

Forms of Good Government (FOGG)
Presentation to Midcoast Community Council
March 26, 1997

Overview

History

Options Examined

Analysis

Issues

Findings/Recommendations

OVERVIEW

- MCC chartered FOGG to investigate viability of different forms of government for the unincorporated Midcoast.
- The formation of FOGG was in response to two primary issues:
 1. Land use decisions are made by people who do not live in the community, and who do not share the community's interpretation of the Local Coastal Plan.
 2. Increased infrastructure, especially the new sewer plant, will allow significant growth and development of the area.

HISTORY

- FOGG formed in summer of 1995 by a unanimous vote of the MCC.
- First meeting held September 19, 1995.
- Numerous meetings were held, four of which were attended by Peter Banning, who was then the Executive Director of the San Mateo LAFCo.
- Meetings have been attended by:

Dennis Coleman

Larry De Young

Don Johnson

Zoe Kersteen-Tucker

Ric Lohman

Chris McComb

James Marsh

Paul Perkovic

Katheryn Slater-Carter

David Spiselman

Leonard Woren

OPTIONS EXAMINED

- Maintenance of Status Quo
- Establishment of Coastside Planning Commission
- Incorporation
- Annexation to HMB

ANALYSIS

Maintain Status Quo

- We continue to fight inappropriate development, with no guarantee of success.
- Continues lack of local control.
- Development continues without regard for local benefit.
- Development continues without regard for impact on the community.

Establishment of Coastside Planning Commission

- Issue in last supervisor's race which was supported by defeated candidate
- A stopgap measure in which any decisions could be overruled by the County

ANALYSIS Cont.

Incorporation

- Appears to be less financially feasible than annexation
- Requires extensive investment in infrastructure
- Fails to take advantage of economies of scale
- Fails to politically integrate the coastside
- May require a reduction in current level of service
- Not favored by County Government, who must also approve

ANALYSIS Cont.

Annexation by Half Moon Bay

- This appears to be more financially feasible than incorporation
- Utilizes existing government infrastructure in HMB
- Potentially consolidates special districts (pending voter approval)
- Provides uniform land use control of the entire area from HMB to Montara
- Provides larger area over which to build revenue-generating development that does not subvert our quality of life and the environment
- Required administrative steps can be accomplished in less time than incorporation
- Levels of service will become those of HMB

ISSUES

Any change in government will require very significant community discussion process.

Any change in government can only be successful if it is the result of a grass-roots effort.

Significant resources will be required to do the necessary work.

INCORPORATION

Two methods:

1. Petition by 25% of registered voters of the area to LAFCo, calling for the consideration of formation of a city.
2. Any special district board can pass a resolution to LAFCo, calling for the consideration of formation of a city.

From either genesis, LAFCo must then find “cause” for such a city. The Board of Supervisors, based on LAFCo’s report, then calls the election.

In either case, must be approved by a majority of the registered voters of the area.

ANNEXATION

Two methods:

1. Citizens of the area to be annexed can petition the annexing governing body. Petition requires signatures of 25% of registered voters of area to be annexed.
2. Governing body of annexing area can pass a resolution. Does not require a vote of the “annexee” citizens. However, “annexee” citizens can protest. Signatures of 25% of the registered voters puts the issue to a vote; signatures of 50% of the registered voters kills the process.