Democracy & Local Control for Unincorporated Communities



California (un)Incorporated Statewide Coalition

- Alameda County: Ashland, Castro Valley
- El Dorado County: El Dorado Hills
- Humboldt County: McKinleyville (?)
- Los Angeles County: East Los Angeles, Walnut Park
- Placer County: North Lake Tahoe
- Orange County: Ladera Ranch
- Sacramento County: Arden Arcade, Rio Linda Elverta
- Santa Barbara County: Isla Vista
- San Joaquin County: Mountain House
- Stanislaus County: Salida

Cities are Important

- Centers of commerce & culture
 - ✓ Home to 83% of Californians
 - ✓ Provide municipal services
 - ✓ Infrastructure stewardship
- CA policies depend on cities
 - ✓ Affordable housing, quality-of-life
 - ✓ Sustainability, GHG reduction, infill, smart growth
 - ✓ Open space, farmland preservation
- Serving a growing California
 - ✓ Commercial prosperity
 - ✓ Valued Activity Centers
 - ✓ Transportation hubs
 - ✓ Housing and Sense-of-Place





Problems

- 6M+ Californians in urbanized unincorporated areas
 - ✓ No Mayors/City Councils to focus on local priorities
 - ✓ Effective denial of democratic representation
 - County elected officials/constituents: LA 1:2M, Orange 1:638K, Ala/Sac 1:300K
 - Communities don't matter: Ladera Ranch, East L.A., Mountain House, Ashland <10% of Supervisor's constituents, El Dorado Hills is 2x county's largest city & 4x it's other city
 - Appointed bodies not beholden to voters
 - ✓ Outsiders make decisions
 - o Infrastructure, local law enforcement, land use
- Current policies impede incorporation
 - ✓ Reflective of bygone budget issues
 - ✓ Process inequities
 - Tilted towards special interests with agendas
 - Prohibitive costs (\$500K and up) for grassroots proponents
 - ✓ Substantive inequities
 - Revenue neutrality agreements are unbounded in time and scope
 - Revenues all other cities get are denied to new cities
 - ✓ Significant barriers to local control





Solutions – LAFCO Reform

- Restore VLF property tax stream
 - ✓ Give new cities same access to revenues as existing cities

AB818 of 2019

- CEQA exemption for incorporations
 - ✓ Pre-incorporation CEQA duplicative / serves no purpose
 - ✓ New city General Plan requires CEQA analysis and mitigation
- State Controller to do primary financial analysis
 - ✓ Need for centralized, uniform process to assess viability
 - ✓ Controller already does this analysis upon appeal
- Reasonable Restraints on Revenue Neutrality
 - ✓ Time limits and transparency that demonstrate fulfillment of public interest
 - ✓ Should protect counties during transition, not impede incorporations or hobble new cities
- Incentives and Funding for Incorporations
 - ✓ Remove procedural impediments to consideration of new cities
 - ✓ Provide grants to fund processes

Another Way: CSD-to-City conversion

- Districts need a smooth pathway towards cityhood
 - ✓ Already have considerable municipal powers

 Government Code Section Section 61100 et seq
 - ✓ Legislative intent transition to city

 Government Code Section Section 61001 (b) (4)



What if a District:

- ✓ RESOLVED TO BE CITY
- ✓ FINANCIAL ANALYSIS
- ✓ CONTROLLER REVIEW
- ✓ BALLOT MEASURE

WHY NOT?

Please Consider Support For

- Municipal Incorporations
 - ✓ Neglect does not serve California
 - ✓ Urbanized Californians want/expect Mayors & City Councils
 - ✓ Responsive local governance for residents and businesses
- CSD Conversions
 - ✓ Mechanism for CSDs to become cities
 - ✓ Concept could apply @ other districts
- Make LAFCOs job easier
 - ✓ Relieve CEQA & financial analysis (CFA) burdens
 - ✓ Provide at least some funding

 Small grants for LAFCOs and grassroots proponents



THANK YOU!

- Visit and like us on Facebook
- @caluning
- √ https://www.facebook.com/caluninc
- Visit and comment on our web site
 - √ http://ca-uninc.com
- Contact us at:
 - ✓ Michael Kusiak michaelkusiak@gmail.com
 - ✓ Katherine Borges

 salidakat@gmail.com
 - ✓ Michael Seaman

 michaeljseaman@gmail.com

