

COLAB SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

WEEK OF JANUARY 12-18, 2014

KEYNOTE SPEAKER
Dr. Sam Blakeslee

THURSDAY, MARCH 27 2014

SAVE THE DATE

5th Annual Dinner & Fundraiser

MADONNA EXPO CENTER

Details to follow... We hope to see you there!

COLAB SLO COUNTY

**GIBSON REMAINS BOARD CHAIR FOR 2014
(MECHAM VICE-CHAIR)**

**GIBSON MOVES TO CONSOLIDATE POWER
THROUGH COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS**

**NEW ANTI-HARASSMENT RULES: NO MORE
HARASSING PHONE CALLS OR E-MAILS**

Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday, January 7, 2014 (Completed)

Unnumbered Item: Reorganization of the Board of Supervisors - Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson. The Board confirmed 2nd District Supervisor Bruce Gibson as Chairman for 2014. Gibson was Vice-Chair in 2013 when Supervisor

Teixeira passed away. Gibson acceded in June. The vote was 4 to approve with Supervisor Arnold abstaining.

As predicted, with the now domineering power of the new left majority, no one else was proposed and no one challenged.

San Luis Obispo County Board of Supervisors Meeting of Tuesday, January 14, 2014 (Scheduled)

Item 2 - Appointment of a Planning and Building Director. The Board formalized its appointment of James Bergman as Planning and Building Director at an annual salary of \$125,528 and a total cost of \$200,980 including benefits. Bergman currently serves as Planning and Building Director of Windsor, Ca. (population 26,801; land area 7.2 sq. miles), located in Sonoma County. He had previously served in various capacities in the City of Arroyo Grande Community Development Department. Bergman has a Master's Degree in City and Regional Planning from Cal Poly.



“Smart Growth” Scene in Windsor
Note the “walkable,” leafy environment.

Item 4 - Appointment of Board Members to Various Committees and Commissions. As the new calendar year begins, the Board must review and make assignments to a variety Boards and commissions on which the Supervisors serve. In San Luis Obispo County the Board Chair recommends the assignments and then the full Board considers approval or amendments. The practice is more open in some other counties. In those counties (but not SLO County), the Clerk of the Board provides a list of the current assignments and then the members express interest in open session without the stigma of having to go against with the Chairman's preferences. Gibson's list is displayed below:

TITLE	2014 APPOINTMENTS
Student-Community Liaison Committee	Debbie Arnold; alternate Adam Hill
Adult Services Policy Council	Caren Ray
Cal ID Advisory Board	Frank Mecham
California State Association of Counties (CSAC)	Bruce Gibson; alternate Adam Hill
Carrizo Plain National Monument Advisory Committee	Debbie Arnold
SB/SLO Regional Health Authority (CenCal)	Adam Hill
Economic Vitality Corporation	Adam Hill and Caren Ray
Fire Safe Council	Frank Mecham
First 5 Children & Families Commission	Bruce Gibson
Homeless Services Oversight Council	Debbie Arnold
Latino Outreach Council	Debbie Arnold
Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)	Bruce Gibson, Frank Mecham; alternate Adar Hill
Model of Care Partnership Oversight Committee (MOCPOC) Martha's Place	Bruce Gibson
Behavioral Health Advisory Board	Frank Mecham
National Estuary Program Executive Committee	Bruce Gibson
South County Area Transit (SCAT)	Caren Ray

The power/prestige assignments include LAFCO (see page 12 below for details of how important this will be in 2014), California State Association of Counties, Economic Vitality Corporation, and Regional Health Authority. Note that Gibson and Hill are proposed to serve on one or more of the important ones. Gibson is of course already Board Chairman and Hill could be made Chairman of the APCD later this month. Gibson may wish to be nominated for the Coastal Commission (see item 14 below). Concentration of power here?

Item 7 - County Updates Its Policies on Discrimination, Workplace Violence, Harassment, Sexual Harassment, and Equal Employment Opportunity. The staff is proposing updated language to the various policies. Readers may recall that as part of the Board's whitewash of the Supervisor Gibson/legislative aide affair last year, staff was directed to review the policies and report back. There is an attachment to the Board item which compares the old and new language for the various categories. It is available at the link:

<http://agenda.slocounty.ca.gov/agenda/sanluisobispo/2929/QXR0YWN0XzFfUG9saWN5IENvbXBhcmlzb24gTWf0cml4IF8gRXhpc3RpbmcgUG9saWN5IHZlcnN1cyBQcm9wb3NIZCBQb2xpY3kgKDIpLnBkZg==/12/n/23307.doc>

Some of the more relevant sections include:

Employee Conduct:

*The County will not tolerate acts of violence or threats of violence by employees. Any violation of this policy is grounds for disciplinary action up to and including termination. San Luis Obispo County requires that all employees and **officers** of the County treat the public and other employees with courtesy and respect. Off duty conduct meeting the definition of workplace violence above may also be subject to discipline depending on the nexus to the employee's job as well as the discredit such conduct may bring to the County. Violation of this policy by an employee will result in discipline up to and including termination.*

Workplace Violence:

This policy applies to all County employees, contractors and volunteers. This policy applies to all locations where County employees work or represent the County including any County facility, County vehicles, customer and vendor premises and County sponsored events and activities. This policy may apply to off-duty employee conduct depending on the nexus to the job and the impact on the County.

Workplace violence is defined as all threats or acts of violence occurring at a County workplace regardless of the relationship between the County and the individual involved in the incident. This list of behaviors, while not all inclusive, provides examples of conduct that is prohibited:

- Hitting, shoving or making contact with an individual in a threatening or hostile manner, with any part of one's body and/or an object;*
- Threatening to harm an individual or his/her family, friends, associates, or property;*
- Making harassing or threatening telephone calls, or sending harassing or threatening written or electronic communications;***
- Aggressive or hostile behavior that creates a reasonable fear of injury in another person or subjects another individual to emotional distress;*
- Intimidating or attempting to coerce an employee to do wrongful acts, or violate law, administrative rule, or policy;*

The new policies on sexual harassment seem to permit consensual relationships. They seem to avoid dealing with conflicts of interest that could occur in a government work place as a result of such consensual relationships. This could be problematical. For example, about 4 years ago a Deputy County Administrator was terminated for having a personal relationship with a county employee-union representative with whom she was conducting labor negotiations. What are the ethics, rules, standards of behavior, reporting requirements, and sanctions for such situations if they occur in the future? What about other forms of cronyism?

The policy on plain harassment (non- sexual harassment) contains the section highlighted in yellow above. If these behaviors are defined as forbidden starting on January 14, 2014, were they unacceptable when they took place in the past?



Item 14 - Request to Nominate One or More Elected Officials for Appointment by the Governor to the California Coastal Commission. The California Coastal Commission is a quasi-independent regulatory body consisting of 12 members, some of whom are appointed by the Governor, some by the Speaker of the Assembly, and some by the Senate Pro Tem. The agency is renowned for its abuse of property rights, trashing of local government policies and preferences, and its radical environmental ideology. A vacancy has occurred which must be filled by the Governor. The appointee must be a city council member or county supervisor from San Luis Obispo County, Santa Barbara County, or Ventura County. The City Selection Committee of San Luis Obispo County (a Commission made up of the mayors of the County's 7 cities has nominated Mayor Debbie Peterson of Grover Beach). See the City Selection Committee item on page 12 below.

In 2011 Bruce Gibson was nominated by the Board of Supervisors but was not appointed. We will see during the Board meeting if he requests to be appointed or is nominated by one of his colleagues. As an alternative, would the Board support Mayor Peterson's nomination? Supervisor Janet Wolf of Santa Barbara County might also wish to be appointed. She and Gibson are CSAC pals. It would be interesting to see if one would defer.

SLO County officials wishing to be nominated should explain how they would try to control the Commission's arrogant and exploitive staff and reform the Commission in general before being considered.

Background: A great article by Paul J. Beard II, in the *Winter 2009-10 Objective Standard*, explains the awful powers and abuses of this rogue Commission in the excerpt below:

The regulatory scheme established by the Coastal Act guarantees that the Commission will violate property rights. The right to property is the right to freely acquire, use, and dispose of the product of one's efforts, including any goods acquired via trade. If a person builds a chair or a business, or purchases a car or a yacht, that chair, business, car, or yacht is his to use or dispose of as he sees fit—so long as he does not violate the rights of others. According to this basic principle embodied in the American founding, a landowner has a right to use

and dispose of the land he has acquired by his effort, free from force (or the threat of force) by the government.

The Coastal Act violates and authorizes the daily violation of the property rights of coastal landowners. The Act assumes that landowners have, at most, mere “interests” in their land, not rights. These interests, according to the Act, are subservient to the needs and desires of “society” for open space, beach access, ocean views, plant and animal protection, and other “values” that the Commission can pursue only by the use of force against property owners.

The Act effectively collectivizes “ownership” of all the property in the coastal zone on the grounds that this zone is “a distinct and valuable natural resource of vital and enduring interest to all the people” and that its “permanent protection” is “a paramount concern to present and future residents of the state and nation.”⁷ To that end, all property within the coastal zone is at the service of “the economic and social well-being of the people of this state and especially to working persons employed within the coastal zone.”⁸

The Coastal Commission does not recognize a property owner’s right to build a home of his choosing on his land. He must seek the Commission’s permission, and then submit to its demands about the size, color, and precise location of the home. The Commission does not recognize a property owner’s right to protect his bluff-top home from beach erosion by, for example, installing a seawall. He must seek the Commission’s permission and—if fortunate enough to obtain approval—likely submit to its demand for money as compensation to “society” for the loss of sand and the sullied beach views that allegedly accompany seawalls. The Commission does not recognize a property owner’s right to install a fence, a tree, a picnic table, or anything else on his land without its prior approval and inevitably the satisfaction of a laundry list of conditions. Because use or development of coastal property without a development permit results in heavy fines and possible confiscation of the property, owners have little choice but to submit to the will of the Commission.

The awesome task of deciding the many permit applications appeals lies with the Commission’s twelve voting members, appointed by the governor and legislative leaders. With their votes at public hearings scheduled every month, commissioners decide the fates of coastal property owners who want to use and develop their land. But because these political appointees generally have full-time obligations outside the Commission, they rely heavily upon the research and recommendations of the Commission’s executive director—appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the agency—and his full-time career staff of analysts, enforcement officers, and lawyers.

See the full article at the link below:

<http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2009-winter/ca-coastal-commission.asp>

Item 15 - County 2013 Annual Report. The report is available at the link:

<http://www.slocountyannualreport.com/about-slo-county.html#.Us3-hXuA3IW>

Item 17 - General Plan Progress Report. The summary states:

This report reviews the activities that took place to implement the County General Plan between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013. The General Plan is the blueprint for the future physical, economic and social development of the unincorporated areas of the county, outside cities. It implements California laws that regulate land use planning and development. This report fulfills a state requirement to measure progress in implementing the General Plan. The scope of the report includes:

- *Status of the General Plan documents,*
- *Major planning activities that were begun, worked on or completed,*
- *Changes to plans and ordinances to implement plan policies,*
- *Residential development in relation to Housing Element goals, and*
- *Number of public hearings held for development and amendment applications.*

The report summarizes the number of Plan of Development updates and implementing ordinance additions and changes that took place in Fiscal Year 2013. More interesting are some of the tables:

Table 4: Trend in Residential Development – Fiscal Years 2008-2013

Final Building Permits	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Single-Family	519	362	364	200	253
Multi-Family	82	114	30	22	0
Total	601	476	394	222	253
% Multi-Family	13.6%	23.9%	7.6%	9.9%	0%

A total of 1,693 residential permits were issued over the past five years. The report goes on to indicate that for 2009-2012, 1,197 dwelling units were actually constructed, an average of 299 per year. Of the units constructed, 1,024 were only affordable to buyers or renters with above moderate incomes. Thus only 173 (14%) were affordable to people with moderate or low incomes.

Item 19 - Los Osos Water Conservation Program. It would appear that there are some contradictions and problems in the mandatory Los Osos Water Conservation Program. For example, one part of the staff report states:

Title 8 - Retrofit on Sale

The Title 8 retrofit-on-sale ordinance was adopted at the same time as the Title 19 retrofit-to-build ordinance. Both have been in place for approximately 5½ years. This program, along with the wastewater project mandatory retrofit program in the PZ, has

completed the retrofitting in this area of the community. However, the program also applies outside of the PZ within the Los Osos Groundwater Basin. The Title 8 program has administrative and cost burdens on buyers, sellers and representatives. If the amendments are authorized for processing, staff will evaluate the retrofit-on-sale ordinance and recommend whether or not it should be continued or revised.

Duh!

So how come the Climate Action Plan is full of proposals for retrofit-on-sale ordinances? What about item 20 below, which recommends a whole new set of these requirements for the entire Paso Basin? It's not working in Los Osos, so let's spread it to a vast area in the north County.

Item 20 - More Implementation of the Moratorium Ordinance/ Resource Conservation District Proposals. The Board will consider two proposals by the Upper Salinas-Las Tablas Conservation District (see their website <http://us-ltrcd.org/>). The first is to assist the County to implement an interim agricultural water offset program immediately. The second is to develop a much more comprehensive offset and conservation program for potential future adoption by the Board.

The **interim program** is summarized below:

This interim program is designed to assist county staff in determining appropriate agricultural crop conversions – and their associated water use(s) – until a more formal offset program is completed in the spring of 2014. This interim program would treat projects on a case by case basis, examining existing and proposed farming practices and evaluating appropriate water offsets for those changes. These evaluations would be conducted by experts in the field of agriculture and natural resources management from the Upper Salinas – Las Tablas Resource Conservation District.

Proposed Program Process:

The US-LT RCD proposes to duplicate a successful process adopted by the Napa County RCD with Napa County for erosion control planning which involves these simple steps:

1. Landowner has water use conversion need and prepares a conversion plan or hires a technical advisor to assist them with creating an offset "Plan".
2. The "Plan" is brought to the RCD technical team who reviews it for technical accuracy and site specific appropriateness.
3. The RCD technical team reviews the proposed "Plan" and schedules an on-site walk through with the landowner (and his/her technicians, if applicable). "Plan" specifications will be modified to include recommendations and adaptations from RCD technical expert.
4. Once the landowner receives the RCD approved "Plan", they will take it back to the County for processing.
5. Site visits will follow (typically 1-3) to ensure "plan" specifications are being carried out as designed.

Permanent Program: The proposed scope of work to develop the permanent program includes:

1. Rural Residential and Hobby Farm Landowners

- Use evaluation and reduction
- Water use efficiency education

2. Crop Conversion

- Alfalfa and other high water using crops to lower water use crops
- Water credit banking and sale
- Teaching efficiencies

3. New Irrigated Agriculture

- Offsets
- Tracing water use history
- Recharge

4. Water Banking

Staff Report Digression is Revealing: This item is ostensibly about development of measures to compel and assist agriculturalists to use less water. For some reason the actual Board letter also discusses other measures in the works which relate to residential and commercial land uses (perhaps the farmer's homes and tasting rooms, etc., and related ag. tourism uses such as bed and breakfasts.)

Other types of development, including commercial, institutional and processing uses that use groundwater are also affected by the ordinance and must offset their new water use. The program is being designed so that interior plumbing fixtures are replaced with more efficient models (e.g 1.28 gallon-per-flush (gpf) toilets in lieu of 3.5 gpf). Design of the program involves two key steps: 1. calculate water demand of new residential uses; and 2. calculate the water savings from replacement of fixtures.

Retrofit Costs

A range of potential costs of retrofit credits can be estimated. The County will target homes constructed prior to 1994 when the water use standard for toilets was set at 3.5 gpf. Pre-1980 homes were constructed with 6.0 gpf toilets. However, the program is not expected to find many 6.0 gpf toilets as natural attrition has seen most of those old toilets already replaced in the intervening 33 years. Pre-1994 showerheads are up to 5.0 gpm and post-1994 showerheads are assumed to be 2.5 gpm.

Intrusive and Costly Penetration of the County into your Privacy and Home:

Program Implementation

At this time, staff has identified three methods to implement the residential component of the offset program:

1. The County can contract with a licensed plumber to perform the retrofits. The County would implement, operate, monitor and report on the program's status periodically. In this option, builders would deal directly with the County without a middle man. However, there are liability, cost and prevailing wage issues to consider.

2. The County can contract with a private firm to implement, operate, monitor and report on the status of the program. An engineering firm with water system operational experience should be able to implement and run the program adequately. This option relieves the County of the program's liability and administrative burdens. However, this option may impose some additional expense on builders and may be less responsive to program problems or changes as they develop.

3. The County can allow each builder to find retrofits on his/her own. This has been done in Los Osos since 2008. The County would assist with some target marketing of the program to pre-1994 structures. However, each builder would hire a licensed plumber to perform the retrofits and certify them to the County. No bank would be created. This option places the burden on the builder and may result in difficulty in finding affordable and adequate retrofit targets.

Staff will fully analyze these three options in consultation with the Public Works.

As noted in the previous Agenda Item 19 above, Public Works has indicated that the retrofit-on-sale program has problems: *The Title 8 program has administrative and cost burdens on buyers, sellers and representatives. If the amendments are authorized for processing, staff will evaluate the retrofit-on-sale ordinance and recommend whether or not it should be continued or revised.*

Here it is proposed that the County government will not even wait for properties to be sold to impose new costs and upgrades. It will now use the 1:1 offset requirement to force these changes whenever anyone makes any physical changes in their home or business.

San Luis Obispo County Council of Governments Meeting of Wednesday, January 8, 2014, 8:30AM (Completed)
--

Item 3a: Election of President and Vice-President. The SLOCOG Board elected Pismo Beach Mayor Shelly Higginbotham as President and 5th District County Supervisor Debbie Arnold as Vice-President for 2014.

Item B-2: Draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Financial Expectations and Projections. The Board received the report and conducted a fairly extensive discussion of the growing transportation infrastructure deficit. Per prior policy direction, the staff is launching an extensive public information program containing information about the long-term need for road maintenance, new highway and road construction, and

“alternative mode” transportation – buses, bikes, etc. This is designed to educate the public and business community and lay the groundwork for the submittal of a ballot measure in 2016. It is expected that the measure would propose a one-half cent sales tax for 20 to 30 years dedicated to transportation. It would be a countywide vote requiring 2/3rds approval by those voting. The Board also discussed conducting a voter poll in the spring of 2015 to assess the prospects of such a measure. A poll conducted several years ago indicated that there was not sufficient support at that time.

There was considerable rhetorical handwringing about the lack of revenue for transportation, lack of Federal and State aid, and the insufficiency of the gasoline tax.

What Was Missed: Not surprisingly, there was no discussion (other than by Supervisor Arnold) about what the County and cities could do to grow the economy and grow existing revenues. Sadly, not one official or staffer brought up the potential of oil and gas development, which through dedicated royalties, could fund hundreds of millions of (if not billions) of dollars in transportation and other capital improvements over the decades.

A Good Faith Public Policy Question: From a broad policy context, and in exchange for broad support of business, agriculture, and other segments of the community for a sales tax increase, the County and the cities should adopt a moratorium on new regulatory measures, restrict climate action planning measures to the absolute minimums required by State law (which some cities have done), and cap application processing fee increases and development exaction payments. The rescission of the Paso Robles water/development moratorium would be a good faith first step. Otherwise, why should business, farmers, ranchers, homeowners, builders, and job seekers support layering on more new taxes? What good faith steps will the elected officials take to balance the situation, which is totally on the tax, fee, and regulatory side?

Background: This document is extremely important and has many long-term implications for local and countywide road funding. It also once again raises the specter of requesting the voters to impose a one-half cent sales tax over 20 to 30 years to provide local match for State funding of major highway projects, such as the widening of Highway 101. The draft document contains considerable data about gasoline taxes, miles traveled, and transit alternatives.

The full document can be read at the link:

https://library.slocog.org/PDFs/AGENCY_MTGS_AGENDAS/SLOCOGBOARD/2014/January%202014/B-2%20Draft%202014%20RTP%20Attachment.pdf

Planning Commission Meeting of Thursday, January 9, 2014 (Completed)

Item 3 - Hearing to consider a request by DOUGLAS FILIPPONI & STEVE BONESO for a Phased Vesting Tentative Tract Map (Tract 2992) and a concurrent phased Conditional Use Permit to allow for the subdivision and mixed-use development of three existing parcels and a remainder (Tract 2559),

totaling approximately 15 acres, into 8 commercial lots, ranging in size from 0.98 acres to 3.53 acres, and 2 residential lots, of approximately 13,000 square feet each. The project includes the development of the commercial lots with approximately 42,400 square feet of commercial retail space, 62,700 square feet of office space, and a 66,000 square foot hotel (120 units). Each proposed residential lot would be developed with a single-family residence. The proposed project is within the Commercial Retail, Office Professional and Residential Single Family land use categories and is located at the northwest corner of Las Tablas Road and Bennett Way, in the community of Templeton. The project site is in within the Salinas River planning area.

The planning Commission approved the project by a unanimous vote.

A Positive Project: The proposal of this project is a good sign that there is recovery in the economy in the unincorporated area of the County. The architectural renderings show a very attractive theme, which will be visible from Highway 101. A hotel, which is included, will provide not only accommodations for travelers and tourists but also long-term stay facilities for families of patients at Twin Cities Hospital. The project benefits the County by providing jobs, increased property tax revenue, new sales tax revenue, and new transient occupancy tax revenue. The developers propose the project to be constructed in phases over the years.

Significantly, there was no public comment and no opposition.

City Selection Committee Meeting of Friday, January 3, 2014 (Completed)

Coastal Commission Nominee. The City Selection Committee (a fairly obscure committee comprised of the mayors of San Luis Obispo County's seven cities) met and nominated Grover Beach Mayor Debbie Peterson as the cities' nominee for the vacant California Coastal Commission slot. (See Board of Supervisors item 14 above for information about the Commission and importance of who is ultimately appointed by the Governor.) All the Mayors voted for Peterson except Mayor Marx of the City of San Luis Obispo who thought the Committee should do more recruiting and processing. Is Marx just towing the enviro-socialist line or is she facilitating Adam Hill's vendetta against Peterson? Or both?

Local Agency Formation Commission Appointment. The Committee appointed Atascadero City Councilwoman Roberta Fonzi to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). LAFCO will have an important role in the review and ultimate approval of the structural design, function, and financing the California Water District, now jointly proposed by the Paso Robles Groundwater and Pro Water Equity. The State established LAFCOs in the 1950s to deal with the uncoordinated proliferation of new cities and special districts (especially in LA County). The composition of the LAFCO Board could have a major influence on the powers, costs, and impacts of the proposed new district. Will city representatives be protective of rural agricultural owners' primary water rights or, as municipal appropriators, will they support diminishment of those

rights? What about County Supervisors who have already voted for the urgency ordinance moratorium and who never held a discussion of or acknowledged those primary rights as part of their deliberations?

LAFCO Background: The spread of new jurisdictions, in the ‘50’ and thereafter, created financial inefficiency and competition for resources such as water. Some new cities’ boundaries were gerrymandered to serve and protect special interests to the exclusion of broader general public interests. Also, creation of new cities often left their host counties holding the financial bag for funding countywide services (Sheriff, jail, District Attorney, Public Defender, Courts, Public Health, elections, etc.). The new cities and special districts would cream off sales and property taxes to provide beautiful parks and enriched police, fire, and street services, etc., leaving the counties to fend for themselves on the State mandated justice, poverty, and human services overburdens. LAFCOs seek to make the impact of the creation of new entities and or annexations fair and to enforce revenue neutrality.

Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) Background:¹ Commission is comprised of seven (7) Regular Members (two county, two city, two special district, and one public member), and four (4) Alternate Members (one county, one city, one special district, and one public member), each serving four-year terms.

Current members and their term expiration dates are:
<p>Chairman Muril Clift Special District Member, Cambria Community Services District December 2016</p>
<p>Vice Chairman Kris Vardas City Member, City of Pismo Beach December 2013</p>
<p>Bruce Gibson County Board Member, District 2 Supervisor December 2015</p>
<p>Frank Mecham County Board Member, District 1 Supervisor December 2013</p>
<p>Duane Picanco City Member, City of Paso Robles December 2015</p>
<p>Tom Murray</p>

¹ From the SLO LAFCO website.

Public Member
December 2016

Marshall Ochylski
Special District Member
December 2014

LAFCO's Purpose

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act of 2000 calls on the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) to make decisions while balancing the following goals:

Encourage Orderly Growth and Development

LAFCO considers proposals for the formation of new local governmental agencies including Cities and Special Districts. LAFCO is also responsible for considering annexations and detachments for agencies. LAFCO also determines the Sphere of Influence, which is a plan for the probable physical boundary of a City or Special District.

Promoting Efficient Provision of Public Services

LAFCO reviews proposals based on a variety of factors including: a plan for services submitted by the agency, resource and infrastructure capacity, and the need for services.

Preserve Agricultural Land Resources

LAFCO considers the impact that a proposal may have on existing agricultural lands with focus on prime agricultural lands. San Luis Obispo LAFCO has adopted specific policies regarding the preservation of agricultural resources.

Discourage Urban Sprawl

Urban sprawl can best be described as irregular and disorganized growth occurring without apparent design or plan. By discouraging sprawl, LAFCO limits the misuse

of land resources and promotes a more efficient system of services by local governmental agencies.