are required by State law to be conducted every five years. MSRs are required to be prepared prior to or in conjunction with SOI updates.

State law requires that the Commission in its consideration of the MSRs adopt written determinations for each of the following nine criteria:

1. Infrastructure needs or deficiencies.
2. Growth and population projections for the affected area.
3. Financing constraints and opportunities.
4. Cost avoidance opportunities.
5. Opportunities for rate restructuring.
6. Opportunities for shared facilities.
7. Government structure options, including advantages and disadvantages of the consolidation or reorganization of service providers.
8. Evaluation of management efficiencies.

## 9. Local accountability and governance.

As part of the SOI update, if the Commission determines that modifications to a district's SOI boundary is appropriate, it is required to consider the following four criteria and make appropriate determinations in relationship to each of the following criteria:

1. The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.
2. The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.
3. The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide.
4. The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

### **Environmental Determination**

Staff has determined that consideration of and adoption of the Mosquito Abatement and Pest Control District Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence determinations are actions considered to be "Categorically Exempt" as per Section 15306 (Information Collection) of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (CEQA). Any change to a District's Sphere of Influence resulting from recommendations adopted by the Commission will require additional review under CEQA.

### **Discussion & Summary of Determinations**

#### **1. Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District**

- A. The MSR/SOI Update Report supports the District's request to expand its present boundaries to include areas within Eastern Fresno County. A separate application for a SOI Revision and Annexation will be presented under Agenda Item # 9.

The Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District (MAD) is located within the Cities of Clovis, Fowler, Kingsburg, Parlier, Reedley, Orange Cove, Sanger, and Selma, a portion of the City of Fresno, and the unincorporated areas surrounding these cities. The District provides services including mosquito and disease surveillance, mosquito suppression and control, mosquito source reduction and public education for abatement of mosquitoes and vector-borne disease. District boundaries are coterminous with its Sphere of Influence and encompass approximately 1,058 square miles including approximately 18 square miles in Kings County.

The District is adjacent to the Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control, Fresno Westside Mosquito Abatement, and Coalinga-Huron Mosquito Abatement Districts on its west side. The District is the easternmost mosquito abatement district in Fresno County. Approximately 2,430 square miles located east of the District and within Fresno County are not within the SOI of a mosquito abatement district. The District has submitted a request to revise its present SOI to include this area. A separate application to consider this expansion will be considered following this item.

Based on the information received from the District it appears that an update of the District's sphere of influence to include the 2,430 square mile area to the east is warranted. Without expansion, this area will no longer receive mosquito abatement services. No expansion to the north, south, or west is considered warranted as the District abuts the Fresno County boundary and other mosquito abatement districts on these three sides.

The District has an office located in Selma and operates five “depots” from which it serves the areas within the District. The majority of revenues received by the District are generated from property taxes. Additional revenues are generated from fees, interest, and dividends.

The MSR did not identify any obvious opportunities for rate restructuring, or shared facilities, with the exception of possibly consolidating the District’s operations with other mosquito abatement districts, although such possibility was not recommended. The District did not express a desire to consolidate with other districts at this time. In order to reduce potential costs, the District participates in a joint chemical purchase bidding program with other districts, shares equipment with other districts, and is part of a self-insurance pool for liability, workers compensation, and other insurances.

## **2. Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District**

A. Maintain the District’s existing Sphere of Influence boundaries.

The Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District is located within the City of Kerman, a portion of the City of Fresno, and the surrounding unincorporated area. The District provides mosquito and disease surveillance, mosquito suppression and control, mosquito source reduction and public education for abatement of mosquitoes and vector-borne disease. The District’s boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous, encompassing approximately 281 square miles.

The District’s office is located in Fresno. A majority of the District’s revenues are derived from property taxes and parcel assessments. The MSR did not identify any obvious opportunities for rate restructuring, or shared facilities with the exception of possibly consolidating the District’s operations with other mosquito abatement districts, although such possibility was not recommended. The District did not express a desire to consolidate with other districts at this time.

In order to reduce potential costs, the District participates in a joint chemical purchase bidding program with other districts, shares equipment with other districts, and is part of a self-insurance pool for liability, workers compensation, and other insurances.

The District has not proposed any SOI changes. The present District boundaries are adequate to provide efficient and effective mosquito abatement services to the service area.

## **3. Fresno Westside Mosquito Abatement District.**

A. Maintain the District’s existing Sphere of Influence boundaries.

B. The District Board of Directors should initiate discussions with the City of San Joaquin regarding the possibility of annexing the remaining one-square mile located within the City of San Joaquin to the District. This action should be initiated by the District.

C. The District Board of Directors should initiate discussions with all Mosquito Abatement Districts operating within Fresno County to determine interest in consolidation of Districts to better serve Fresno County residents.

The Fresno Westside Mosquito Abatement District is located in the Cities of Mendota and Firebaugh, a portion of the City of San Joaquin, and the unincorporated area surrounding these cities. The District’s SOI is not coterminous with the District’s boundaries, as the District’s SOI surrounds the City of San Joaquin, but a portion in the city, approximately one square mile in size, remains separate from the District. Mosquito abatement services are not provided to this

portion of the city. The District's boundaries encompass approximately 1,288 square miles and about the Coalinga-Huron Mosquito Abatement, Consolidated Mosquito Abatement, and Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control Districts.

The District's office is located in Firebaugh. A majority of the District's revenues are derived from property taxes and parcel assessments. Services provided by the District include mosquito and disease surveillance, mosquito suppression and control, mosquito source reduction and public education for abatement of mosquitoes and vector-borne disease.

The District suggests that annexation of the approximately one-mile square area in the City of San Joaquin, which is located within the District's SOI, may result in more effective mosquito abatement. Because this portion of the City is not within the District, the District does not serve that area. As a result, mosquito control and disease surveillance and prevention is not consistent area wide, which is necessary for abatement measures to be as effective as possible.

District representatives indicated that they previously surveyed San Joaquin area residents to determine their interests in receiving mosquito abatement services from the District. They reported that very few surveys were returned. Given this response, the District would be willing to entertain an annexation proposal if initiated by LAFCo or by the City of San Joaquin.

Information provided by the District indicates that financial cuts have affected its ability to keep up with the latest technology and science related to the services it provides. The District suggests that consolidation with one or more of the other mosquito abatement districts located in Fresno County may result in provision of expanded and more effective services to its constituents without additional costs. The District has not yet thoroughly investigated the costs and benefits of consolidation.

The MSR did not identify any obvious opportunities for rate restructuring, or shared facilities, with the exception of consolidating the District's operations with other mosquito abatement districts. The District provides health and life insurance through the Central California Vector Control Joint Powers Agency and is a part of mutual aid agreements with other mosquito control agencies in the south San Joaquin Valley.

The District has not proposed any SOI changes. Given the District's present boundaries in relationship to the other Abatement Districts, there is no indication that an expansion or a reduction in the District's SOI is necessary in order to provide more efficient and effective mosquito abatement service to the area.

#### **4. Central Valley Pest Control District**

- A. Maintain the District's existing Sphere of Influence boundaries.

The Central Valley Pest Control District is located in the southeastern portion of the County adjacent to Tulare County and includes the cities of Orange Cove and Reedley and surrounding unincorporated areas, encompassing approximately 659 square miles. The District's boundaries and SOI are coterminous.

Services provided by the District include control and eradication of various citrus pests, and in particular citrus tristeza virus. The District has no facilities or employees. All staffing and services are provided through the Central California Tristeza Eradication Agency—a joint powers authority to which the District belongs.

The MSR did not identify any obvious opportunities for rate restructuring. Cost avoidance opportunities have already been realized in that its operations are consolidated with other functions performed by the Central California Tristeza Eradication Agency.

The District has not proposed any changes in its sphere of influence and no information has been submitted indicating changes to the existing sphere of influence are warranted.

**Recommendations:**

- A. Acting as Lead Agency pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, find that prior to adopting the written determinations, the Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence determinations under consideration are Categorical Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 15306, "Information Collection".
- B. Find the Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence Updates prepared for the Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District, Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District, Fresno Westside Mosquito Abatement District, and Central Valley Pest Control District are complete and satisfactory.
- C. Find that the written determinations within the Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence Updates satisfy State Law.
- D. Pursuant to Government Code Sections 56425 and 56430 adopt the determinations as presented in the Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update documents.

**RESOLUTION NO. MSR-07-1**

**FRESNO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION  
FRESNO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

**In the Matter of**

**LAFCo Determination**

RESOLUTION ADOPTING MUNICIPAL )  
SERVICE REVIEWS AND MAKING )  
DETERMINATIONS FOR THE )  
SPHERES OF INFLUENCE OF THE )  
CONSOLIDATED MOSQUITO ABATE- )  
MENT DISTRICT; FRESNO MOSQUITO - )  
& VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT; )  
FRESNO WESTSIDE MOSQUITO )  
ABATEMENT DISTRICT; AND )  
CENTRAL VALLEY PEST CONTROL )  
DISTRICT )

ADOPT MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEWS  
PREPARED FOR THE CONSOLIDATED  
MOSQUITO ABATEMENT DISTRICT; THE  
FRESNO MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL  
DISTRICT; FRESNO WESTSIDE MOSQUITO  
ABATEMENT DISTRICT; AND CENTRAL  
VALLEY PEST CONTROL DISTRICT; AND  
ADOPT FINDINGS FOR EACH DISTRICT'S  
SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Government Code Section 56425 et. Seq.) the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission is required to review and update, as necessary, Spheres of Influence of local agencies not less than once every five years; and

**WHEREAS**, Government Code Section 56430 directs the Commission to conduct a review of municipal services not later than the time it considers an action to establish or update a Sphere of Influence; and

**WHEREAS**, notice of this Commission's hearing of said request was duly given in a publication of general circulation as required by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Government Reorganization Act of 2000 and State law, and at the time and in the form and manner provided by law; and

**WHEREAS**, the Commission has heard, discussed and considered all relevant evidence, including but not limited to the Executive Officer's *Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update Report*, environmental documentation, applicable land use plans and all testimony, correspondence and exhibits received during the public hearing process, all of which are included herein by reference.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Local Agency Formation Commission of the County of Fresno does **HEREBY STATE, FIND, RESOLVE, DETERMINE, AND ORDER** as follows:

**Section #1.** Acting as Lead Agency pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, this Commission finds that prior to adopting the written determinations, the Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence determinations under consideration are Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 15306, "Information Collection".

**Section #2.** This Commission hereby accepts the Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence Updates prepared for the Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District, Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District, Fresno Westside Mosquito Abatement District, and Central Valley Pest Control District prepared by Fresno LAFCo, finds them complete and satisfactory, and adopts their analysis and recommendations.

**Section #3.** This Commission finds that the written determinations within the Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence Updates satisfy State Law.

**Section #4.** Pursuant to Government Code Sections 56425 and 56430 this Commission hereby adopts the determinations as presented in the Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update documents.

**Section #5.** - The Executive Officer is hereby authorized and directed to mail certified copies of this resolution as provided in Government Code Section 56882 and to file, as appropriate, in the office of the Fresno County Clerk all environmental documents, if any, pertaining to the approval of this Proposal, as required by State law.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ADOPTED THIS 18<sup>th</sup> DAY OF APRIL, 2007, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:**

**AYES:** Commissioners Anderson, Lopez, Rodriguez, Fortune, Waterston

**NOES:** None

**ABSENT:** None

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)  
COUNTY OF FRESNO )

**CERTIFICATION**

I, Bob Waterston, Chairman of the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo), Fresno County, State of California, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Commission on the 18<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2007.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Bob Waterston, Chairman  
Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission





# **MOSQUITO ABATEMENT, VECTOR CONTROL, AND PEST CONTROL DISTRICTS**

## **MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE**

Report to the  
**Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission**

*April 2007*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Introduction and Overview	Section A
	1. Before LAFCOs	
	2. LAFCO – Formed to regulate local boundary changes	
	3. Fresno LAFCO	
	4. Legislative History	
	5. Requirement to Prepare Municipal Service Reviews	
	6. Requirement to Update Sphere of Influence	
B.	Mosquito Abatement / Vector Control / Pest Control Districts	Section B
C.	Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District	Section C
	1. Municipal Service Review	
	2. MSR Determinations	
	3. Sphere of Influence Review and Update	
	4. Acknowledgements and References	
	5. Recommendations	
D.	Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District	Section D
	1. Municipal Service Review	
	2. MSR Determinations	
	3. Sphere of Influence Review and Update	
	4. Acknowledgements and References	
	5. Recommendations	
E.	Fresno Westside Mosquito Abatement District	Section E
	1. Municipal Service Review	
	2. MSR Determinations	
	3. Sphere of Influence Review and Update	
	4. Acknowledgements and References	
	5. Recommendations	
F.	Central Valley Pest Control District	Section F
	1. Municipal Service Review	
	2. MSR Determinations	
	3. Sphere of Influence Review and Update	
	4. Acknowledgements and References	
	5. Recommendations	

## **A: GENERAL INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW**

Local Agency Formation Commissions (or LAFCOs) are a method unique to California in dealing with population growth and public service conditions that became evident in a significant way following World War II.

During and after World War II, California experienced a dramatic increase in population and economic development. These changes, together with increased personal mobility related to common automobile ownership created growing demands for housing, public services, and public infrastructure, often in suburban areas.

### **1. Before LAFCOs**

Prior to 1964, decisions to expand city and special district boundaries were left to the annexing agency and the affected landowners. There was no external or third party oversight.

As a result, and due to the desires of some communities to capture their perceived share of new growth, annexation “wars” evolved between some agencies with some expanding their area to be in a better position to annex additional territory. The creation of new cities or special districts also occurred without any third party review.

A general lack of coordination led to a multitude of overlapping, inefficient jurisdictional and service boundaries and premature conversion of much of the State’s productive agricultural and open-space lands. The result was “urban sprawl.”

Recognizing these problems, in 1959 newly elected Governor Edmund G. Brown, Sr. appointed the Commission on Metropolitan Area Problems. Its task was to study and make recommendations on the "misuse of land resources" and the growing complexity of local governmental jurisdictions.

The Commission's revelations about local governments were converted into legislation enacted in 1963 that created a Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in each county (except the City and County of San Francisco).

### **2. LAFCO – Formed to regulate local boundary changes**

Beginning in 1964, local boundary changes required approval of this new Commission with county-wide regulatory authority. Its broad goals and objectives include discouraging urban sprawl, encouraging the orderly formation and development of local governments based on local circumstances, promoting efficient and economical local governments and, where appropriate, guiding development away from agricultural and open space resources.

LAFCO regulates by approving or denying city and special district boundary changes and the extension of public services. It is empowered to undertake studies of local agencies and to initiate updates to the spheres of influence. Typically, applications to LAFCO originate with affected landowners and/or developers and cities or districts seeking to annex territory.

The Commission is an independent agency, exercising a direct grant of legislative authority from the State government. Its decisions, while subject to judicial review, are not appealable to the County or any other local or State-wide administrative body.

### 3. Fresno LAFCO

The Fresno LAFCO consists of five regular members: two members appointed by the Board of Supervisors from its own membership; two members of city councils appointed by the mayors of the cities in the County; and one public member, appointed by the other Commissioners.

There are also three alternates – one in each category of member - who vote in the absence of a regular member. Commissioners are appointed to four-year terms.

The day-to-day business of the Commission, including analysis and recommendations about proposals is the responsibility of the Executive Officer. The Commission has appointed a legal counsel for assistance.

### 4. Legislative History (Significant Changes Only)

Through a series of legislation over the past 34 years LAFCO has become responsible for coordinating logical, timely changes in the local governmental structure, including annexations and detachments of territory, incorporations of cities, formations of special districts, consolidations, mergers and dissolutions, and to regulate the extension of services by cities and special districts outside of their boundaries.

A brief timeline of significant legislation and litigation that shaped LAFCO's current powers and duties is useful to understanding the need for Municipal Service Reviews.

- 1964 LAFCO is created as a regulatory agency in each county to regulate cities and districts, promote orderly boundaries and discourage urban sprawl.
- 1971 LAFCO becomes a planning agency when directed by the Legislature to prepare and adopt a “sphere of influence” of each city and special district.
- 1976 Due to a legal challenge to a city annexation, the courts declare LAFCOs are subject to the California Environmental Quality Act and annexations are “projects” under CEQA.
- 1983 Responding to a lawsuit involving an annexation, the Legislature dictates

firm time limits for LAFCOs to adopt spheres of influence or lose the ability to approve annexations.

- 1985 LAFCO and boundary change statutes are combined into one volume, the Cortese/Knox Local Government Reorganization Act.
- 1993 Significant reforms include allowing LAFCO to initiate special district reorganizations and waive certain conduct authority protest hearings.
- 2000 LAFCO required to (1) review and update spheres a least every five years and (2) prepare Municipal Service Reviews when updating spheres.

##### 5. Legislative Requirement to Prepare Municipal Service Reviews

Two separate studies recommended that LAFCOs review local agencies.

Little Hoover Commission - A May 2000 Little Hoover Commission report, *Special Districts: Relics of the Past or Resources for the Future?*, focused on governance and financial problems among independent special districts, and barriers to LAFCO's pursuit of district consolidation and dissolution.

The report focused on the need for special districts oversight, noting "the underlying patchwork of special district governments has become unnecessarily redundant, inefficient and unaccountable." It raised concerns about a lack of visibility and accountability among some independent special districts and indicated many special districts have excessive reserve funds and questionable property tax revenue. The report expressed concern about the lack of financial oversight of the districts.

The report called on the legislature to increase the oversight of special districts by mandating that LAFCOs identify service duplications and study reorganization alternatives when service duplications are identified, when a district appears insolvent, when district reserves are excessive, when rate inequities surface, when a district's mission changes, when a new city incorporates and when service levels are unsatisfactory.

To accomplish this, the report recommended the state strengthen the independence and funding of LAFCOs, require districts to report to their respective LAFCO, and require LAFCOs to study service duplications.

Commission on Local Governance - The second report, *Growth Within Bounds: Planning California Governance for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, had its genesis in legislation that created the Commission on Local Governance for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century in 1997. It was established to review current statutes on the policies, criteria, procedures and precedents for city, county and special district boundary changes.

The 21<sup>st</sup> Century Commission released its final report in January 2000. It examined how local government is organized and operates, and established a vision of how the state will grow by “making better use of the often invisible LAFCOs in each county.”

The report points to the expectation that California’s population will double over the first four decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, and raises concern that our government institutions were designed when our population was much smaller and our society was less complex. The report warns that, without a strategy, open spaces will be swallowed up, expensive freeway extensions will be needed, job centers will become farther removed from housing, and this will lead to longer commutes, increased pollution and a more stressful lifestyle.

The report suggests local governments face unprecedented challenges in their ability to finance service delivery since voters cut property tax revenues in 1978 and the legislature shifted property tax revenues from local government to schools in 1993.

The report recommended encouraging effective, efficient and easily understandable government and suggested that LAFCOs cannot achieve their fundamental purposes without a comprehensive knowledge of the services available within its county, the current efficiency of providing service within various areas of the county, future needs for each service, and expansion capacity of each service provider. Further, the report asserted that many LAFCOs lack such knowledge, and should be required to conduct such reviews to ensure that municipal services are logically extended to meet California’s future growth and development.

The Report’s recommendations were made part of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000. The law requires LAFCO to periodically update spheres of influence and review municipal services before updating them.

Municipal Service Reviews (MSRs) are intended to provide LAFCO and the public with a comprehensive study of existing and future public service conditions and evaluate organizational options to accommodate growth, prevent urban sprawl and ensure that critical services are provided efficiently and cost-effectively.

Government Code Section 56430, which became effective on January 1, 2001, requires LAFCO to review municipal services and prepare a written statement of determinations with respect to each of the following:

1. Infrastructure needs or deficiencies;
2. Growth and population projections for the affected area;
3. Financing constraints and opportunities;
4. Cost avoidance opportunities;
5. Opportunities for rate restructuring;
6. Opportunities for shared facilities;

7. Government structure options, including advantages and disadvantages of consolidation or reorganization of service providers;
8. Evaluation of management efficiencies; and
9. Local accountability and governance.

MSRs do not require LAFCO to initiate changes based on service review findings, only to make determinations regarding the provision of public services. LAFCO, local agencies and the public may subsequently use the determinations to analyze prospective changes of organization or to establish or amend spheres of influence.

MSRs are not “projects” under the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act; they are feasibility or planning studies for *possible* future action that LAFCO has not approved.

The outcome of conducting an MSR may implement a recommended change of organization or reorganization. Either LAFCO or a local agency that submits a proposal may be the lead agency for compliance with CEQA and conduct an appropriate environmental review.

#### 6. Legislative Requirement to Update Spheres of Influence

Since 1971 LAFCO has been obligated to “develop and determine the sphere of influence of each local governmental agency within the county and enact policies designed to promote the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere.” (Government Code Section 56425)

Section 56076 defines a sphere of Influence as:

A plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the commission.

The Cortese/Knox/Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 requires LAFCO, for the first time, to “review and update, as necessary, the adopted sphere not less than once every five years.” (Government Code Section 56425 (f)).

LAFCO is prohibited from approving a boundary change that is inconsistent with the adopted sphere for the affected agencies. It is a planning tool to provide guidance for individual jurisdictional changes. They are meant to encourage the efficient provision of public services and prevent service duplication.

The direct relationship between MSRs and Sphere of Influence Updates is in Government Code Section 56430. It states “In order to prepare and to update spheres of influence in accordance with Section 56425, the Commission shall conduct a service review of the municipal services provided in the county or other appropriate area designated by the commission.”

In addition to the written MSR determinations, whenever LAFCO adopts or amends a sphere of influence it must make the following additional written determinations:

1. Present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands;
2. Present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area;
3. Present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public service that the agency provides or is authorized to provide; and
4. Existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

The statute contains procedural requirements for LAFCO to review and update spheres. It must notify affected agencies 21 days before holding a public hearing to consider the sphere. The Executive Officer must issue a report and recommendations on the sphere update at least five days prior to the public hearing.



## **B : MOSQUITO ABATEMENT / VECTOR CONTROL / PEST CONTROL DISTRICTS**

These reports were prepared for the Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in accordance with Sections 56425 and 56430 of the California Government Code. They respond to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

All of Fresno County, except for the eastern portion and a portion of the City of San Joaquin, is within an existing Mosquito Abatement District (MAD) or Vector Control District. These include the following:

- Consolidated MAD - a large portion of the central area, extending from Madera to Kings Counties. On the west it is adjacent to the Coalinga-Huron MAD, Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District and Fresno Westside MAD. The portion of the County not within a MAD is east of and adjacent to this District.
- Coalinga-Huron MAD - southwestern area adjacent to Kings, Monterey and San Benito Counties. It is adjacent to the Fresno Westside MAD on the north and the Consolidated MAD on the east.
- Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District - north central area. It is adjacent to Madera County on the north, Consolidated MAD on the south and east and the Fresno Westside MAD on the west.
- Fresno Westside MAD - northwestern area adjacent to Madera, Merced and San Benito Counties. It is contiguous to the Coalinga-Huron MAD on the south and the Fresno Mosquito and Vector Control District and the Consolidated MAD on the east.

In addition, portions of Fresno County are included in the following, related districts:

- Central Valley Pest Control District - southeastern portion of County adjacent to Kings and Tulare Counties.
- West Fresno County Red Scale Protective District – remainder of the County.

Enclosed for the Commission's review are reports with MSR determinations and SOI Update information for the following four districts.

- Consolidated Mosquito Abatement District
- Fresno Mosquito & Vector Control District
- Fresno Westside Mosquito Abatement District

- Central Valley Pest Control District

These reports are informational documents and do not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

These reports are subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing these studies.

Reports for the following districts are not complete at this time and will be presented to the Commission at future meetings:

- Coalinga-Huron Mosquito Abatement District
- West Fresno County Red Scale Protection District

# **CENTRAL VALLEY PEST CONTROL DISTRICT**

## **MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE**

Report to the  
**Fresno Local Agency Formation Commission**

*April 2007*

## **F. CENTRAL VALLEY PEST CONTROL DISTRICT**

### **1. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW**

#### Description of District

The Central Valley Pest Control District was formed in 1958. It operates pursuant to the Citrus Pest District Control Law (Food and Agriculture Code, Section 8401 et seq.).

The District includes approximately 659 square miles and encompasses the southeastern portion of the County adjacent to Tulare County. It includes the Cities of Orange Cove and Reedley and significant surrounding unincorporated areas. In the past year, the District provided service to approximately 22,173 acres of commercial citrus crops within its boundaries.

Its boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous, as shown on the enclosed map.

The five-member board of directors that governs the District is appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

The District has no employees. Administrative services for the District are provided by the Central California Tristeza Eradication Agency, a Joint Powers Authority to which the District belongs.

#### District Services

District services are control and eradication of various citrus pests, and in particular citrus tristeza virus. The District may treat or respond to additional diseases and pests as the need arises. All operations and staffing are through the Central California Tristeza Eradication Agency.

### **2. MSR DETERMINATIONS**

This portion of the report addresses the factors specified in the governing statute for Municipal Service Reviews.

#### **Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies**

The District staff is housed at the JPA office in Tulare. It appears from the information provided that the District is able to accommodate its needs from this facility; all services are provided within the citrus growing areas within the District.

## **Growth and Population Projections**

The District's services do not affect rates or location of urban development or population growth, nor does that directly affect the governance of the District. The board of directors is appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

## **Financing Constraints and Opportunities**

The District operating budget for FY 2006-07 is \$238,471. Projected revenue for this year is \$238,471 including the use of \$32,850 in reserves. Parcel assessments constitute the main revenue sources (\$205,121) with some funding derived from interest. There is no District debt.

## **Cost Avoidance Opportunities**

There are no obvious cost avoidance opportunities in providing District services since it already works in cooperation with similar agencies in Tulare and Kern Counties.

## **Opportunities for Rate Restructuring**

There are no obvious opportunities for rate restructuring in the operations of the District.

## **Opportunities for Shared Facilities**

Facilities for operations of the District are already being shared with similar districts.

## **Government Structure Options**

There are no obvious opportunities for a different government structure. Unlike the Boards of Directors for Mosquito Abatement Districts that include appointments from city councils, the entire governing board of the Pest Control District is appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

## **Management Efficiencies**

No obvious management inefficiencies were identified from this limited review and it appears the District is efficiently serving its customers, the commercial citrus growers.

## **Local Accountability and Governance**

The District Board of Directors is appointed by the Board of Supervisors. District agendas are posted at meeting locations and the JPA office. The JPA has a website.

### 3. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Government Code Section 56076 defines Sphere of Influence as “A plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the commission.”

#### Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The District’s boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous.

#### No Proposed Sphere Changes

The District reports its sphere and boundary is correct at this time and no changes are anticipated.

#### Sphere of Influence Determinations

Inasmuch as no changes in the sphere of influence are proposed at this time, it is not necessary for the Commission to adopt or approve any sphere of influence update determinations.

### 4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

This Municipal Service Review was prepared by Braitman & Associates working at the direction of the Fresno LAFCO staff. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Central Valley Pest Control District provided information upon which the evaluation is based. Jill Barnier, Operations Manager for the Central California Tristeza Eradication Agency, was instrumental in providing data.

#### Available Documentation

The “Request for Information for Municipal Service Reviews” submitted by the District and supporting documents referred to therein are available in the LAFCO office.

### 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update, it is recommended the Commission:

1. Accept public testimony regarding the draft Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Update.

2. Approve the recommended Municipal Service Review determinations, together with any changes deemed appropriate.
3. Affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be revised at this time.