

December 1, 2003

TO: Local Agency Formation Commission

FROM: Executive Officer

SUBJECT: 2003-04 Legislative Report

Attached is a summary of LAFCO related bills that were introduced in the 2003-04 Legislative Session. The year-end legislative summary is provided to the Commission for information purposes and no action is recommended.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL D. OTT
Executive Officer

MDO:tjm

Attachment

Bills Sent to the Governor

Bill and Position	Summary	Status
<p>AB 192 (Harmon)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: Support SD LAFCO Position: Support</p>	<p>This CALAFCO sponsored bill would clarify that the 300-acre limitation for non-contiguous city annexations involving territory owned by a city and used for municipal purposes, applies to an individual proposal.</p>	<p>Assembly LG Committee postponed on 4/23/03.</p>
<p>AB 208 (Harman)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: Support SD LAFCO Position: Watch</p>	<p>This CALAFCO sponsored bill would clarify that as part of any change of organization or reorganization that includes dissolution, a LAFCO can designate a successor agency for all of the powers of the dissolved agency. The bill would further clarify that while the successor agency must be entitled to exercise the power of the dissolved agency, it does not have to be a power that the successor agency has exercised in the past.</p>	<p>4/23/03 hearing cancelled at author's request. CALAFCO requested that this bill become a two-year bill so that the staffs of CALAFCO and ACWA can discuss issues and concerns. The bill is in the Assembly Local Government Committee.</p>
<p>AB 518 (Salinas)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: Support SD LAFCO Position: Watch</p>	<p>This CALAFCO sponsored bill would modify the requirement that LAFCO's consider the impact of annexations on an agency's ability to meet its regional housing needs determination such that the LAFCO should consider the impact on both a city and the county. Currently, a LAFCO is only mandated to look at the impact on a city.</p>	<p>The Governor signed this bill: Chapter 176, Statutes of 2003.</p>
<p>AB 520 (Salinas)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: Oppose SD LAFCO Position: Watch</p>	<p>This bill, sponsored by the City of Watsonville, waives certain restrictions of the Government Code to allow Santa Cruz LAFCO to approve annexations today with effective dates in the near or distant future. This will allow Watsonville to seek approval today of annexations that its voter-approved growth measure does not allow to occur until prescribed dates.</p>	<p>The Governor signed this bill: Chapter 36, Statutes of 2003.</p>
<p>AB 668 (Cox)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: Watch SD LAFCO Position: Watch</p>	<p>This bill, sponsored by Sacramento County, ensures that some of the County's regional housing needs allocation will be transferred to newly incorporated Rancho Cordova. The bill applies to all incorporations and creates a process for housing allocations to be transferred from a county to a new city.</p>	<p>The Governor signed this bill: Chapter 760, Statutes of 2003.</p>

*2003 San Diego LAFCO Legislative Update
December 1, 2003*

Bill and Position	Summary	Status
<p>AB 838 (Spitzer)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: Watch SD LAFCO Position: Watch</p>	<p>This bill would clarify that ordinances of the City of Rancho Santa Margarita supercede the covenants of any property owners association.</p>	<p>6/30/03 hearing cancelled at author's request. The affected parties requested that this become a two-year bill while they review certain technical issues. The bill is in the Senate Local Government Committee.</p>
<p>AB 1268 (Wiggins)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: None SD LAFCO Position: Watch</p>	<p>This bill would require cities and counties to designate growth zones where infrastructure is to be extended over 20 years.</p>	<p>6/26/03 re-referral to Assembly LG</p>
<p>AB 1385 (Haynes)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: None SD LAFCO Position: Watch: (Conditioned on LAFCO authority to impose terms and conditions).</p>	<p>This bill concerns only the San Diego County Water Authority, and is designed to allow a member agency to pursue detachment through LAFCO without losing entitlements and water rights.</p>	<p>5/7/03 hearing cancelled at author's request.</p>
<p>AB 1425 (Pacheco)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: Oppose SD LAFCO Position: Oppose</p>	<p>This bill pertains to L.A. County only and would expand the boundaries of the Newhall CWD without LAFCO approval.</p>	<p>5/7/03 hearing cancelled at author's request.</p>
<p>SB 66 (Omnibus)</p> <p>CALAFCO Position: Support SD LAFCO Position: Watch</p>	<p>One provision in the bill would permit the Borrego WD, a Calif. Water District, to request LAFCO for authorization to provide park and recreation facilities, landscaping and lighting, and trash collection services within the boundaries of the CSD, if the CSD is dissolved.</p>	<p>The Governor signed this bill: Chapter 296, Statutes of 2003.</p>

*2003 San Diego LAFCO Legislative Update
December 1, 2003*

Bill and Position	Summary	Status
SB 341 (Local Gov't) CALAFCO Position: Support SD LAFCO Position: Watch	This bill rewrites the Public Cemetery District Law.	The Governor signed this bill: Chapter 57, Statutes of 2003.
SB 487 (Torlakson) CALAFCO Position: Support SD LAFCO Position: Watch	This bill requires special districts to make explicit its determinations for exercising its authority to terminate an annexation initiated by a property owner.	The Governor signed this bill: Chapter 123. Statutes of 2003.

Two-Year Bills

Bill and Position	Summary	Status
SB 865 (Hollingsworth) CALAFCO Position: Watch SD LAFCO Position: Watch	The author's office describes this bill as a placeholder. As published, the bill would modify certain noticing requirements that only affect Los Angeles LAFCO.	The bill is in the Senate Local Government Committee.

Inactive Bills

Bill and Position	Summary	Status
AB 406 (Jackson) CALAFCO Position: Oppose SD LAFCO Position: None	This bill proposed a number of changes to the creation and evaluation of CEQA documents. CALAFCO was particularly concerned about a provision that would have eliminated the right of a lead agency to use a document prepared by a consultant whose fees were paid by the applicant.	The bill passed committee but was sent to the Assembly Inactive File on June 4, 2003 when it became clear it would not pass.
AB 721 (Matthews) CALAFCO Position: Watch SD LAFCO Position: None	This bill proposed to require all general plans to include an urban growth boundary and that this boundary be coterminous with an agency's sphere of influence.	This bill was never referred to a committee.
AB 1015 (Laird) CALAFCO Position: Watch SD LAFCO Position: None	This bill would have required that the land use element of a general plan provide details on the planned sources of water supply under various conditions.	The bill was sent to the Assembly Inactive File on June 9, 2003. The core issue of the bill may have been resolved through another avenue – recent court decisions involving CEQA.