

CALAFCO Regional/Board Restructure Working Group
Feedback Received from Executive Officers as of 1/10/26

MEMBER LAFCOS							
LAFCO	Current Region	Responded	Favor Map	Favor adding EOs	Favor removing seat type	Dues mentioned?	Other
Alameda	Coastal	Y	N	?	?	N	
Marin	Coastal	in WG - Y	W changes	?	?	Y	
Monterey	Coastal	Y	W changes	?	?	N	
San Benito	Coastal	Y	N	concerns	?	Y	provided joint alt proposal
San Luis Obispo	Coastal	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	
San Mateo	Coastal	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	no on 1 per LAFCO
Santa Barbara	Coastal	Y	Neutral	?	?	Y	
Santa Cruz	Coastal	in WG	Y	?	?	N	
Ventura	Coastal	in WG	Y	?	?	N	
Contra Costa	Coastal	N	-	-	-	-	
San Francisco	Coastal	N	-	-	-	-	
Santa Clara	Coastal	N	-	-	-	-	
Solano	Coastal	N	-	-	-	-	
Calaveras	Central	Y	N	concerns	?	Y	provided joint alt proposal
Fresno	Central	in WG	Y	?	?	N	
Merced	Central	Y	Y	?	?	N	
Sacramento	Central	in WG	Y	?	?	N	
Yolo	Central	in WG	Y	?	?	N	
Alpine	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Amador	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Inyo	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Kings	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Madera	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Mono	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Placer	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
San Joaquin	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Stanislaus	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Tulare	Central	N	-	-	-	-	
Tuolumne	Central	N	-	-	-	-	

CALAFCO Regional/Board Restructure Working Group
Feedback Received from Executive Officers as of 1/10/26

MEMBER LAFCOS							
LAFCO	Current Region	Responded	Favor Map	Favor adding EOs	Favor removing seat type	Dues mentioned?	Other
Butte	Northern	in WG - Y	N	?	?	N	
Humboldt	Northern	in WG	Y	?	?	Y	N
Lassen	Northern	Y	N	concerns	?	Y	provided joint alt proposal
Modoc	Northern	Y	N	concerns	?	Y	provided joint alt proposal
Nevada	Northern	Y	N	concerns	?	N	expressed concerns re: timing and requested more time to respond
Plumas	Northern	Y	N	concerns	?	Y	provided joint alt proposal
Sierra	Northern	Y	N	concerns	?	Y	provided joint alt proposal
Trinity	Northern	in WG	Y	?	?	Y	N
Colusa	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Del Norte	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Glenn	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Lake	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Mendocino	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Shasta	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Siskiyou	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Sutter	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Tehama	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Yuba	Northern	N	-	-	-	-	
Imperial	Southern	in WG	Y	?	?	N	
Riverside	Southern	Y					
NON-MEMBER LAFCOS WHO RESPONDED							
Napa	Coastal		Y	?	?	N	
Kern	Central		?	seems yes	?	Y	dues always a concern and won't rejoin without a change
Los Angeles	Southern		Y	Y	Y	N	no on 1 per LAFCO
San Diego	Southern		Y	?	?	N	

Of the current 49 member-LAFCOs, 24 responded (49%)

Of those 24, 11 expressed concerns or outright rejection of proposed new regional boundaries (46%)
 There are expressed concerns regarding EOs serving on the Board (as noted by 7 respondents - 29%)
 There appears to be no resistance to eliminating commissioner "seat types" for Board election
 One respondent expressed opposition to allowing only 1 Board member per LAFCO at any given time

Of the current 9 non-member LAFCOs, 4 responded (44%)

Of those 4, there were no expressed concerns on the proposed new regional boundaries, having EOs on the Board, or eliminating commissioner "seat types" for Board election
 One respondent expressed opposition to allowing only 1 Board member per LAFCO at any given time

CALAFCO

Feedback from Executive Officers on Working Group proposed regional boundaries map

(Feedback is verbatim and listed in the order in which they were received.)

Feedback is as of January 10, 2026

Member LAFCOs

Riverside - In general, I am OK with the new proposed structure as a better option than what exists today. I certainly support the smaller Board and elimination of the CALAFCO staff EO/DEOs as voting members. I do support allowing EO to be Board members if they are elected by their Region. I think that is a better option to include EO level personnel for historical/continuity sake, but leave it up to the Regions to decide that. I do have a few issues that need to be addressed:

- 1) All LAFCOs that are not current CALAFCO members should be so identified on the map so everyone knows who they are in relation to their Region.
- 2) With respect to the new South Coast Region, since the 3 LAFCOs (Los Angeles, Orange and San Diego) comprising the South Coastal Region, do there two Board seats remain vacant as it should be? This must be a requirement and the By-Laws changes should reflect that.
- 3) Language in the By-Laws changes to implement this plan should also have language that does not allow any LAFCO anywhere in the state that is not a CALAFCO member to vote on selection of a Regional Board Member or any other CALAFCO matters that the Regions are requested to address.

Marin - As you may recall from your time as ED for CALAFCO, Marin LAFCo has for some time has talked about needing better equity between regions as regions have been grossly unbalanced for some time. I am very happy to see CALAFCO taking on this effort and think the proposed new regional structure is much better than the current structure we have in place. With that said I have two comments on the structure:

First while regional balance could be looked at in many ways one part, for Marin LAFCo, is how much does each region pay in dues to CALAFCO. If all 58 LAFCo were part of CALAFCO, which is how information is being provided for the regional restructure, I noticed that the Cascade-Sierra (CS) region would be paying 8.57% compared to the Inland Desert (ID) region which would be paying 8.80%. Now the CS gets only one seat on the board and ID gets 2 seats on the board. It appears to me that from a dues perspective both are about equal but not treated that way in seats on the board.

Second is the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) region is about 20% of the CALAFCO budget. As a member of the transition team I understand the representative of SJV thought breaking up the SJV would not be wise which I respect but if the regions stay as is then I would suggest a discussion that SJV be given a third seat on the board to allow for better equality amongst board seats.

I would feel more comfortable with approving as is if the CS and SJV regions with board seat breakout had they been given more information, particularly CALAFCO budget percentage, and said they are OK with this imbalance. Since the restructure team has not shared this information I am not sure how my Commission will choose to vote on the restructure if things stay as is.

Fresno - Just to confirm for the record, Fresno LAFCo is supportive as proposed but also open to changes pending overall feedback.

CALAFCO

Feedback from Executive Officers on Working Group proposed regional boundaries map

(Feedback is verbatim and listed in the order in which they were received.)

Feedback is as of January 10, 2026

Merced - Merced LAFCO supports this restructuring proposal, specifically as to Merced LAFCO and the San Joaquin Valley Region. We were able to review the information during the Executive Officer's Report at our December 11th Commission meeting. While the new 9 region proposal looks logical, the Commissioners primarily focused on the effects to Merced LAFCO. Since the core of the San Joaquin Valley portion of the current Central Region is remaining the same, we expect it to have little impact on our Commission's status. While there was no objection to the other 8 regional boundaries, our Commission did not feel prepared to declare support for the proposed configuration - but they had no objection either.

Santa Barbara - I don't have any concerns with the new regions, seem reasonable enough. I expressed to Joe already my Commission is mostly concerned on what effect these changes will have on dues.

I understand that's for a later discussion, but am cautious to agree with many little steps along the way to find ourselves at a no return point before dues gets discussed. Then find out that based on all these choices the dues structure is what it is, based on logical outcomes of the smaller decisions and my Commission takes issue. Santa Barbara LAFCO was not a supporter of the 2009 4 region model and have always expressed concerns with higher dues.

San Luis Obispo - Thanks for reaching out, I'm also looping in Joe since I owe him similar feedback. First, thank you both for your work and involvement on this effort, particularly representing our areas, I'm sure it has taken a lot of time. Generally speaking, the proposed changes are positive. The regions make sense. I wasn't expecting to see so many new regions, but it is certainly an improvement, and I understand why we went in that direction. I also appreciate the reduction in the size of the Board. While I personally think 16 is still massive for a Board it is nonetheless an improvement from the current situation and necessary in context to the organization. I also appreciate moving away from seat type. I think these efforts achieve the goals we have all been discussing with reasonable compromises such as Board size given the context of the situation.

I also appreciate the ability for EO to be on the Board, that seems to be a no brainer. The professionals should be able to sit on the board of a professional organization of which they are a part of. Anyway, those are my brief comments. Again, overall great work, I'm sure it wasn't easy to get where we are with these proposed changes. Thank you.

Alameda – see attached letter.

Butte – see attached letter.

Nevada – expressed general concerns and requested more time to review and respond.

San Mateo - Thanks for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft Regional Map Revision & Proposed New Board Structure. In review of the changes, I have the following comments:

- 1) I support the change to remove commissioner "seat type", especially if the number of voting members from each region is reduced.

CALAFCO

Feedback from Executive Officers on Working Group proposed regional boundaries map

(Feedback is verbatim and listed in the order in which they were received.)

Feedback is as of January 10, 2026

- 2) I am ok with the change to allow EOs to be to be elected to the Board from their respective region. I feel that if a region agrees upon electing an EO, that they should be able to have the ability. I think that the removal of Regional Officers as voting members is also a good action.
- 3) The old Costal Region is divided into three new regions, with the Bay Area being split into two. I am ok with the division and the split of the Bay Area region. I think there will still be collaboration between the Bay Area LAFCoS. Hopefully there could be the creation of ad hoc groups either focused on specific topics of interests or inclusive of multiple regions, such as the creation of the old Coastal Region, to allow for larger discussions at the CALAFCO Conference or other settings.
- 4) One concern I have is related to the limitation of one Board Member representative from a LAFCo at any given time. I agree with the intent and the proposed policy and in most of the proposed regions, I don't foresee an issue, but in the regions with fewer LAFCoS, I do want to bring a potential issue. In the South Coast (3 LAFCoS) and South Bay and Inland Desert (4 LAFCoS each), there could be a situation where either a LAFCo has left CALAFCO, and hence reduced the pool of eligible LAFCoS from that region to send members to the CALAFCO Board (such as the current cased in South Coast and Inland), or a situation where LAFCoS are not actively engaged with CALAFCO (South Bay and San Francsico LAFCo). In these cases, I would suggest that language that allows for LAFCoS from a region with two or fewer participating/eligible LAFCoS to have more than one Board Member from a local LAFCo. If additional LAFCo rejoin CALAFCO and are in a region where this exemption was in place and now there are three or more LAFCoS, this language would no longer be applicable.

The reason I suggest two or more is that you could have a situation in the South Bay where two LAFCoS leave CALAFCO (San Mateo, Santa Clara, and/or Alameda) and with one plus San Francisco remaining. If San Francisco doesn't actively participate in CALAFCO (which they historically have not), that would mean that voting members from other LAFCo would likely run for the two allocated seats. However, the current proposed language would restrict that LAFCo to only one seat, with the other having to remain vacant. This could be the case in the South Bay or the other two mentioned regions if there was just one LAFCo that was a member of CALAFCO.

The existing proposed language in the draft document could be edited to say : Limit Member LAFCoS to one Board Member representative at any given time, with the exception of LAFCoS from a region with two or fewer CALAFCO participating/eligible LAFCoS. At a time when a region has three or more CALAFCO participating/eligible LAFCoS, member LAFCoS shall be limited to one Board Member representative at any given time.

I would like to thank you and the other members of the CALAFCO Regional/Board Restructure Working Group for taking on this challenging task and I look forward to continuing to be a member of CALAFCO for the foreseeable future.

Calaveras – Plumas – Lassen – Modoc – Sierra – San Benito – see attached letter and alternate proposal.

CALAFCO

Feedback from Executive Officers on Working Group proposed regional boundaries map

(Feedback is verbatim and listed in the order in which they were received.)

Feedback is as of January 10, 2026

Monterey - I am writing to provide comments in collaboration with Monterey LAFCO Executive Officer Kate McKenna on the draft proposal from the Regional/Board Restructuring Working Group. I am thankful for Deputy EO Joe Serrano's time in speaking with me, answering questions, and clarifying the goals and objectives of the working group. We appreciate the diligent work of the working group and this opportunity to provide comments.

After reviewing the proposed new regional map, we would recommend revising the map to reduce the number of regions (four or five regions, ideally). Having nine regions may limit the pool of eligible Board Members in regions and, thereby, potentially work against the objective of attracting qualified and committed Board Members. Having fewer and larger regions could still promote regional cohesion by creating subgroups within the region to meet more regularly and collaborate. Holding eight or nine separate elections during the Annual CALAFCO Conference may be challenging from a logistical standpoint.

We generally concur with the proposed number of Board Members (currently 16). It is our understanding that attracting qualified and dedicated Board Members is a priority, and we agree with this overarching objective. If you have any questions, please feel welcome to contact Kate or me.

Calaveras Commissioner and Board member Anita Paque - I realize that the working group spent time, energy and thought on the proposed map but there are areas that need additional work.

Unfortunately it is unclear as to why the regions are being revised and what goals the working group is attempting to achieve. It would be beneficial to provide that information in order for the members to understand and evaluate the proposed regions.

Although population was not in the graph of the considerations submitted by the EOs and the dues are not part of the working group's scope, dues are a concern of all members. Since the dues may be determined by the Board without a vote by the membership (within the current structure), the Cascade Sierra and Lake Coast regions will have virtually no say in how the variables of the dues structure are set.

One of CALAFCO's goals has been to represent all 58 counties. The 13 Cascade Sierra region members comprise 22% of the potential members yet are receiving just six percent of the votes. Combining this with the Lake Coast region over 30 percent of the membership is in the two regions with just 12 percent of the vote. The transition team spent time and money meeting with various LAFCOs who didn't renew their membership. Are you willing to do the same if the North Coast and Cascade Sierra region LAFCOs drop out?

Is it possible for a single Board member to represent the Cascade Sierra region? The distance from Alturas in Modoc County to Mariposa, Mariposa County is 450 miles with 13 members. Representing this region is an unreasonable lift.

Many counties, e.g. Calaveras, consider the major benefit to being a member of CALAFCO is that the organization would have their back, such as support legislation that affects rural LAFCOs. Giving the regions a token vote has the potential to cause members to reconsider what benefits they receive. Please consider these issues when revising the region map.

CALAFCO

Feedback from Executive Officers on Working Group proposed regional boundaries map

(Feedback is verbatim and listed in the order in which they were received.)

Feedback is as of January 10, 2026

Non-member LAFCOs

San Diego - Looks good

Kern - The issues CALAFCO is facing isn't so much Northern California vs. Southern Cal or coastal vs. inland. The vast majority of issues that LAFCOs face are universal to all of us. This is even more true now that some of the no-growth folks have seen the light. If there was an imbalance on the board it was the number of politicians vs. the number of bureaucrats. There is a place for both, but there needs to be a good balance. I don't know if the changes proposed brings a better balance or not.

I am aware that some of the southern LAFCO's complained about the northern having more influence. I believe it's true. Why? Because the northern LAFCOs show up and do the work. I wasn't able to get any of my Commissioners interested in serving on the CALAFCO board when we were members. I don't blame the northern LAFCOs for that. I appreciate them stepping up. No map revision is going to help if we don't have solid people overseeing the organization.

Napa - I personally love the new regional boundaries. In my opinion, the smaller regions will facilitate more tight-knit relationships and encourage more in-person convening. It could be just what the doctor ordered.

Los Angeles – see attached email.

Attachments:

1. Alameda letter
2. Butte letter
3. Calaveras – Plumas – Lassen – Modoc – Sierra – San Benito letter and alternate proposal
4. Los Angeles email

This page intentionally left blank.



LAFCO

Alameda Local Agency Formation Commission

January 8, 2026

Pamela Miller
Transition Team Consultant
CALAFCO
1451 River Park Drive, Suite 185
Sacramento, CA 95815
pmiller@millermcg.com

Dear Ms. Pamela Miller:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed CALAFCO regional restructuring. Alameda Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) appreciates the Working Group’s efforts and the intent to improve representation and governance.

Alameda LAFCO has concerns with proposals that would divide Bay Area LAFCOs across multiple regions. The Bay Area functions as a highly integrated planning and governance region, with shared housing, infrastructure, environmental, and service delivery challenges. Splitting Bay Area LAFCOs risks weakening collaboration and fragmenting a regional perspective that already operates cohesively. Executive Officer feedback indicates that regional cohesion is the top priority in revising CALAFCO’s structure. Preserving the Bay Area as a unified region is consistent with that priority and with long-standing coordination among Bay Area LAFCOs.

Alameda LAFCO encourages the Working Group to reconsider regional boundaries to maintain Bay Area cohesion or otherwise ensure strong alignment among Bay Area LAFCOs within the final structure.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Sincerely,

Rachel Jones
Executive Officer
Alameda LAFCO



January 9, 2026

Dear Pamela,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft Regional Map Revision and proposed Board restructuring circulated on December 9, 2025. The Butte Local Agency Formation Commission has considered the proposed map, and after Commission discussion, does not support the regional restructuring as currently proposed.

First, the Commission does not find the proposed regional restructuring to be timely or necessary at this time. From Butte LAFCO's perspective, there is no demonstrated immediate need that warrants a significant reorganization of regions, nor does the proposal resolve the operational or governance challenges currently facing the CALAFCO Board. The Commission is concerned that the restructuring would result in substantial change without a clear, corresponding benefit.

Second, the proposed reorganization of the northern region would dilute the voice of Butte LAFCO, which has historically carried a significant share of the administrative and leadership responsibilities for the far northern region. Under the proposed structure, placing Butte LAFCO within a Sacramento Valley-based region alongside several large and highly active LAFCOs would materially reduce the influence and effectiveness of Butte LAFCO's participation. That voice has been used not only on behalf of Butte County, but also to represent the distinct perspectives and challenges of the far northern counties, which would be diminished under the proposed configuration.

Third, the Commission does not believe that Butte County is a good fit within the proposed Sacramento Valley region. There are meaningful differences between Butte County and the other counties included in that region, including growth pressures and patterns, the role and protection of agricultural lands, susceptibility to natural disasters such as wildfire and flooding, and the type and scale of agricultural land uses present within the county. These differences result in distinct LAFCO priorities and policy considerations that are not well aligned with those of the proposed region.

For these reasons, Butte LAFCO does not support the draft regional map as proposed. Thank you for considering Butte LAFCO's comments. Please do not hesitate to reach out if additional clarification or discussion would be helpful.

Sincerely,

Shannon Costa

Shannon Costa
Executive Officer

Subject: Feedback and Alternate Proposal on Draft Regional Map Revision and Proposed Board Structure

To: CALAFCO Transition Team and Regional/Board Restructure Working Group

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the Draft Regional Map Revision and the proposed Board structure. We appreciate the time, data analysis, and collaborative effort that the Working Group has undertaken as part of CALAFCO's broader transformation process. The intent to improve regional cohesion and governance effectiveness is clear, and we offer the following comments and alternate proposal in the spirit of strengthening the proposal and ensuring it serves the full and diverse membership of CALAFCO.

1. Clarification of Purpose and Problem Statement

At present, it is unclear what specific problem(s) the proposed regional map and Board structure are intended to solve. While the memo references regional cohesion, alignment, and operational capacity, the connection between these goals and the specific regional breakdown is not fully articulated. Beyond population metrics, additional justification would be helpful to explain why these particular regional configurations best advance CALAFCO's stated objectives. Clarifying the core aim of the map would help members better evaluate whether the proposal achieves its intended outcomes.

2. Representation of the Cascade–Sierra Region

The proposal to allocate a single Board member to the Cascade–Sierra region, which encompasses 13 counties spread across a vast geographic area, raises significant concerns. This region includes counties with distinct challenges, operational contexts, and travel constraints. Expecting one representative to adequately engage with, represent, and communicate the needs of such a large and diverse region appears to be an unrealistic lift for any individual and risks underrepresentation of those member LAFCOs.

3. Equity of Regional Representation

The proposed Board structure results in unequal representation among regions, largely driven by population. While population is an important factor, CALAFCO is not solely a population-based organization. Rural and less-populated counties face unique service, governance, and capacity challenges that warrant an equal voice at the Board level. Basing representation primarily on population risks limiting the influence of rural counties and may unintentionally diminish statewide balance and equity.

4. Potential Secondary Uses and Unintended Consequences

There is concern about how this new regional map may be used beyond Board representation. Specifically, members may reasonably question whether the map could later be used to inform other decisions, such as annual dues or resource allocation. While the memo notes that dues restructuring is outside the scope of the Working Group, the inclusion of population caps and dues-related data raises questions about potential unintended consequences. Greater clarity and guardrails around future use of the map would be helpful.

5. Executive Officers Serving on the Board

Allowing Executive Officers to serve as regional Board members also raises governance concerns. Executive Officers, by virtue of their roles, possess deep institutional knowledge and are paid staff who can dedicate significant time to CALAFCO matters. While their expertise is valuable, there is a risk that EO participation could unintentionally dominate Board composition, discussions, and decision-making. Consideration should be given to limiting EO Board participation and designating any such positions as at-large roles serving the interests of the entire state rather than specific regions.

Alternate Proposal

In the spirit of addressing the concerns outlined above and offering a constructive path forward, the following proposal is intended to respond directly to several of the identified issues—particularly those related to representational equity, geographic scale, and the practical workload placed on individual Board members. Rather than merely highlighting challenges, this alternative framework seeks to build on the Working Group’s objectives by refining the regional structure in a way that better balances counties, commissioners, and governance capacity, while preserving statewide perspective and institutional expertise.

Purpose

This proposal recommends modifying the Draft Regional Map by dividing the proposed Cascade–Sierra region into two distinct regions—**Cascade–Sierra** and **Foothills**—in order to improve representational equity, governance effectiveness, and workload balance for Board members.

Background

As currently proposed, the Cascade–Sierra region encompasses 13 counties spread across a vast geographic area with significant differences in operational context, travel distances, and local issues. Representing this region with a single Board member places an unrealistic burden on that individual and risks limiting meaningful engagement with member LAFCOs.

In addition, analysis of county counts, commissioner representation, and geographic scale (as shown in the attached spreadsheet) demonstrates that the current configuration creates a disproportionate representation imbalance compared to other regions.

Proposed Regional Structure

1. Cascade–Sierra Region

The following counties would constitute the revised Cascade–Sierra region:

- Modoc
- Lassen
- Plumas
- Sierra
- Nevada
- Placer

2. Foothills Region

A new Foothills region would be established, consisting of:

- El Dorado
- Amador
- Calaveras
- Alpine
- Tuolumne
- Mariposa
- Mono

This split results in two regions with more comparable:

- Number of counties
- Number of LAFCO commissioners represented
- Geographic scope and travel demands

Board Representation Model

Under this proposal:

- Each of the regions would elect **one Board member**, and
- **Only LAFCO Commissioners** would serve as regional Board representatives.

To balance regional representation with statewide operational expertise:

- **Four (4) Executive Officers would be elected at-large** to serve on the Board, representing the interests of the entire state rather than any single region.

This results in a **14-member Board**, structured as follows:

- 10 regional Board members (one from each region)
- 4 at-large Executive Officer Board members

Benefits of This Approach

- **Improved Equity:** Reduces extreme disparities in counties and commissioners represented per Board seat.
- **Realistic Workload:** Creates regions that are manageable in size, geography, and engagement expectations.
- **Balanced Governance:** Preserves the value of Executive Officer expertise without allowing regional dominance.
- **Clear Accountability:** Ensures regional Board members are directly accountable to commissioners, while EOs serve a statewide advisory and governance role.

Conclusion

Splitting the proposed Cascade–Sierra region into Cascade–Sierra and Foothills strengthens the overall regional model, aligns representation more closely with CALAFCO’s diverse membership, and supports a more functional and equitable Board structure. This approach

directly addresses concerns raised by members while remaining consistent with the broader goals of CALAFCO's transformation effort.

Thank you for considering this proposal as part of your ongoing work.



Jennifer Stephenson, Executive Officer
Calaveras LAFCo



Brandon Pangman, Executive Officer
Sierra LAFCo



Jennifer Stephenson, Executive Officer
Lassen LAFCo



Kevin Goss, CALAFCO Board Member
Northern Region (Plumas LAFCo)



Jennifer Stephenson, Executive Officer
Modoc LAFCo



Paul Minchella, CALAFCO Board Member
Northern Region (Modoc LAFCo)



Jennifer Stephenson, Executive Officer
Plumas LAFCo



Anita Paque, CALAFCO Secretary
Central Region (Calaveras LAFCo)



Jennifer Stephenson, Executive Officer
San Benito LAFCO

	North Coast	Cascade-Sierra	Foothills	Sacramento Valley	North Bay	South Bay	Central Coast	South Coast	San Joaquin Valley	Inland Desert
	Del Norte Humboldt Mendocino Lake Siskiyou Trinity Shasta	Modoc Lassen Plumas Sierra Nevada Placer	El Dorado Amador Calaveras Alpine Tuolumne Mariposa Mono	Tehama Glenn Colusa Butte Sutter Yuba Yolo Sacramento	Sonoma Napa Marin Solano Contra Costa	San Francisco San Mateo Alameda Santa Clara	Santa Cruz San Benito Monterey San Luis Obispo Santa Barbara Ventura	Los Angeles Orange San Diego	San Joaquin Stanislaus Merced Madera Fresno Kings Tulare Kern	Inyo San Bernardino Riverside Imperial
Number of counties	7	6	7	8	5	4	6	3	8	4
Population	556,945	582,560	364,796	2,346,724	2,502,210	5,145,804	2,329,586	16,266,413	4,420,359	4,944,423
Population with Cap	556,945	582,560	364,796	1,435,493	2,029,603	2,800,000	2,194,159	2,100,000	3,757,597	1,600,209
Number of LAFCO Commissioners (incl. alt.)	73	54	68	70	49	38	63	39	74	38
Square Miles	24,891	14,974	11,041	10,392	5,097	3,098	15,380	10,226	27,479	42,116
Proposed # of Board Members	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

This page intentionally left blank.

From: [Paul Novak](#)
To: pmiller@millermcg.com; [Michelle McIntyre](#); [Jose Henriquez](#)
Cc: [Tyler Salcido](#); [Adriana Romo](#)
Subject: RE: REQUEST FOR INPUT - CALAFCO Regional/Board Restructuring Drafts
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 11:08:20 AM
Attachments: [image004.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Pamela, José, and Michelle:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Because we received your (Pamela's) at the time of our December meeting, we were unable to agendaize this proposal for the Commission's December 10th Meeting. Given availability issues over the holiday season, we were unable to confer with commissioners until this week. Adriana and I drafted the comments, and we've run them by three commissioners for input; the comments; this email includes their input. Nevertheless, we've scheduled a discussion for next Wednesday's (January 14th) Commission Meeting, so please know that we may provide you with additional comments thereafter (additionally, the audio of that meeting will be available on our website the following week).

We genuinely appreciate the hard work of the CALAFCO Transition Team and Regional/Board Restructure Working Group. The Proposal reflects considerable effort, thought, and deliberative discussion among a wide group of individuals with varied perspectives, and clearly seeks to balance inherently competing interests. While we do not support all recommendations, we generally support most of them, and we believe that the effort is worthwhile. At the outset, we believe it is important to be clear about which elements of the Proposal are essential to LA LAFCO's continued engagement with CALAFCO, which elements are supportive but not determinative, and which would significantly undermine the likelihood of our rejoining the Association. The comments below are offered in that spirit.

We **enthusiastically support allowing LAFCO executive officers to be eligible to serve as members of the CALAFCO Board of Directors**. In all candor, LA LAFCO will not consider rejoining CALAFCO unless and until this is in effect. We also view this change as a logical and appropriate exchange for the proposal that Regional Officers no longer serve as voting Board Members, resulting in a clearer and more accountable governance structure.

We **enthusiastically support eliminating the current requirement that CALAFCO Board-members represent "categories" of commissioners** (County Supervisor, City Council, Independent Special District Board, and General Public). We know from experience that this existing "quota" has harmed the Southern Region, in which we have had several commissioners interested in serving on the CALAFCO Board in one category (Public Member) while having to scramble to fill another category (County Supervisor). We have heard from LAFCO commissioners and staff in other regions that the current "category" system hasn't worked well for them either.

We **support the proposal that Regional Officers (the four volunteers (EO and three DEOs) would no longer be voting Board Members**. It is our understanding that this was intended as a "temporary measure." Should the Working Group's Proposal (or most of it)

be adopted by the CALAFCO membership, this temporary measure is no longer necessary. We assume Regional Officers would continue to play an important coordinating and advisory role, even if they no longer serve as voting Board Members, and we support that continued engagement.

With respect to the proposal for new regions:

- CALAFCO's current bylaws proscribe four (4) regions, each electing four (4) representatives to serve on the CALAFCO Board of Directors, creating a sixteen (16) member Board. We do not think that this system is necessarily in need of change; in other words, it may—or may not—be “broken” and merit a restructuring.
- **If there is a collective will to create new regions, we support the Regional/Board Restructure Working Group's “Proposed Region Map Revision as of November 2025.”** for several reasons: one, the regional map generally creates smaller regions (allowing representatives of several LAFCOs within a region to meet in person, if so desired); two, it aggregates adjacent LAFCOs into logical groupings; three, it fairly and creatively balances the competing interests of larger LAFCOs (those with a larger share of the State's population, specifically Los Angeles in the new south Coast Region) and smaller LAFCOs (those with a smaller share of the State's populations, specifically in the proposed Cascade-Sierra and North Coast Regions) and awards board seats accordingly. Again, we are not certain that new regions are warranted. If the CALAFCO membership nevertheless votes to move in that direction, the “Proposed Region Map Revision as of November 2025” merits our support.
- We **strongly oppose the proposal to limit Member LAFCOs to one Board Member representative at any given time.** In all candor, adoption of this proposal would make LA LAFCO significantly less likely to consider rejoining CALAFCO. The proposal is both unworkable and impractical, for several reasons:
 - a. Several LAFCOs no longer belong to CALAFCO, which means that some of the smaller regions may not have a large “pool” of LAFCOs from which to solicit candidates, in fact, they may have only 1 (one) LAFCO from which to solicit board-members;
 - b. The proposal inherently contradicts the “*Proposed Region Map Revision as of November 2025*” if any individual region has two board-member representatives but includes only one Member LAFCO.
 - c. It replaces the universally unpopular “seat type” quota with a new quota that, similarly, discourages qualified, committed individuals from serving on the Board;
 - d. It presumes a level of interest in Board service that may not exist in smaller or

less-populated regions under the proposed structure.

Put simply, this proposal would reduce flexibility, not improve representation, and would undermine the viability of the new regional model itself.

It appears to us that the “CALAFCO DRAFT Regional Map Revision & Proposed New Board Structure” does not address what happens to the 4 (four) officers of the Board of Directors (Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer, and Secretary). Our questions/concerns are:

- a. Currently, there are 4 (four) regions and 4 (four) officer positions. **How would these positions allocated amongst 9 (nine) new regions?**
- b. Should the proposed regional map and new structure be adopted on February 23rd, our understanding that an election for all 16 (sixteen) Board seats will occur in the fall of 2026; and, further, due to the new regions, there will be no true “incumbents” for Board positions. This would suggest a strong possibility that the membership on the CALAFCO Board of Directors will change significantly. It makes little or no sense to maintain the officers of the “current” Board of Directors and install these same representatives as the officers of a “new” to-be-elected Board of Directors. Under any and all scenarios (that is, not presuming how CALAFCO’s membership will vote on this Proposal on February 23rd), **we strongly suggest that the newly-elected Board of Directors, once installed, proceed to elect four new officers from this new membership with specified minimum requirements to serve (e.g., a minimum number of years on their respective home Commission, and/or participated/attended in at least one CALAFCO Board Meeting).**
- c. The current system has a “rotation” in which each of the 4 (four) regions appoints an officer, and those four officers “move up” over 4 (four) successive years to serve first as Secretary, then as Treasurer, then as Vice Chair, and then as Chair). **We suggest that this “regional rotation” be maintained (this will require some “adjusting,” given that there would be four leadership positions and 9 new regions).**

Of secondary importance to the comments, above, is the sensitivity associated with LAFCO executive officers competing with LAFCO commissioners for Board seats (which would first occur in October, should these changes be adopted by the CALAFCO membership). We have heard it said that “allowing EO’s to serve could lead to a CALAFCO Board of Directors that is largely composed of executive officers.” We believe that such an outcome is highly unlikely. LAFCO executive officers report to commissioners, and commissioners are the people who hire us, who decide whether we merit a raise, and can even terminate our employment. There is not a single EO who would welcome entering a race against their own commissioner, and most if not all EO’s would be cautious about competing with a commissioner from another LAFCO in their respective region for a CALAFCO Board seat. We believe that there is a much higher likelihood that the “new” Board of Directors is more likely to have a handful (3-4, at most) EOs.

Finally, we recognize and appreciate the Working Group’s decision to keep dues restructuring outside the scope of the current Proposal so the focus can remain on governance and regional structure. At the same time, we note that questions of representation and dues, particularly as they relate to LAFCO size and operational complexity, continue to be of interest to some members. We offer this observation simply as a consideration for a future phase of the Association’s ongoing work at the appropriate

time.

We understand that CALAFCO is under no obligation to solicit input from representatives of LAFCOs which are no longer members of the association. The fact that you are doing so speaks highly of the Transition Team's efforts, and we are grateful.

Thank you again.

Paul A. Novak, AICP
Executive Officer
**Local Agency Formation Commission
for the County of Los Angeles**
80 South Lake Avenue
Suite 870
Pasadena, CA 91101
pnovak@lalafco.org
626/204-6500



From: pmiller@millermcg.com <pmiller@millermcg.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 12:02 PM
To: Paul Novak <pnovak@lalafco.org>
Cc: pmiller@millermcg.com; Michelle McIntyre <mmcintyre@calafco.org>; Jose Henriquez <HenriquezJ@saLAFCO.org>; Tyler Salcido <tylers@iclafco.com>
Subject: FW: REQUEST FOR INPUT - CALAFCO Regional/Board Restructuring Drafts

Good morning Paul, I hope you are doing well.

In the spirit of keeping you informed and connected to the ongoing transformation of CALAFCO, please see the attached memo and email below, sent to all Member LAFCO EOs yesterday. You are welcome to provide your input on the proposed changes (see memo for details). If you would like the working group to consider your input, please provide it to me no later than January 9 @ 5 p.m.

Reach out to me, Michelle, José, or Tyler (or anyone else in the working group) with any questions.

Thank you and happy holidays,