

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**



FROM: Supervisor Bob Buster

SUBMITTAL DATE: May 3, 2005

SUBJECT: WILDOMAR INCORPORATION PROCESS

RECOMMENDATION: That the Board place the attached Resolution on the Policy Calendar Agenda on May 24th for discussion and action.

EXPLANATION AND BACKGROUND: This matter is agendized in three weeks so that any interested party, especially the Wildomar public, has advance notice and can comment if they wish.

Approval of the Resolution would allow Wildomar incorporation proponents to continue forward with the incorporation process without having to collect thousands of voter signatures of support a second time. Approval would not relieve proponents from any other incorporation requirement, including environmental and fiscal analyses.

The Resolution does override the technical reason why the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) did not accept the petitions in support of Wildomar cityhood, even though they appeared to contain many more than the requisite percentage of total community voters needed.¹ Under a rule peculiar statewide to the LAFCO of Riverside County, those attempting incorporation must present a Preliminary Fiscal Analysis (PFA) with signature petitions, which Wildomar proponents had not done.


Wildomar cityhood proponents did not do a PFA for two understandable reasons:

1. They were forced to rush to gather sufficient signatures of support to counter the unexpected bid by the City of Murrieta to annex the southern half of Wildomar.
2. A Municipal Service Review, which provided "90% of the (fiscal) information"² that a PFA would have, was commissioned by LAFCO, the County and the City of Murrieta, to examine whether and how public services could be funded by annexation or incorporation.

That Review initially showed that Wildomar incorporation was financially possible in the short term. Then State budget changes last summer cut funding for new cities, dashing Wildomar's chances for cityhood. State funding shifts also made annexation more costly for Murrieta. Murrieta then withdrew its annexation application completely.

With a dozen or more other communities throughout the State besides Wildomar now

stymied in their cityhood efforts, bi-partisan legislation³ has been introduced to correct the situation and restore funding to new cities. With Board of Supervisors support for this Resolution, Wildomar can now realistically proceed to explore incorporation.


BOB BUSTER

¹ LAFCO requires 25% of registered voters' signatures to commence the process. Proponents presented 2,990 signatures, or 30% of the estimated 10,005 total Wildomar voters.

² According to LAFCO's Executive Director.

³ A.B. 1602 by Assemblyman Laird; co-authors Benoit, Bogh, Cogdill, Haynes, Leslie, Nakanishi, Alquist, Battin, Cox, Hollingsworth, and Maldonado.

2
3 RESOLUTION NO. 2005-239

4 NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT RESOLUTION REQUESTING
5 THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION TAKE
6 PROCEEDINGS FOR THE INCORPORATION OF
7 THE CITY OF WILDOMAR

8 BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors assembled in regular session on May 3, 2005,
9 that this Board intends to review on May 24, 2005 at 9:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as possible, in the
10 Board of Supervisors meeting room at 4080 Lemon Street, Riverside, California 92501, the adoption of a
11 resolution requesting the Local Agency Formation Commission take proceedings for the incorporation of
12 the City of Wildomar.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28