

TULARE COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

**2800 W. Burrel Ave., Visalia, CA 93291 – Tulare County Administrative Building
September 01, 2021 – Meeting Minutes**

Members Present: Allen, Mendoza, Townsend, Vander Poel
Members Absent:
Alternates Present:
Alternates Absent: Valero, Sheriff, Harrell
Staff Present: Giuliani, Ingoldsby, & Kane recording
Counsel Present: Jeff Kuhn

- I. **Call to Order:** Chair Allen called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.
- II. **Approval of the August 4, 2021 Meeting Minutes:**
Upon motion by Commissioner Vander Poel and seconded by Commissioner Mendoza, the Commission unanimously approved the LAFCO minutes.
- III. **Public Comment Period:**
Chair Allen opened/closed the Public Comment Period at 2:02 p.m. No public comments received.
- IV. **New Action Items:**
 1. **Sphere of Influence Amendment to the City of Porterville, Case 1560-P-323A Continuance**
 2. **Reconsideration Request for Annexation to the City of Porterville and Detachment from County Service Area #1 Case 1560-P-323 (Citrus Blossom Subdivision)**
Staff Analyst Ingoldsby reviewed both action items together since they have significant overlap. Staff Analyst Ingoldsby explained that the commission continued a decision on LAFCO Case 1560-P-323A, that was SOI amendment that would have accommodated a proposed annexation. Though the proposed annexation was denied, the commission chose to continue the SOI amendment request and refer to staff and the city for further study. Staff Analyst Ingoldsby explained that the city had not yet studied the SOI amendment and presented options on how to proceed depending on the outcome of the reconsideration request.

The request for reconsideration of the denied annexation of approximately 12.29 acres was received from QK. Staff Analyst Ingoldsby outlined the key provision for the review of a reconsideration request citing government code 568959(a): "The request shall state the specific modification to the resolution being requested and shall state what new or different facts that could not have been presented previously are claimed to warrant the reconsideration". Possible options were reviewed by the Commission if the request for reconsideration is granted.

Mr. John Philips, attorney with Fennemore Dowling Aaron and representing the project developer; and Mr. Steve Brandt, Principal Planner with QK presented additional information in favor of the reconsideration of the proposed annexation.

Chair Allen opened the Public Hearing at 2:55 p.m.

Darrel Lee, Greg Shelton, David Cox, Dustin Maddox, Gary Lotts, Camila Garcia, Joyce Brown, Bill Polanec, Karla Crocker, Juan Martinez, Kathy Bartlett, Penelope Martinez, Jenny Cox, Marco Martinez, all local residents that spoke against the reconsideration of the proposed annexation.

John Lollis, City Manager for the City of Porterville; Erin Toor, and Skip Barwick, all spoke in support of the proposed annexation.

Chair Allen closed the Public Hearing at 3:41 p.m.

The Commission had much in depth discussion concerning the reconsideration and proposed annexation. County Counsel, Jeff Kuhn provided clarification regarding the reconsideration provision.

Upon motion by Commissioner Townsend and seconded by Commissioner Vander Poel, the Commission voted 3-1 (Commissioner Mendoza against) to deny the request for reconsideration of the Citrus Blossom subdivision annexation to the city of Porterville.

Upon Motion by Commissioner Townsend and seconded by Commissioner Mendoza, the Commission unanimously approved to continue the hearing for the SOI amendment to receive input from City of Porterville

3. **Review of Senate Bills 9 and 10**

EO Giuliani reported on SB-9 and SB-10 regarding housing development; both bills had been passed and on the way to the Governor's desk. After discussion, the Commission requested that the legislative policy and platform be brought back for review at a future meeting.

4. **Designation of Voting Delegate and Alternate for CALAFCO Conference**

EO Giuliani announced that this item was to select a Commissioner and Alternate to vote on items to our local region and at the business meeting at this year's CALAFCO Conference. EO Giuliani explained that currently it is unclear if an in person conference will take place due to Covid-19. If the in person conference is not held a remote video conference would be likely and therefore a voting member would still need to be appointed.

Upon motion by Commissioner Vander Poel and seconded by Commissioner Townsend, the Commission unanimously designated Chair Allen as the voting delegate and EO Giuliani as the alternate for the 2021 CALAFCO Conference and or Business Meeting.

5. **Cancellation of October 6th Meeting**

EO Giuliani announced that no urgent items had been scheduled for the October meeting therefore the next regularly scheduled meeting could be November 3, 2021.

Upon motion by Commissioner Mendoza and seconded by Commissioner Townsend, the Commission unanimously cancelled the October meeting as recommended.

V. Executive Officer's Report

1. **Legislative Update:**

EO Giuliani stated that there was nothing new to add at this time.

2. **Upcoming Projects:**

EO Giuliani noted no new projects at this time.

VI. Correspondence:

1. **Tevison CSD Designation Letter**

2. **SWRCB Letters to the City of Exeter and Tooleville Water System**

3. **CALAFCO Quarterly Report**

Chair Allen outlined the correspondence, and no questions or comments were noted.

VII. Other Business:

1. **Commissioner Report:**

Commissioner Mendoza announced that the city of Woodlake would be holding a mariachi festival on September 12th and invited all to attend.

2. **Request from LAFCO for items to be set for future agendas:**

Chair Allen requested an update on city water supplies and GSA updates.

Commissioner Mendoza requested updates on Cemetery Districts within the next few months.

Commission Vander Poel expressed that once new members are appointed to the LAFCo Commission that standard new member training be conducted.

VIII. Setting Time and Place of Next Meeting:

The next Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) meeting is scheduled for **December 13, 2021 at 2:00 p.m.** in the Tulare County Human Resources and Development Building, 2500 W. Burrel Ave., Visalia, CA 93291.

IX. Adjournment: The Tulare County LAFCO meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m.

This page intentionally left blank.



TULARE COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

210 N. Church Street, Suite B, Visalia 93291 Phone: (559) 623-0450 FAX: (559) 733-6720

COMMISSIONERS:
Julie Allen, Chair
Rudy Mendoza, Vice-Chair
Dennis Townsend
Pete Vander Poel
Liz Wynn

ALTERNATES
Eddie Valero
Fred Sheriff
Steve Harrell

EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Ben Giuliani

To: LAFCO Members, Alternates and Executive Officer
From: Jeff Kuhn, Chief Deputy County Counsel
Subject: Adoption of Resolution: Approve Remote Attendance at Public Meetings Pursuant to State Assembly Bill 361

BACKGROUND:

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Governor suspended part of the Brown Act concerning the requirements for allowing Governing Board members to remotely participate in Board meetings. The suspended provisions require that (1) Governing Board meeting agendas allowing remote Board Member participation list each of the specific locations from which Board members will be remotely participating, (2) such agendas be posted at each such location, and (3) members of the general public must be allowed to remotely participate in the meeting from each of the listed locations. The suspension was done to promote social distancing and so to help limit the spread of COVID-19.

DISCUSSION:

The Governor's suspension of these Brown Act provisions expired as of September 30 and was replaced by new AB 361, an urgency statute that became effective as of September 30. Under AB 361, Governing Boards can continue to allow remote Board members participation in Brown Act public meetings if several conditions are met:

1. The meeting is held during a declared State of Emergency (Like the Governor's COVID-19 pandemic State of Emergency that's still in effect in California);
2. The Governing Board adopts findings to the effect that allowing remote meeting participation by Governing Board members promotes social distancing, which in turn helps prevent the spread of COVID-19;
3. The Governing Board confirms these conditions continue to be met every 30 days.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve members to continue to have the option to participate in its governing board meetings remotely through the use of the teleconferencing provisions of AB 361.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

ATTACHMENT:

1. Resolution approving remote attendance at public meetings as outlined in AB 361.

BEFORE THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
OF THE
COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Approval of Remote Attendance at Brown)
Act Public Meetings Pursuant to State) **RESOLUTION NO. 21-XXX**
Assembly Bill 361)

WHEREAS, meetings of this Commission are governed by the provisions of California’s open meetings law known as the Ralph M. Brown Act, found at Government Code section 54950, *et seq.* (the “Brown Act”); and

WHEREAS, for many years the Brown Act has allowed local legislative bodies such as ours to conduct their meetings, at least in part, through the use of teleconferencing for the benefit of the public and the legislative body in connection with any meeting or proceeding authorized by law; and

WHEREAS, as a condition of using teleconferencing in part or in whole for meetings of local legislative bodies, the Brown Act requires that such meeting agendas disclose the precise locations from which teleconferencing will occur, that notices and agendas of the teleconferencing meetings be posted at all of those locations, and that all of the locations be freely accessible by members of the general public during the meetings; and

WHEREAS, as part of his response to the COVID-19 pandemic, in March 2020 Governor Newsom issued his Executive Order N-29-20 suspending said posting, noticing, and public access conditions for teleconferencing in order to allow local

legislative bodies to carry out their important work while promoting social distancing and combatting the spread of COVID-19; and

WHEREAS, Executive Order N-29-20 expired on September 30, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the newly-enacted AB 361 allows local legislative bodies to continue meeting remotely to the extent possible upon making certain findings; and

WHEREAS, a state of emergency, declared by the Governor pursuant to Government Code section 8625, remains in effect in the State of California due to the continued effects of the COVID-19 pandemic; and

WHEREAS, this Commission wishes to allow its members to continue to have the option to participate in its governing board meetings remotely through the use of the teleconferencing provisions of AB 361.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Governing Commission of the Tulare County Local Agency Formation Commission hereby finds and declares the following,

1. The above-listed recitals are adopted as being true and correct.
2. COVID-19 continues to threaten our community. The unique characteristics of public governmental meetings (such as the increased mixing associated with bringing together people from across the community, the need to enable those who are immunocompromised or unvaccinated to be able to safely continue to fully participate in public governmental meetings, and the challenges with fully ascertaining and ensuring compliance with vaccination and other safety recommendations at such meetings), and the continued increased safety protection that social distancing provides is one means by which to reduce the risk of COVID-19 transmission.

3. Relaxing the requirements for remote meeting attendance by Board members through teleconferencing will promote social distancing and allow potential governing board meeting attendees to maintain the privacy of their vaccination status, which will reduce the health and safety risk inherent in personal attendance at public meetings.

4. Based on these findings and pursuant to Government Code section 54953 (e)(1)(A), members of the Commission may use teleconferencing for meeting attendance without complying with the provisions of Government Code section 54953 (b)(3), so long as the requirements of AB 361 and this Resolution are met.

5. Pursuant to Government Code section 54953(e)(2), if meetings of this Board allow for remote participation by members through teleconferencing as described above, then all of the following shall apply to such meetings:

- (A) The Board shall give notice of the meeting and post agendas as otherwise required by the Brown Act.
- (B) The Board shall allow members of the public to access the meeting and the agenda shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board directly pursuant to Government Code section 54954.3. In each instance in which notice of the time of the teleconferenced meeting is otherwise given or the agenda for the meeting is otherwise posted, the Board shall also give notice of the means by which members of the public may access the meeting and offer public comment. The agenda shall identify and include an opportunity for all persons to attend via a call-in option or an internet-based service option. This subparagraph shall not be construed to require the Board to provide a physical location from which the public may attend or comment.
- (C) The Board shall conduct teleconference meetings in a manner that protects the statutory and constitutional rights of the parties and the public appearing before the Board.

- (D) In the event of a disruption which prevents the Board from broadcasting the meeting to members of the public using the call-in option or internet-based service option, or in the event of a disruption within the Board's control which prevents members of the public from offering public comments using the call-in option or internet-based service option, the Board shall take no further action on items appearing on the meeting agenda until public access to the meeting via the call-in option or internet-based service option is restored. Actions taken on agenda items during a disruption which prevents the Board from broadcasting the meeting may be challenged pursuant to Government Code section 54960.1.
- (E) The Board shall not require public comments to be submitted in advance of the meeting and must provide an opportunity for the public to address the Board and offer comment in real time. This subparagraph shall not be construed to require the Board to provide a physical location from which the public may attend or comment.
- (F) Notwithstanding Government Code section 54953.3, an individual desiring to provide public comment through the use of an internet website, or other online platform, not under the control of the Board, that requires registration to log in to a teleconference may be required to register as required by the third-party internet website or online platform to participate.
- (G) (i) If the Board provides a timed public comment period for each agenda item, then it shall not close the public comment period for the agenda item, or the opportunity to register, pursuant to subparagraph (F), to provide public comment until that timed public comment period has elapsed.
- (ii) If the Board does not provide a timed public comment period, but takes public comment separately on each agenda item, then it shall allow a reasonable amount of time per agenda item to allow public members the opportunity to provide public comment, including time for members of the public to register pursuant to subparagraph (F), or otherwise be recognized for the purpose of providing public comment.
- (iii) If the Board provides a timed general public comment period that does not correspond to a specific agenda item, then it shall not close the public comment period or the opportunity to register, pursuant to subparagraph (F), until the timed general public comment period has elapsed.

6. If a state of emergency remains active, then in order to continue to teleconference without compliance with Government Code section 54953 (b)(3), this Board shall, not later than 30 days after teleconferencing for the first time pursuant to this Resolution, and every 30 days thereafter, make the following findings by majority vote:

- (A) The legislative body has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency.
- (B) Any of the following circumstances exist:
 - (i) The state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person.
 - (ii) State or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

7. If this Board does not meet within thirty days of this meeting, or any subsequent meeting where these findings are ratified, and a state of emergency pursuant to Government Code section 8625 remains in effect, then the Board will be deemed to have delegated to its Executive Director the authority to call a meeting pursuant to these provisions, provided that official also places on the agenda of that meeting an item calling for the Board to ratify that action and readopt this Resolution.

8. For purposes of this Resolution, a “state of emergency” means a state of emergency proclaimed pursuant to Section 8625 of the California Emergency Services Act found at Article 1 (commencing with § 8550) of Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

The foregoing resolution was adopted upon motion of Commissioner_____, seconded by Commissioner _____, at a regular meeting held on this 1st day of December, 2021, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

Ben Giuliani, Executive Officer

ak



TULARE COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

210 N. Church Street, Suite B, Visalia 93291 Phone: (559) 623-0450 FAX: (559) 733-6720

COMMISSIONERS:
Julie Allen, Chair
Rudy Mendoza, Vice-Chair
Dennis Townsend
Pete Vander Poel
Liz Wynn

ALTERNATES
Eddie Valero
Fred Sheriff
Steve Harrell

EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Ben Giuliani

To: LAFCO Members, Alternates and Executive Officer
From: Amie Kane, LAFCO Clerk
Subject: Proposed 2022 LAFCO Meeting and Application Deadline Schedule

The following meeting dates and application deadlines are proposed for 2022. Complicated proposals or those which have not been "pre-noticed" by the initiating agency may require additional time to process. Staff will make every effort to place the proposal on the corresponding agenda, however, unforeseen circumstances (i.e. missed publication dates, need for further information, incomplete applications etc.) may require placement of the proposal on another agenda.

APPLICATION DEADLINE

TENTATIVE MEETING DATE

<i>Friday, December 3, 2021</i>	January 19, 2022 [^]
<i>Friday, January 14, 2022</i>	March 2, 2022
<i>Friday, February 18, 2022</i>	April 6, 2022
<i>Friday, March 18, 2022</i>	May 4, 2022
<i>Friday, April 15, 2022</i>	June 1, 2022
<i>Friday, May 20, 2022</i>	July 6, 2022
<i>Friday, June 17, 2022</i>	August 3, 2022
<i>Friday, July 22, 2022</i>	September 7, 2022
<i>Friday, August 19, 2022</i>	October 5, 2022
<i>Friday, September 16, 2022</i>	November 2, 2022
<i>Friday, October 21, 2022</i>	December 7, 2022
<i>Friday, December 9, 2022</i>	January 25, 2023 [^]

[^]Meetings have been moved from first Wednesday to accommodate Holidays/CALAFCO Annual Conference
*All meetings held in the Tulare County Board of Supervisors Chambers

This page intentionally left blank.

**TULARE COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE OFFICER’S REPORT**

December 1, 2021

**LAFCO Case Number 1562-E-34
City of Exeter Annexation 2021-01 (Smea Subdivision)**

PROPOSAL: Annexation to the City of Exeter and detachment from CSA #1

PROPONENT: The City of Exeter by resolution of its City Council

SIZE: 9.85 acres

LOCATION: Northwest corner of Sequoia Drive and Filbert Road. **(Figure 1)**

NOTICE: Notice for this public hearing was provided in accordance with Government Code Sections 56660 & 56661.

SUMMARY: The annexation area is intended to facilitate the development of a 36-lot single family residential subdivision.

APNs: 138-200-001

GENERAL ANALYSIS

1. Land Use:

A. Site Information

	Existing	Proposed
Zoning Designation	A-1	R-1-6
General Plan Designation	Light Agriculture	Single Family Residential, 6,000 sq/ft. minimum
Uses	Field and tree crops, single family homes and accessory structure	Single-family residential

B. Surrounding Land Uses and Zoning and General Plan Designations:

	Zoning Designation	General Plan Designation	Existing Use
North	A-1	Light Agriculture	Agriculture
South	R-1-6 PUD	Single Family Residential, Min 6,000 sq/ft. Planned Unit Development	Residential
East	R-1-7.5	Single Family Residential, Min 7,500 sq/ft.	Residential Dwellings
West	A-1	Light Agriculture	Vacant Railroad Right-of-Way

C. Topography, Natural Features and Drainage

The site is generally flat with no major natural features. Railroad Right-of-Way lies directly west of the site.

D. Conformity with General Plans and Spheres of Influence:

The site is consistent with the City’s General Plan and is within the City’s Sphere of Influence.

2. Impact on Prime Agricultural Land, Agriculture and Open Space:

The parcels within the site are not under a Williamson Act or Farmland Security Zone contract.

3. Population:

There is one existing home in the proposal area with a city average of 3.03 persons per household the estimated population is three. The County Elections Division has indicated that there are fewer than 12 registered voters in the proposal area. Therefore, pursuant to GC Section 56046, the annexation area is uninhabited.

4. Services and Controls - Need, Cost, Adequacy and Availability:

Agency providing service

Service	Now	After	Method of finance
Police Protection	Tulare County Sheriff’s Office	City of Exeter	General Fund
Fire Protection	Tulare County Fire	Tulare County Fire	General Fund
Water Supply	Private well	City of Exeter	Developer funded, then user fees
Sewage Disposal	Private Septic	City of Exeter	Developer funded,

			then user fees
Street Lighting	None	City of Exeter	Developer funded installation maintenance funded by General Fund
Street Maintenance	Tulare County	City of Exeter	General Fund
Planning/Zoning	Tulare County	City of Exeter	General Fund
Garbage Disposal	Mid-Valley Disposal	Mid-Valley Disposal	User fees

The City of Exeter will provide police protection, water supply, sewage disposal, street maintenance, planning and zoning services. The costs of these connections will be paid for by a combination of property tax, impact fees and developer fees and ongoing services will be paid for with user fees. The County will continue to provide fire service and has provided a will-serve letter (**Figure 3**).

According to the City it can serve the increased demand for domestic water with the city’s existing water supply infrastructure. According to the City’s 2019 Water System Master Plan the city currently has six active wells all with chlorination treatment facilities, two inactive wells and a 100,000-gallon elevated tank for storage. The 2019 Water System Master Plan and its accompanying capital improvement plan details the actions the city will take to ensure it continues to provide adequate and safe drinking water through 2030.

The city’s wastewater treatment plan has a capacity of approximately 2.14 million gallons per day which equates to a population capacity of approximately 14,500 persons. Exeter’s current population is 10,997 and the addition of 36 single-family homes represents approximately an additional 120 persons.

5. Boundaries and Lines of Assessment:

The boundaries of the proposal area are definite and certain and conform to the lines of assessment and ownership. A map sufficient for filing with the State Board of Equalization has been received.

6. Environmental Impacts:

The City of Exeter is the lead agency for this proposal. The City prepared an initial study/environmental checklist and on the basis of that study and other planning documents, a Negative Declaration was approved for use with this proposal. A copy of the document is included in the application materials.

7. Landowner Consent:

The landowner has provided signed consent to annexation. Because this annexation is uninhabited, no affected local agency has requested a protest hearing and there is 100% landowner consent within the annexation area, the protest hearing may be waived pursuant to GC §56662.

8. Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA):

Pursuant to GC §56668 (I), LAFCO shall consider the extent to which the proposal will assist the receiving city and the County in achieving its fair share of regional housing needs as determined by the appropriate council of governments.

Thirty-six single family units are proposed for development and are intended to serve the “Moderate” and “Above Moderate” categories. A tentative subdivision map has been filed with the City of Exeter. The table below shows the current RHNA cycle allocation

2014-2023 City of Exeter RHNA

Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
143	125	85	272	625

From 2014 through the end of 2020, the City of Exeter has made the following progress towards providing its fair share of regional housing.

Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
12	34	13	31	90

The table below shows the total remaining fair share of regional housing for the City of Exeter

Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
131	91	72	241	535

If approved, this proposal would assist the City of Exeter in achieving its fair share of regional housing needs for the “Moderate” and “Above Moderate” categories.

9. Discussion:

Residential Land Supply

The City of Exeter currently has approximately a 6.4-year supply of residential land. This assumes a population growth rate of 1.77% and a dwelling unit density of 4.75 units per acre. The City's General Plan projects a growth rate between 1.88% and 2.38% though the average growth rate over the last 20 years has been 1.23%. The City of Exeter currently has approximately 98.1 acres of undeveloped residential land within the city.

State Water Resources Control Board

In August of this year the State Water Resources Control Board sent the City of Exeter a letter informing them that the Division is taking the first step towards ordering consolidation of Tooleville with the City of Exeter. This is due to the State's concerns regarding Tooleville's current and historic deficiencies and the ongoing and future ability of Tooleville to provide a safe and affordable supply of drinking water.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

It is recommended that this proposal be approved and that the Commission take the following actions:


1. Certify that the Commission has reviewed and considered the Negative Declaration prepared by the City of Exeter for this project and determine that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. Find that the proposed reorganization of the City of Exeter complies with the policies and priorities of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act, Section 56377.
3. Pursuant to LAFCO Policy and Procedure Section C-1, find that:
 - a. The boundaries of the proposed reorganization are definite and certain and conform to lines of assessment.
 - b. The proposed annexation is compatible with the City's General Plan
 - c. There is a demonstrated need for municipal services and controls and that the city has the capability of meeting this need.
 - d. There is a mutual social and economic interest between the residents of the city and the proposed annexation territory.





- e. The proposed annexation represents a logical and reasonable expansion of the annexing municipality.
 - f. All urban services and infrastructure can be provided for by the city.
4. Find that the annexation does not contain any Williamson Act contract land.
 5. Find that the territory proposed for this reorganization is uninhabited.
 6. Approve the proposed reorganization, to be known as LAFCO Case Number 1562-E-34, City of Exeter Annexation 2021-01 (Smee Subdivision) subject to the following conditions:
 - a. No change be made to land use designations or zoning for a period of two years after the completion of the annexation, unless the city council makes a finding at a public hearing that a substantial change has occurred in circumstances that necessitate a departure from the designation or zoning.
 - b. The applicant must provide the required filing fee for the Statement of Boundary Change that is to be submitted to the Board of Equalization.
 7. Waive the protest hearing for this proposal in accordance with Government Code §56662 and order the reorganization without an election.
 8. Authorize the Executive Officer to sign and file a Notice of Determination with the Tulare County Clerk.


Figures:

- Figure 1 Site Location Map
- Figure 2 Aerial
- Figure 3 Tulare County Fire Letter
- Figure 4 Tentative Subdivision Map
- Figure 5 Resolution


LAFCO Case 1562-E-34




-  Site Location 1562-E-34
-  Parcels
-  City of Exeter
-  Exeter Sphere of Influence








Boundaries as of 10/18/21




LAFCO Case 1562-E-34



-  Site Location 1562-E-34
-  Parcels
-  City of Exeter
-  Exeter Sphere of Influence



Boundaries as of 10/18/21





TULARE COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT

835 S Akers St, Visalia, CA 93277 - Phone (559) 802-9800 - Fax (559) 687-6919

Charlie Norman
FIRE CHIEF

November 16, 2021

Tristan Suire
Collins & Schoetter - Subdivision Consultant
1002 W. Main Street,
Visalia, CA 93291

RE: Will Serve Letter for APN 138-200-001
Location: West side of Filbert and North of Sequoia Drive, Exeter.

This Will Serve Letter is to confirm the Tulare County Fire Department will extend its fire services to serve the proposed APN: 138-200-001 development located at West side of Filbert and North of Sequoia Drive, Exeter as provided through the agreed upon fire protection agreement with the City of Exeter.

This agreement to provide service is subject to the development paying all costs required by County / Exeter City Ordinance and Regulations and complying with all District/City/County requirements.

Location of nearest Tulare County Fire Station / City of Exeter Fire Station: .5 miles – Station 11, Located at 137 N. F Street, Exeter CA. 93221 and is 24 hour, full time staffed by salaried employee.




All Hazard Fire response will be provided.

Property is **NOT** located in the SRA.

If you have questions on this letter or items, please contact me at 559-802-9803.

Very truly yours,

Kevin Riggi
Division Chief – Prevention
Fire Marshal
Tulare County Fire Department
Office: 559-802-9803
KRiggi@co.tulare.ca.us




OWNER/DEVELOPER
 OWNER: SMEE HOMES
 ENGINEER: AWENGINEERING

SITE DATA/LEGEND
 APN: 138-200-001-000
 PROPOSED USE: RESIDENTIAL
 CURRENT ZONING: R-1-6
 PROPOSED ZONING: SAME
 SITE AREA: 9.85 AC±
 SEWAGE DISPOSAL: CITY OF EXETER
 WATER SUPPLY: CITY OF EXETER
 ELECTRIC: S.C.E
 FLOOD ZONE: X

LEGEND

- R RADIUS
- PROPOSED STREETLIGHT
- EXISTING STREETLIGHT
- FIRE HYDRANT
- SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
- WATER VALVE
- STREET MONUMENT
- S.F. SQUARE FEET





REVISIONS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	REV. BY	DATE

REV. BY	DATE

APPROVED
 Jesse Allen Williams R.C.E. 64742
 CITY ENGINEER
 MONIQUE MELLO, R.C.E.



724 N. BEN MADDIX
 WAY SUITE "A"
 (559) 713-6139

EXETER CONCEPTUAL

SCALE: 1" = 40'	FLOOD ZONE: "X"
JOB #: XXXX	DRAWN BY: GCE

SHEET
1
 OF
 1
 SHEETS

BEFORE THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
OF THE
COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Proposed Annexation)
To the City of Exeter and Detachment)
from CSA #1. LAFCO Case 1562-E-34,)
City of Exeter Annexation 2021-01 (Smee)
Subdivision)) **RESOLUTION NO. 21-XXX**

WHEREAS, application has been made to this Commission pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Government Code Sections 56000 et seq.) for approval of a proposal to annex certain territories described in attached Exhibit “A” made a part hereof; and

WHEREAS, this Commission has read and considered the Resolution of Application and application materials, the report of the County Assessor and the Executive Officers report and recommendations of the Executive Officer, all of which documents and materials are incorporated by reference herein; and

WHEREAS, on December 1, 2021 this Commission heard, received, and considered testimony, comments, recommendations and reports from all persons present and desiring to be heard concerning this matter.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, DETERMINED AND ORDERED as follows:

1. The information, material and facts set forth in the application, the report of the County Assessor, and the report and recommendations of the Executive Officer

(including any corrections), have been received and considered in accordance with Government Code Section 56668. All of said information, materials, facts, reports and other evidence are incorporated by reference herein.

2. The City of Exeter, as Lead Agency, filed a Negative Declaration in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). And finds that the Commission has reviewed and considered the Negative Declaration prepared by the City of Exeter for this project and determines that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

3. The Commission has reviewed and considered, in accordance with Government Code Section 56668, the information, material and facts presented by the following persons who appeared at the meeting and commented on the proposal:

XXXXXXX
XXXXXXX

4. All notices required by law have been given and all proceedings heretofore and now taken in this matter have been and now are in all respects as required by law.

5. Based upon the evidence and information on the record before it, the Commission makes the following findings of fact:

- a. Fewer than 12 registered voters reside in the affected territory, which is considered uninhabited.
- b. The subject territory is within the Sphere of Influence of the City of Exeter.
- c. The proposed reorganization does not contain any Williamson Act contract land.

6. Based upon the evidence and information on the record before it and the findings of fact made above, the Commission makes the following determinations:

- a. The boundaries of the proposed reorganization are definite and certain and conform to lines of assessment.
- b. The proposed annexation is compatible with the City's General Plan.
- c. There is a demonstrated need for municipal services and controls and that the city has the capability of meeting this need.
- d. There is a mutual social and economic interest between the residents of the city and the proposed annexation territory.
- e. The proposed annexation represents a logical and reasonable expansion of the annexing municipality.
- f. All urban services and infrastructure can be provided for by the city.

8. The Commission hereby waives the protest hearing proceedings in accordance with GC §56662 and orders the annexation without an election.

9. The Commission hereby approves the proposed reorganization of the territory described in Exhibit "A," attached hereto, subject to the following conditions:

- a. No change shall be made to land-use designations or zoning for a period of two years after completion of the annexation, unless the city council makes a finding at a public hearing that a substantial change has occurred in circumstance that necessitate a departure from the designation or zoning.
- b. The applicant must provide the required filing fee for the Statement of Boundary Change that is to be submitted to the Board of Equalization.

10. The following short form designation shall be used throughout these proceedings:

LAFCO Case No. 1562-E-34, City of Exeter Annexation 2021-01 (Smee Subdivision)

11. The Executive Officer is hereby authorized and directed to mail certified copies of this resolution as required by law.

12. The Executive Officer to hereby authorized to sign and file a Notice of Determination with the Tulare County Clerk.

The foregoing resolution was adopted upon motion of Commissioner_____, seconded by Commissioner _____, at a regular meeting held on this 1st day of December, 2021, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

Ben Giuliani, Executive Officer

si



TULARE COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

210 N. Church St., Suite B, Visalia, CA 93291 (559) 623-0540 FAX (559) 733-6720

COMMISSIONERS:
Julie Allen Chair
Rudy Mendoza, V-Chair
Dennis Townsend
Pete Vander Poel
Liz Wynn

December 1, 2021

ALTERNATES:
Eddie Valero
Fred Sheriff
Steve Harrell

TO: All LAFCO Commission Members and Alternates

FROM: Steven Ingoldsby

EXECUTIVE OFFICER:
Ben Giuliani

SUBJECT: Election of Officers for 2022




Commission Policy A-4 requires that the LAFCO Chair and Vice-Chair be annually chosen on a rotating basis so that all members will have an equal opportunity to serve as an officer. This has typically been rotated between City-County-Public members. Using the typical rotation, City representative Rudy Mendoza is scheduled to be Chair and County representative Dennis Townsend is scheduled to be selected as Vice-Chair. The terms of office for chair and vice-chair shall be one year from January 31 to December 31.

2021 Member Roster

<u>Member</u>	<u>Term Expires</u>
Pete Vander Poel (County Commissioner)	May 2024
Dennis Townsend (County Commissioner)	May 2024
Julie Allen (Public Commissioner)	May 2022
Rudy Mendoza (City Commissioner)	May 2023
Liz Wynn (City Commissioner)	May 2024
<i>Eddie Valero</i> (County Alternate)	May 2023
<i>Steve Harrell</i> (City Alternate)	May 2025
<i>Fred Sheriff</i> (Public Alternate)	May 2024

This page intentionally left blank.

LAFCO Case 1560-P-323A



This page intentionally left blank.



TULARE COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

210 N. Church Street, Suite B, Visalia 93291 Phone: (559) 623-0450 FAX: (559) 733-6720

COMMISSIONERS:
Julie Allen, Chair
Rudy Mendoza, V-Chair
Dennis Townsend
Pete Vander Poel
Liz Wynn

December 1, 2021

To: LAFCO Commissioners and Alternates

ALTERNATES:
Eddie Valero
Fred Sheriff
Steve Harrell

From: Steven Ingoldsby, Staff Analyst

EXECUTIVE OFFICER:
Ben Giuliani

Subject: 2021 Annual Report

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) were established in each California county with the purpose of discouraging urban sprawl, preserving open-space and prime agricultural lands, efficiently providing governmental services to the residents of their respective counties, and encouraging the orderly formation and development of local agencies (i.e. cities and special districts) based on local conditions and circumstances. To help the Commission accomplish its propose, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Reorganization Act of 2000 (Act) establishes procedures for local government changes of organization that are subject to commission review and approval such as annexations to a city or special district, city incorporation, district formation and consolidation of districts. A copy of the latest version of the Act can be accessed here <http://alcl.assembly.ca.gov/publications>.

A listing of Commission actions and reports, and a series of maps, graphs and tables are presented each year, which track changes within several categories under the purview of the Commission. These maps not only provide the Commission insight into future issues, challenges, and opportunities that could arise during consideration of future proposals, but they also serve as a gauge of the Commission’s progress in accomplishing their purpose. The following is a summary of the materials contained in this presentation.

Action and Report Summary

Listed below is a summary of all the actions taken by the Commission and the special reports given to the Commission in 2021. The February meeting was combined with January and the June, October, and November meetings were cancelled.

JANUARY

Formation of the Ducor Water District and Dissolution of the Ducor Irrigation District, Case 1551A (Ducor ID-WD)

The Commission approved the formation of the Ducor Water District subject to an election for approximately 10,181 acres in conjunction with the dissolution of the Ducor Irrigation District which was approximately 10,454 acres.

Sphere of Influence for the Ducor Water District, Case 1551B

The Commission approved a Sphere of Influence for the Ducor Water District to follow the same boundary as the Sphere of Influence for the Ducor Irrigation District subject to the successful formation of the Ducor Water District.

Sphere of Influence Amendment to the Allensworth Community Services District, Case 1552A (Allensworth CSD)

The Commission approved a Sphere of Influence amendment for approximately 5 acres of land located northwest of the intersection of Road 80 and Avenue 28 alignment.

Annexation to the Allensworth Community Services District and Detachment from the Tulare Public Cemetery District, Case 1552B (Allensworth CSD)

The Commission approved an annexation of approximately 5 acres of land located northwest of the intersection of Road 80 and Avenue 28 alignment and a detachment from the Tulare Public Cemetery District for all the area within the Allensworth CSD district boundaries which is approximately 809 acres.

Activation of Latent Cemetery Maintenance Powers of the Allensworth Community Services District, Case 1552C (Allensworth CSD)

The Commission approved an activation of latent cemetery maintenance powers for the Allensworth Community Services District.

Sphere of Influence Amendment to the City of Farmersville, Case 1553-F-27A

The Commission approved a sphere of influence amendment of approximately 5.7 acres of land located southwest of the developed urban area of Farmersville, adjacent to the existing Farmersville Wastewater Treatment Plant

Annexation to the City of Farmersville and Detachment from County Service Area #1, Case 1553-F-27-B

The commission approved the annexation of approximately 13.4 acres of land located southwest of the developed urban area of Farmersville and adjacent to the existing Farmersville Wastewater Treatment Plant and 2.4 acres of land located along the Visalia Road Right-of-Way.

Alta Healthcare District Municipal Services Review Update

The Commission adopted the Alta Healthcare District Municipal Services Review update.

MARCH

Annexation to the City of Woodlake and the Woodlake Fire Protection District and Detachment from County Service Area #1, Case 1554-W-26

The Commission approved the annexation of 76.62 acres of land located west of Mulberry Street between Avenue 352 and State Route 216 to the City of Woodlake and the Woodlake Fire Protection District and detachment of the same area from CSA #1.

Selma-Kingsburg-Fowler County Sanitation District Annexation

Fresno County LAFCO approved a 47.2 acre annexation to the SKF County Sanitation District containing the Anderson Village subdivision on the border of the City of Kingsburg in the County of Tulare.

State Water Resources Control Board

The Commission was presented with a letter from the SWRCB to the East Orosi CSD and Orosi PUD requiring the districts to immediately submit a consolidation plan and quarterly report for review and approval. Both districts had failed to submit a consolidation plan within the timeline given in SWRCB's mandatory consolidation order.

APRIL

Annexation to the City of Dinuba and Detachment from Kings River Conservation District and from County Service Area #1, Case 1555-D-62

The Commission approved an annexation to the City of Dinuba and detachment of the same area from Kings River Conservation District and from County Service Area #1 for approximately 7.28 acres of land located northwest of the intersection of El Monte Way and Randle Avenue.

Detachment from Porterville Irrigation District, Case 1556 (PID)

The Commission approved a detachment from the Porterville Irrigation District for approximately 15.2 acres of land located at 19628 Ave. 144.

Annexation to the City of Visalia and Detachment from County Service Area #1, Case 1557-V-454

The Commission approved an annexation to the City of Visalia and detachment of the same area from County Service Area #1 for approximately 19.61 acres of land located approximately 300 feet northeast of the intersection of Akers Street and Sedona Avenue.

2021/2022 Preliminary Budget and Work Program

The Commission approved the 2021/2022 Preliminary Budget and Work Program and designated \$80,000 from reserve funding to offset city/county contributions.

Alternate Public Member Selection Committee

The Commission appointed Commissioner Townsend and Commissioner Flores to the selection committee

MAY

Annexation to the City of Visalia and Detachment from County Service Area #1, Case 1558-V-455

The Commission approved an annexation to the City of Visalia and detachment of the same area from County Service Area #1 for 38.5 acres of land located approximately 200 feet east of the southeast corner of the intersection of Mooney Boulevard and Visalia Parkway.

2021/2022 Final Budget and Work Program Adoption

The Commission adopted the Final 2021/2022 Budget and Work Program with the application of \$80,000 of reserve funds.

Support Letter for AB 1581

The Commission approved a support letter for AB 1581. This bill contained technical, non-substantive changes to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000.

JULY

Sphere of Influence Amendment to the City of Porterville, Case 1560-P-323A

The Commission continued the public hearing for a sphere of influence amendment to the City of Porterville of approximately 26.4 acres located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Linda Vista Ave and North Newcomb St.

Annexation to the City of Porterville and Detachment from County Service Area #1, Case 1560-P-323 (Citrus Blossom Subdivision)

The Commission denied an annexation to the City of Porterville of approximately 12.29 acres of land located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Linda Vista Ave and North Newcomb St.

Orosi PUD and East Orosi CSD Consolidation Order

The Commission was presented with a letter from the SWRCB which included the milestones and time objectives for the consolidation of Orosi PUD and East Orosi CSD for both water and sewer services.

AUGUST

Annexation to the City of Visalia and Detachment from County Service Area #1, Case 1561-V-456 (Sycamore Heights)

The Commission approved an annexation of the City of Visalia and detachment of the same area from CSA #1 of approximately 24.75 acres located at 2780 North Akers Street.

Teviston CSD Designation Letter

The Commission was presented with a letter from the SWRCB which began the process for the selection of a new administrator for the Teviston CSD water system.

Letters Regarding East Orosi CSD Water System Consolidation

The Commission was presented with letters from the Tulare Board of Supervisors, the State Water Resources Control Board and a September 2020 letter from Tulare County LAFCO regarding the East Orosi CSD consolidation with Orosi PUD.

SEPTEMBER

Sphere of Influence Amendment to the City of Porterville, Case 1560-P-323A Continuance

The Commission continued the public hearing for a sphere of influence amendment to the City of Porterville of approximately 26.4 acres located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Linda Vista Ave and North Newcomb St.

Reconsideration Request for Annexation to the City of Porterville and Detachment from County Service Area #1, Case 1560-P-323 (Citrus Blossom Subdivision)

The Commission denied the reconsideration request to annex to the City of Porterville approximately 12.29 acres of land located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Linda Vista Ave and North Newcomb St.

Designation of Voting Delegate and Alternate for CALAFCO Conference

The Commission designated Chair Allen as the voting delegate and EO Giuliani as the alternate for the 2021 CALAFCO Conference and/or Business Meeting.

Teviston CSD Designation Letter

The Commission was presented a letter from the SWRCB responding to Teviston CSD regarding the process for the selection of a new administrator for the Teviston CSD water system.

SWRCB Letter to the City of Exeter and Tooleville Water System

The Commission was presented a notice from the SWRCB which began the 6-month voluntary consolidation process for the City of Exeter and Tooleville water systems.

Note: One ESA for the City of Tulare to provide domestic water to two existing residences on one parcel were approved by the Executive Officer in 2021 (listed in the March 2021 agenda)

LAFCO Activity Overview

Figure 1 (City Annexation Map)

During the calendar year 2021 Tulare County LAFCO approved 6 city annexations.

Figure 2 (District Annexation and Detachment Map)

During the calendar year 2021 Tulare County LAFCO approved 2 district annexations, 1 detachment, 1 dissolution and 1 formation.

Figures 3-10 (City Maps)

Individual maps of the County's (8) incorporated cities.

Tables 1 (Cities) and Table 2 (Special Districts)

These tables correspond to Figure 1 and Figure 2. The tables summarize city and special district growth in terms of total acreage and square mileage over the period 1/1/1980 to 12/1/2021. Cities and special districts that annexed or detached territory into their jurisdictional boundaries during 2021 are highlighted in blue, while cities and districts that extended services to an area outside of their jurisdictional boundaries through an Extraterritorial Service Agreement (ESA) are highlighted in green.

Note: Only districts that provide an urban level of service appear on Table 2. Growth of these districts, in terms of acreage and square mileage, is a dependable indicator of pressure on open space and agricultural land as well as demand for urban services and space. There was 1 extraterritorial service agreement approved in 2021 for the City of Tulare to provide domestic water to two existing residences on one parcel.

The County's four most populace cities experienced the largest total acreage increase and highest square mileage growth rate from 1/1/1980 to 12/1/2021. The special districts listed have experienced little growth over the last 35 years. Generally, Tulare County special districts lack the financial resources and adequate infrastructure to support additional growth of any type. Table 2 indicates that districts containing the most populated unincorporated communities within their jurisdictional boundaries have experienced the largest gain in total acreage and largest percentage increase in square mileage area; however, most of that growth occurred from 1980 to 2000.

Table 3

Table 3 corresponds with Figure 1. The table provides the total amount of acreage annexed each year and further divides the total into developed acres, undeveloped acres and road right-of-way (ROW) in terms of acres. The total amount of proposals considered by the Commission each year is also provided, as well as annexation proposals 300 ac in size or larger. In 2021, no single annexations occurred that were 300 acres or larger.

Table 4

Table 4 corresponds to Figure 11. The table shows the loss of prime agricultural soils from 1/1/1980 to 12/1/2021, both in terms of total acreage and percentage of square mileage. The table also contains a pie chart illustrating the proportion each soil class represents of all soil within Tulare County.

Table 5

For each of the last fifteen years (2006-2021), this table shows total acreage annexed each year, the amount of acres pre-zoned residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional, and the percentage of the total acres annexed each land-use category represents.

Residential

As the figures indicate, at the height of the housing bubble in 2006 annexations intended to accommodate residential development accounted for almost 75% of all acres annexed. In 2021, 54% of the acres annexed occurred within this category.

Commercial

Commercial annexations saw modest spikes in 2007. Total commercial acres annexed between 2007 and 2021 were minimal with 61% of total commercial acreage annexed in 2007. In 2021, two annexations occurred in this category.

Industrial

2007, 2011, and 2016 experienced spikes in industrial annexations; however, these were the result of a single annexation in each year. In 2021, no annexations occurred within this category.

Institutional

This type of use includes sites slated for the development of parks, accommodation of city municipal service facilities, road improvements or construction, etc. Annexation rates for this type of use remained steady between 2006 and 2010. In 2021, three annexations occurred in this category.

Mixed Use

In 2017, a new land use category was added to the table, Mixed Use, which was the pre-zoning for the Lowry West development. In 2021 no annexations occurred in this category

Figure 11 (Prime Agricultural Soils)

This map shows the five classes of soils identified by the USDA Soil Survey of Tulare County and their location throughout the County. Class 1 and 2 are identified as prime agricultural soils, all other classes are considered non-prime. Visalia and Tulare, the county's fastest growing cities in terms of total acreage annexed, are predominately surrounded by Class 1 and 2 soils. This indicates that a large portion of prime agricultural land will inevitably be converted to urban uses.


Figure 12 (Williamson Act Land)

In order for land to be considered prime agricultural land, it must meet one of five requirements listed under GC 56064; a USDA 1 or 2 soil classification is listed as a requirement. While land under Williamson Act contract isn't specifically defined as prime under Code, it can be an indicator of the presence of other qualifications for prime land. Also, the locations of contracts with notices of non-renewal may indicate future growth pressure in the area.

Figure 13 (Lands Owned by Government Entities)

This map identifies lands owned by the federal, state, county, city, district (all types of districts including special districts and school districts) governments. The map also includes land under trust for the purpose of open-space conservancy.


Figure 1 City Annexations Overview



Annexation Case Number

- Site Location 1553-F-27
- Site Location 1554-W-26
- Site Location 1555-D-62
- Site Location 1557-V-454
- Site Location 1558-V-455
- Site Location 1561-V-456


Figure 2 District Annexations and Detachments





City of Dinuba

ANNEXATION HISTORY


	Acres	Cases
Pre-LAFCO	1,116	N/A
1964-1973	169	12
1974-1983	199	13
1984-1993	825	16
1994-2003	807	4
2004-2013	1,051	11
2014-	34	2
LAFCO Total	3,085	58




City of Dinuba
 Streets



City of Exeter



 City of Exeter
 Streets





City of Farmersville



ANNEXATION HISTORY

	Acres	Cases
Pre-LAFCO	542	N/A
1964-1973	91	5
1974-1983	308	5
1984-1993	114	3
1994-2003	195	4
2004-2013	183	6
2014-	21	2
LAFCO Total	912	25


198



 City of Farmersville
 Streets




City of Lindsay




ANNEXATION HISTORY


	Acres	Cases
Pre-LAFCO	1062	N/A
1964-1973	195	17
1974-1983	192	16
1984-1993	90	6
1994-2003	0	0
2004-2013	124	4
2014-	83	2
LAFCO Total	685	45


- City of Lindsay
- Streets




City of Porterville




 City of Porterville

 Streets

0 0.5 1 1.5
 Miles




City of Tulare




City of Tulare Streets


0 0.5 1 1.5 Miles



City of Visalia



City of Woodlake



ANNEXATION HISTORY		
	Acres	Cases
Pre-LAFCO	653	N/A
1964-1973	54	3
1974-1983	723	7
1984-1993	33	1
1994-2003	85	4
2004-2013	264	5
2014-	279	6
LAFCO Total	1,659	26



City of Woodlake



Streets





Table 1 - City Area Increase 1980 to 2021

	1/1/1980 Acres	12/1/2021 Acres	Annexed Acres	1/1/1980 Sq. Miles	12/1/2021 Sq. Miles	Annexed Sq. Miles	% Increase
Dinuba	1,429.9	4,201.1	2,771.2	2.2	6.6	4.3	193.8
Exeter	1,173.3	1,569.0	395.8	1.8	2.5	0.6	33.7
Farmersville	931.4	1,453.7	522.3	1.5	2.3	0.8	56.1
Lindsay	1,375.7	1,746.9	371.3	2.1	2.7	0.6	27.0
Porterville	6,436.9	12,005.0	5,568.1	10.1	18.8	8.7	86.5
Tulare	7,094.3	13,115.8	6,021.5	11.1	20.5	9.4	84.9
Visalia	13,162.8	24,405.1	11,242.3	20.6	38.1	17.6	85.4
Woodlake	926.9	2,092.0	1,165.0	1.4	3.3	1.8	125.7
CITY TOTAL	32,531.2	60,588.7	28,057.5	50.8	94.7	43.8	86.2

Visalia had 3 annexations. Dinuba, Farmersville and Woodlake each had 1 annexation. Tulare had 1 ESA.

Table 2 - Urban District Area Increase 1980 to 2021

	1/1/1980 Acres	12/1/2021 Acres	Annexed Acres	1/1/1980 Sq. Miles	12/1/2021 Sq. Miles	Annexed Sq. Miles	% Increase
Allensworth CSD	783.1	788.1	5.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	0.6
AV/SC CSD	985.3	985.3	0.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0
Cutler PUD	560.5	665.1	104.6	0.9	1.0	0.2	18.7
Ducor CSD	263.3	263.3	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Earlimart PUD	814.6	972.4	157.8	1.3	1.5	0.2	19.4
East Orosi CSD	52.9	52.9	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Goshen CSD	577.4	1,220.8	643.4	0.9	1.9	1.0	111.4
Ivanhoe PUD	594.8	626.9	32.1	0.9	1.0	0.1	5.4
Lemon Cove SD	21.2	24.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.2
London CSD	189.7	189.7	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Orosi PUD*	717.0	887.7	164.2	1.1	1.4	0.3	22.9
Patterson Tract CSD	77.9	77.9	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Pixley PUD	634.6	888.9	254.3	1.0	1.4	0.4	40.1
Ponderosa CSD	251.6	251.6	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Poplar CSD	180.1	418.1	238.0	0.3	0.7	0.4	132.2
Porter Vista PUD	1,742.8	1,742.8	0.0	2.7	2.7	0.0	0.0
Richgrove CSD	263.4	361.9	98.5	0.4	0.6	0.2	37.4
Springville PUD	303.7	308.8	5.1	0.5	0.5	0.0	1.7
Strathmore PUD	298.8	417.6	118.8	0.5	0.7	0.2	39.8
Sultana CSD	317.6	420.6	103.0	0.5	0.7	0.2	32.4
Terra Bella SMD	165.1	169.6	4.6	0.3	0.3	0.0	2.8
Teviston CSD	191.5	191.5	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Three Rivers CSD	5,253.4	5,253.4	0.0	8.2	8.2	0.0	0.0
Tipton CSD	673.0	683.3	10.3	1.1	1.1	0.0	1.5
Tract 92 CSD	73.4	73.4	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Woodville PUD	319.2	336.3	17.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	5.3
DISTRICT TOTAL	16,306.0	18,272.1	1,959.5	25.5	28.6	3.1	12.0

Table 3 - A City/Urban District Annexations Per Year

Year	Total	Undeveloped	Developed	ROW	Projects	Annexations of over 300 acres:
1980	971.41	577.11	296.20	98.11	30	
1981	1,024.37	952.35	16.03	55.99	16	736ac to Tulare for Farm Show and surrounding area
1982	723.59	295.12	413.75	14.72	13	380ac to Woodlake for Bravo Lake
1983	114.50	68.49	27.88	18.13	6	
1984	56.85	47.56	2.21	7.08	9	
1985	94.92	94.92	0.00	0.00	8	
1986	787.14	578.43	157.42	51.30	17	337ac to Visalia for Green Acres Airport and surrounding area
1987	789.94	676.74	66.51	46.68	22	
1988	514.89	408.69	36.40	69.79	15	
1989	1,397.36	1,219.34	76.61	101.42	24	
1990	1,666.24	927.22	647.25	91.77	25	622ac to Tulare (Lagomarsino) and 323ac to Visalia (industrial uses)
1991	997.20	897.60	18.99	80.61	24	
1992	1,806.90	1,708.49	12.18	86.23	29	
1993	643.94	510.00	92.97	40.97	14	
1994	570.06	490.56	46.98	32.52	9	
1995	1,022.06	946.69	5.07	70.31	21	432ac to Goshen CSD for primarily industrial uses
1996	393.09	331.75	14.70	46.65	9	
1997	491.72	467.22	8.23	16.27	14	
1998	363.31	326.23	1.49	35.59	11	
1999	314.13	293.70	1.53	18.89	7	
2000	102.99	0.00	99.93	3.06	6	
2001	819.22	764.18	1.45	53.59	5	702ac to Visalia for Shannon Ranch
2002	1,368.78	1,292.33	27.50	48.95	11	472ac to Visalia (IOH/Luisi) and 384ac to Dinuba (northwest residential)
2003	1,390.80	1,361.98	4.80	24.02	16	935ac to Visalia for wastewater irrigation
2004	1,448.00	1,362.61	34.30	51.09	22	
2005	2,680.64	1,726.33	756.22	198.10	43	
2006	2,042.20	1,293.00	560.00	189.00	33	534 to Dinuba for reclamation/golf course
2007	1,682.72	851.42	831.30	1.80	20	707 to P-ville city uses and 460 to Visalia for Industrial Park Expansion
2008	139.54	63.23	76.31		3	
2009	159.70	157.70	0.00	2.00	1	
2010	1,104.52	513.52	28.96	13.00	9	461 Tulare South I Street Annexation
2011	113.89	40.00	73.89	0.00	2	
2012	38.46	38.46	0.00	0.00	1	
2013	10.50	10.50	0.00	0.00	1	
2014	219.00	135.00	84.00	0.00	4	
2015	606.01	42.14	561.87	16.90	7	Porterville 4 island annexations totaling 455.90 acres
2016	224.30	201.40	13.70	9.20	3	
2017	240.30	137.63	81.02	21.65	6	
2018	17.90	0.00	15.40	2.50	1	
2019	216.23	101.70	96.73	17.80	5	
2020	292.93	243.79	12.96	36.18	4	
2021	187.56	170.94	13.50	3.12	6	
TOTAL	29,849.80	22,326.07	5,316.23	1,674.97	532	

Annexation Acreage per Year (Cities, CSDs, PUDs, SMDs)

Total Undeveloped




Table 4 - Annexations per Soil Type (USDA classifications) 1980 to 2021

	1/1/1980 Acres	12/1/2021 Acres	Annexed Acres	1/1/1980 Sq. Miles	12/1/2021 Sq. Miles	Annexed Sq. Miles	% Decrease
Class I	392,000.6	371,385.4	20,615.2	612.5	580.3	32.2	5.3
Class II	115,157.4	112,241.2	2,916.2	179.9	175.4	4.6	2.5
Non-Prime	596,052.7	591,555.9	4,496.8	931.3	924.3	7.0	0.8
Other	1,947,144.2	1,945,322.2	1,822.0	3,042.4	3,039.6	2.8	0.1
Cities/Districts	48,837.1	78,860.7	29,850.2	76.3	123.2	46.6	-61.1

Notes:

*The acreage and square mileage figures for soil types exclude areas inside City, PUD, CSD and SMD boundaries.

*Other smaller developed areas within the County are not taken into account.

*Undeveloped versus developed annexations are not taken into account.

*While classified as Non-Prime by the USDA, much of the areas covered by these soils would qualify as Prime for LAFCO purposes (GC Section 56064).

*'Other' includes exposed rock, rocky soils and water. Mostly consisting of the foothill and mountain areas.

*'Cities/Districts' include districts that are subject to urban development - CSDs, PUDs, SMDs

Tulare County - USDA Soil Type




Table 5 - Annexation Land Use

By Year

Year	Total Acres	Residential Ac.	% of Total	Commercial Ac.	% of Total	Industrial Ac.	% of Total	Institutional Ac.	% of Total	Mix Use Ac	% of Total
2006	2042.2	1483.6	72.6	52.4	2.6	0.0	0.0	505.3	24.7	0.0	0.0
2007	1682.7	452.9	26.9	398.0	23.7	771.0	45.8	368.0	21.9	0.0	0.0
2008	139.5	26.5	19.0	66.5	47.7	36.5	26.2	10.0	7.2	0.0	0.0
2009	159.7	20.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	159.7	100.0	0.0	0.0
2010	1104.5	22.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	491.0	44.5	480.1	43.5	0.0	0.0
2011	113.9	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	113.6	99.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2012	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2013	10.5	0.0	0.0	10.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2014	219.0	113.0	51.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	106.0	48.4	0.0	0.0
2015	606.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2016	224.3	68.3	30.5	0.0	0.0	156	69.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2017	240.3	179.6	74.7	0	0	0	0.0	26.2	10.9	34.5	14.4
2018	17.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2019	216.2	157.7	72.9	9.5	4.4	0.0	0.0	49.0	22.7	0.0	0.0
2020	292.9	217.3	74.2	68.6	23.4	0.0	0.0	7.0	2.4	0.0	0.0
2021	187.6	102.0	54.4	45.8	24.4	0.0	0.0	39.8	21.2	0.0	0.0

Figure 11 - Prime Agricultural Soils




Figure 12 - Williamson Act Land





Figure 13 - Government Owned Land





TULARE COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

210 N. Church St., Suite B, Visalia, CA 93291 (559) 624-7274 FAX (559) 733-6720

COMMISSIONERS:
Julie Allen, Chair
Rudy Mendoza, V-Chair
Dennis Townsend
Pete Vander Poel
Liz Wynn

December 1, 2021

ALTERNATES:
Eddie Valero
Fred Sheriff
Steve Harrell

TO: LAFCO Commissioners, Alternates, Counsel

FROM: Ben Giuliani

EXECUTIVE OFFICER:
Ben Giuliani

SUBJECT: Legislative Policy

Background

At the September 1st meeting, the Commission requested to review and potentially amend the existing legislative policy and/or platform.

Discussion

LAFCO's legislative policy was adopted on 8/3/2016 and is as follows:

5.7. Legislative Process Participation

- A. *The Commission shall consider adoption of a legislative platform annually, or as needed.*
- B. *In emergency situations when proposed legislation affecting LAFCO cannot be considered by the full Commission due to timing, the Executive Officer is authorized to provide written or e-mail correspondence regarding the Commission's position if the position is consistent with the adopted legislative platform of the Commission.*
- C. *The Chair and Vice-Chair shall review and either sign the letter or approve the email prior to it being submitted for consideration.*
- D. *After submission, the Executive Officer shall forward the approved e-mail or letter to the Commission.*
- E. *The correspondence will be placed in the next available Commission agenda for affirmation.*

LAFCO adopted CALAFCO's 2016 legislative platform as its own also on 8/3/2016. CALAFCO annually adopts a legislative platform near the beginning of the calendar year. Attached is the CALAFCO legislative platform for 2021. Staff recommends bringing this item back as an action item at the first available meeting after CALAFCO issues their 2022 platform. The Commission could decide to adopt the new CALAFCO platform, adopt it's own platform or add/remove provisions from the CALAFCO platform.



CALAFCO 2021 Legislative Policies

As adopted by the Board of Directors on January 22, 2021

1. LAFCo Purpose and Authority

- 1.1. Support legislation which enhances LAFCo authority and powers to carry out the legislative findings and authority in Government Code §56000 et seq., and oppose legislation which diminishes LAFCo authority.
- 1.2. Support authority for each LAFCo to establish local policies to apply Government Code §56000 et seq. based on local needs and conditions, and oppose any limitations to that authority.
- 1.3. Oppose additional LAFCo responsibilities which require expansion of current local funding sources. Oppose unrelated responsibilities which dilute LAFCo ability to meet its primary mission.
- 1.4. Support alignment of responsibilities and authority of LAFCo and regional agencies which may have overlapping responsibilities in orderly growth, preservation, and service delivery, and oppose legislation or policies which create conflicts or hamper those responsibilities.
- 1.5. Oppose grants of special status to any individual agency or proposal to circumvent the LAFCo process.
- 1.6. Support individual commissioner responsibility that allows each commissioner to independently vote his or her conscience on issues affecting his or her own jurisdiction.

2. LAFCo Organization

- 2.1. Support the independence of LAFCo from local agencies.
- 2.2. Oppose the re-composition of any LAFCo to create special seats and recognize the importance of balanced representation provided by cities, the county, the public, and special districts in advancing the public interest.
- 2.3. Support representation of special districts on all LAFCos in counties with independent districts and oppose removal of special districts from any LAFCo.
- 2.4. Support communication and collaborative decision-making among neighboring LAFCos when growth pressures and multicounty agencies extend beyond a LAFCo's boundaries.

3. Agricultural and Open Space Protection

- 3.1. Support legislation which clarifies LAFCo authority to identify, encourage and ensure the preservation of agricultural and open space lands.
- 3.2. Encourage a consistent definition of agricultural and open space lands.
- 3.3. Support policies which encourage cities, counties and special districts to direct development away from all types of agricultural lands, including prime agricultural lands and open space lands.
- 3.4. Support policies and tools which protect all types of agricultural lands, including prime agricultural lands and open space lands.
- 3.5. Support the continuance of the Williamson Act and restoration of program funding through State subvention payments.

4. Orderly Growth

- 4.1. Support the recognition and use of spheres of influence as a management tool to provide better planning of growth and development, and to preserve agricultural and open space lands.
- 4.2. Support recognition of LAFCo spheres of influence by other agencies involved in determining and developing long-term growth and infrastructure plans.
- 4.3. Support orderly boundaries of local agencies and the elimination of islands within the boundaries of agencies.
- 4.4. Support communication among cities, counties, and special districts through a collaborative process that resolves service, housing, land use, and fiscal issues, prior to application to LAFCo.
- 4.5. Support cooperation between counties and cities on decisions related to development within the city's designated sphere of influence.
- 4.6. Support the recognition of extreme natural disasters and disaster preparedness when considering growth and service delivery issues.

5. Service Delivery and Local Agency Effectiveness

- 5.1. Support the use of LAFCo resources to review Regional Transportation Plans, including sustainable communities strategies and other growth plans to ensure reliable services, orderly growth, sustainable communities, and conformity with LAFCo's legislative mandates. Support efforts that enhance meaningful collaboration between LAFCOs and regional planning agencies.
- 5.2. Support LAFCo authority as the preferred method of local governance. Support the availability of LAFCo tools which provide options for local governance and efficient service delivery, including the authority to impose conditions that assure a proposal's conformity with LAFCo's legislative mandates.
- 5.3. Support the creation or reorganization of local governments in a deliberative, open process which will fairly evaluate the proposed new or successor agency's long-term financial viability, governance structure and ability to efficiently deliver proposed services.
- 5.4. Support the availability of tools for LAFCo to insure equitable distribution of revenues to local government agencies consistent with their service delivery responsibilities.
- 5.5. Support collaborative efforts among agencies and LAFCOs that encourage opportunities for sharing of services, staff and facilities to provide more efficient and cost effective services. Support legislation which provides LAFCo with additional opportunities to encourage shared services.

2021 Legislative Priorities

Primary Issues

Authority of LAFCo

Support legislation that maintains or enhances LAFCo's authority to condition proposals to address any or all financial, growth, service delivery, and agricultural and open space preservation issues. Support legislation that maintains or enhances LAFCo's ability to make decisions regarding boundaries and formations, as well as to enact recommendations related to the delivery of services and the agencies providing them, including changes of organization and reorganizations.

Agriculture and Open Space Protection

Support policies, programs and legislation that recognize LAFCo's mission to protect and mitigate the loss of all types of agricultural lands, including prime agricultural lands and open space lands and that encourage other agencies to coordinate with local LAFCOs on land preservation and orderly growth. Support efforts that encourage the creation of habitat conservation plans.

Water Availability

Support policies, programs and legislation that promote an integrated approach to water availability and management. Promote adequate water supplies and infrastructure planning for current and planned growth as well as to support the sustainability of all types of agricultural lands, including prime agricultural lands and open space lands. Support policies that assist LAFCo in obtaining accurate and reliable water supply information to evaluate current and cumulative water demands for service expansions and boundary changes including impacts of expanding water company service areas on orderly growth, and the impacts of consolidation or dissolution of water companies providing services.

Viability of Local Services

Support legislation that maintains or enhances LAFCo's ability to review and act to determine the efficient and sustainable delivery of local services and the financial viability of agencies providing those services to meet current and future needs including those identified in regional planning efforts such as sustainable communities strategies. Support legislation which provides LAFCo and local communities with options for local governance and service delivery to ensure efficient, effective, and quality service delivery. Support efforts which provide tools to local agencies to address aging infrastructure, fiscal challenges, the maintenance of services, and services to disadvantaged communities.

Issues of Interest

Housing

Provision of territory and services to support housing plans consistent with regional land use plans and local LAFCo policies.

Transportation

Effects of Regional Transportation Plans and expansion of transportation systems on future urban growth and service delivery needs, and the ability of local agencies to provide those services.

Flood Control

The ability and effectiveness of local agencies to maintain and improve levees and protect current infrastructure. Carefully consider the value of uninhabited territory, and the impact to public safety of proposed annexation to urban areas of uninhabited territory which is at risk for flooding. Support legislation that includes assessment of agency viability in decisions involving new funds for levee repair and maintenance. Support efforts that encourage the creation of habitat conservation plans.

Adequate Municipal Services in Inhabited Territory

Expedited processes for inhabited annexations should be consistent with LAFCo law and be fiscally viable. To promote environmental justice for underserved inhabited communities, funding sources should be identified for extension of municipal services, including options for annexation of contiguous disadvantaged unincorporated communities. Support policies, programs, and legislation which would provide municipal services to disadvantaged communities. Promote the delivery of adequate, sustainable, efficient, and effective levels of service through periodic updates of Municipal Service reviews, Spheres of Influence, and other studies.

This page intentionally left blank.



TULARE COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

210 N. Church St., Suite B, Visalia, CA 93291 (559) 624-7274 FAX (559) 733-6720

COMMISSIONERS:
Julie Allen, Chair
Rudy Mendoza, V-Chair
Dennis Townsend
Pete Vander Poel
Liz Wynn

December 1, 2021

ALTERNATES:
Eddie Valero
Fred Sheriff
Steve Harrell

TO: LAFCO Commissioners, Alternates, Counsel

FROM: Ben Giuliani

EXECUTIVE OFFICER:
Ben Giuliani

SUBJECT: Commissioner Training Policy

Background

At the September 1st meeting, the Commission requested that a new policy be developed regarding training for new commissioners,

Discussion

Listed below is the Commissioner training policy from Amador County LAFCO. Staff is seeking direction from the Commission regarding any edits to this policy and will bring the new policy back for action at the next meeting.

1.4.4 New Commissioners joining Amador LAFCO will meet with the Executive Officer for an orientation to the agency within 45 days of assuming office. New Commissioners are encouraged to attend courses or programs about the functions and responsibilities of LAFCO, particularly CALAFCO sessions, within their first year of service to LAFCO.

1.4.5 Each Commissioner and Alternate signs a Code of Ethics adopted by Amador LAFCO and agrees to adhere to its standards and precepts. The signed code of ethics shall be filed with LAFCO.

As an alternative to the ethics policy, below is a similar policy from Yolo County LAFCO:

3.8 ETHICS TRAINING

The California Government Code (GC) requires that all legislative body or local agency officials who receive compensation, salary, stipends or reimbursement for expenses, receive ethics training as specified in GC sections 53234-53235.2. LAFCo is not one of the legislative bodies or local agencies covered by these statutes, so service on LAFCo alone does not trigger the statutory requirement for ethics training. Commissioners who are county supervisors or city council members are required to receive this training in their respective roles as county/city officials and should file a copy of their certificate of training with the LAFCo Clerk. LAFCo Public Members are required by this policy to receive ethics training. LAFCo staff will advise the Public Members of opportunities to receive this training. Commissioners who receive this training shall file their certificate of training with the LAFCo Clerk.

This page intentionally left blank.

State Water Resources Control Board

Video and Teleconference Meeting During COVID-19 Emergency

Due to the COVID-19 emergency, and as authorized by Government Code section 11133, this meeting will take place online only.

Notice of Public Meeting

Tooleville Mutual Non-Profit Water Association Potential Consolidation with the City of Exeter

December 7, 2021

6:00pm - 8:00pm

[https://bit.ly/Tooleville Consolidation](https://bit.ly/Tooleville_Consolidation)

Virtual & Phone Participation Only

PURPOSE

The State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) invites you to attend a public meeting to learn about the potential for the Tooleville Mutual Non-Profit Water Association (Tooleville Mutual) to consolidate with the City of Exeter. The consolidation would provide safe drinking water to people served by Tooleville Mutual.

The meeting will also include an opportunity for the public to ask questions and provide comments regarding the potential consolidation. The public can submit questions and comments now through **December 14, 2021**.

BACKGROUND

The inability of Tooleville Mutual to reliably and consistently provide safe drinking water has led the State Water Board to propose the consolidation with the City of Exeter. Consolidation is the joining of two or more water systems. This typically includes a smaller system being absorbed into a larger water system. Benefits of consolidation include spreading costs over a larger customer base and sharing water resources. As a result, the water systems become more resilient and better equipped to provide safe drinking water.

Tooleville Mutual is a community water system with a population of 340 residents served through 77 service connections. Tooleville Mutual provides groundwater to its customers through two active wells that have had historic detections of hexavalent chromium and nitrate.

On July 7, 2021, the State Water Board issued Order No. 03-24-21D-002 requiring technical reporting in response to drought. The State Water Board identified Tooleville Mutual as facing a potential future water shortage at their groundwater source. On July 21, 2021 the State Water Board issued a Boil Water Notice due to a water outage. During the water outage, Tooleville Mutual relied on bottled water as there are no on-site tanks to deliver hauled water. On July 22, 2021, water service was returned to Tooleville Mutual.

To date, Tooleville Mutual has failed to maintain an adequate pressure throughout its distribution system. Water pressure drops from 50 pounds per square inch (psi) in the mornings to 20 psi by the late afternoon, as measured at the well sites. Tooleville Mutual consistently fails to provide an adequate supply of safe drinking water.

MEETING LOGISTICS:

If you wish to join the meeting in English by Zoom or phone:

Zoom: https://bit.ly/Tooleville_Consolidation

Phone: +1-669-900-9128 Meeting ID: 962 7894 6689

If you wish to join the meeting in Spanish by Zoom or phone:

Zoom: https://bit.ly/Tooleville_Consolidation

Phone: +1-916-255-4044; No code needed

LANGUAGE SERVICES

This meeting will be in English and offer Spanish language interpretation services. For questions regarding language services, or to request sign language services or language interpretation for a language other than Spanish, please submit your request no later than **November 23, 2021** by contacting Marina Pérez at (916) 322-4265 or SAFER@waterboards.ca.gov.

ACCESSIBILITY

Telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) users may contact the California Relay Service at: (800) 735-2929 or voice line at (800) 735-2922.

MEETING MATERIALS

Meeting materials and details on remote participation can be requested by emailing SAFER@waterboards.ca.gov or calling 916-445-5615.

PUBLIC COMMENTS - SUBMIT IN ANY LANGUAGE BY DECEMBER 14, 2021

Mail: Caitlin Juarez
State Water Resources Control Board – Division of Drinking Water
265 W. Bullard Avenue Suite #101
Fresno, CA 93704

Email: Caitlin.Juarez@waterboards.ca.gov or Phone: (559) 447-3395