

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

**SANTA BARBARA
GOLETA VALLEY
AREA**

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 1 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- A. Introduction and Overview Section A
 - 1. Before LAFCOs were created
 - 2. LAFCO regulation of boundary changes
 - 3. Santa Barbara LAFCO
 - 4. Legislative History
 - 5. Requirement to Prepare Municipal Service Reviews
 - 6. Requirement to Update Sphere of Influence
 - 7. Apportionment of Property Taxes for Local Services
 - 8. Eastern Goleta Valley
 - 9. Difference between Sphere of Influence and Annexation
 - 10. Relationship of City of Santa Barbara to Special Districts
 - 11. Mobile Home Parks in the Goleta Valley
 - 12. Unification of Goleta Valley Sanitary Districts
 - 13. Isla Vista/UCSB Governmental Options Study

- B. City of Goleta Section B
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Municipal Service Review
 - 3. MSR Determinations
 - 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 - 5. Acknowledgements and References
 - 6. Recommendations

- C. City of Santa Barbara Section C
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Municipal Service Review
 - 3. MSR Determinations
 - 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 - 5. Acknowledgements and References
 - 6. Recommendations

- D. County Service Area No. 3 (Goleta Valley) Section D
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Municipal Service Review
 - 3. MSR Determinations
 - 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 - 5. Acknowledgements and References
 - 6. Recommendations

- E. County Service Area No. 31 (Isla Vista) Section E
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations
- F. County Service Area No. 32 (Law Enforcement) Section F
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations
- G. Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District Section G
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations
- H. Goleta Sanitary District Section H
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations
- I. Goleta Water District Section I
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations

- J. Goleta West Sanitary District Section J
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations
- K. Isla Vista Recreation and Park District Section K
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations
- L. Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District Section L
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. Municipal I Service Review Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Update Determinations
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations
- M. Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District Section M
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations
- N. Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District Section N
1. Introduction
 2. Municipal Service Review
 3. MSR Determinations
 4. Sphere of Influence Review
 5. Acknowledgements and References
 6. Recommendations

A: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

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

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

1. Before LAFCOs were created

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

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

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

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

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

2. LAFCO regulation of boundary changes

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

LAFCO regulates by approving or denying city and special district boundary changes and the extension of public services. It is empowered to undertake studies of local

agencies and to initiate updates to the spheres of influence. Typically, applications to LAFCO originate with affected landowners and/or developers and cities or districts seeking to annex territory.

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

3. Santa Barbara LAFCO

The Santa Barbara LAFCO consists of seven regular members: two members appointed by the Board of Supervisors from its own membership, two members of city councils appointed by the mayors of the cities in the County, two members of special district boards appointed by the presiding officers of the independent special districts in the County; and one public member, appointed by other Commissioners.

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

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

4. Legislative History (Significant Changes Only)

Through a series of legislative amendments over the past 30 years LAFCO has become responsible for coordinating logical and timely changes in the local governmental structure, including annexations and detachments of territory, incorporations of cities, formations of special districts, consolidations, mergers and dissolutions, and to regulate the extension of services by cities and special districts outside of their boundaries.

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

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

- 1983 Responding to a lawsuit involving a special district annexation, the Legislature creates firm time limits within which LAFCOs must adopt spheres of influence or lose the ability to approve annexations.
- 1985 LAFCO and boundary change statutes are combined into one volume, the Cortese/ Knox Local Government Reorganization Act
- 1993 Significant reforms include allowing LAFCO to initiate some special district reorganizations and waive certain conduct authority protest hearings
- 2000 LAFCO required to (1) review and update spheres a least every five years and (2) prepare Municipal Service Reviews when updating spheres

5. Legislative Requirement to Prepare Municipal Service Reviews

Two separate studies recommended that LAFCOs review local agencies.

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

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

The report called on the legislature to increase the oversight of special districts by mandating that LAFCOs identify service duplications and that LAFCOs study reorganization alternatives when service duplications are identified, when a district appears insolvent, when district reserves are excessive, when rate inequities surface, when a district's mission changes, when a new city incorporates and when service levels are unsatisfactory. To accomplish this, the report recommended that the state strengthen the independence and funding of LAFCOs, require districts to report to their respective LAFCO, and require LAFCOs to study service duplications.

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

The Commission released its final report in January 2000 that examined the way that local government is organized and operates and established a vision of how the state will grow by “making better use of the often invisible LAFCOs in each county”.

The report points to the expectation that California’s population will double over the first four decades of the 21st Century, and raises concern that our government institutions were designed when our population was much smaller and our society was less complex. The report warns that, without a strategy, open spaces will be swallowed up, expensive freeway extensions will be needed, job centers will become farther removed from housing, and this will lead to longer commutes, increased pollution and a more stressful lifestyle. The report suggests local governments face unprecedented challenges in their ability to finance service delivery since voters cut property tax revenues in 1978 and the legislature shifted property tax revenues from local government to the schools in 1993.

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

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

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

Government Code Section 56430, which became effective on January 1, 2001, requires LAFCO to review municipal services provided in geographic areas appropriate to the service or services to be reviewed, and prepare a written statement of determinations with respect to each of the following:

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

8. Evaluation of management efficiencies; and
9. Local accountability and governance.

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

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

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

6. Legislative Requirement to Update Spheres of Influence

Since 1971 LAFCO has been obligated to develop and adopt a sphere of influence for each city and special district within the county. The statute states “The Commission shall develop and determine the sphere of influence of each local governmental agency within the county and enact policies designed to promote the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere.” (Government Code Section 56425)

Section 56076 defines a sphere of influence as:

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

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

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

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

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

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

LAFCO is statutorily required to review and update spheres. The Commission must notify affected agencies 21 days before holding a public hearing to consider the sphere. The Executive Officer report and recommendations on sphere updates under consideration must be issued at least five days prior to the public hearing.

7. Apportionment of Property Taxes in the Goleta Valley

One required determination for MSRs is “Financing constraints and opportunities.” In the Goleta Valley this leads to discussion of the apportionment of property taxes among local agencies.

Enterprise vs. Non-enterprise Functions – Some types of local governmental services are more readily financed by levying fees, charges or assessments to those receiving the service. Examples are water supply, sewer treatment or streetlights where fees can recover service costs including necessary infrastructure costs.

Some services such as recreation programs are partly recovered by fees to help offset program costs, for example, from those who participate in organized athletic events. But it is more difficult to recover other community recreational costs such as parks. These facilities are generally open to the public; it is difficult to levy a user fee which would cover the cost of park maintenance, utilities and so forth.

A May 2000 report by the State’s “Little Hoover” Commission ¹ devoted a chapter to “Property Tax Allocations to Enterprise Districts.” The report notes that,

Enterprise special districts that levy property taxes on their customers before Proposition 13 was enacted in 1978 continue to receive a portion of the property tax revenues that are now allocated by the state.

¹ Milton Marks ‘Little Hoover’ Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy

The policy of sharing property tax revenue with some enterprise districts made sense immediately after Proposition 13 – which cut tax rates and severed the link between specific taxpayers and specific government agencies. With property tax revenue pooled at the state, there was some logic to divide it among agencies which historically received it. That policy, however, makes less sense with each passing day.”

The idea of transferring property taxes from enterprise to non-enterprise functions is being supported for a number of reasons.

Property Taxes Are Scarce with Restricted Growth – The enactment of Proposition 13 fundamentally altered the relationship between property taxes and public services. It created a scarcity of this type of revenue that did not exist previously.

Prior to 1978 each local agency receiving property tax revenue levied its own tax rate. The amount received was determined by that rate multiplied by the taxable assessed value within the boundaries of the agency. Overall tax rates differed among different parts of a county based on the local array of taxing agencies and cumulative tax rate.

Taxing agencies were independent of each other and did not “compete” for property tax dollars. That was altered by Proposition 13, which imposed three basic changes:

- A. First - Taxes are limited to 1% of the fair market value of property being taxed. This essentially creates a “uniform” tax rate throughout the state regardless of the agencies within which a property is located.

This change significantly reduced the amount of property tax was being collected as compared to the prior cumulative tax rates. Prior to Proposition 13 effective tax rates could be as high as two or three percent of the value of the property; now it is limited to one percent of the value of the property.

- B. Second – The growth in taxable value for each parcel of land is limited to no more than 2% per year, regardless of growth in the actual value of the property, until such time as it is sold or there is a significant change in use. As a result, growth in taxable value tends to lag behind actual rates of inflation.

- C. Third – Property taxes are allocated to local agencies based solely on the historic allocations of such taxes, not by changing public service needs. Local agencies with high tax rates prior to Proposition 13 saw those rates become high property tax apportionment factors.

As a result of these changes, the property tax payments are no longer related to levels of service, the local organization of governments or financial needs of each agency. Agencies receiving property tax revenue in one fiscal year continue to receive such taxes in the next fiscal year (increased by assessed value growth within the agency) unaffected by changed local circumstances other than boundary changes.

Rigidity in the Allocation of Property Taxes – The property tax apportionment factor for each agency, meaning the percent of the one percent property tax it receives, is constant from one year to the next. Property tax apportionment factors are changed only with a jurisdictional change such as an annexation, detachment or incorporation that alters the array of taxing agencies in which the parcel is located.

As a result there is significant rigidity in the allocation of property taxes in California. It is difficult to reallocate taxes among local agencies even to reflect changed public service needs and priorities.

The other way tax apportionment factors are changed is when the State legislature alters the factors by transferring taxes to school districts through the Educational Resource Augmentation Fund (ERAF), which it has done on more than one occasion.

It is difficult, absent a boundary change, to reapportion taxes among local agencies. Consequently communities may experience (the Goleta Valley is good example) insufficient park and recreation services, limited fire protection and strained law enforcement budgets while at the same time significant property tax revenues in the community are allocated to an agency that provides enterprise services that can be funded through fees, charges and assessments.

While the State law allows the transfer of property tax factors among local agencies without a jurisdictional change examples of voluntary exchanges are not common.

Effect of Revenue Neutrality on the City of Goleta – Laws governing incorporations of new cities requires “revenue neutrality,” a concept stating that revenue lost by county government due to incorporating a city cannot exceed the County’s reduced public service costs.

If an incorporation results in a greater revenue loss to the county than the public service costs that it “sheds,” LAFCO is prohibited from approving the incorporation unless it imposes measures to mitigate the loss to the county. This is defined as making the incorporation “revenue neutral” for the county.

For the incorporation of Goleta, revenue neutrality conditions included long-term sharing of City sales taxes and conditions that make the City, despite its robust sales tax revenues, marginally funded in comparison to revenues received by similar cities.

At the same time, most of the City is within the Goleta West Sanitary District that receives a significant amount of the property taxes allocated to local agencies within the area. The amount allocated to the Goleta West Sanitary District is a matter of debate. The gross amount before deductions appears to be about \$1.5 million but some of that is paid to the Goleta Redevelopment Agency, leaving \$1.2 million.

In addition, for two years \$530,000 is subject to a State-mandated property tax shift.

Comparison of Goleta Valley With Other Areas – The staff compared the allocation of property taxes in the City of Goleta with other cities in Santa Barbara County, with the following results:

	A*	B **	C
	Total Property Taxes Within City	Total Property Taxes Allocated to Utilities	% Allocated to Utilities
Buellton	5 092 166		- 0 -
Carpinteria	13 425 516	516 164	3.84
Goleta	37 420 331	1 276 469	3.41
Guadalupe	2 215 813	56 257	2.54
Lompoc	18 081 134	0	- 0 -
Santa Barbara	108 119 883	99	- 0 -
Santa Maria	48 245 588	0	- 0 -
Solvang	7 415 408	0	- 0 -

* Entire “1% general” property tax including portions allocated to schools.

** Taxes allocated to water, sewer and street lighting districts.

The table illustrates that in city areas that receive sewer service from special districts, i.e. Carpinteria and Goleta, more than 3% of the property taxes collected are allocated to sanitary services. [In the City of Guadalupe, the allocation is to a City-governed street lighting district, a service borne in many communities by assessments rather than by a portion of the general property tax.]

If sewer services in Goleta were provided on an “enterprise” basis, similar to the cities of Lompoc, Santa Maria and Santa Barbara, it would “free up” almost \$1,300,000 annually in property taxes that could be used for other needed, non-enterprise public services in the community.

The City of Santa Barbara reports in its response to the MSR questionnaire:

The City’s enterprise funds, including water, wastewater, airport, waterfront, parking and golf rely primarily on user fees and charges. Rates are established based upon costs of service and are intended to recover all costs, including capital and depreciation. (Emphasis added)

Accumulated Fund Balance – Enterprise districts that receive property tax revenues are often prohibited from using those taxes to fund certain services. Consequently there is a tendency to accumulate tax revenues that are excess of current needs.

Reserves the accumulate from property taxes are available for any legitimate local service, as opposed to reserves received from fees or charges for sewer services. The Little Hoover Commission concluded, “a significant portion of the property tax allocated to all enterprise districts subsidizes districts with the highest reserves.”

Conclusion – In an area of the County where a significant amount of property tax revenue is annually apportioned to sewers, other necessary and desirable community services appear to be significantly underfunded. The rigidity in the reallocation of property taxes is a significant factor.

The State has not been reticent to shift property tax revenues from counties, cities and special districts to school districts. The current situation may increase further “raids” by the State on local revenues. This will not increase revenues for education but will reduce State obligations to fund public education at the expense of local agencies.

8. Eastern Goleta Valley

The incorporation of Goleta in 2002 left an unincorporated area between the cities of Goleta and Santa Barbara. It is variously referred to as the Eastern Goleta Valley, West Santa Barbara, or “Noleta.”

This area is the object of significant attention with regard to its governmental future. Obvious options are (1) annexation of all or part of the area to the City of Goleta, (2) annexation of all or part of the area to the City of Santa Barbara or (3) no municipal change, in which the area remains unincorporated.

Although this area is within the boundaries of Goleta-oriented agencies, i.e., Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta Water District, Goleta Union School District and County Service Area No.3, it appears many residents and property owners in this area choose not to identify with “Goleta.” As evidenced by the testimony during the Goleta incorporation hearing, this may be because the area is within Zip Code 93111 “Santa Barbara, California” with which there is strong voter identification.

9. Difference between a Sphere of Influence and an Annexation

Some citizen groups are advocating that the Eastern Goleta Valley be included in the City of Santa Barbara’s sphere of influence. These efforts include circulating petitions requesting the City’s sphere be extended to include the area.

A sphere is defined as a “plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by [the Local Agency Formation] Commission.” (GC 56076) The purpose of a sphere is to guide future annexations. One analogy that has been used is that the sphere is the “engagement” and being annexed is the “marriage.” With an engagement there should be a serious commitment to a resulting marriage.

It appears to the LAFCO staff that some interest expressed by citizen groups relates exclusively to the sphere without a commitment to pursue annexations to the City.

This issue is relevant because at one time the entire Goleta Valley was in the City of Santa Barbara's sphere of influence, yet neither the City nor the County recognized or implemented the sphere. The City did not file applications to annex any of the area, and the County continued to treat the Goleta Valley as any other unincorporated area (despite it being included in the City sphere.) There was no deference by the County to the City regarding land use or public service decisions.

The City sphere was "pulled back" to its current location to accommodate a proposed incorporation of Goleta in about 1987 for what was termed the G.O.O.D. (Goletans Organized for Orderly Government) incorporation proposal.

If the Commission extends the City's sphere to include Eastern Goleta Valley it should have an assurance the City is serious about extending its boundaries as well to avoid duplicating the situation that existed in the past.

10. Relationship of the City of Santa Barbara to Special Districts

Expanding City boundaries to include the Eastern Goleta Valley should require either concurrent detachments from Goleta water and sewer districts (if the City wishes to provide those services) or, alternatively, contractual agreements to allow overlaps of agencies without a conflict in providing public services.

The Commission will recall the St. Vincent's Reorganization in 2002 in which the City annexed property that was concurrently detached from the Goleta Water District. It was contentious due in major part to the fact the affected agencies had not agreed upon a plan relative to either a detachment from the District or an overlap.

If the City of Santa Barbara sphere is expanded to include the Eastern Goleta Valley, should be a formal understanding between the affected local agencies that defines and accepts their respective service areas.

11. Mobile Home Parks in the Goleta Valley

Another complication with City annexations of the Eastern Goleta Valley concerns mobile home park rent controls. A rent control ordinance exists in the unincorporated area but not within the City. Consequently unless this matter is resolved the staff sees significant opposition on the part of mobile home park residents to being included in the City. The scenario of individuals on fixed or retirement incomes being unable to afford ever-increasing rents has been presented to the Commission in the past.

The option of annexing Eastern Goleta Valley except for mobile home parks should require automatic aid agreements whereby the City automatically responds to calls for law enforcement or fire protection to avoid duplications of service with the County.

The City proposed annexing the Goleta Valley (when the incorporation of Goleta was being heard). The Board of Supervisors expressed concern about the potential effect

on the County Fire Protection District. While staff understands there are discussions between the City and County with respect to a unified fire protection agency we are unsure of the status of these discussions or whether this is considered a potentially viable arrangement for providing fire protection services.

12. Unification of Goleta Valley Sanitary Districts

There are two basic sanitation agencies in the Goleta Valley, the Goleta Sanitary District and the Goleta West Sanitary District, each with its own sphere of influence. The staff is recommending there be a single sphere of influence for both Districts.

As way of background, on 1995 the Commission considered a proposal by the Goleta West Sanitary District to unify its services with the Goleta Sanitary District. This was to be achieved by dissolving the Goleta West District and concurrently annexing its service area and transferring its assets to the Goleta District.

The Commission conceptually approved the proposal in March 1996; a final decision was postponed to give additional time for the reorganization committee to address unresolved issues regarding employment rights and benefits. Before the Commission could give final approval, the Goleta West District withdrew the proposal, which the Commission acknowledged in May 1996.

Discussions are underway between the Districts relative to a potential unification of their service areas and governing structure. The staff does not know if this would be a consolidation or some other arrangement. Nevertheless the Commission has already adopted a position, which has not been rescinded, favoring the unification of sanitary services within the Goleta Valley, and logically a single sphere of influence.

13. Preparation of Isla Vista/UCSB Governmental Options Study

In considering the incorporation of the City of Goleta the Commission directed that a separate analysis be prepared to identify and evaluate available governmental options for Isla Vista and UCSB. That report concluded that:

- Isla Vista/ UCSB is not financially feasible as a city since it would not generate sufficient annual public revenues to cover municipal expenditures.
- Annexation to the new City of Goleta could be financially feasible, depending on the terms of the annexation and timing. The annexation could work if terms are negotiated that are similar to the tax transfer and mitigations for an incorporation.
- Annexation to the City of Santa Barbara may be financially feasible, depending on the outcome of negotiations between the City and the County and the ability to mitigate potential impacts on the County.
- Forming a Community Services District or benefit assessment district is feasible but may have limited financial resources without voter support for tax increases.

CITY OF GOLETA

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

1. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the City of Goleta was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the City and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

2. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of City

The City was incorporated February 1, 2002 and is the newest of the eight cities in Santa Barbara County. It operates pursuant to the general laws of the State of California (Government Code, Section 34000 et seq.).

It is governed by a five-member city council all of whom are elected at large. It has a city manager form of government. See the organization chart.

The City is in southern Santa Barbara County, at the western end of the Goleta Valley. It is located on either side of U.S. Hwy 101. It is adjacent to the Santa Barbara Airport and the UCSB campus

LAFCO has not adopted a sphere of influence for the City; its approval is dependent on the City adopting its general plan. A map of the City is included in this report.

City Services

The City provides a broad variety of municipal services, which include:

- ❑ Law enforcement including traffic law enforcement
- ❑ Parks and open space maintenance
- ❑ Land use planning and regulation of building
- ❑ Library services
- ❑ Refuse collection, recycling and disposal
- ❑ Street maintenance
- ❑ Street lighting
- ❑ Drainage and storm water disposal

The Request for Information for Municipal Service Reviews includes significant detail about the services provided by the City including a discussion of services provided in concert with other public agencies. A copy is available in the LAFCO office.

The City participation in joint powers authorities with other public agencies is detailed in the Request for Information.

Other Governmental Agencies within the City

Local agencies that overlap the City include the Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District, Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta Water District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District.

3. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This portion of the report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute. LAFCO is responsible for assessing whether the City is reasonably capable of providing needed resources and infrastructure to serve areas within the City and its Sphere of Influence. It is important that infrastructure and resources are available when SOI revisions or annexations occur.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The City provides and maintains facilities that extend public services to its residents and property owners, primarily roads, drainage facilities, parks and City offices. The City is in the process of developing a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Growth and Population Projections

The City does not accept for use in Municipal Service Reviews the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's growth projections. It has adopted interim General Plan policies but has not adopted a General Plan to assess services needs for the City for the next several years, growth projections or plans to maintain municipal service levels.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The City is subject to the funding regulations that apply to municipalities throughout the State and is therefore subject to broad changes in revenue allocation based on the State budget, its relationship to local funding sources and revenue transfers.

As a newly incorporated city, Goleta is even more constrained as a result of the revenue neutrality agreement governing City revenues. Although significant sales taxes revenues are generated within the City, it is obligated to share portions of those and other revenues with the County.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

There are no obvious cost avoidance opportunities. It may be possible for the City to spread central administrative costs over a greater number of functions if the City becomes more of a "full service" agency.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

There are no obvious opportunities for rate restructuring in City operations.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

Some sharing is already occurring in terms of library and transit services in that the City participates cooperatively with other local agencies and does not duplicate these facilities.

Government Structure Options

There are opportunities for governmental structure options. Proponents of incorporating the City of Goleta chose to allow the overlap of the city with existing public service agencies, although in some communities it is common for cities to provide such services.

The City's Request for Information states, "Any proposed consolidation or other modification of organizational structures for delivery of sewage collection and treatment services affecting territory within the City of Goleta should be carefully evaluated.

Management Efficiencies

The City started municipal life with an interim city manager and no staff. It has grown and added capacity in order to serve its residents and customers. The General Plan process has occupied a significant amount of effort with a limited number of staff. It is anticipated that the City will become increasingly effective as time goes on.

Local Accountability and Governance

The City is a relatively compact government, which enhances the ability of the public to participate in its activities. The City Council is elected by and accountable to the voters who reside in the City.

The City is in the process of obtaining equipment to broadcast public meetings. There is a City website with information about City activities.

4. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The City's sphere of influence will be defined following adoption of the City General Plan. A map of the City is included.

Potential Sphere Changes

In response to the MSR Request for Information, the City responded as follows however a more recent letter from the City indicates this may not be the case:

Do you feel that your agency's boundary is correct at this time? Yes

Are there areas your agency desires or plans to serve that are not now within its boundaries or its sphere of influence? No

Sphere of Influence Determinations

At such time in the future that a sphere is proposed it would be appropriate to consider the information in this MSR and the City General Plan in making that determination,

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The City of Goleta provided the information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. City staff, notably Assistant City Manager Luci Serlet was instrumental in providing data.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

Available Documentation

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

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission accept this report and defer adoption of a sphere of influence for the City of Goleta until the City General Plan is adopted.

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

7. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the City of Santa Barbara was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the City and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

8. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of City

The City was incorporated in 1850 and is one of eight cities in Santa Barbara County. The current Charter was adopted in 1967. It operates pursuant to the laws of the State of California (Government Code, Section 34000 et seq.).

It is governed by a seven-member city council, which includes a directly-elected mayor, all of whom are elected at large. It has a city manager form of government and is a “full service” city, providing most essential city services. See the organization chart.

The City is located in southern Santa Barbara County, situated between the Pacific Ocean and coastal mountains. The main part of the City extends from Montecito on the east to Highway 154 and Hope Ranch on the west. A portion, contiguous only by means of an annexation through the ocean, includes the Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and adjacent property in the Goleta Valley, about four miles west of the rest of the City.

The City’s sphere is larger than its boundaries, due to some pockets and islands that have not been annexed. These include the Mission Canyon and Las Positas areas. A map of the City and its sphere is included in this report.

City Services

The City provides a broad variety of municipal services, which include:

- ❑ Law enforcement including traffic law enforcement
- ❑ Fire prevention and suppression
- ❑ Emergency medical response and search and rescue
- ❑ Parks, recreation programs and golf courses
- ❑ Open space maintenance
- ❑ Land use planning and regulation of buildings
- ❑ Library services
- ❑ General aviation airport
- ❑ Marina and small boat harbor
- ❑ Retail and wholesale water supply, including water conservation
- ❑ Wastewater collection, treatment and disposal
- ❑ Refuse collection, recycling and disposal
- ❑ Street maintenance including bridges and culverts
- ❑ Street lighting
- ❑ Drainage and storm water disposal

The Request for Information for Municipal Service Reviews includes significant detail about the services provided by the City including a discussion of services provided in concert with other public agencies. A copy is available in the LAFCO office.

The City participates in a number of inter-agency contracts, joint powers authorities and automatic and mutual aid agreements with other public agencies that are also detailed in the Request for Information.

The City tracks services provided in various ways, depending on the type of service. The City population of approximately 93,000 residents rises to 200,000 or more on weekends.

There are 25,700 water accounts and 23,700 wastewater accounts. In addition there are 1,340 out-of-city water and 200 out-of-city wastewater accounts. The population of the library service area is approximately 228,140. The passenger count at the airport in 2004 was 828,000.

The City is the major provider of active and passive recreation services for residents of the City and nearby south coast communities as well as visitors to the area.

Other Governmental Agencies within the City

Local agencies that overlap the City include the Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta Water District, Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

9. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The City provides and maintains a variety of facilities to extend public services to its residents, property owners and visitors. The City's Capital Plan identifies projects for construction through the year 2011 to improve and maintain the City's public services, projects which total \$317,691,000.

By identifying these current and future needs the City is able to plan for sufficient financing and sequencing of construction to meet its probable needs.

Growth and Population Projections

In addition to the City accepts the Santa Barbara County Association of Government's growth projections for the City the City's Aviation Facilities Plan forecasts passenger growth based on the SBCAG regional data and other factors.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The City's enterprise funds, including water, wastewater, airport, waterfront, parking and golf rely primarily on user fees and charges. Rates are established based upon costs of service and are intended to recover all costs, including capital and depreciation.

The City General Fund relies primarily on various taxes such as property, sales, transient occupancy and utility for 64% of total revenue. Fees and services charges contribute another 18% of revenues. Rarely do fees and charges recover the full costs associated with some services such as parks and recreation, planning, fire or police protection.

The City is subject to the funding regulations applicable to municipalities throughout the State and is therefore subject to broad changes in revenue allocation based on the State budget and its relationship to local funding sources.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

There are no obvious cost avoidance opportunities that have not been implemented by the City through internal reviews, contracts with other agencies, mutual aid agreements and joint powers authorities to assist in service economy and mitigate the impacts of emergencies by avoiding the costs to duplicate facilities and equipment.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

The opportunity for restructuring rates occurs during annual budget processes and the adoption of each rate ordinance.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

Significant sharing is occurring through arrangements for providing community services, such as library staffing, cooperatively with other local agencies.

Government Structure Options

There are no obvious opportunities for governmental structure options.

Management Efficiencies

The City exhibits the characteristics of a well-managed agency operating efficiently and serving its residents and customers effectively. A significant amount of effort is invested in planning how best to provide services to City residents and property owners.

Local Accountability and Governance

The City is a relatively compact government, which enhances the ability of the public to participate in its activities. The Mayor and City Council are elected by and accountable to the voters who reside in the City.

The City maintains many outreach programs. City Council meetings and others such as the Airport, Police, Planning and Parks Commissions are televised. There is a City website with information about contacts and activities, flyers are distributed with City

utility bills and the City has a school education program regarding the importance of conservation and recycling.

10. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The City's sphere is larger than its boundaries, due to some unincorporated pockets and islands that have not been annexed. These include the Mission Canyon and Las Positas areas. A map of the City and its sphere is included in this report.

In the past LAFCO adopted a much larger sphere for the City. Based on the concept of having one city in this area, the sphere included Montecito and the Goleta Valley. There was, however, no plan or commitment by the City, County or the communities to annex those areas. Over time, as proposals were filed with LAFCO to incorporate Montecito and Goleta, the City sphere was "pulled back" to its current position.

Potential Sphere Changes

In response to the MSR Request for Information, the City responded as follows:

Do you feel that your agency's boundary is correct at this time? Yes

Are there areas your agency desires or plans to serve that are not now within its boundaries or its sphere of influence? Yes

Areas and island within the City's existing Sphere of Influence will be annexed when development is proposed.

The City Council will also be considering the potential of adding the Eastern Goleta Valley to our sphere of influence a the request of resident sin the area. We expect the Council to take a position prior to LAFCO's consideration of the Municipal Service Reviews.

Proposal by the Committee for One to expand the City's Sphere

On December 30, 2002 the Committee for One, a citizens group, filed a request with LAFCO to amend the City of Santa Barbara's sphere of influence "to include the eastern part of the Goleta Valley excluded from the formation of the City of Goleta."

The Commission considered this request on March 6, 2003. After accepting testimony from interested parties, including representatives of the Cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta, the Commission "directed the staff to schedule a hearing when the proper environmental documentation is prepared, the Commission prepares Municipal Service Reviews and all interested parties have an opportunity to comment on the proposal."

The geographic area the Committee for One wants included in the City's Sphere is shown on the enclosed map. It is the entire unincorporated area between the Cities of Santa Barbara and Goleta, extending from the Pacific Ocean to and including the foothills.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

Inasmuch as a change in the City's sphere of influence has been proposed, it is necessary for the Commission to make a decision about the proposal, to either approve, deny or modify the application to modify the sphere.

If, after conducting a public hearing, the Commission determines to expand the City's Sphere, the staff will draft the appropriate determinations required by the sphere of influence statute and in so doing will consider the information in this MSR

With respect to extending the City sphere to include the Eastern Goleta Valley, this process should require either concurrent removal of the area from the existing water and sewer district spheres (if the City intends to provide those services) or there should be, alternatively, contractual agreements between these public agencies to allow overlaps of boundaries without future conflicts in how these services will be provided.

It is clear from letters received in response to the proposal by the Committee for One, there needs to be a satisfactory resolution of the mobile home park rent control issue if there is to be serious consideration of the City annexing these areas.

11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The City of Santa Barbara did an excellent job in providing information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. The City staff, Community Development Director Paul Casey and Finance Director Bob Pierson were instrumental in providing data but it is clear from the quality of the submittal that the entire City organization was involved.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

Available Documentation

The "Request for Information for Municipal Service Reviews" submitted by the City and the supporting documents referred to therein, and the request submitted by the Committee for One, are available in the LAFCO office.

12. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review and the application submitted by the Committee for One, it is recommended the Commission, following a public hearing, either (1) affirm the current Sphere of Influence or (2) determine to expand the Sphere to include all or a portion of the Eastern Goleta Valley. As a precedent to such a sphere expansion there should be agreements between the City and the Goleta Sanitary District and the Goleta Water District regarding their respective service areas in the intended “sphere overlap” area. .

**COUNTY SERVICE AREA
NO. 3 (GOLETA VALLEY)**

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

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

13. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding County Service Area No. 3 (Goleta Valley) was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

14. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed in 1962 and operates pursuant to the County Service Area Law (Government Code, Section 25210 et seq.).

The District is governed by the Board of Supervisors and administered by the County Public Works Department.

The District is located in southern Santa Barbara County and includes the unincorporated Goleta Valley, excluding Hope Ranch.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are largely coterminous. There are undeveloped areas within the Goleta Valley that are in the sphere but not in the district. A map of the District and its sphere is included.

District Services

The District provides streetlighting, maintenance of parks and open space, and enhanced support for public library services.

The District energizes approximately 2,800 street lights and maintains approximately 223 acres of open space in 51 separate areas.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District are County Service Area 32 (Law Enforcement), Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta Water District, Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

15. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The district maintains dedicated parkland, the amount of which has been determined by County land use development conditions and decisions to acquire parks and open space. The county does not operate active parks or recreation programs in unincorporated areas.

Other district activities include energizing streetlights and collecting taxes to support the operation of public libraries

Growth and Population Projections

The District energizes streetlights and maintains parks and open space. The District does not influence or affect population growth or projections but instead provides services when land use changes are approved that resulting in the dedication of public parkland or an increase in the number of street lights.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The District receives a portion of general property tax and benefit assessments levied on parcels within the district. These sources are sufficient to fund district services.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

There are no obvious cost avoidance opportunities; the majority of the cost is involved in energizing streetlights and contracting for parkland maintenance.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

There are no obvious opportunities for rate restructuring in the operations of the district since other than benefit assessments rates are not charged for district services.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

There are no obvious opportunities for shared facilities in the operations of the district other than current expenses to support community library services.

Government Structure Options

There are no obvious opportunities for structural changes in the governance of the district. CSA No. 3 included most of the Goleta Valley but the area within the City of Goleta was automatically detached from the district and its service obligations transferred to the City when the incorporation was completed.

Management Efficiencies

The District is managed by the County Public Works Department by utilizing a small portion of the time of current employees.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is governed by the Board of Supervisors, which is elected by districts each of which include approximately 20% of the total County population.

16. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The district boundaries and sphere are largely coterminous. Areas that would logical annex to the district due to existing general plans are already within the sphere.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

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

17. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

Available Documentation

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

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

Martin Wilder in the County Public Works Department provided the basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

18. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.

**COUNTY SERVICE AREA
NO. 31 (ISLA VISTA)**

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

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

19. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding County Service Area No. 31 (Isla Vista) was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

20. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed in 1963 and operates pursuant to the County Service Area Law (Government Code, Section 25210 et seq.).

The District is governed by the Board of Supervisors and administered by the County Public Works Department.

It is located in southern Santa Barbara County and encompasses Isla Vista, a primarily residential community immediately west of the main UCSB campus and surrounded by University-owned property.

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

District Services

The District provides streetlighting and acquires open space in conjunction with the Isla Vista Redevelopment Agency. The District energizes approximately 31 streetlights.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District are County Service Area 32 (Law Enforcement), Goleta West Sanitary District, Isla Vista Recreation and Park District, Goleta Water District, Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

21. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The district energizes streetlights and acquires open space. There are no infrastructure deficiencies.

Growth and Population Projections

The District does not influence or affect population growth or projections.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The District receives a portion of general property tax and benefit assessments levied on parcels within the district. In acquiring open space it relies on funding generated by the Isla Vista Redevelopment Agency. These sources are sufficient to fund district services.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

There are no obvious cost avoidance opportunities; the majority of the cost is involved in energizing streetlights.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

There are no obvious opportunities for rate restructuring in the operations of the district since rates benefit assessments are charged for district services.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

There are no obvious opportunities for shared facilities in the operations of the district.

Government Structure Options

When considering the incorporation of the City of Goleta, the Commission analyzed of governmental options for Isla Vista and UCSB. The report concluded, in part, that forming a Community Services District or benefit assessment district for Isla Vista, with broader powers that recreation and park services, is feasible but may have limited financial resources unless there is voter support for increased taxes.

Other than including the County Service Area No. 3 functions in a multi-purpose special district for Isla Vista there are no opportunities for structural changes in governance.

Management Efficiencies

The District is managed by the County Public Works Department by utilizing a small portion of the time of current employees.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is governed by the Board of Supervisors, which is elected by districts each of which include approximately 20% of the total County population.

22. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The district boundaries and sphere are coterminous.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

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

23. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

Available Documentation

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

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

Martin Wilder in the County Public Works Department provided the basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

24. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.

**COUNTY SERVICE AREA
NO. 32 (LAW ENFORCEMENT)**

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

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

25. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding County Service Area No. 32 (Law Enforcement) was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

26. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed in 1979 and operates pursuant to the County Service Area Law (Government Code, Section 25210 et seq.).

The district includes the entire unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County and excludes all cities. It is governed by the Board of Supervisors and administered by the Sheriff.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. As land is annexed to a city it is detached from the district.

District Services

The District provides an accounting mechanism to help fund law enforcement services in the unincorporated area. The District has no separate staff and functions as a source of revenue for the Sheriff's office.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District in the Goleta Valley area include County Service Area 3 (Goleta Valley), County Service Area 31 (Isla Vista), Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District, Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta Water District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Isla Vista Recreation and Park District, Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

27. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

This is not a pertinent issue to this agency, which is a funding source for law enforcement services in the unincorporated area. There is no related infrastructure other than law enforcement vehicles and equipment.

Growth and Population Projections

The district generates revenues that increase as population growth occurs. It does not affect the rate or location of population development.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The district receives sales and other unincorporated area revenues generated in the unincorporated area to help fund law enforcement services.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

This is not a pertinent issue to this agency, which is a funding source for law enforcement services in the unincorporated area. The County may institute staffing or other changes but they are not directly related to this agency.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

This is not a pertinent issue to this agency. It does not establish or administer rates or charges for current services.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

This is not a pertinent issue to this agency. This agency does not own or manage any facilities.

Government Structure Options

This is not a pertinent issue to this agency. The district is governed by the Board of Supervisors and includes the entire unincorporated area.

Management Efficiencies

This is not a pertinent issue to this agency. The County may institute staffing or other changes but they are not directly related to this agency.

Local Accountability and Governance

The district is governed by the Board of Supervisors, which is elected by Supervisorial districts, each of which include approximately 20% of the total County population. It is administered by the County Sheriff's Office.

28. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The district's boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. As land is annexed to a city it is detached from the District.

No Proposed Sphere Changes

There are no sphere changes proposed at this time.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

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

29. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Santa Barbara Sheriff's Office provided the basic information upon which the evaluation is based. Commander Jeff Meyer was instrumental in providing data.

Available Documentation

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

30. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.

EMBARCADERO MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

31. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District (EMID) was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

32. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed in 1940 and operates pursuant to the Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District Act, Chapter 81, Statutes of 1960.

It is located in southern Santa Barbara County, extending inland from the Pacific Ocean at the western end of the Goleta Valley.

A five-member board of directors, elected at-large, governs the District. A Clerk/District Manager is responsible for administrative functions. A District organizational chart is included as part of the District's response to the Request for Information.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. A map of the District and its sphere is included.

District Services

EMID includes 165 single-family homes, plus several residences on the Tecolote Ranch portion of the District.

The District provides a variety of services, though it appears that some are provided only in conjunction with other agencies such as the County Sheriff. Following are the services the District indicates it provides:

- Police protection (EMID has contracted with the Sheriff for additional patrols),
- Fire prevention (by working with the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District to install a bridge in the area that will accommodate fire apparatus),
- Vector control (by funding a program to distribute fly predators to horse properties),
- Building regulation utilizing an Architectural Committee (established by statute in 1980 to allow EMID to enforce private covenants, conditions and restrictions),
- Parks, open space, and recreation including a playground, BBQ area and equestrian riding ring,
- Beautification of public rights-of-way and
- Advocacy for local residents in relationships with the County and other public agencies.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District are the City of Goleta, Goleta Water District, County Service Area 32 (Law Enforcement), Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

33. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The District does not have a capital improvement plan but it appears from the information provided that the District is able to accommodate present and anticipated service demands with its available facilities.

Growth and Population Projections

The District is almost entirely built out and developed.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The District is funded by a portion of the general property tax.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

There are no obvious cost avoidance opportunities, other than perhaps transferring the sewers and responsibilities entirely to the Goleta West Sanitary District.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

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

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

There are no obvious opportunities for shared facilities in the operations of the District. A cooperative agreement with the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District allows the RPD to use EMID meeting facilities in exchange for inspection of EMID's playground.

Government Structure Options

There are no obvious opportunities for government structure options other than to annex the District area to the Goleta West Sanitary District.

Management Efficiencies

The District exhibits characteristics of a well-managed agency operating efficiently with very limited staff resources to effectively serve its residents and customers.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is compact, enhancing the public's ability to participate in District activities. The Board of Directors is elected by and accountable to the voters who reside in the District. The District distributes a monthly Newsletter and maintains a District website.

34. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

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

No Proposed Sphere Changes

In response to the MSR Request for Information, the District responded as follows:

Do you feel that your agency's boundary is correct at this time? Yes

Are there areas your agency desires or plans to serve that are not now within its boundaries or its sphere of influence? No

Are there areas your agency currently serves that might be served more efficiently by another agency? No

The staff concurs with this response and does not identify a need to modify the District boundaries or sphere of influence.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

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

35. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The District provided the basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. District staff, Clerk/District Manager Susan Paxton Koesterer, was instrumental in providing data.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

Available Documentation

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

36. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.

GOLETA SANITARY DISTRICT

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

37. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the Goleta Sanitary District was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

38. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed in 1942 and operates pursuant to the Sanitary District Act of 1923 (Health & Safety Code §6400 et seq.).

It is located in southern Santa Barbara County, occupying much of the Goleta Valley on both sides of Highway 101 and is adjacent to Hope Ranch and the City of Santa Barbara.

A five-member board of directors, elected at-large, governs the District. A General Manager is responsible for administrative functions. A District organizational chart is included as part of this report.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are largely coterminous. A map of the District and its sphere is enclosed.

District Services

The District provides wastewater collection, treatment and disposal and produces reclaimed water that is distributed by the Goleta Water District.

The District operates a regional wastewater treatment and disposal facility by accepting and treating wastewater from the Goleta West Sanitary District, Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District, University of California at Santa Barbara, City of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and County of Santa Barbara building complex.

The District's own collection system serves about 16,000 equivalent residential units, representing a population of about 53,000. The regional treatment plan serves about 24,000 equivalent residential units, representing a population of about 80,000.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District are the City of Goleta, City of Santa Barbara, Goleta Water District, County Service Area 3 (Goleta Valley), County Service Area 32 (Law Enforcement), Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

39. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

District evaluation and planning documents include a Sewer Collection System Master Plan (2000), Wastewater Treatment Plant Maintenance Master Plan (2000), Water Reclamation Master Plan (1999), updated projections for its NPDES application (2003) and five-year capital improvement plan (2003), termed the Capital Refurbishment Plan for the Wastewater Treatment Plant and other documents that project infrastructure needs for the agency and its service area.

There appears to be sufficient capacity in the plant to meet projected demands, though expansion may be required in the future. The most significant immediate challenge to the District will be modifying its wastewater treatment plan over the next several years to achieve full secondary treatment.

Growth and Population Projections

The District obtained growth projections in connection with its recent renewal of the NPDES discharge permit from the UCSB Economic Forecast Project. Planning documents include a land use survey and wastewater generation projection, conducted jointly with the Goleta West Sanitary District (1998).

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The District generates increased revenues as population and water usage and wastewater generation are increased.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

The District participates in a Joint Powers Authority with other public utilities to obtain pooled property, automotive, liability and workers compensation insurance savings.

The Commission previously endorsed consolidating sewer services in the Goleta Valley in order to reduce administrative costs and inefficiency for these programs and promote economy in the use of personnel and equipment.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

The District's rates are established to recover costs. The opportunity for restructuring rates occurs during annual budget processes and the adoption of each rate ordinance.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

The District's wastewater treatment facility is currently shared with other agencies and sharing of equipment might be enhanced through a consolidation of these agencies.

Government Structure Options

One option is consolidation with the Goleta West Sanitary District. Both agencies were formed and operate under the same principal act, provide similar types of services and share a single treatment plant. The Commission previously endorsed this option.

The “Request for Information for Municipal Service Reviews” asked,

“Are there structural reorganizations such as consolidations or reorganizations that your agency thinks should be evaluated in the next few years to benefit recipients of your agency’s services or improve the provision of services generally?”

The District responded by stating:

“The District would be interested in providing sewer service to the unincorporated Hope Ranch community if such service is desired by the residents and can be provided in a cost effective manner.

“The Goleta Sanitary District is also interesting in exploring the possibility of consolidating with the adjacent Goleta West Sanitary District. Approximately 10 years have passed since this issue was last studied and a consolidation at this time could be in the best interests of the constituents of both agencies.

“In addition, the District is interested in exploring the possibility of annexing the sewer systems of (i) the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and adjacent areas within the City of Santa Barbara, and (ii) the University of California at Santa Barbara.”

Though the District is emphatic that it is opposed to any reorganization that does not have the concurrence of all of the affected agencies.

Management Efficiencies

The District exhibits the characteristics of a well-managed agency effectively serving its residents and customers. With regard to overall services more efficient use of personnel and equipment might be possible via the consolidation or unification with the adjacent Goleta West Sanitary District.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is a relatively compact government, which enhances the ability of the public to participate in its activities. The Board of Directors is elected by and accountable to the voters who reside in the District. The District’s maintains a website and conducts a public education program involving twice-annual newsletters sent to all constituents, tours of the treatment plant and an elementary school program.

40. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are not coterminous. The sphere is larger and there are several of pockets or islands within the overall boundaries. A map of the District and its sphere is included.

No Proposed Boundary Changes

In response to the MSR Request for Information, the District responded as follows:

Do you feel that your agency's boundary is correct at this time? Yes

The boundaries will require adjustment as properties located outside of the District's present boundaries develop or other require sewer service.

Are there areas your agency desires or plans to serve that are not now within is boundaries or its sphere of influence? No

The District would be interested in providing sewer service to the unincorporated Hope Ranch if such service is desired by the residents and can be provided in a cost effective manner

The District is interested in exploring the possibility of consolidating with the adjacent Goleta West Sanitary District. Approximately 10 years have passed since this issue was last studied and a consolidation at this time could be in the best interests of the constituents of both agencies.

The Goleta Sanitary District is interested in exploring the possibility of assuming responsibility for the sewer collection systems which are currently owned and operated by (i) the city of Santa Barbara Municipal Airport and adjacent areas within the City of Santa Barbara, and (ii) the University of California at Santa Barbara.

Are there areas your agency currently serves that might be served more efficiently by another agency? No

Sphere of Influence Determinations

It is recommended the Commission adopt a "single sphere of influence" for the Goleta Sanitary District and Goleta West Sanitary District, which will reflect the Commission's official view these agencies should be consolidated or unified.

The following sphere of influence determinations are proposed in support of this sphere:

Present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands

A variety of urban use exist or are planned within the proposed sphere, i.e., residential, commercial, industrial and institutional, with some open space and agriculture. No change in existing or planned uses will result from having a “common sphere” with the Goleta West Sanitary District.

Present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area

There is an existing and ongoing need for community wastewater treatment and disposal services in the proposed sphere, as anticipated in the District’s capital facilities plan. No change in the need for these services will result from having a “common sphere” with the Goleta West Sanitary District.

Present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public service that the agency provides or is authorized to provide

The District’s capital facilities plan indicates the capacity of public facilities to serve the territory within the District and its logical growth area. Public services are adequate with the understanding the District’s wastewater treatment plant will be upgraded to meet higher levels of treatment. Plans to comply with the State’s requirements to upgrade the treatment plant are already under way although full compliance may take up to 10 years.

Existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

Goleta Valley residents share many similar social and economic characteristics, including a government structure that encompasses much of the entire valley with respect to water, sewer, library, fire protection and public education. Such common interests appear to favor a consolidated or unified sewer system operation.

41. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Goleta Sanitary District provided the basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. District staff, notably General Manager/District Engineer Kamil Azoury, was instrumental in providing data.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

Available Documentation

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

42. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission approve determinations and adopt a common sphere of influence for the Goleta Sanitary District and Goleta West Sanitary District.

A single sphere of influence appears to be exempt from CEQA in light of Categorical Exemption Class 20 (Changes in Governmental Organization).

GOLETA WATER DISTRICT

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

43. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the Goleta Water District was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

44. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed November 17, 1944 and operates pursuant to the California Water Code, Section 30,000 et seq.

Located in southern Santa Barbara County the District encompasses much of the Goleta Valley and also some properties east of Highway 154. It extends west and includes some properties along the Gaviota Coast.

A board of directors, consisting of five members elected at-large, governs the District. A General Manager is responsible for administrative functions. A District organizational chart is included.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are generally coterminous.

District Services

The District provides retail water delivery to approximately 16,000 metered accounts, wholesale water supply to three private entities, recycled water to 30 metered accounts and actively promotes water conservation.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District include the City of Goleta, City of Santa Barbara, County Service Area 32 (Law Enforcement), County Service Area 31 (Goleta Valley), County Service Area No. 3 (Isla Vista), Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District, Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

45. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The District's water supply sources include the Cachuma Project, State Water Project and groundwater from Central Goleta Groundwater Basin. A May 2001 study by Camp, Dresser & McKee identifies infrastructure needs for system reliability and rehabilitation, all of which are within the District's capabilities to achieve.

Growth and Population Projections

The District prepares service demand projections based on zoning for vacant properties. Actual water usage is used to check population projections. The District accepts Association of Government growth projections for use in Municipal Service Reviews.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The District generates increased revenues as population and water usage grow.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

The District pursues various methods to achieve greater staff efficiency. These include converting to “touch read” water meters and preventive replacement of polybutylene lines with copper service lines.

The District participates in Joint Powers Authorities with other public utilities to protect legal interests of south coast agencies and to obtain pooled property, automotive, liability and workers compensation insurance savings.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

The District’s rates are established to recover costs. The opportunity for restructuring rates occurs during annual budget processes and the adoption of each rate ordinance.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

The District participates in Joint Powers Authorities with other public utilities to operate jointly used facilities to bring water from the Cachuma Project on the Santa Ynez River to the South Coast and to deliver State Project water to Santa Barbara County.

Government Structure Options

The “Request for Information for Municipal Service Reviews” asks,

“Are there structural reorganizations such as consolidations or reorganizations that your agency thinks should be evaluated in the next few years to benefit recipients of your agency’s services or improve the provision of services generally?”

The District response is:

“Should the Goleta Sanitary District and the Goleta West Sanitary District propose a merger/consolidation/reorganization of those two districts, consideration at that time could be given to also evaluating an options which would include the Goleta Water District.”

At such time as a proposal is received to consolidate or unify the two sanitation districts the staff will include an evaluation of the including the Goleta Water District as part of the unification. Moreover, it might be appropriate for the Goleta Water District to contact the sanitation districts since consolidation is in the discussion stage.

Management Efficiencies

The District exhibits the characteristics of a well-managed agency effectively serving its residents and customers.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is a relatively compact government, which enhances the ability of the public to participate in its activities. The Board of Directors is elected by and accountable to the voters who reside in the District.

The District maintains a website, distributes a quarterly newsletter to its constituents, sponsors a Water Awareness Day, provides primary and secondary school presentations and tours and participates in community festivals.

46. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are largely coterminous, with a few "islands." A map of the District and its sphere are included.

No Proposed Boundary Changes

In response to the MSR Request for Information, the District responded as follows:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| Do you feel that your agency's boundary is correct at this time? | No |
| Are there areas your agency desires or plans to serve that are not now within its boundaries or its sphere of influence? | No |
| Are there areas your agency currently serves that might be served more efficiently by another agency? | Yes |

In response to this question the District referred to the "overlap area" where the District borders the City of Santa Barbara and its desire to transfer service responsibility to the City in this area. The Commission is aware of this situation and is cooperating with the City and District to secure an effective and timely resolution of the problem.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

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

47. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Goleta Water District provided the basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. The District staff, notably General Manager Kevin Walsh was instrumental in providing data.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

Available Documentation

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

48. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.

GOLETA WEST SANITARY DISTRICT

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

49. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the Goleta West Sanitary District was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

50. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed November 8, 1954 and operates pursuant to the Sanitary District Act of 1923 (Health & Safety Code §6400 et seq.).

It is located in southern Santa Barbara County, specifically in the western Goleta Valley on both sides of Highway 101 and includes much of the City of Goleta and Isla Vista.

A five-member board of directors, elected at-large, governs the District. A General Manager is responsible for administrative functions. A District organizational chart is included as part of this report.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are largely coterminous. A map of the District and its sphere is included.

District Services

The District provides wastewater collection. The District collects its fees through the property tax rolls and annually bills approximately 5,165 parcels. It serves a population of approximately 32,300 and maintains about 62 miles of mainline sewers.

The District accepts wastewater from the Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District, which is largely outside the District, and by an agreement with that District, performs maintenance for the District collection system.

Sewage is treated at the Goleta Sanitary District's treatment plant through a joint use agreement for treatment and disposal. The District uses over 40% of the treatment plant.

The District also provides street sweeping that is funded by property taxes.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District are the City of Goleta, Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Goleta Water District, County Service Area 31 (Isla Vista), County Service Area 32 (Law Enforcement), Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

51. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The District's Capital Facilities Engineering & Financial Plan (May 2003) evaluates current facilities and projects capital needs to serve projected growth in service demand.

From the information provided in the District's adopted plans, the District has substantial remaining capacity for future service demands.

Growth and Population Projections

The District includes the City of Goleta and some unincorporated areas, namely Isla Vista and the Embarcadero development. It has sufficient capacity to serve projected land uses within its sphere of influence.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

Major District revenues are sewer user fees and ad valorem property taxes. The fees are established, as required by State funding guidelines, to recover sewer system operations, maintenance and replacement costs.

Property taxes received by the District exceed \$1 million this year and are discussed in the introduction to this report for the Santa Barbara Goleta Valley Area.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

The Commission previously endorsed consolidating sewer services in the Goleta Valley in order to reduce administrative costs and inefficiency for these programs and promote economy in the use of personnel and equipment.

The District participates in a Joint Powers Authority with other public utilities to obtain pooled property, automotive, liability and workers compensation insurance savings.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

The District's rates are established to recover costs. The opportunity for restructuring rates occurs during annual budget processes and the adoption of each rate ordinance.

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

The District is currently sharing a treatment facility with the Goleta Sanitary District and sharing of other equipment might be enhanced though a consolidation of these Districts.

Government Structure Options

One option is consolidation with the Goleta Sanitary District. Both agencies were formed and operate under the same principal act, provide similar services and share a single wastewater treatment plant. The Commission previously endorsed this option.

The “Request for Information for Municipal Service Reviews” asked,

“Are there structural reorganizations such as consolidations or reorganizations that your agency thinks should be evaluated in the next few years to benefit recipients of your agency’s services or improve the provision of services generally?”

The District responded by stating:

“There are ongoing discussions with Goleta Sanitary District regarding potential consolidation. The potential for increased costs to customers must be evaluated.”

Management Efficiencies

The District exhibits the characteristics of an agency serving its residents and customers effectively. More efficient use of personnel and equipment might be possible via the consolidation or unification with the adjacent Goleta Sanitary District.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is a relatively compact government, which enhances the ability of the public to participate in its activities. The Board of Directors is elected by and accountable to the voters who reside in the District. District Newsletters can be accessed on its website.

52. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The District’s boundaries and sphere of influence are largely coterminous. A map of the District and its sphere are included.

No Proposed Boundary Changes

In response to the MSR Request for Information, the District responded as follows:

Do you feel that your agency’s boundary is correct at this time?	Yes
Are there areas your agency desires or plans to serve that are not now within is boundaries or its sphere of influence?	No
Are there areas your agency currently serves that might be served more efficiently by another agency?	No

Sphere of Influence Determinations

It is recommended that the Commission adopt a “common sphere of influence” for the Goleta West Sanitary District and Goleta Sanitary District, reflecting the Commission view these agencies should be consolidated or unified.

The following sphere of influence determinations are proposed in support of this sphere:

Present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands

A variety of urban use exist or are planned within the proposed sphere, i.e., residential, commercial, industrial and institutional, with some open space and agriculture. No change in existing or planned uses will result from having a “common sphere” with the Goleta Sanitary District.

Present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area

There is an existing and ongoing need for community wastewater treatment and disposal services in the proposed sphere, as anticipated in the District’s capital facilities plan. No change in the need for these services will result from having a “common sphere” with the Goleta Sanitary District.

Present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public service that the agency provides or is authorized to provide

The District’s capital facilities plan indicates the capacity of public facilities to serve the territory within the District and its logical growth area. Public services are adequate with the understanding the wastewater treatment plant operated by the Goleta Sanitary District will need to be upgraded to meet higher levels of treatment. Plans to comply with the State’s requirements to upgrade the treatment plant are already under way.

Existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

Goleta Valley residents share many similar social and economic characteristics, including a government structure that encompasses much of the entire valley with respect to water, sewer, library, fire protection and public education. Such common interests appear to favor a consolidated or unified sewer system operation.

53. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Goleta West Sanitary District provided the basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. District staff, notably General Manager/Superintendent Mark Nation, was instrumental in providing data.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

Available Documentation

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

5 4 . R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission approve determinations and adopt a common sphere of influence for the Goleta West Sanitary District and Goleta Sanitary District.

A single sphere of influence appears to be exempt from CEQA in light of Categorical Exemption Class 20 (Changes in Governmental Organization).

ISLA VISTA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT

MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

55. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the Isla Vista Recreation and Park District was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

56. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed October 31, 1972 and operates pursuant to the Recreation and Park Act (Public Resources Code, Section 5780 et seq.).

It is located in southern Santa Barbara County and encompasses Isla Vista, a primarily residential community immediately west of the main UCSB campus and surrounded by University-owned property.

A five-member board of directors, elected at-large, governs the District. A General Manager is responsible for administrative functions. A District organizational chart is included as part of this report.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. A map of the District and its sphere is included.

District Services

Approximately 20,000 people reside in this one-half square mile District. It owns and operates public parks and open space and administers public recreation programs.

The District sponsors the "Adopt-A-Block" program to assist in keeping Isla Vista streets free of litter and participates in local planning studies such as the Isla Vista Master Plan and Community Center Feasibility Study.

The District by contract maintains County parks and beach access ways and maintains County Redevelopment Agency open space.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District are County Service Area 31 (Isla Vista), County Service Area 32 (Law Enforcement), Goleta Water District, Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District, Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

57. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The District is in the process of preparing a five-year Capital Improvement Plan, which is being developed in conjunction with the Isla Vista Master Plan.

Growth and Population Projections

The District population forecast is estimated from the Isla Vista Master Plan, which estimates eventual growth of an additional 1,445 units, equivalent to 4,350 new Isla Vista residents.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The District receives a share of the general property tax and revenues from two separate voter-approved special taxes, in addition to fees for service.

The two special taxes generate, respectively, \$10 per dwelling unit and \$0.05 per square foot of commercial space and \$77.66 per bedroom and \$277.35 per commercial unit.

The District concludes, “The District’s two main revenues sources are tied to bedrooms and units and as units and bedrooms increase, our revenues will theoretically keep pace with population growth and the District should be able to provide continued uninterrupted levels of service, barring any unforeseen additional revenue shifts to the State of California.”

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

There are no obvious cost avoidance opportunities in District operations since the most significant costs are related to levels of property maintenance and recreation programs.

The District participates in a Joint Powers Authority with other public utilities to obtain pooled property, liability and workers compensation insurance savings.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

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

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

There are no obvious opportunities for additional shared facilities.

Government Structure Options

When considering the incorporation of the City of Goleta, the Commission analyzed of governmental options for Isla Vista and UCSB. The report concluded, in part, that forming a Community Services District or benefit assessment district for Isla Vista, with powers broader than recreation and park services, is feasible but may have limited financial resources unless there is voter support for increased taxes.

In responding to the “Request for Information” for the MSRs, the District responded “No” to the question of whether reorganizations should be evaluated in the next few years to benefit recipients of agency services or improve the provision of services generally

Management Efficiencies

The District exhibits the characteristics of a well-managed agency operating efficiently and serving its residents and customers effectively.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is a compact government, which enhances the public’s ability to participate in its activities. The Board of Directors is elected by and accountable to the voters who reside in the District. The District’s maintains a website.

58. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The District’s boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. A map of the District and its sphere are included.

No Proposed Boundary Changes

In response to the MSR Request for Information, the District responded as follows:

Do you feel that your agency’s boundary is correct at this time?	Yes
Are there areas your agency desires or plans to serve that are not now within	No
Are there areas your agency currently serves that might be served more efficiently by another agency?	No

Sphere of Influence Determinations

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

59. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Isla Vista Recreation and Park District provided basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. District staff, notably General Manager Derek Johnson, was instrumental in providing data.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

Available Documentation

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

60. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.

**SANTA BARBARA COASTAL
VECTOR CONTROL
DISTRICT**

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

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

61. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

62. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed 1959 and operates pursuant to the Pest Abatement District Law (Health and Safety Code. Section 2200 et seq.).

The District encompasses the entire unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County and the Cities of Carpinteria, Goleta and Santa Barbara. It excludes the Cities of Buellton, Guadalupe, Lompoc, Santa Maria and Solvang.

The District is governed by an eight -member board of trustees, appointed by the Board of Supervisors and City Councils of cities within the District. A General Manager is responsible for administrative functions.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are not coterminous. For cities not in the District, as land is annexed to the city it is concurrently detached from the District.

District Services

The District provides abatement of mosquitoes, roof rats and other disease vectors and routine surveillance of vector-borne disease.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District in the Goleta Valley area include the City of Goleta, City of Santa Barbara, County Service Area 3 (Goleta Valley), County Service Area 31 (Isla Vista), County Service Area 32 (Unincorporated Law Enforcement), Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District, Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta Water District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Isla Vista Recreation and Park District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

63. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The District provided to LAFCO in October 2004 a report on its current service plans and programs. It indicates the District is progressing with the purchase of equipment and hiring of personnel to conduct a more effective response to the threat of West Nile Virus disease in the County.

Growth and Population Projections

The District's services do not affect the rate or location of population development. The District generates revenues that increase as population growth occurs

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

District revenues are limited to growth in the property tax allocation it receives from the general property tax levy, assessments on parcels within the District and the amount the County allocates to the District in the unincorporated North County area.

Opportunities for revenue enhancement include the potential of annexing cities that are outside of the District and imposing assessments on the parcels in such annexation area in conjunction with providing District services to the annexation area.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

There are no obvious cost avoidance opportunities in providing District services.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

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

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

There are no obvious opportunities for shared facilities in the operations of the District.

Government Structure Options

There are no obvious opportunities for a different government structure, other than the County becoming responsible for vector control activities. The County previously decided to defer to the District to provide these types of services.

Management Efficiencies

While it is still in a growth and expansion stage the District exhibits characteristics of an agency that is operating efficiently and serving its residents and customers effectively.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is governed by the Board of Trustees appointed by the Board of Supervisors and by City Councils of cities within the District.

64. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The District's sphere of influence is countywide, though the Cities of Buellton, Guadalupe, Lompoc, Santa Maria and Solvang are not included in the current District boundaries. The District has filed a proposal to annex these areas.

No Proposed Sphere Changes

There are no sphere changes proposed at this time.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

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

65. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District provided the basic information upon which the evaluation is based. The District General Manager Mitch Bernstein was instrumental in providing data.

Available Documentation

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

66. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.

**SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
FIRE PROTECTION
DISTRICT**

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

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

67. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

68. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed in April 1926 and operates pursuant to the Fire Protection District Law of 1987 (Health and Safety Code, Section 13800 et seq.).

The District is Countywide except for the Cities of Guadalupe, Lompoc, Santa Barbara, Santa Maria and Solvang and the Carpinteria/Summerland, Montecito and Orcutt Fire Protection Districts.

The District is governed by the Board of Supervisors and administered by the County Fire Chief.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. As land is annexed to one of the cities that provide fire protection it is detached from the District.

District Services

The District provides fire prevention and suppression, emergency medical response and transport, search and rescue, building permits and inspections and participates in the County Office of Emergency Services.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies that overlap the District in the Goleta Valley area include County Service Area 3 (Goleta Valley), County Service Area 31 (Isla Vista), County Service Area 32 (Unincorporated Law Enforcement), Embarcadero Municipal Improvement District, Goleta Sanitary District, Goleta Water District, Goleta West Sanitary District, Isla Vista Recreation and Park District, Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District and Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District.

69. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The District operates Fire Station No 11 at 6901 Frey Way, Goleta; No. 12 at 5330 Calle Real, Goleta; No. 13 at 4570 Hollister, Santa Barbara; No. 14 at 320 Los Carneros Road, Goleta; No. 15 at 2491 Foothill Road, Santa Barbara; No. 17 at Mesa Road, Bldg 547 at UCSB and No. 18 at 17200 Mariposa Reina, Goleta which serve the unincorporated area west of the City of Santa Barbara. It appears the District is able to accommodate potential service demands in the area from these facilities, provided sufficient funding is available to adequately staff these facilities.

The County's Capital Improvement Plan projects capital needs for the District to serve projected growth in its entire service area and estimates funds that will be needed for proposed capital improvements to serve anticipated needs.

Growth and Population Projections

The District will provide services as population growth occurs. It does not affect the rate or location of population development.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The District receives a portion of the general property tax levied within its boundaries and fees to mitigate impacts of development projects. It is not clear whether these will avoid long-term, unfunded financial obligations for improvements or operations for this service, especially if the State continues to transfer funding from local government.

Providing services for the UCSB campus and related State property may not generate sufficient funding to adequately compensate the District for these services.

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

The District participates in mutual aid and response agreements with other emergency response agencies to obtain increased levels of service and coverage.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

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

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

There may be possible savings by sharing administrative and field staff and/or facilities and equipment. See response below to Government Structure Options.

Government Structure Options

While no proposals have been made to LAFCO the District reports that "fiscal and service efficiencies could be attained through county-wide regionalization of the types of services provided by the District."

There have been discussions in the past few years between the staffs of the District and City of Santa Barbara regarding unification of fire protection services. However such discussion have not reached any agreement to proceed in that direction.

Management Efficiencies

Given its extensive service area the District exhibits the characteristics of a well-managed agency operating efficiently and serving its residents and customers effectively.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District is governed by the Board of Supervisors, which is elected by districts each of which include approximately 20% of the total County population.

70. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW AND UPDATE

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. As lands is annexed to one of the cities or districts that provide fire protection it is detached from the District.

No Proposed Sphere Changes

There are no known sphere changes proposed at this time.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

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

71. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District provided the basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. The District staff, notably Deputy Fire Chief Steve Vittum was instrumental in providing data.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

Available Documentation

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

72. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.

**SANTA BARBARA
METROPOLITAN TRANSIT
DISTRICT**

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

Report to the
**Santa Barbara Local Agency
Formation Commission**

September 2005

73. INTRODUCTION

This report regarding the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District was prepared by the Santa Barbara Local Agency Formation Commission (“LAFCO”) in accordance with Section 56430 of the California Government Code. It responds to the requirement that LAFCO conduct a Municipal Service Review (MSR) to study the delivery of municipal services and update spheres of influence.

The MSR evaluates services provided by the District and issues regarding its sphere of influence. MSR Guidelines prepared by the State Office of Planning and Research were referred to in developing information, performing analysis and organizing this study.

This report describes service delivery and related issues for LAFCO to consider and presents determinations as required by law. The decision to approve or disapprove any determinations or policies rests entirely with the Commission.

Written determinations regarding the MSR and sphere of influence update are provided for the Commission’s consideration. This report is an informational document and does not substitute for discretionary decisions that can only be made by the Commission.

This Report is subject to reconsideration and revision as directed by the LAFCO staff or by the Commission during the course of its deliberations.

74. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Description of District

The District was formed in 1966 and operates pursuant to the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District Act of 1965 (Public Utilities Code §95000 et seq.).

It is located in southern Santa Barbara County and encompasses developed areas from the Ventura County boundary to the Baccara Resort, including the Cities of Carpinteria, Goleta and Santa Barbara.

A five-member board of directors – two appointed by the Board of Supervisors, two appointed by the Santa Barbara City Council and one appointed by the other members - governs the District. A General Manager is responsible for administrative functions. A District organizational chart is included as part of this report.

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. A map of the District and its sphere is enclosed.

District Services

The District provides public transit services, including buses and shuttles.

Other Governmental Agencies within the District

Local agencies overlapped by the District include the Cities of Carpinteria, Goleta and Santa Barbara, Carpinteria Valley Water District, Carpinteria Sanitary District, Carpinteria/Summerland Fire Protection District, Goleta Water District, Goleta West Sanitary District County Service Area 3 (Goleta Valley), County Service Area 12 (Mission Canyon), County Service Area 11 (Carpinteria Valley), County Service Area 31 (Isla Vista), County Service Area 32 (Law Enforcement), Montecito Fire Protection District, Montecito Sanitary District, Montecito Water District, Santa Barbara Coastal Vector Control District and Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District.

75. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This report addresses the MSR factors specified in LAFCO's governing statute.

Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies

The District maintains a fleet of vehicles for transit purposes which are sufficient for the programs being operated

Growth and Population Projections

District services do not influence population growth or projections but are affected when population changes occur that result in greater demands for service.

Financing Constraints and Opportunities

The District receives a portion of the general property tax, revenues from riders and State or Federal grants and subventions related to public transit

Cost-Avoidance Opportunities

The District maintains a fleet of vehicles to provide efficient service and schedules that create the greatest service opportunities with unnecessary duplications.

Opportunities for Rate Restructuring

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

Opportunities for Shared Facilities

There are no obvious opportunities for shared facilities in the operations of the district.

Government Structure Options

There are no obvious opportunities for structural change in the governance of the District. It provides services within two incorporated cities and a large unincorporated area and represents a consolidation of possible transit operators.

Management Efficiencies

The District exhibits the characteristics of a well-managed agency effectively serving its residents and customers.

Local Accountability and Governance

The District Board of Directors is comprised of individuals appointed by and responsible to other agencies.

76. SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW

Description of Current Sphere of Influence

The District's boundaries and sphere of influence are coterminous. A map of the District and its sphere are included.

Sphere of Influence Determinations

No changes in the sphere of influence are proposed at this time so it is not necessary for the Commission to adopt or approve any determinations.

77. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & REFERENCES

The Santa Barbara LAFCO staff prepared this Municipal Service Review. Responsibility for any errors or omissions rests with those who prepared the report.

The Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District provided the basic information and documents upon which the evaluation is based. District staff, notably General Manager Sherrie Fisher was instrumental in providing data.

Mapping services were provided by JDL Mapping.

78. RECOMMENDATIONS

In consideration of information gathered and evaluated during the Municipal Service Review it is recommended the Commission affirm the current Sphere of Influence and that it not be expanded or revised at this time.