



City Council Meeting Agenda

February 21, 2023
7:00 PM – Regular Meeting
Council Chambers
400 N. Douty St.

Council Members will meet in-person in the Council Chambers. The meeting will also be lived streamed on the City's website: <http://livestream.hanford.city/>

5:00 PM CALL TO ORDER STUDY SESSION AND CLOSED SESSION:

ROLL CALL BY THE CITY CLERK:

PUBLIC COMMENT:

*Study Sessions are considered Special Meetings under the Brown Act. Accordingly, comments from the public are limited to items listed on the agenda (GC 54954.3a). A maximum of **three minutes** is allowed for each speaker. Please begin your comments by stating your name and providing your city of residence.*

STUDY SESSION:

- A. Parks and Community Services: Presentation and Debriefing on the 2022 Winter Wonderland Event
- B. Community Development: Overview of the City Annexation Process and the Role of LAFCO

CLOSED SESSION FOR DISCUSSION OF THE FOLLOWING:

- A. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS (GC 54956.8):
Property: 426 W. Lacey Blvd.
APN: 010-253-001-000
Agency Negotiators: Mario Cifuentes and Ty Mizote
Negotiating Party: Nick Warner for MSI Hanford

CALL TO ORDER REGULAR SESSION:

ROLL CALL:

INVOCATION:

FLAG SALUTE:

COUNCIL REPORTS/GENERAL REPORTS:

Brief information-only reports from City Council and/or Staff, including committee reports and reports by City Council related to meetings attended at City expenses (AB1234).

PUBLIC COMMENT:

This is the time for citizens to comment on subject matters within the jurisdiction of the Hanford City Council. This is also the public's opportunity to request an item from the Consent Calendar be pulled for discussion purposes or to comment on any item on the agenda. State law does not allow the Council to discuss or take action on issues not on the agenda, except that members of the Council or staff may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising their public testimony rights (Gov. Code sec. 54954.2). A maximum of three minutes is allowed for each speaker. Please begin your comments by stating your name and providing your city of residence.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these matters unless a request is made and then the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar to be discussed and voted upon by a separate motion.

- A. PROCEDURAL WAIVER: Waive reading in full of resolutions and ordinances and approval and adoption of same by reading title the only.
- B. City Clerk: Approval of the Minutes of the December 20, 2022 Meeting
- C. City Clerk: Approval of the appointment of Bert Parolini and Scott Goddard to the Parking and Traffic Commission.
- D. Administration: Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance No. 23-04, Amending Chapters 2.32 and 2.28 of the Municipal Code to create Alternate seats on both the Parks & Recreation and Parking & Traffic Commissions.
- E. Police: Authorization to accept a tobacco enforcement grant in the amount of \$70,110.00 and Authorization for Chief of Police, on behalf of the City of Hanford, to execute the MOU with the Department of Justice for the grant.

PUBLIC HEARING:

- A. Community Development: **Annexation No. 160, Part 4:** A proposal to annex approximately 93.2 +/- acres into the City of Hanford from the Kings County jurisdiction. **Prezone No. 2021-09:** A proposal to prezone Annexation 160 Area 4 a combination of R-L-5 Low-Density Residential and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use, in accordance with the General Plan designation for the area – Low-Density Residential and Corridor Mixed Use. **CEQA Determination:** The project has been determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Categorical Exemption Class 19 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15319(a). The project is generally located east of 10th Avenue, South of Florinda Street, North of Lacey Boulevard.

CONVENE AS SUCCESSOR AGENCY:

PUBLIC COMMENT-SUCCESSOR AGENCY :

Any person may directly address the Board at this time on any item on the agenda, or on any item that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board. A maximum of three minutes is allowed for each speaker.

SUCCESSOR AGENCY FOR THE DISCUSSION OF THE FOLLOWING:

- A. Finance: Review And Approval Of The Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 23-24) For The Period July 1, 2023 To June 30, 2024

ADJOURN AS THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY:

COUNCIL COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS::

At this time, any Council Member may ask a question for clarification, make an announcement, or report briefly on their activities. In addition, subject to Council Policies and Procedures, they may request staff to report back to the Council at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter or take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda. (GOV. CODE SEC. 54954.2)

- A. Council Future Agenda Items

- B. Upcoming Events and Important Dates:

March 7: Regular City Council Meeting

March 11: Hanford Helping Hands Volunteer Program at Encore Park-[Sign up here](#)

March 21: Regular City Council Meeting

March 22: Special City Council Meeting-Goals Setting, Time: TBD

ADJOURNMENT:

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the City Council after distribution of the agenda packet are available to public inspection in the City Clerk's Office located at 319 N. Douty Street, Hanford, California 93230, during normal business hours. Such agendas are also available at the city's website, www.cityofhanfordca.com subject to staff's ability to post the agenda before the meeting.

If you need a disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to participate in this meeting, please contact the City Clerk's office, 559-585-2515, 319 N. Douty Street, Hanford, California 93230, at least 2 days prior to the meeting {28 CFR 35.102.35.104 ADA Title II}



AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 2/21/2023	AGENDA SECTION: STUDY SESSION
--------------------------------	--------------------------------------

SUBJECT:

Presentation and Debriefing on the 2022 Winter Wonderland Event

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation: The City Council receives the presentation and report from staff and provide feedback to staff.

Recommended Motion:

BACKGROUND:

In many ways, the Winter Wonderland Event exceeded expectations. The modifications and lessons learned from the previous year's inaugural event proved beneficial. The larger-sized ice rink enabled us to increase the capacity and number of visits by 25%, with 17,779 visits. The partnership with ABC30 proved very beneficial with commercials and on-air mentions by the news anchors. Snappy, the Gingerbread Person, was a fun addition and enabled us to use TikTok as a new marketing medium. We had TikTok influencer Leo Gonzalez visit and created two videos promoting the event.

We also added the S'more to the Merrier area, where families could purchase and prepare S'mores.

- **Community Support-** The sponsorships increased with \$102,000 secured and another \$42,500 in value for trade goods and services.

- **Marketing** – 34,476 website visits, 6,581 Facebook followers, 2,326 Instagram followers, 160 TikTok followers, and a trade sponsorship with ABC30 worth \$5,800 plus several on-air mentions.

- **Event Data**
 1. 47 days of operation. Four days were canceled due to the weather
 2. 20 canceled sessions resulting in up to \$27,100 in lost revenue
 3. 17,779 tickets sold
 4. 16,540 actual visits
 5. Percentage of tickets purchased and not redeemed: 7%

6. The average number of skaters per session: 94 (25% increase from last year)

- **Financial Data** – This year's event generated a cost recovery percentage of 107% (See attached Financial Report).

- **Lessons Learned**

1. The larger ice rink resulted in a 25% increase in skating capacity and revenue
2. The general facility layout worked well for operations and customer safety
3. Expenses for the event tent rental exceeded revenue.
4. Focus on sponsorship development.
5. Village concept with Tuff Shed and vendors
6. The addition of Sanppy and TikTok expanded the marketing reach
7. Adjust sessions
8. Adjust the snow machine location

FISCAL IMPACT:

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Winter Wonderland Financial Report 2023

Winter Wonderland FY 23 Financial Report

Expenses	FY 23	Revenue	FY23
Ice Rink rental + tax	\$166,120	Ice Skating Tickets	\$238,414
PT Staffing	\$58,000	Sponsorships	\$56,702
FT Staffing (% of FT staff)	\$37,000	Vendor Split	\$22,744
Gingerbread tent rental	\$11,976	Northpole Lounge/Ice Rink & Gingerbread tent rentals	\$31,090
Utilities (Gas, Water, Refuse, Electricity)	\$5,595	Skate Aid rentals	\$14,510
Promotions (Tik Tok & Videos)	\$12,670	S'Mores	\$2,980
Skate Aids (one time purchase)	\$12,870	Skate Lessons	\$2,960
Supplies & Equipment	\$42,095	Circus & Enchanted Princess	\$4,777
Sod Replacement	\$2,956	Misc. (Lockers/Socks etc..)	\$1,217
Total	\$349,282	Total	\$375,394



AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 2/21/2023	AGENDA SECTION: STUDY SESSION
--------------------------------	--------------------------------------

SUBJECT:

Overview of the City Annexation Process and the Role of LAFCO

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation: Recieve Presentation Regarding City Annexation Processes and the Role of LAFCO

BACKGROUND:

Increasing the size of Hanford's City Limits (annexation) requires multiple approvals and the completion of several planning processes. In most cases, a proposed annexation requires public hearings, Planning Commission and City Council approvals, pre-zoning, compliance with CEQA, a request to initiate the annexation with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and LAFCO approval.

Annexations can be initiated for several reasons, but typical applicants might include:

- Developers seeking annexation to cities in order to obtain more favorable development and urban services extended to new housing or commercial development.
- Cities annexing pockets or “islands” of unincorporated land located within the borders in order to avoid duplication of services with the county and to comply with LAFCO policies.

The City and LAFCO are subject to local ordinances, state law (Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg), adopted policies and procedures, and other rules and regulations when considering an annexation. When reviewing properties for annexation, City and LAFCO Staff evaluate if a proposal meets those policies and makes recommendations to their respective Council/Board.

The LAFCO Commission in Kings County is comprised of two City Council members from the four incorporated cities, two Board of Supervisors members and a public member chosen by the four city and county commissioners. The objectives of LAFCO are to encourage the orderly formation of local government agencies, preserve agricultural land resources, discourage urban sprawl, and provide a sphere of influence for each city and special district in the county.,

FISCAL IMPACT:

ATTACHMENTS:

None



AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 2/21/2023	AGENDA SECTION: CONSENT CALENDAR
--------------------------------	---

SUBJECT:

Approval of the Minutes of the December 20, 2022 Meeting


RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation: Approve the minutes of the December 20, 2022 meeting.

Recommended Motion: I move to approve the minutes of the December 20, 2022 meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 12.20.2022



**CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
December 20, 2022 7:00 PM
Council Chambers
400 N. Douty St.**

5:00 PM CALL TO ORDER STUDY SESSION AND CLOSED SESSION:

Mayor Paden called the study session and closed session to order at 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL BY THE CITY CLERK:

Present: Travis Paden, Mark Kairis, Kalish Morrow, Diane Sharp, Lou Martinez

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mayor Paden put the public comment period on hold until after the study session items were presented.

STUDY SESSION:

A. Community Development Housing the City's First Time Homebuyer Assistance Program.

Administrative Analyst Sandra Lerma discussed the application process and requirements for the First Time Home buyers Program. Ms. Lerma also explained the State of California HOME Program is working with HUD to update the HOME First-Time Homebuyer (FTHB) program policy. Until those policy updates are in place; all HOME Program grantees operating HOME FTHB programs are suspended.

Public Comment:

Bob Ramos questioned the amount of funds that are available.

Ms. Lerma addressed the Council's questions and concerns. After a brief discussion, the Council requested to revisit the item, when there are funds available. The presentation was for informational purposes only, no formal action was taken.

B. Presentation by City of Hanford Staff and Peters Engineering regarding the Downtown Pedestrian and Traffic Safety project and Council direction regarding the proposed roundabouts or 4-Way stops at the Douty Intersection locations

Deputy City Manager Jason Waters presented three scenarios and the implications to traffic, parking, future planning and budget for the Council's review and direction. Staff also provided roundabout video examples. Dep. Waters addressed the questions and concerns from the Council.

Public Comment:

Larry Faria thanked the city for the community outreach. He's spoke in favor of scenario #3 but is still opposed to three traffic circles.

Bob Ramos expressed his disappointment in the lack of community interest. He spoke in opposition of all presented scenarios. Mr. Ramos suggested improving traffic lights, sidewalks, and crosswalks.

Ronald Jones stated removing traffic lights will be problematic and may cause an increase in accidents. He also commented on the presented scenarios.

Brain Fagundes thanked the city for the presentation and shared his recommendations for improving more than 3 intersections.

Michael Quinn commented on the project and discussed the importance of increasing parking downtown. He also questioned the budget, design immunity, the charge of businesses coming downtown, and the term level of service.

Mary Beth Lamunyon-Jones shared her experience driving on roundabouts. She also expressed her concerns for pedestrian safety.

Jerry Irons shared his recommendation for the intersections that should be a priority for traffic circles. He also shared his concerns about four-way stops in the downtown area.

The Council thanked the staff and discussed each of the presented scenarios. David Peters of Peters Engineering addressed the questions and concerns of the Council. City Attorney Mizote discussed design immunity and he encouraged the Council to select a design that will protect the residents of the city. Council Members Sharp, Morrow, Kairis, and Paden spoke in favor of scenario 3. Council Member Martinez is opposed to the traffic circles project. He would like the funds to be used for other projects.

Motion to approve scenario 3 and direct staff to move forward with a request for proposals.

RESULT:	APPROVED [4 TO 1]
MOVER:	Kalish Morrow, Council Member
SECONDER:	Mark Kairis, Vice Mayor
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Kairis
NAYS:	Martinez

The Council convened to closed session at 6:38 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION FOR DISCUSSION OF THE FOLLOWING:

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL - REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS (GC

54956.8):

Property: 113 Court St.
APN: 010-265-001-000
Agency Negotiators: Mario Cifuentez and Ty Mizote
Negotiating Party:

CALL TO ORDER REGULAR SESSION:

Mayor Paden called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Travis Paden	Mayor	Present	4:15 PM

Diane Sharp	Council Member	Present	4:12 PM
Kalish Morrow	Council Member	Present	4:22 PM
Lou Martinez	Council Member	Present	4:17 PM
Mark Kairis	Vice Mayor	Present	4:13 PM

INVOCATION:

The invocation was led by Pastor Orris Whitley.

FLAG SALUTE:

The flag salute was led by Mayor Paden.

COUNCIL REPORTS/GENERAL REPORTS:

Brief information-only reports from City Council and/or Staff, including committee reports and reports by City Council related to meetings attended at City expenses (AB1234).

The Council discussed the meetings and community events they attended.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

This is the time for citizens to comment on subject matters not on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Hanford City Council. This is also the public's opportunity to request an item from the Consent Calendar be pulled for discussion purposes or to comment on any item on the agenda. Comments related to Public Hearing items will be heard at the time the item is discussed.

*A maximum of **three minutes** is allowed for each speaker. Please begin your comments by stating your name and providing your city of residence.*

Andre Booker expressed his concerns about the annexation notification he received from the city.

Steve Para expressed his concerns about the annexation notice he received from the city less than a week ago.

Alan Para expressed his concerns about the annexation notification he received from the city.

Robert Val commented on the annexation and spoke in opposition.

Nick Wagner commented on his public comment he made at a previous meeting regarding the traffic circles project and addressed the city attorney's response to his comment.

Rusty Brookshire stated he does not like the roundabouts.

Michael Quinn questioned the charge for parking spaces for new businesses. He also commented on the selection of the company designing the traffic circles.

Bob Ramos commented on the city attorney's statement at a previous meeting regarding the Northstar project. He also commented on the approval of new developments in the city.

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these matters unless a request is made and then the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar to be discussed and voted upon by a separate motion.

Item E was pulled by Mayor Paden and Vice Mayor Kairis.

Motion to approve the consent calendar except for the items pulled for separate discussion.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Diane Sharp, Council Member
SECONDER:	Kalish Morrow, Council Member
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Martinez, Kairis

- A. PROCEDURAL WAIVER: Waive reading in full of resolutions and ordinances and approval and adoption of same by reading title the only.
- B. City Clerk: Approval of the Minutes of the December 2, 2022, Special Meeting
- C. City Clerk: Denial of a claim for damages and authorization for the City Clerk to send out notification of such to Earlene Carson
- D. Community Development: Adoption of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Thresholds and Implementation Guidelines, establishing thresholds and guidelines for addressing VMT, in accordance with Senate Bill 743

PULLED ITEMS:

- 1. Public Works: Pre authorization to provide disking services on City's 1600 acre farm property and appropriate \$50,000 from the Wastewater Fund.

[Item E]

Deputy Public Works Director Jim Ross answered questions from the Council.

Motion to approve.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Diane Sharp, Council Member
SECONDER:	Lou Martinez, Council Member
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Martinez, Kairis

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- A. Community Development: Annexation No. 159: A request to annex approximately 19 acres into the City of Hanford from the Kings County jurisdiction. Prezone No. 2021-09: A request to pre-zone the annexation area as I-H Heavy Industrial, in accordance with the General Plan designation for the area. Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 2022-62: An initial study was prepared, and it was determined that the project will not result in significant impacts; therefore, Mitigated Negative Declaration 2022-62 has been prepared. The project is located south of Iona Avenue, west of 10th Avenue (APN 018-242-014, 018-242-015, 018-242-016, 018-242-017, 018-242-018, and 018-242-019).

Mayor Paden opened the public hearing at 7:35 p.m. and called for the staff report. Senior Planner Gabrielle Myers discussed Annexation No. 159 and Prezone 2021-09, for the Council's review and consideration. Ms. Myers also addressed the comments received during the public comment period. Ms. Myers and a representative of the applicant, Ronald Jones answered questions from the Council.

Public Comment:

IN-FAVOR:

None.

OPPOSED:

Andre Booker shared his concerns about the annexation.

Steve Para spoke in opposition.

Alan Para stated the residents are not in favor. He also commented on the process of the annexation.

Larry Faria spoke in support of the landowners.

Rusty Brookshire expressed his concerns of the annexation.

Liz Wagner spoke in opposition.

Albert Belle spoke in opposition. He also expressed his concerns for the property owners.

Nick Wagner expressed his concerns about the annexation.

Bob Ramos discussed his experience on the General Plan Committee. He also expressed his concerns about the annexation.

Onan Champi questioned LAFCO's process. He also asked if the residential properties can be excluded?

Staff addressed the questions and concerns from the Council.

Rebuttal Comments:

Ronald Jones, representative of the applicant discussed the goals of the applicant and proposed approving a partial annexation.

Staff addressed the questions and concerns from the Council. Staff also discussed LAFCO's policy. After much discussion Council, the Council suggested moving forward with approving the annexation with the amendment to exclude APN's 018-242-014, 018-242-015, 018-242-016, 018-242-017, 018-242-0180. Staff discussed the next steps moving forward with the project.

1. Motion to certify Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 2022-62 for the project.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Travis Paden, Mayor
SECONDER:	Kalish Morrow, Council Member
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Martinez, Kairis

2. Motion to introduce and waive the first reading of Ordinance 22-08, approving Prezone No. 2021-09, as amended.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Travis Paden, Mayor
SECONDER:	Kalish Morrow, Council Member
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Martinez, Kairis

3. Motion to adopt Resolution 22-48-R initiating proceedings for Annexation 159 as amended and direct staff to file the appropriate forms with the Kings County Local Agency Formation Commission.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Travis Paden, Mayor
SECONDER:	Kalish Morrow, Council Member
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Martinez, Kairis

GENERAL BUSINESS:

- A. Public Works: Approve change orders and an appropriation transfer of \$40,000 from the Accumulated Capital Outlay (ACO) Fund, to fully fund the completion of the Police Activities League Parking Lot project.

City Engineer Lisa Dock discussed the project and budget for the Council's review and approval. The Council expressed their concerns regarding the project estimates. Staff addressed the Council's questions and concerns. After a lengthy discussion Vice Mayor Kairis made the motion to approve.

Motion to approve.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Mark Kairis, Vice Mayor
SECONDER:	Diane Sharp, Council Member
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Martinez, Kairis

- B. Public Works: Approve change orders and an appropriation transfer of \$39,000.00 from the Accumulated Capital Outlay (ACO) Fund, to fully fund the completion of the Police Parking Lot Expansion Construction Project

City Engineer Lisa Dock discussed the project and budget for the Council's review and approval. Staff answered questions from the Council.

Motion to approve.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Kalish Morrow
SECONDER:	Lou Martinez
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Martinez, Kairis

- C. Council: Review and Approval of the 2023 Calendar of City Council Meetings

City Manager Cifuentez discussed the canceled meetings dates and answered questions from the Council.

Motion to approve.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Mark Kairis, Vice Mayor
SECONDER:	Diane Sharp, Council Member
AYES:	Paden, Sharp, Morrow, Martinez, Kairis

COUNCIL COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS:

At this time, any Council Member may ask a question for clarification, make an announcement, or report briefly on their activities. In addition, subject to Council Policies and Procedures, they may request staff to report back to the Council at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter or take action to direct staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda. (GOV. CODE SEC. 54954.2)

The Council directed staff to bring back future study session discussions for:

Landscape Assessment Districts improvements, brought forth by Mayor Paden.

The Cooling and Warming Centers Policy, brought forth by Vice Mayor Kairis.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mayor Paden adjourned the meeting at 9:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Natalie Corral
City Clerk



AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 2/21/2023

AGENDA SECTION: CONSENT CALENDAR

SUBJECT:

Approval of the appointment of Bert Parolini and Scott Goddard to the Parking and Traffic Commission.

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation: The Mayor, with the approval of the full City Council, appoint Bert Parolini to fill an unexpired term ending 12/31/2023, and Scott Goddard to fill a vacancy with a term expiring on 12/31/26 on the Parking and Traffic Commission.

Recommended Motion: I move to appoint Bert Parolini and Scott Goddard to the Parking and Traffic Commission.

BACKGROUND:

The Parking and Traffic Commission currently has three vacancies; two are unexpired terms. Mr. Parolini and Mr. Goddard submitted their application in December 2022 with the Parking and Traffic Commission listed as their first preference. It's the staff's recommendation to appoint both applicants to the Parking and Traffic Commission so that the commission can have a quorum to conduct business at the regularly scheduled monthly meetings.

Section 2.20.030 of the City of Hanford Municipal Code states that:

"Vacancies occurring due to resignation or other cause, shall be noticed as required by state law and appointment made by the mayor at the earliest date possible. All such appointments shall be approved by a majority of the members of the city council."

In addition, staff will conduct interviews and bring back their recommendations to fill the third vacancy on the Parking and Traffic Commission and each of the commission alternate seats.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There will be some cost to the General Fund for Commissioner training but it is budgeted annually in the corresponding departmental budgets and totals less than \$10,000 for all commissions.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Application - Bert Parolini
2. Application - Scott Goddard

RECEIVED
CITY OF HANFORD

DEC 20 2022

CITY CLERK

SUBMIT TO:

CITY CLERK
319 N. Douty St.
Hanford, CA 93230
Phone (559) 585-2515
Fax (559) 585-2595

CLERK'S OFFICE USE ONLY:

CITY OF HANFORD

RESIDENT: YES NO

DISTRICT NO. A B C D E

mc

CITY OF HANFORD
APPLICATION FOR COMMISSION APPOINTMENT

APPLICANTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO CONTACT A COUNCILMEMBER TO COMMUNICATE THEIR INTEREST FOR APPOINTMENT.

1. Mr. Bert S. Parolini
Mrs. _____
Ms. _____
First Middle Last
2. Residence address: _____
Hanford Kings CA 93230
City County State Zip
Cell/Home Phone (____) _____
E-mail address: _____
3. Position(s) sought: (List in order of preference)
1) Parking and Traffic Commission
2) _____
3) _____
4. Business Title or Occupation: California Highway Patrol (Retired)
Company: _____
Address: _____
City County State Zip
Phone (____) _____
5. Education - List schools attended and/or graduated/degree(s):
California Highway Patrol Academy/Peace Officer Standards and Training Certificate

6. Other Special Training or Experience:

7. Previous and present governmental and civic experience. Indicate when, position and duties:

Retired California Highway Patrol Officer. (2003 until 2020).

Duties as an officer included, but not limited to; traffic safety and enforcement, investigating traffic collisions, which included identifying potential roadway conditions and hazards which may pose a threat to the safety of the motoring Public.

I also conducted several traffic and drivers safety training classes for the general public and the Kings County Sheriff's Office.

8. Please explain why you wish to serve on a Commission for the City of Hanford:

I wish to serve on the Parking and Traffic Commission because as I drive through our town, I constantly observe traffic safety issues and violations in the City of Hanford and I believe my knowledge, training and experience could be a valuable asset to potentially improve the safety of the motoring public in our town.

9. Do you have any interests or associations which might present a conflict of interest? If yes, please explain:

No.

Please attach your resume, and any additional information or statements which you feel would be helpful in reviewing your qualifications.

AUTHORIZATION AND RELEASE

I, Bert S. Parolini, understand that in connection with this application for appointment, this document and the information contained herein will be made available to the general public upon request. I certify under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.


Signature of Applicant

12/16/2022

Date

SUBMIT TO:

CITY CLERK
319 N. Douty St.
Hanford, CA 93230
Phone (559) 585-2515
Fax (559) 585-2595

RECEIVED
CITY OF HANFORD

DEC 13 2022

CITY CLERK

CLERK'S OFFICE USE ONLY:

CITY OF HANFORD

RESIDENT: YES NO

DISTRICT NO. A B C D E

CITY OF HANFORD
APPLICATION FOR COMMISSION APPOINTMENT

APPLICANTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO CONTACT A COUNCILMEMBER TO COMMUNICATE THEIR INTEREST FOR APPOINTMENT.

1. Mr. SCOTT PATRICK GODDARD
Mrs. _____
Ms. _____ First Middle Last
2. Residence address: _____
HANFORD KINGS CA 93230
City County State Zip
Cell Home Phone (_____) _____
E-mail address: _____
3. Position(s) sought: (List in order of preference)
1) PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION
2) _____
3) _____
4. Business Title or Occupation: LIEUTENANT
Company: CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
Address: 1565 BLONDALE AVENUE
HANFORD KINGS CA 93230
City County State Zip
Phone (559) 582-0231
5. Education - List schools attended and/or graduated/degree(s):
- WESTERN GOVERNORS UNIVERSITY - MASTER OF SCIENCE IN
MANAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP. TIFFIN UNIVERSITY
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

6. Other Special Training or Experience:

26 PLUS YEAR CAREER AS A SWORN OFFICER WITH
THE CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL - 10 YEARS WORKING AS
AN OFFICER FOCUSED ON TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT, FIVE
YEARS AS A SERGEANT AND 11 YEARS AS A LIEUTENANT.

7. Previous and present governmental and civic experience. Indicate when, position and duties:

NONE

8. Please explain why you wish to serve on a Commission for the City of Hanford:

AS A RESIDENT OF HANFORD DATING BACK TO 1977 AND
WITH PLANS TO STAY IN THE COMMUNITY INTO RETIREMENT,
I HAVE STRONG TIES TO THE CITY OF HANFORD. COUPLE
THIS WITH MY EXTENSIVE EXPERIENCE WITH TRAFFIC-RELATED
ISSUES, I BELIEVE I WOULD BE AN EXCELLENT
CANDIDATE TO SERVE THE CITY OF HANFORD.

9. Do you have any interests or associations which might present a conflict of interest? If yes, please explain:

NONE

Please attach your resume, and any additional information or statements which you feel would be helpful in reviewing your qualifications.

AUTHORIZATION AND RELEASE

I, SCOTT GODDARD, understand that in connection with this application for appointment, this document and the information contained herein will be made available to the general public upon request. I certify under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.


Signature of Applicant

12-13-22
Date



AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 2/21/2023	AGENDA SECTION: CONSENT CALENDAR
--------------------------------	---

SUBJECT:

Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance No. 23-04, Amending Chapters 2.32 and 2.28 of the Municipal Code to create Alternate seats on both the Parks & Recreation and Parking & Traffic Commissions.

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation: That the City Council, by motion, Approve the Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance No. 23-04, Amending Chapters 2.32 and 2.28 of the Municipal Code to create Alternate seats on both the Parks & Recreation and Parking & Traffic Commissions.

Recommended Motion: I move to Approve the Second Reading and Adoption of Ordinance No. 23-04, Amending Chapters 2.32 and 2.28 of the Municipal Code to create Alternate seats on both the Parks & Recreation and Parking & Traffic Commissions.

BACKGROUND:

At the January 17, 2023, Council meeting, Council directed staff to bring back modifications to the City's Municipal Code to create an alternate seat on both the Parks & Recreation and the Parking & Traffic Commissions.

The Commissions currently have five (5) seats each. Given the increased interest from the public in serving on the various commissions, as indicated by the 11 applications received by the Clerk's office, the Council would like to take advantage of that interest and fill the alternate positions as the same time as the current vacancies. Having an alternate will reduce the number of meetings where having a quorum may be an issue and will also provide for continuity in the commission when the need arises to fill a seat.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Ordinance No. 23-04
2. 2.28 Parking and Traffic Commission - Final
3. 2.28 Parking and Traffic Commission - Redline
4. 2.32 Parks and Recreation Commission - Final
5. 2.32 Parks and Recreation Commission - Redline

ORDINANCE NO. 23-04

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING HANFORD MUNICIPAL CODE CHAPTERS 2.28 & 2.32
RELATING TO THE CREATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION.**

The City Council of the City of Hanford does ordain as follows:

Section 1: Hanford Municipal Code Chapters 2.28 & 2.32 contains regulations relating to the establishing of the City's Parks & Recreation and Parking and Traffic Commissions.

Section 2: The regulations contained in Chapters 2.28 & 2.32 were amended in 2021 but the Council has determined that the chapters need updates for the effective operation and administration of the City's Commissions.

Section 3: The City Council of the City of Hanford does ordain that Chapters 2.28 and 2.32 of the Hanford Municipal Code are hereby amended and restated as shown in the attached Exhibit "A", which is incorporated herein by reference.

Section 4: This ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days after its passage and shall be published once in the Hanford Sentinel within fifteen (15) days after its passage or a summary of this ordinance shall be published in the Hanford Sentinel in a manner consistent with the requirements of the California Government Code.

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hanford duly called and held on _____, 2023, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: _____

NOES: _____

ABSTAIN: _____

ABSENT: _____

APPROVED

Travis Paden
MAYOR of the City of Hanford

ATTEST:

NATALIE CORRAL
CITY CLERK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF KINGS) ss
CITY OF HANFORD)

I NATALIE CORRAL, City Clerk of the City of Hanford, do hereby certify the foregoing ordinance was duly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hanford on the 7th day of February, 2023, and it was duly passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hanford held on the day ____ of _____, 2022.

NATALIE CORRAL
CITY CLERK

Exhibit “A”

Chapter 2.28 PARKING AND TRAFFIC COMMISSION

2.28.010 Created.

A. There is created a parking and traffic commission, which shall consist of five (5) members and one (1) alternate, appointed in accordance with Section [2.20.030](#).

B. Notwithstanding subsection A, Present members of the parking and traffic commission shall hold office for the balance of their respective terms. Thereafter, appointments shall be for four (4) year terms; including the alternate.

C. If a vacancy shall occur other than by expiration of a term, a new commissioner shall be appointed in the manner as set forth in section 2.20.030.

D. The alternate may participate in deliberations, but shall not vote unless at least one (1) commissioner is absent or recuses himself or herself from a matter due to an actual or potential conflict of interest.

E. The city engineer or designee shall serve as secretary to the commission.

F. The parking and traffic commission shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

1. To make recommendations to the City Council regarding the most practical means for coordinating the activities of all officers and agencies of the city having authority with respect to the enforcement of the parking and traffic laws and ordinances;

2. To review traffic issues and recommend any needed changes related traffic safety matters and parking restrictions that may be the result of a citizen's request or a staff recommendation;

3. To make recommendations to the city council for installation of traffic control and amendments to the municipal code for traffic related items that may ease traffic congestion and help facilitate transportation throughout the city.

4. Perform any other functions, which may be assigned by the city council. (Ord. 16-01, 2016; prior code § 2-8.08)

Chapter 2.32 PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

2.32.010 Created.

A. There is created a parks and recreation commission which shall consist of five (5) members and one (1) alternate, appointed in accordance with Section 2.20.030.

B. Present members of the existing parks and recreation commission shall hold office for the balance of their respective terms. Thereafter, appointments shall be made for four (4) year terms, including the alternate.

C. The director of the Parks & Community Services department, or designee, shall serve as secretary to the commission.

D. The parks and recreation commission shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Become informed and knowledgeable about the city parks and recreation programs, facilities, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and recreational needs;

2. Interpret the city's recreational programs to the general citizenry in order to promote understanding and public support;

3. Foster cooperation between the city and other governmental agencies and civic groups interested in the development of a community parks and recreation program;

4. Encourage a sound program of parks and recreation development and maintenance;

5. Advise the council on programs and projects that will enhance the city's parks and recreation facilities or programs;

6. Recommend and encourage the adoption of a plan for future development of parks and recreation;

7. Receive and report on all matters referred to them by the council, as well as make recommendations to the City Council regarding studies and surveys for plans and reports;

8. Review the annual recreation department budget and make recommendations to the city council;

9. Consult with the Director on applications to remove street trees and applications to prune or remove heritage trees. The commission shall make recommendations to the director concerning heritage or street tree removal and heritage tree pruning after an inspection by a subcommittee of the commission and after deliberation by the commission pursuant to (Ord. 12.12.210 Pruning and removal of Heritage or street trees – permit required);and

9. Make recommendations to the city council regarding the planting, care and/or removal of trees and shrubbery on property owned by the city and upon city streets and alleys;

10. Perform any other functions which may be assigned by the city council. (Ord. 17-01 § 1, 2017; Ord. 15-13 § 2, 2015; prior code § 2-8.09)

2.28.010 Created.

A. There is created a parking and traffic commission, which shall consist of five (5) members and one (1) alternate, appointed in accordance with Section [2.20.030](#).

B. Notwithstanding subsection A, Present members of the parking and traffic commission shall hold office for the balance of their respective terms. Thereafter, appointments shall be for four (4) year terms, including the alternate.

C. If a vacancy shall occur other than by expiration of a term, a new commissioner shall be appointed in the manner as set forth in section 2.20.030.

D. The alternate may participate in deliberations, but shall not vote unless at least one (1) commissioner is absent or recuses himself or herself from a matter due to an actual or potential conflict of interest.

E. The city engineer or designee shall serve as secretary to the commission.

F. The parking and traffic commission shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

1. To make recommendations to the City Council regarding the most practical means for coordinating the activities of all officers and agencies of the city having authority with respect to the enforcement of the parking and traffic laws and ordinances;

2. To review traffic issues and recommend any needed changes related traffic safety matters and parking restrictions that may be the result of a citizen's request or a staff recommendation;

3. To make recommendations to the city council for installation of traffic control and amendments to the municipal code for traffic related items that may ease traffic congestion and help facilitate transportation throughout the city.

4. Perform any other functions, which may be assigned by the city council. (Ord. 16-01, 2016; prior code § 2-8.08)

2.28.010 Created.

A. There is created a parking and traffic commission, which shall consist of five (5) members and one (1) alternate, appointed in accordance with Section 2.20.030.

B. Notwithstanding subsection A, Present members of the parking and traffic commission shall hold office for the balance of their respective terms. Thereafter, appointments shall be for four (4) year terms, including the alternate.

C. If a vacancy shall occur other than by expiration of a term, a new commissioner shall be appointed in the manner as set forth in section 2.20.030.

D. The alternate may participate in deliberations, but shall not vote unless at least one (1) commissioner is absent or recuses himself or herself from a matter due to an actual or potential conflict of interest.

E. The city engineer or designee shall serve as secretary to the commission.

FD. The parking and traffic commission shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

1. To make recommendations to the City Council regarding ~~suggest~~ the most practical means for coordinating the activities of all officers and agencies of the city having authority with respect to the enforcement of the parking and traffic laws and ordinances;

2. ~~To stimulate and assist in the preparation of the publication of parking and traffic reports;~~

3. To review traffic issues and recommend any needed changes related traffic safety matters and parking restrictions that may be the result of a citizen's request or a staff recommendation~~receive comments and complaints from the public having to do with parking and traffic matters;~~

4. To make recommendations to the city council for installation of traffic control and amendments to the municipal code for traffic related items that may ease traffic congestion and help facilitate transportation throughout the city; and~~recommend to the city council ways and means of improving parking and traffic conditions and the administration and enforcement of the parking and traffic laws and ordinances; and~~

5. —Perform any other functions, which may be assigned by the city council. (Ord. 16-01, 2016; prior code § 2-8.08)

2.32.010 Created.

A. There is created a parks and recreation commission which shall consist of five (5) members and one (1) alternate, appointed in accordance with Section 2.20.030..

B. Present members of the existing parks and recreation commission shall hold office for the balance of their respective terms. Thereafter, appointments shall be made for four (4) year terms, including the alternate.

C. The director of the Parks & Community Services department, or designee, shall serve as secretary to the commission.

D. The parks and recreation commission shall have the following duties and responsibilities:

1. Become informed and knowledgeable about the city parks and recreation programs, facilities, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and recreational needs;

2. Interpret the city's recreational programs to the general citizenry in order to promote understanding and public support;

3. Foster cooperation between the city and other governmental agencies and civic groups interested in the development of a community parks and recreation program;

4. Encourage a sound program of parks and recreation development and maintenance;

5. Advise the council on programs and projects that will enhance the city's parks and recreation facilities or programs;

6. Recommend and encourage the adoption of a plan for future development of parks and recreation;

7. Receive and report on all matters referred to them by the council, as well as make recommendations to the City Council regarding studies and surveys for plans and reports;

8. Review the annual recreation department budget and make recommendations to the city council;

9. Consult with the director on applications to remove street trees and applications to prune or remove heritage trees. The commission shall make recommendations to the director concerning heritage or street tree removal and heritage tree pruning after an inspection by a subcommittee of the commission and after deliberation by the commission pursuant to (Ord. 12.12.210 Pruning and removal of Heritage or street trees – permit required).

9. Make recommendations to the city council regarding the planting, care and/or removal of trees and shrubbery on property owned by the city and upon city streets and alleys;

10. Perform any other functions which may be assigned by the city council. (Ord. 17-01 § 1, 2017; Ord. 15-13 § 2, 2015; prior code § 2-8.09)

2.32.010 Created.

- A. There is created a parks and recreation commission which shall consist of five (5) members and one (1) alternate, appointed in accordance with Section 2.20.030.
- B. Present members of the existing parks and recreation commission shall hold office for the balance of their respective terms. Thereafter, appointments shall be made for four (4) year terms, including the alternate.
- C. The director of the Parks & Community Services department, or designee, shall serve as secretary to the commission.
- D. The parks and recreation commission shall have the following duties and responsibilities:
1. ~~To be~~ Become informed and knowledgeable about the city parks and recreation programs, facilities, Parks and Recreation Master Plan, and recreational needs;
 2. Interpret the city's recreational programs to the general citizenry in order to promote understanding and public support;
 3. Foster cooperation between the city and other governmental agencies and civic groups interested in the development of a community parks and recreation program;
 4. Encourage a sound program of parks and recreation development and maintenance;
 5. Advise the council on programs and projects that will enhance the city's parks and recreation facilities or programs;
 6. Recommend and encourage the adoption of a plan for future development of parks and recreation;
 7. Receive and report on all matters referred to them by the council, as well as make recommendations to the City Council regarding ~~initiate~~ studies and surveys for plans and reports ~~for recommendations to the city council except that all expenditures of city funds shall be subject to prior approval by the city council;~~
 8. Review the annual recreation department budget and make recommendations to the city council;
 9. Consult with the director on applications to remove street trees and applications to prune or remove heritage trees. The commission shall make recommendations to the director concerning heritage or street tree removal and heritage tree pruning after an inspection by a subcommittee of the commission and after deliberation by the commission pursuant to (Ord. 12.12.210 Pruning and removal of Heritage or street trees – permit required).
 9. Make recommendations to the city council regarding the ~~To recommend to the city the~~ planting, care and/or removal of trees and shrubbery on property owned by the city and upon city streets and alleys;
 10. Perform any other functions which may be assigned by the city council. (Ord. 17-01 § 1, 2017; Ord. 15-13 § 2, 2015; prior code § 2-8.09)



AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 2/21/2023

AGENDA SECTION: CONSENT CALENDAR

SUBJECT:

Authorization to accept a tobacco enforcement grant in the amount of \$70,110.00 and Authorization for Chief of Police, on behalf of the City of Hanford, to execute the MOU with the Department of Justice for the grant.

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation: That the City Council, by motion, Authorize the acceptance of a tobacco enforcement grant in the amount of \$70,110.00 and Authorize the Chief of Police, on behalf of the City of Hanford, to execute the MOU with the Department of Justice for the grant. .

Recommended Motion: That the City Council by motion accept the award of \$70,110.00 for tobacco enforcement activities and authorize the Chief of Police to enter into an MOU with the Department of Justice for the grant.

BACKGROUND:

The Hanford Police Department applied for and received a tobacco grant in the amount of \$70,110.00. This grant covers a 3 year period and provides \$22,870.00 for overtime and \$500.00 for expenses per year. This grant requires no match from the City and fully pays for the enforcement efforts related to tobacco for each of the three years of the grant. The MOU the Hanford Police Department will enter into with this approval, will not put the City under any financial obligation outside of the reimbursement for the overtime worked by the officers.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. California Department of Justice MOU

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

PURPOSE

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by the Department of Justice ("Department") and the Hanford Police Department ("Grantee"), for the purpose of disbursing grant funds to Grantee for reimbursement of expenditures in compliance with the California Code of Regulations and the Fiscal Year 2022-23 Grantee Handbook.

Commencing January 1, 2023, the California Code of Regulations, Title 11, Division 1, Chapter 5: Department of Justice Tobacco Grant Program ("TGP Regulations") shall govern the policies and procedures of the Tobacco Grant Program.

The TGP Regulations, Request for Proposals, Grantee Handbook (dated April 2022), and Summary of Award document are hereby incorporated by reference into this MOU. Grantee will expend funds for the purposes identified in the approved Summary of Award document. Reimbursements are to be funded under the California Healthcare, Research and Prevention Tobacco Tax Act of 2016, approved by the voters as Proposition 56.

COST REIMBURSEMENT

The Department agrees to reimburse Grantee in arrears, for Grantee's actual expenditures in performing the project or scope of work included in the approved Summary of Award document. Reimbursements will be made upon receipt of invoices from Grantee and approval of the invoices by the Department, in accordance with the reimbursement procedures set forth in the TGP Regulations and Grantee Handbook.

BUDGET CONTINGENCY CLAUSE

It is mutually agreed, if the Budget Act of the current fiscal year and/or any subsequent years covered under the MOU does not appropriate sufficient funds, the MOU shall be of no further force and effect. In the event this situation occurs, the Department shall have no liability to reimburse/pay any funds to Grantee, or to furnish any other considerations under this MOU. As well, Grantee shall not be obligated to continue performing the provisions of this MOU, for which the Grantee would have been reimbursed.

If funding for any fiscal year is reduced or deleted in the Budget Act for purposes of this MOU, the Department shall have the option to either cancel this MOU with no liability occurring to the Department, or offer an addendum to the Grantee to reflect the reduced amount.

PROJECT BREACH-TERMINATION

Failure of a Grantee to comply with this MOU or the TGP Regulations shall be treated by the Department as a breach of contract. If an act of noncompliance occurs, the Department may take actions described within the TGP Regulations, including termination. The Department may terminate this MOU and be relieved of any obligation to disburse grant funds to Grantee should Grantee fail to perform the scope of work at the time and in the manner provided in this MOU.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Addendum – No addendum or variation of the terms of this MOU is valid unless made in writing, and signed by the duly authorized representatives of the parties.

Assignment – This MOU is not assignable by Grantee in whole or in part.

Indemnification – Grantee agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the Department, its officers, agents and employees from all claims, liabilities, or losses in connection with the performance of this MOU.

TERMS

Grant Duration: 1/1/2023 – 6/30/2026

Award Amount				
Category of Expenditure	Budget FY 2022- 2023	Budget FY 2023- 2024	Budget FY 2024- 2025	Budget FY 2025- 2026
Personal Services	\$22,870	\$22,870	\$22,870	\$0
Operating Expenses and Equipment	\$500	\$500	\$500	\$0
Administrative Costs (Not to Exceed 5%)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL AWARD AMOUNT	\$70,110			

The time limit for reimbursements against this award ends 6/30/2026. Requests for reimbursement received after 7/15/2026 cannot be considered by the Department.


GRANTEE CONTACT INFORMATION

Jimmy Macias, Administrative Analyst
Hanford Police Department
425 North Irwin Street
Hanford, CA 93230
(559) 585-4721
jmacias@cityofhanfordca.com

AUTHORIZATION

The Department and Grantee, by their duly authorized officials, have executed this MOU on the respective dates indicated below. This MOU and any future addendums shall be e-mailed to TobaccoGrants@doj.ca.gov, care of the Division of Operations, Local Assistance Unit, Tobacco Grant Program, and will become fully executed upon completion of signatures from all parties.


NAME: PARKER SEEGE
Title: CHIEF
Agency: HANFORD P.D.


Date

NAME: _____
Title: _____
Agency: _____

Date

NAME: _____
Title: _____
Agency: _____

Date

SHAYNA RIVERA, Grant Manager
Division of Operations
California Department of Justice

Date

STACY HEINSEN, Administrative Manager
Division of Operations
California Department of Justice

Date

CHRIS RYAN, Chief
Division of Operations
California Department of Justice

Date

State of California
Financial Information System for California (FI\$Cal)
GOVERNMENT AGENCY TAXPAYER ID FORM

2000 Evergreen Street, Suite 215
Sacramento, CA 95815
www.fiscal.ca.gov
1-855-347-2250



The principal purpose of the information provided is to establish the unique identification of the government entity.

Instructions: You may submit one form for the principal government agency and all subsidiaries sharing the same TIN. Subsidiaries with a different TIN must submit a separate form. Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are required. Hover over fields to view help information. Please print the form to sign prior to submittal. You may email the form to: vendors@fiscal.ca.gov, or fax it to (916) 576-5200, or mail it to the address above.

Principal
Government
Agency Name*

Hanford Police Department

Remit-To
Address (Street
or PO Box)*

425 N. Irwin

City*

Hanford

State * CA

Zip Code**4 93230-4425

Government Type:



City



County



Special District



Federal



Other (Specify)

Federal
Employer
Identification
Number
(FEIN)*

List other subsidiary Departments, Divisions or Units under your principal agency's jurisdiction who share the same FEIN and receives payment from the State of California.

Dept/Division/Unit
Name

Complete
Address

Dept/Division/Unit
Name

Complete
Address

Dept/Division/Unit
Name

Complete
Address

Dept/Division/Unit
Name

Complete
Address

Contact Person*

Jimmy Macias

Title Administration Analyst

Phone number*

(559)585-4721

E-mail address

jmacias@cityofhanfordca.com

Signature*

Date

1/11/22

**CITY OF HANFORD CITY COUNCIL
STAFF REPORT
Tuesday, February 21, 2023**

PROJECT: **Annexation No. 160, Part 4:** A proposal to annex approximately 93.2 +/- acres into the City of Hanford from the Kings County jurisdiction.

Prezone No. 2021-09: A proposal to prezone Annexation 160 Area 4 a combination of R-L-5 Low-Density Residential and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use, in accordance with the General Plan designation for the area – Low-Density Residential and Corridor Mixed Use.

CEQA Determination: The project has been determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Categorical Exemption Class 19 (Annexation of areas containing existing public or private structures developed to the density allowed by the current rezoning) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15319(a), and because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment per CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3). A Notice of Exemption has been prepared for the project in accordance with CEQA

LOCATION: The project is generally located east of 10th Avenue, South of Florinda Street, North of Lacey Boulevard.

PLANNER: Gabrielle Myers, Senior Planner

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council

1. Adopt the Notice of Exemption, in accordance with CEQA.
2. Introduce and waive the first reading of Ordinance 23-02, approving Prezone No. 2021-09.
3. Adopt Resolution No. 23-02-R, initiating proceedings for Annexation 160 (Part 4) and direct staff to file the appropriate forms with the Kings County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

RECOMMENDED MOTION


I move to:

1. Adopt the Notice of Exemption, in accordance with CEQA.
2. Introduce and waive the first reading of Ordinance 23-02, approving Prezone No. 2021-09.
3. Adopt Resolution No. 23-02-R, initiating proceedings for Annexation 160 (Part 4) and direct staff to file the appropriate forms with the Kings County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In 2021, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) of Kings County approved the annexation of seven separate county islands into the City of Hanford. One fully surrounded county island remains, known as Island #4.


Figure 1: County Islands (all 8)



Annexation No. 160, Part 4

Annexation No. 160, Part 4 is a proposal to annex approximately 93.2 +/- acres into the City of Hanford from the Kings County jurisdiction.

Figure 2: Propose Annexation Area #4




A map of the proposed Annexation 160 area, Part 4 is attached – **Attachment 1.**

Prezone No. 2021-09

Prezone No. 2021-09 is a request to prezone Island #4, as R-L-5 Low-Density Residential and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use, in accordance with the General Plan land use designation for the island, Low Density Residential and Corridor Mixed Use.

Figure 3: Proposed Prezone Area #4

General Plan Designation – Low Density Residential and Corridor Mixed Use
Proposed Prezoning to Low Density Residential, 5,000 sq. ft. min. (R-L-5) and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use



Project Location #4 East Hanford

County island #4 includes 172 parcels located east of 10th Avenue, South of Florinda, North of Lacey Boulevard. The assessor's parcel numbers (APNs) are:

014-184-003 through -009	014-201-009 through -011	014-212-006
014-185-020 through -035	014-202-001	014-212-013 through -022
014-185-400	014-202-004 through -006	014-213-001 through -005
014-186-002 through -030	014-203-002 through -006	014-213-009
014-186-035	014-204-001	014-221-007 through -009
014-186-037 through -039	014-204-002	014-221-012
014-191-002 through -019	014-204-004 through -006	014-221-015
014-192-002 through -006	014-204-008	014-221-017 through -019
014-192-008	014-205-001 through -005	014-221-021
014-192-012	014-206-004 through -007	014-221-022
014-192-013	014-211-002	014-221-026
014-192-015	014-211-016	014-221-033
014-192-016	014-211-020	014-221-036
014-193-001 through -016	014-211-021	014-221-037
014-201-003	014-211-025	014-221-040
014-201-007	014-212-001 through -004	014-221-0

Existing Land Use #4 East Hanford

The existing land uses are urban residential, rural residential, commercial, and vacant land within the County boundary. All 172 parcels are within City Urban Development and the Sphere of Influence. The City considers this area as Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, and Corridor Mixed Use per City of Hanford 2035 General Plan. There are a total of 172 lots with 125 developed residential structures and average parcel sizes are approximately 0.46 acres with a few large 14 acre lots.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

General Plan Land Use Designations

The General Plan designates Island #4 as Low-Density Residential and Corridor Mixed Use.

The following policies apply to the Low-Density Residential designation.

3.4.1 Low Density Residential

The expected density range for Low Density Residential is 2 to 10 units per gross acre with an expected average of 4 units per gross acre.

Policy L31 Purpose of the Low-Density Residential Land Use Designation

Establish the Low-Density Residential land use designation to provide mainly single-family development on lot sizes typically found in urban settings.

Policy L32 Typical Uses in the Low-Density Residential Land Use Designation

Define the uses allowed in the Low-Density Residential land use designation to include residential uses in a variety of single-family lot types. Duplexes, second dwelling units, and home occupations can also be allowed when made compatible with the residential nature of the neighborhood.

Policy L33 Size of Lots in the Low-Density Residential Land Use Designation

While it is recognized that existing lot sizes of 10,000 to 40,000 square feet are included in this designation, new individual lot sizes shall range from 5,000 to 10,000 square feet in size. Under Planned Unit Development provisions, smaller lot sizes at higher densities may be permitted when clustered around shared open space amenities or through density bonus policies.

The following policies apply to the Corridor Mixed Use designation.

3.6.2 Corridor Mixed Use

Policy L65 Purpose of Corridor Mixed Use Land Use Designation

Establish the Corridor Mixed Use land use designation to promote a mix of commercial, office, and multifamily residential uses along transportation corridors at a scale compatible with adjacent

residential neighborhood, with the intent of creating a pedestrian-friendly environment that encourages walking between uses.

Policy L66 Typical Uses in Corridor Mixed Use Land Use Designation

Define the uses allowed in the Corridor Mixed Use land use designation to include small- and medium scale commercial providing primarily day-to-day goods and services, office, and multi-family dwellings along with horizontal and vertical mixed-use developments that include these uses. Typical uses include duplexes, townhomes, apartments, markets, small retail shops, eating establishments, offices, service stations, medical and dental offices, convenience stores, dry cleaning and laundry services, beauty salons, and other similar uses. Both vertical and horizontal mixed-use developments are encouraged.

Policy L67 Design of the Corridor Mixed Use Land Use Designation

Require that new development projects and major site reconfigurations in the Corridor Mixed Use land use designation provide site layouts, buildings, landscaping, and walkways that are designed to encourage pedestrian access on the site and between adjacent sites. Strongly encourage buildings to be located near the street corridor with parking to the side of or behind buildings.

Annexation Policies

The General Plan also has policies regarding annexation of land into the city limits. The Planning Commission is charged with reviewing proposed annexations and making a finding that the proposed annexation is consistent with the policies of the General Plan, and then forward that finding to the City Council. The Planning Commission found Annexation 160, Part 4 consistent with the Hanford General Plan Policies L15, L16, and L17 at their meeting on January 10, 2023.

Policy L15 Initiation of Annexations

Consider initiation of annexation of land into the City of Hanford only when the following criteria are met:

1. The land is within the Primary Sphere of Influence.
2. The capacity of the water, sewer, fire, school, and police services are adequate to service the area to be annexed or will be adequate at the time that development occurs.
3. Land for development within the City limits is insufficient to meet the current land use needs.
4. The territory to be annexed is contiguous to existing developed areas.

Policy L16 County Islands

Initiate annexation of County islands when it is found that urban services are needed and can be provided or made available in the near future.

Policy L17 Plan for Services

Prepare and make publicly available a written Plan for Services that describes how urban services will be provided prior to initiating an annexation.

State Law

To facilitate the annexation of county islands to contiguous cities, the state legislature has adopted specific provisions in the Government Code that require LAFCo annexation approval and waiver of protest proceedings if LAFCo makes certain findings and determinations. Those determinations are found in Government Codes 56375(a)(4) and 56375.3.

Government Code Section 56375

(a)(4) A commission shall not disapprove an annexation to a city, initiated by resolution, of contiguous territory that the commission finds any of the following:

(A) Surrounded or substantially surrounded by the city to which the annexation is proposed or by that city and a county boundary or the Pacific Ocean if the territory to be annexed is substantially developed or developing, is not prime agricultural land as defined in Section 56064, is designated for urban growth by the general plan of the annexing city and is not within the sphere of influence of another city.

(B) Located within an urban service area that has been delineated and adopted by a commission, which is not prime agricultural land, as defined by Section 56064, and is designated for urban growth by the general plan of the annexing city.

(C) An annexation or reorganization of unincorporated islands meeting the requirements of Section 56375.3.

Government Code Section 56375.3

(a) In addition to those powers enumerated in Section 56375, a commission shall approve, after notice and hearing, the change of organization or reorganization of a city, and waive protest proceedings pursuant to Part 4 (commencing with Section 57000) entirely, if all of the following are true:

(1) The change of organization or reorganization is initiated on or after January 1, 2000.

(2) The change of organization or reorganization is proposed by resolution adopted by the affected city.

(3) The commission finds that the territory contained in the change of organization or reorganization proposal meets all the requirements set forth in subdivision (b).

(b) Subdivision (a) applies to territory that meets all the following requirements:

(1) It does not exceed 150 acres in area, and that area constitutes the entire island.

(2) The territory constitutes an entire unincorporated island located within the limits of a city or constitutes a reorganization containing several individual unincorporated islands.

(3) It is surrounded in either of the following ways:

(A) Surrounded, or substantially surrounded, by the city to which annexation is proposed or by the city and a county boundary or the Pacific Ocean.

(B) Surrounded by the city to which annexation is proposed and adjacent cities.

(4) It is substantially developed or developing. The finding required by this paragraph shall be based upon one or more factors, including, but not limited to, any of the following factors:

- (A) The availability of public utility services.
- (B) The presence of public improvements.
- (C) The presence of physical improvements upon the parcel or parcels within the area.
- (5) It is not prime agricultural land, as defined by Section 56064.
- (6) It will benefit from the change of organization or reorganization or is receiving benefits from the annexing city.
- (7) This subdivision does not apply to any unincorporated island within a city that is a gated community where services are currently provided by a community services district.

While the final determination will be made by LAFCo, City staff believes that the proposed island annexation meets all the requirements in these two State codes. This means that, if initiated by the City Council, there is a high likelihood that Kings LAFCo will approve the annexations.

Planning Commission Hearing

The annexation and prezone requests were presented to the Planning Commission on January 10, 2023.

The Planning Commission voted 4,0 on all items to:

1. Recommend adoption of the Notice of Exemption, in accordance with CEQA, to the City Council.
2. Adopt Resolution No. 2023-01, recommending approval of Prezone No. 2021-09 to the City Council.
3. Adopt Resolution No. 2023-02, finding the proposed Annexation No. 160, Part 41 through 8, except part 7, is consistent with the Hanford General Plan Policies L15, L16, and L17 and forward Annexation No. 160, Parts 1 through 8, except part 7, to the City Council, with a recommendation that an application be made to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) of Kings County.

Public Comment(s) during the public comment portion included the following:

Favor:

Onan Champi –owner of 10 parcels within the annexation area. He was in favor of the annexation, but he was concerned that the prezone would be more restrictive than Kings County zoning. He was not in favor of that

Kurt Lavenson and Lesly Avedisian - Written comments received and distributed (**Attachment 2**)

Opposed:

None

A copy of the minutes from the January 10, 2023 Planning Commission meeting are attached – **Attachment 3.**

PROJECT EVALUATION

Annexation No. 160, Part 4

The project is a request to annex the county island into the City of Hanford from the Kings County jurisdiction. The premise and guidance for the proposal is given by State law, which finds that county islands should generally be annexed into a city so they may receive more efficient delivery of services, as a city is usually more equipped to provide urban level services than a county or other entity.

Annexation of land into Hanford allows previously undeveloped land to become available for development and allows the City of Hanford to provide the territory that is annexed with its full range of City services. However, in this case, the land within the county island is already developed and receives some of the City's services.

The General Plan also has policies regarding annexation of land into the city limits. The Planning Commission found that Annexation 160, Part 4 is consistent with the Hanford General Plan Policies L15, L16, and L17 at their meeting on January 10, 2023.

Policy L15 Initiation of Annexations

Consider initiation of annexation of land into the City of Hanford only when the following criteria are met:

1. The land is within the Primary Sphere of Influence.

Analysis: The island is within the Primary Sphere of Influence.

2. The capacity of the water, sewer, fire, school, and police services are adequate to service the area to be annexed or will be adequate at the time that development occurs.

Analysis: A Municipal Services Review was conducted for the Sphere of Influence Expansion and 8-Island Annexations – attached as **Attachment 4**. Table 1 shows which services are currently being provided by the City or the County.

Table 1
Current Island Annexation Service Providers

Municipal Service Type	Island Annexation #							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Law Enforcement	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Fire / Emergency Service	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Water Supply	Private	City	City	City	City	City	City	Private
Water Distribution	Private	City	City	City	City	City	City	Private
Wastewater Collection	Private	City	City	City	City	City	City	Private
Wastewater Disposal	Private	City	City	City	City	City	City	Private
Solid Waste Collection*	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Flood Control/Drainage	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Street Maintenance	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Street Lighting	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Parks and Recreation	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County

Source: 2017 Water System Master Plan, 2017 Sewer System Master Plan, 2017 Storm Drain Master Plan City of Hanford, and 2035 City of Hanford General Plan

* Solid waste collection in the County islands is currently optional.

Water

The City currently supplies and distributes water to the county island proposed to be annexed.

Sewer

The City currently provides wastewater collection and disposal service to the county island proposed to be annexed.

Fire and Police

The County is currently responsible for police, emergency, and fire protection of the eight County islands proposed to be annexed. The population of these islands is 1,293.

The Police Department's current staffing ratio is 1.09 officers per 1,000 residents. The General Plan Background Report suggests a ratio of 1.1 to 1.2 is appropriate for similar cities of the size of Hanford. Annexation of the County islands will result in an increase in population of 1,293 persons who will need to be served by the City's Police Department. This would increase the total population to 58,203. The ratio will then be 1.06 officers per 1,000 residents. The Police Department would need to hire 3 new officers to reach a ratio of 1.1 officers per 1,000 residents.

According to the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Hanford and County of Kings established in 2019, The County Sheriff's Office will provide police services to the County islands for a two-year period beginning on the date of annexation of the County islands, after which time, the City will be responsible for providing such services in perpetuity.

The City's current ISO rating is 2 (ISO rating is on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being best). Due to the City's ability to provide such services to its current population, there is no evidence indicating

that the addition of 1,293 residents would be too great for the City to adequately serve. According to the Memorandum of Understanding, signed between the City of Hanford and the County of Kings in 2019, the mutual aid agreement between the fire services executed by the City and the County will not be amended. The City continues to be able to use the County's fire services in times of need, therefore the overall fire service capacity will not be affected.

School

There would be no change to school districts because of the island annexation. Since no new development is proposed, the annexation will not affect school enrollment.

Utilities/Public Services

Natural gas, electricity, and communications public services would not change because of annexation of the county islands.

3. Land for development within the City limits is insufficient to meet the current land use needs.

Analysis: The proposed annexation of the county island is not to accommodate any specific proposed development project. Instead, the purpose of the proposed annexation is to further good local government and make available the full range of City services to both developed and undeveloped county island areas. Therefore, this requirement is not relevant to the proposal.

4. The territory to be annexed is contiguous to existing developed areas.

Analysis: The islands is completely surrounded by developed areas within the city limits of Hanford.

Policy L16 County Islands

Initiate annexation of County islands when it is found that urban services are needed and can be provided or made available in the near future.

Analysis: As shown in Table 1, urban service provision is shared between the City and County. The City has the capacity to provide all of the services currently being provided by the County. Because of their proximity inside the city limits, the provision of service within the county islands can be more efficiently provided by the City.

Policy L17 Plan for Services

Prepare and make publicly available a written Plan for Services that describes how urban services will be provided prior to initiating an annexation.

Analysis: The Plan for Services was described in the letter to property owners dated June 28, 2021 – attached as **Attachment 5**. Note: the pre-zoning has since been changed from a combination of R-L-5 Low-Density Residential, MX-C Corridor Mixed Use and R-M Medium-Density Residential to only R-L-5 Low-Density Residential and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use, in accordance with General Plan Amendment 2021-01. The letter describes the City's intention to provide services to the eight county islands, when the property has the choice to add City services, and when additional City services will be required.

Prezone No. 2021-09

Prezone No. 2021-09 is consistent with the land use designations shown on the 2035 General Plan Land Use Map, as amended under General Plan Amendment No. 2021-01 C. This will ensure that zoning after annexation is consistent with the General Plan. The Low-Density Residential land use designation found in Annexation Area #4, is consistent with the R-L-5 zone. The Corridor Mixed Use designation is consistent with the MX-C Corridor Mixed Use zone.

In accordance with the Hanford Municipal Code Section 17.86.030, before a zone change may be approved, all of the following findings shall be made by the reviewing authority:

1. That the amendment is internally consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Municipal Code.

Analysis: Prezone No. 2021-09 is internally consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan, specifically consistent with Land Use Policies L15, L16, and L17. There is not a plan for development at this time. Most of the parcels proposed for annexation are already developed at the densities consistent with the proposed prezoning.

2. That the amendment would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.

ANALYSIS: There is no evidence that annexation of the county islands into the city limits would negatively affect health, safety, or welfare. On the contrary, the coordination of services between the City and County will be improved by reducing inefficiencies through annexation.

3. That the amendment would maintain the appropriate balance of land uses within the City.

Analysis: The proposed prezoning is consistent with the land use designations established in the General Plan.

4. That the anticipated land uses on the subject site would be compatible with existing and future surrounding uses.

Analysis: Most of the sites are already developed, and those uses appear to be consistent with the proposed prezoning.

Favorable Factors for Annexation

Favorable and unfavorable factors for annexation have been adopted by LAFCO. The existence of favorable or unfavorable factors should not decide approval or denial; however, a substantial number of favorable or unfavorable factors may determine approval or denial of the proposal.

1. The proposed area is close to urban development and municipal-type services and would enhance its potential for full development.

Analysis: The island is fully developed and completely surrounded by urban development. City services are available to the island area.

2. The proposed annexation conforms to the adopted General Plan.

Analysis: As discussed above, there is evidence to support a finding that annexation of the county island is consistent with Policies L15, L16, and L17 of the General Plan. The island area will be rezoned so that zoning after annexation is consistent with the 2035 General Plan Land Use Designation Map, as amended under General Plan Amendment No. 2021-01 C.

3. The proposed area is consistent with the sphere of influence.

Analysis: On April 20, 2021, the City of Hanford City Council initiated a Sphere of Influence Expansion. The island is within the existing Sphere of Influence and the proposed new Sphere of Influence.

4. The proposed annexation comes with 100% consent of all landowners.

Analysis: The county island annexations do not come with 100% consent of the landowners. However, as previously stated, State law encourages the annexation of county islands, and waives the protest hearings at LAFCo that determine landowner consent for island annexations like those being proposed here. The City staff held an open-forum community meeting on August 4, 2021, at the Civic Auditorium to address any questions posed by landowners.

FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

Based on the information and analysis above, City staff recommends that the following findings be made:

1. All county island is within the Primary Sphere of Influence.
2. Most of the annexation area already receives some services from the City of Hanford.
3. Inclusion of the island in the city limits will not negatively affect the Police or Fire Department's ability to provide their services to the community. There is a memorandum of understanding between the City of Hanford and the County of Kings that allows for a two-year transition from County Sheriff to City Police service in the annexation areas.
4. There would be no change to school districts because of the island annexation.
5. The proposed annexation of the county island is not to accommodate any specific proposed development project. The purpose of the proposed annexation is to further good local government and make available the full range of City services to both developed and undeveloped county island areas.
6. The island is completely surrounded by developed areas within the city limits of Hanford.
7. Because of the proximity inside the city limits, the provision of service within the county island can be more efficiently provided by the City.
8. The rezoning is internally consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Municipal Code.

9. The rezoning would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.
10. The rezoning would maintain the appropriate balance of land uses within the City. Annexation would not change most land uses since the parcels are already developed.
11. The anticipated land uses on the subject site would be compatible with existing and future surrounding uses.
12. The county island is developed and completely surrounded by urban development. City services are available to the island area.
13. State law encourages the annexation of county islands to further the goal of effective and efficient provision of local government services.
14. Based on the above findings, Annexation No. 160, Part 4 is consistent with the Hanford General Plan Policies L15, L16, and L17.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Annexation No. 160, Part 4 and Prezone No. 2021-09 were determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Categorical Exemption Class 19 (Annexation of areas containing existing public or private structures developed to the density allowed by the current rezoning) per CEQA Guidelines Section 15319(a), and because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment per CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3). A Notice of Exemption has been prepared for the project in accordance with CEQA – **Attachment 6**.

Noticing of the project was published in the newspaper on January 27, 2023. Notices were mailed to property owners within the annexation territory and to property owners within 300 feet of the annexation territory on January 26, 2023.

Comments were not received as of the date of preparation of this report.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council

1. Adopt the Notice of Exemption, in accordance with CEQA.
2. Introduce and waive the first reading of Ordinance 23-02, approving Prezone No. 2021-09.
3. Adopt Resolution No. 23-02-R, initiating proceedings for Annexation 160 (Part 4) and direct staff to file the appropriate forms with the Kings County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

ORDINANCE NO. 23-02
PREZONE NO. 2021-09

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HANFORD PREZONING ANNEXATION 160, PART 4 AS R-L-15 LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AND MX-C CORRIDOR MIXED USE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION FOR THE PROJECT SITE, LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AND CORRIDOR MIXED USE. THE PROJECT IS GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF 10TH AVENUE, SOUTH OF FLORINDA DRIVE, NORTH OF LACEY BOULEVARD.

The City Council of the City of Hanford does ordain as follows:

Section 1: The following described territory situated in the City of Hanford is hereby prezoned under the terms of Chapter 17.86 of the Hanford Municipal Code:

Annexation 160, Part 1 filed by the City of Hanford

FROM: County zoning of R-1-8 Low-Density Residential, CN Neighborhood Commercial, and CS Service Commercial

TO: City zoning R-L-5 Low-Density Residential and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use

On property described as follows:

Approximately 93.2 acres generally located on the east of 10th Avenue, south of Florinda Drive, north of Lacey Boulevard, as described in the legal description in attached **Exhibit A**, and as depicted in attached **Exhibit B**; and

Section 2: The Council does hereby find as a fact that this Ordinance has been recommended for passage by the Planning Commission of the City of Hanford after public hearing before the Planning Commission after notice required by Section 17.70.100 of the Hanford Municipal Code and Government Code Section 65854. The City Council that the Project is Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Categorical Exemption Class 19 (Annexation of areas containing existing public or private structures developed to the density allowed by the current prezoning) and because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment per CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3). The City Council hereby finds that the prezoning is required to achieve the objectives of the zoning regulations as set forth in Section 17.06.010 of the Hanford Municipal Code, and that this Ordinance has been introduced by the City Council after public hearing held on the 7th day of February, 2023 at 7:00 p.m. of said day after notice required under the provisions of Section 65856 of the Government Code.

Section 3: This Ordinance shall take effect thirty (30) days after its passage, and shall be published once in the Hanford Sentinel within fifteen (15) days after its passage, and the zoning will apply to such

property in the event of subsequent annexation to the City under the provisions of Section 65859 of the Government Code.

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hanford duly called and held on the ____ day of _____, by the following roll call vote:

APPROVED

ATTEST:

MAYOR of the City of Hanford

Natalie Corral
CITY CLERK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF KINGS) ss
CITY OF HANFORD)

I, NATALIE CORRAL, City Clerk of the City of Hanford, do hereby certify the foregoing ordinance was duly introduced at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hanford on the 21st day of February, 2023 and it was duly passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hanford held on the ____ day of _____, 2023.

Dated: _____

Natalie Corral
City Clerk

Exhibit A
Legal Description

ANNEXATION NO. 160 PART 4
ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF HANFORD
GEOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

A portion of the Southwest Quarter of Section 30, Township 18 South, Range 22 E, MDB&M, in the State of California, County of Kings, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast Corner of said Southwest Quarter, also being a point on the existing city limits of the City of Hanford;

Thence along the existing boundary of the City of Hanford, being a description of an existing unincorporated island within said City of Hanford, the following courses:

1. West along the South line of said Southwest Quarter, a distance of 1,133 feet to the Southerly prolongation of the east line, of Parcel 1, as shown on a Parcel Map recorded in Book 5, at Page 42, of Parcel Maps in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
2. Thence North 0°14'00" East, along last said prolongation and last said East line of Parcel 1, a distance of 245.40 feet to an angle point in last said East line;
3. Thence North 0°29'50" West, along last said east line of Parcel 1, a distance of 66.93 feet to the Northeast Corner of said Parcel 1;
4. Thence South 89°28'28" West, along the North line of said Parcel 1, a distance of 93.20 feet to the Northwest corner thereof;
5. Thence South 0°14'00" West, along the West line of said Parcel 1, a distance of 26.47 feet to the most southerly, Southeast corner, of Parcel 2 of last said Parcel Map;
6. Thence West, along the South line of last said Parcel 2, a distance of 186.47 feet to the Southwest corner thereof;
7. Thence North 8°15'00" West, along the West line of last said Parcel 2, a distance of 109.64 feet to a corner in the westerly boundary of last said Parcel 2;
8. Thence North 88°51'10" West, along the boundary of last said Parcel 2, a distance of 58.26 feet to the most westerly, southwest corner of last said Parcel 2;
9. Thence South, along the Southerly Prolongation of the West line of said Parcel 2, a distance of 8.11 feet to a point on the North line of Parcel B as shown on a Parcel Map recorded in Book 12 at Page 28 of Parcel Maps in the office of the Kings County Recorder, said point being on the westerly line of Wilson Lane as depicted thereon;
10. Thence West along the North line of last said Parcel B and the North line of Parcel A as depicted on last said Parcel Map and the westerly prolongation thereof, a distance of 323.82 feet to the Centerline of Peoples Ditch as shown on said Parcel Map;
11. Thence North 0°55'10" West, a distance of 28 feet, to the Easterly prolongation, of the North line, of lot 6, of Benedict's Subdivision, as said lot 6 is shown on a map recorded in Book 1, at Page 39, of Licensed Surveyors' Plats;
12. Thence West along last said prolongation and said North line of lot 6, and the westerly prolongation thereof, a distance of 192 feet to the centerline of Jessie Street as shown on said Benedict's Subdivision;

13. Thence South $0^{\circ}55'50''$ West, along said centerline of Jessie Street, a distance of 75 feet to the Easterly prolongation, of the North line, of the South 75 feet, of lot 20, of last said Subdivision;
14. Thence West, along last said prolongation and North line, a distance of 177.28 feet, to the west line, of said lot 20, also being the East line of Block 2 of Orange Addition as shown on a map recorded in Book 1, at Page 8, of Licensed Surveyors' plats in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
15. Thence South, along the East line of last said Block 2, a distance of 54 feet to the Northeast corner of Lot 9 of last said Block;
16. Thence West, along the North line of said lot 9, and its westerly prolongation, a distance of 162 feet, to the centerline of Miller Street as said street is shown on last said map;
17. Thence North, along said Centerline of Miller Street, a distance of 75 feet, to the Easterly prolongation, of the South line, of lot 20 of Block 1 of said Orange Addition;
18. Thence West, along last said prolongation, and said South lines of lots 20, and 43, and the westerly prolongation of said lot 43, a distance of 366 feet, to the West line of said Southwest Quarter;
19. Thence North, along last said West line, a distance of 200 feet, to the Westerly prolongation, of the South line, of Lot 35, as said lot is shown on said map of Orange Addition;
20. Thence East, along last said prolongation, the South line of said lot 35, and its easterly prolongation, a distance of 191 feet, to the Southwest corner of lot 28, of said Orange Addition;
21. Thence North, along the West lines of lots 28, 29, 30 and 31, and the northerly prolongation thereof, a distance of 120 feet, to the North line of the alley on the South side of Block A, of Bestmann's Addition, as said Bestmann's Addition, is shown on a map recorded in the Map Book, at Page 94, in the office of the Kings County Recorder;
22. Thence West, along said North line of the alley and its westerly prolongation, a distance of 191 feet to said West line of the Southwest Quarter;
23. Thence North, along last said West line, a distance of 380 feet to the intersection with the Westerly prolongation of the North line of the alley, on the North side of Block B, of said Bestmann's Addition;
24. Thence East, along last said North line of the alley, a distance of 155 feet;
25. Thence North a distance of 50 feet;
26. Thence West, a distance of 155 feet, to said West line of the Southwest Quarter;
27. Thence North, along said west line of the Southwest Quarter, a distance of 557.78 feet to the westerly prolongation of the South line of lot 14, in Block 2 of Homevilla Tract, as shown on a map recorded in Book 3, at page 79 of Licensed Surveyors' Plats, in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
28. Thence East, along last said prolongation and the South line of lot 14, a distance of 160 feet to the Southeast corner of said lot 14;
29. Thence North along the east line of said lot 14 and lot 15 and the Northerly projection of lot 15, a distance of 163 feet to the centerline of Myrtle Street as shown on said map of Homevilla Tract;

30. Thence West, along said Centerline, a distance of 160 feet to said West line, of the Southwest Quarter;
31. Thence North, along last said West line, a distance of 549.64 feet, to the Westerly prolongation, of the South line of lot 19 of Homevilla Tract No. 2, as shown on a map recorded in Volume 4, at Page 85, of Licensed Surveyors' Plats, in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
32. Thence South $89^{\circ}35'00''$ East, along last said westerly prolongation and the South line of last said lot 19, a distance of 190.00 feet, to the Southeast corner of said lot 19;
33. Thence South, along the West line of lot 20 of last said Tract, a distance of 63.20 feet to the Southwest corner thereof;
34. Thence South $89^{\circ}49'30''$ East, along the South line of last said Tract. a distance of 1,189.58 feet to a point on the Centerline of People's Ditch, which is also 21 feet east of the Southeast corner of lot 37 of said Homevilla Tract No. 2;
35. Thence South $07^{\circ}00'10''$ West, along said Centerline of People's Ditch, also being along the Westerly boundary of an area annexed to the City of Hanford, by Ordinance 500, and depicted on a map recorded in Volume 5, at Page 5, of Licensed Surveyors' Plats in the Office of the Kings County Recorder, a distance of 501.63 feet;
36. Thence continuing, South $15^{\circ}02'00''$ West, a distance of 161.23 feet; to the Easterly prolongation of the North line of the South 133 feet of lot 12 of Rawlins Tract recorded in the Map Book at Page 6 in the records of the Kings County Recorder;
37. Thence N $89^{\circ}50'00''$ West, along last said prolongation, a distance of 77.54 feet to the Southeast corner of a deed recorded in Book 1185, at Page 783 of official Records in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
38. Thence North, along the East line of last said deed, and its northerly prolongation, a distance of 163 feet to a point 30 feet North of the Northeast corner of last said deed;
39. Thence North $89^{\circ}50'00''$ West, a distance of 60 feet;
40. Thence South $00^{\circ}10'00''$ West, a distance of 30 feet, to the Northwest corner of last said deed;
41. Thence South $7^{\circ}14'00''$ West, along the westerly boundary of said deed, a distance of 133.17 feet to the Southwest corner thereof;
42. Thence South $89^{\circ}50'00''$ East, along the south line of said deed, a distance of 28.42 feet to the Northwest corner of a deed recorded in Book 1278, at Page 713 of Official Records in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
43. Thence South, along the west line of last said deed, and its southerly prolongation, a distance of 158 feet to the centerline of Ivy Street;
44. Thence East, along last said centerline a distance of 81.82 feet to the centerline of People's ditch, also being the area annexed to the City of Hanford by Ordinance 500 and depicted on a map recorded on Volume 5, at Page 5, of Licensed Surveyors' Plats;
45. Thence South $12^{\circ}43'50''$ West a distance of 185 feet to the Southwest corner of Richmond Heights Subdivision, as shown on a map recorded in Volume 5, at Page 6, in Licensed Surveyors' Plats;
46. Thence South $89^{\circ}37'30''$ East, along the South line of said Richmond Heights, a distance of 1,468.24 feet to the East line of said Southwest Quarter;

47. Thence South 0°01'40" West, along last said East line, a distance of 1,327.68 feet to the Point of Beginning;

Excepting therefrom, the following described Parcel which is currently within the city limits of the City of Hanford:

- Beginning at the Southeast corner of said Southwest Quarter;
Thence West, along the South line of said Southwest Quarter, a distance of 973.80 feet;
Thence North 0°16'11" West a distance of 266.90 feet to the True Point of Beginning;
48. Thence North 0°16'11" West a distance of 100.00 feet;
49. Thence East a distance of 100.00 feet;
50. Thence South 0°16'11" East, a distance of 100.00 feet;
51. Thence West a distance of 100 feet to the True point of Beginning

Also Excepting the following described Parcel which is also currently within the city limits of the City of Hanford:


- Beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southwest Quarter of said Southwest Quarter of Section 30;
Thence South 89°37'42" East, along the North line, of last said Southwest Quarter, of the Southwest Quarter, a distance of 264.00 feet;
52. Thence continuing along last said North line, South 89°37'42" East, a distance of 486.08 feet, to the intersection with the Northerly prolongation of the west line of Jessie Street, as said street is shown on said Map of Bestmann's Addition;
53. Thence South 0°00'08" East, along last said prolongation, a distance of 264.90 feet to its intersection with the north line of the alley on the north side of Block C of said Bestmann's Addition;
54. Thence North 89°37'42" West, along last said North line of the alley, a distance of 486.07 feet to a point 486.07 feet Easterly of the West line of said Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter;
55. Thence North 0°00'08" West, along a line parallel with and 264 feet easterly of last said West line, a distance of 268.99 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 93.2 Acres

Exhibit B

Prezone No. 2021-09

General Plan Designation – Low Density Residential and Corridor Mixed Use
Proposed Prezoning to Low Density Residential, 5,000 sq. ft. min. (R-L-5) and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use



RESOLUTION NO. 23-02-R

**A RESOLUTION OF APPLICATION BY THE CITY OF HANFORD REQUESTING THE
LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION TO INITIATE PROCEEDINGS FOR
ANNEXATION NO. 160 PART 4: A REQUEST TO ANNEX APPROXIMATELY 93.2 ACRES
INTO THE CITY OF HANFORD FROM THE KINGS COUNTY JURISDICTION. THE
PROJECT IS GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF 10TH AVENUE, SOUTH OF FLORINDA
DRIVE, AND NORTH OF LACEY BOULEVARD**

RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Hanford, that,

WHEREAS, the City of Hanford desires to initiate proceedings pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Reorganization Act of 2000, Division 3, commencing with Section 5600 of the California Government Code, an affected City, as defined therein, may by resolution adopted by its legislative body make a proposal for a change of organization and request initiation of proceedings thereon; and

WHEREAS, notice of intent to adopt this resolution of application has been given, and this Council has conducted a public hearing based upon this notification; and

WHEREAS, the principal reasons for the proposed annexation are as follows:

1. All county island is within the Primary Sphere of Influence.
2. Most of the annexation area already receives some services from the City of Hanford.
3. Inclusion of the island in the city limits will not negatively affect the Police or Fire Department's ability to provide their services to the community. There is a memorandum of understanding between the City of Hanford and the County of Kings that allows for a two-year transition from County Sheriff to City Police service in the annexation areas.
4. There would be no change to school districts because of the island annexation.
5. The proposed annexation of the county island is not to accommodate any specific proposed development project. The purpose of the proposed annexation is to further good local government and make available the full range of City services to both developed and undeveloped county island areas.
6. The island is completely surrounded by developed areas within the city limits of Hanford.
7. Because of the proximity inside the city limits, the provision of service within the county island can be more efficiently provided by the City.
8. The rezoning is internally consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the General Plan and the Municipal Code.
9. The rezoning would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.

10. The rezoning would maintain the appropriate balance of land uses within the City. Annexation would not change most land uses since the parcels are already developed.
11. The anticipated land uses on the subject site would be compatible with existing and future surrounding uses.
12. The county island is developed and completely surrounded by urban development. City services are available to the island area.
13. State law encourages the annexation of county islands to further the goal of effective and efficient provision of local government services.
14. Based on the above findings, Annexation No. 160, Part 4 is consistent with the Hanford General Plan Policies L15, L16, and L17.

WHEREAS, the following agency would be affected by the proposed jurisdictional changes:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Nature of Change</u>
City of Hanford	Annexation

WHEREAS, the territory proposed to be annexed is inhabited, and a map and description of the boundaries of the territory are attached hereto as:

Annexation 160, Part 4: Exhibit A (annexation map) and (legal description)

and by this reference incorporated herein, and,

WHEREAS, the proposal is consistent with the General Plan of the City of Hanford; and

WHEREAS, it is desired to provide that the proposed annexation be subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. That the annexation areas be rezoned as follows:
 - a. **Annexation 160, Part 4: R-L-5 Low-Density Residential and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use**

WHEREAS, this proposal will be consistent with the spheres of influence for all agencies which would be affected by the annexation; and

WHEREAS, the City Council determined that the Project was Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Categorical Exemption Class 19 (Annexation of areas containing existing public or private structures developed to the density allowed by the current rezoning)

and because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment per CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, this Resolution of Application is hereby adopted and approved by the City Council of the City of Hanford and the Local Agency Formation Commission of Kings County is hereby requested to take proceedings of the annexation of territory as authorized in the manner provided by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Hanford held on the 7th day of February 2023, by the following vote:

AYES:	Council Member	_____

NOES:	Council Member	_____
ABSTAIN:	Council Member	_____
ABSENT:	Council Member	_____

MAYOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF KINGS)
CITY OF HANFORD) SS

I, **Natalie Corral**, City Clerk of the City of Hanford, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Hanford at a regular meeting thereof held on the 21st day of February 2023.

Dated: _____

City Clerk

Exhibit A: Annexation 160, Part 4

AND DETACHED FROM THE KINGS RIVER CONSERVATION DISTRICT AND THE
EXCELSIOR-KINGS RIVER RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT, CITY OF
HANFORD REORGANIZATION NO. XXX.

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY ME ON _____,
AND IS BASED UPON RECORD DATA AND LAFCO RESOLUTION NO. _____,
DATED _____.

JOHN A. ZUMWALT, R.C.E. 21489



RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NO. _____

FEE _____
DOCUMENT NO. _____


RECORDED AT THE REQUEST OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION
COMMISSION OF KINGS COUNTY.

AT _____ MINUTES PAST _____ O'CLOCK __. M.,
_____, 20____ IN VOLUME _____ OF LICENSED
SURVEYORS' PLATS, PAGE _____, KINGS COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

KRISTINE LEE
COUNTY RECORDER

BY: _____
DEPUTY


Not to Scale




S 1/4 COR. SEC. 30-18/22
AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING

LINE TABLE			LINE TABLE			LINE TABLE		
LINE #	LENGTH	DIRECTION	LINE #	LENGTH	DIRECTION	LINE #	LENGTH	DIRECTION
1	1133.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	20	191.00'	N90° 00' 00"E	39	60.00'	N89° 50' 00"W
2	245.40'	N00° 14' 00"E	21	120.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	40	30.00'	S00° 10' 00"W
3	66.93'	N00° 29' 50"W	22	191.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	41	133.17'	S07° 14' 00"W
4	93.20'	S89° 28' 28"W	23	380.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	42	28.42'	S89° 50' 00"W
5	26.47'	S00° 14' 00"W	24	155.00'	N90° 00' 00"E	43	158.00'	S00° 00' 00"W
6	186.47'	N90° 00' 00"W	25	50.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	44	81.82'	N90° 00' 00"W
7	109.64'	N08° 15' 00"W	26	155.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	45	185.00'	S12° 43' 50"W
8	58.26'	N88° 51' 10"W	27	557.78'	N00° 00' 00"E	46	1468.24'	S89° 37' 30"W
9	8.11'	S00° 00' 00"E	28	160.00'	N90° 00' 00"E	47	1327.68'	S00° 01' 40"W
10	323.82'	N90° 00' 00"W	29	163.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	48	100.00'	N00° 16' 11"W
11	28.00'	N00° 55' 10"W	30	160.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	49	100.00'	N90° 00' 00"W
12	192.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	31	549.64'	N00° 00' 00"E	50	100.00'	S00° 16' 11"W
13	75.00'	S00° 55' 50"W	32	190.00'	S89° 35' 00"E	51	100.00'	N90° 00' 00"W
14	177.28'	N90° 00' 00"W	33	63.20'	S00° 00' 00"E	52	486.08'	S89° 37' 42"W
15	54.00'	S00° 00' 00"E	34	1189.58'	N89° 49' 30"E	53	264.90'	S00° 00' 08"W
16	162.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	35	501.63'	S07° 00' 10"W	54	486.07'	N89° 37' 42"W
17	75.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	36	161.23'	S15° 02' 00"W	55	268.99'	N00° 00' 08"W
18	366.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	37	77.54'	N89° 50' 00"W	CONTAINING 93.2± ACRES		
19	200.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	38	163.00'	N00° 00' 00"E			

LEGAL
A PORTION OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER
OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 18 SOUTH, RANGE
22 EAST, MOUNT DIABLO BASE & MERIDIAN.
CONTAINING 93.2 ACRES MORE OR LESS.



SCALE: 1"=200'



SW COR.
SEC. 30-18/22

CIVIL ENGINEERS

**ZUMWALT
HANSEN INC.**

LAND SURVEYORS

609 N. IRWIN ST.

HANFORD, CA. 93230

PH. (559) 582-1056

FILE NO. 0783511

ONE SHEET ONLY

**ANNEXATION NO. 160 PART 4
ANNEXATION TO THE CITY OF HANFORD
GEOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION**

A portion of the Southwest Quarter of Section 30, Township 18 South, Range 22 E, MDB&M, in the State of California, County of Kings, described as follows:

Beginning at the Southeast Corner of said Southwest Quarter, also being a point on the existing city limits of the City of Hanford;

Thence along the existing boundary of the City of Hanford, being a description of an existing unincorporated island within said City of Hanford, the following courses:

1. West along the South line of said Southwest Quarter, a distance of 1,133 feet to the Southerly prolongation of the east line, of Parcel 1, as shown on a Parcel Map recorded in Book 5, at Page 42, of Parcel Maps in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
2. Thence North $0^{\circ}14'00''$ East, along last said prolongation and last said East line of Parcel 1, a distance of 245.40 feet to an angle point in last said East line;
3. Thence North $0^{\circ}29'50''$ West, along last said east line of Parcel 1, a distance of 66.93 feet to the Northeast Corner of said Parcel 1;
4. Thence South $89^{\circ}28'28''$ West, along the North line of said Parcel 1, a distance of 93.20 feet to the Northwest corner thereof;
5. Thence South $0^{\circ}14'00''$ West, along the West line of said Parcel 1, a distance of 26.47 feet to the most southerly, Southeast corner, of Parcel 2 of last said Parcel Map;
6. Thence West, along the South line of last said Parcel 2, a distance of 186.47 feet to the Southwest corner thereof;
7. Thence North $8^{\circ}15'00''$ West, along the West line of last said Parcel 2, a distance of 109.64 feet to a corner in the westerly boundary of last said Parcel 2;
8. Thence North $88^{\circ}51'10''$ West, along the boundary of last said Parcel 2, a distance of 58.26 feet to the most westerly, southwest corner of last said Parcel 2;
9. Thence South, along the Southerly Prolongation of the West line of said Parcel 2, a distance of 8.11 feet to a point on the North line of Parcel B as shown on a Parcel Map recorded in Book 12 at Page 28 of Parcel Maps in the office of the Kings County Recorder, said point being on the westerly line of Wilson Lane as depicted thereon;
10. Thence West along the North line of last said Parcel B and the North line of Parcel A as depicted on last said Parcel Map and the westerly prolongation thereof, a distance of 323.82 feet to the Centerline of Peoples Ditch as shown on said Parcel Map;
11. Thence North $0^{\circ}55'10''$ West, a distance of 28 feet, to the Easterly prolongation, of the North line, of lot 6, of Benedict's Subdivision, as said lot 6 is shown on a map recorded in Book 1, at Page 39, of Licensed Surveyors' Plats;
12. Thence West along last said prolongation and said North line of lot 6, and the westerly prolongation thereof, a distance of 192 feet to the centerline of Jessie Street as shown on said Benedict's Subdivision;

13. Thence South $0^{\circ}55'50''$ West, along said centerline of Jessie Street, a distance of 75 feet to the Easterly prolongation, of the North line, of the South 75 feet, of lot 20, of last said Subdivision;
14. Thence West, along last said prolongation and North line, a distance of 177.28 feet, to the west line, of said lot 20, also being the East line of Block 2 of Orange Addition as shown on a map recorded in Book 1, at Page 8, of Licensed Surveyors' plats in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
15. Thence South, along the East line of last said Block 2, a distance of 54 feet to the Northeast corner of Lot 9 of last said Block;
16. Thence West, along the North line of said lot 9, and its westerly prolongation, a distance of 162 feet, to the centerline of Miller Street as said street is shown on last said map;
17. Thence North, along said Centerline of Miller Street, a distance of 75 feet, to the Easterly prolongation, of the South line, of lot 20 of Block 1 of said Orange Addition;
18. Thence West, along last said prolongation, and said South lines of lots 20, and 43, and the westerly prolongation of said lot 43, a distance of 366 feet, to the West line of said Southwest Quarter;
19. Thence North, along last said West line, a distance of 200 feet, to the Westerly prolongation, of the South line, of Lot 35, as said lot is shown on said map of Orange Addition;
20. Thence East, along last said prolongation, the South line of said lot 35, and its easterly prolongation, a distance of 191 feet, to the Southwest corner of lot 28, of said Orange Addition;
21. Thence North, along the West lines of lots 28, 29, 30 and 31, and the northerly prolongation thereof, a distance of 120 feet, to the North line of the alley on the South side of Block A, of Bestmann's Addition, as said Bestmann's Addition, is shown on a map recorded in the Map Book, at Page 94, in the office of the Kings County Recorder;
22. Thence West, along said North line of the alley and its westerly prolongation, a distance of 191 feet to said West line of the Southwest Quarter;
23. Thence North, along last said West line, a distance of 380 feet to the intersection with the Westerly prolongation of the North line of the alley, on the North side of Block B, of said Bestmann's Addition;
24. Thence East, along last said North line of the alley, a distance of 155 feet;
25. Thence North a distance of 50 feet;
26. Thence West, a distance of 155 feet, to said West line of the Southwest Quarter;
27. Thence North, along said west line of the Southwest Quarter, a distance of 557.78 feet to the westerly prolongation of the South line of lot 14, in Block 2 of Homevilla Tract, as shown on a map recorded in Book 3, at page 79 of Licensed Surveyors' Plats, in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
28. Thence East, along last said prolongation and the South line of lot 14, a distance of 160 feet to the Southeast corner of said lot 14;
29. Thence North along the east line of said lot 14 and lot 15 and the Northerly projection of lot 15, a distance of 163 feet to the centerline of Myrtle Street as shown on said map of Homevilla Tract;

30. Thence West, along said Centerline, a distance of 160 feet to said West line, of the Southwest Quarter;
31. Thence North, along last said West line, a distance of 549.64 feet, to the Westerly prolongation, of the South line of lot 19 of Homevilla Tract No. 2, as shown on a map recorded in Volume 4, at Page 85, of Licensed Surveyors' Plats, in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
32. Thence South 89°35'00" East, along last said westerly prolongation and the South line of last said lot 19, a distance of 190.00 feet, to the Southeast corner of said lot 19;
33. Thence South, along the West line of lot 20 of last said Tract, a distance of 63.20 feet to the Southwest corner thereof;
34. Thence South 89°49'30" East, along the South line of last said Tract. a distance of 1,189.58 feet to a point on the Centerline of People's Ditch, which is also 21 feet east of the Southeast corner of lot 37 of said Homevilla Tract No. 2;
35. Thence South 07°00'10" West, along said Centerline of People's Ditch, also being along the Westerly boundary of an area annexed to the City of Hanford, by Ordinance 500, and depicted on a map recorded in Volume 5, at Page 5, of Licensed Surveyors' Plats in the Office of the Kings County Recorder, a distance of 501.63 feet;
36. Thence continuing, South 15°02'00" West, a distance of 161.23 feet; to the Easterly prolongation of the North line of the South 133 feet of lot 12 of Rawlins Tract recorded in the Map Book at Page 6 in the records of the Kings County Recorder;
37. Thence N 89°50'00" West, along last said prolongation, a distance of 77.54 feet to the Southeast corner of a deed recorded in Book 1185, at Page 783 of official Records in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
38. Thence North, along the East line of last said deed, and its northerly prolongation, a distance of 163 feet to a point 30 feet North of the Northeast corner of last said deed;
39. Thence North 89°50'00" West, a distance of 60 feet;
40. Thence South 00°10'00" West, a distance of 30 feet, to the Northwest corner of last said deed;
41. Thence South 7°14'00" West, along the westerly boundary of said deed, a distance of 133.17 feet to the Southwest corner thereof;
42. Thence South 89°50'00" East, along the south line of said deed, a distance of 28.42 feet to the Northwest corner of a deed recorded in Book 1278, at Page 713 of Official Records in the Office of the Kings County Recorder;
43. Thence South, along the west line of last said deed, and its southerly prolongation, a distance of 158 feet to the centerline of Ivy Street;
44. Thence East, along last said centerline a distance of 81.82 feet to the centerline of People's ditch, also being the area annexed to the City of Hanford by Ordinance 500 and depicted on a map recorded on Volume 5, at Page 5, of Licensed Surveyors' Plats;
45. Thence South 12°43'50" West a distance of 185 feet to the Southwest corner of Richmond Heights Subdivision, as shown on a map recorded in Volume 5, at Page 6, in Licensed Surveyors' Plats;
46. Thence South 89°37'30" East, along the South line of said Richmond Heights, a distance of 1,468.24 feet to the East line of said Southwest Quarter;

47. Thence South 0°01'40" West, along last said East line, a distance of 1,327.68 feet to the Point of Beginning;

Excepting therefrom, the following described Parcel which is currently within the city limits of the City of Hanford:

- Beginning at the Southeast corner of said Southwest Quarter;
Thence West, along the South line of said Southwest Quarter, a distance of 973.80 feet;
Thence North 0°16'11" West a distance of 266.90 feet to the True Point of Beginning;
48. Thence North 0°16'11" West a distance of 100.00 feet;
 49. Thence East a distance of 100.00 feet;
 50. Thence South 0°16'11" East, a distance of 100.00 feet;
 51. Thence West a distance of 100 feet to the True point of Beginning

Also Excepting the following described Parcel which is also currently within the city limits of the City of Hanford:

- Beginning at the Northwest corner of the Southwest Quarter of said Southwest Quarter of Section 30;
Thence South 89°37'42" East, along the North line, of last said Southwest Quarter, of the Southwest Quarter, a distance of 264.00 feet;
52. Thence continuing along last said North line, South 89°37'42" East, a distance of 486.08 feet, to the intersection with the Northerly prolongation of the west line of Jessie Street, as said street is shown on said Map of Bestmann's Addition;
 53. Thence South 0°00'08" East, along last said prolongation, a distance of 264.90 feet to its intersection with the north line of the alley on the north side of Block C of said Bestmann's Addition;
 54. Thence North 89°37'42" West, along last said North line of the alley, a distance of 486.07 feet to a point 486.07 feet Easterly of the West line of said Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter;
 55. Thence North 0°00'08" West, along a line parallel with and 264 feet easterly of last said West line, a distance of 268.99 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Containing 93.2 Acres

AND DETACHED FROM THE KINGS RIVER CONSERVATION DISTRICT AND THE
EXCELSIOR-KINGS RIVER RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT, CITY OF
HANFORD REORGANIZATION NO. XXX.

THIS MAP WAS PREPARED BY ME ON _____,
AND IS BASED UPON RECORD DATA AND LAFCO RESOLUTION NO. _____,
DATED _____.

JOHN A. ZUMWALT, R.C.E. 21489



RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NO. 100


FEE _____
DOCUMENT NO. _____

RECORDED AT THE REQUEST OF THE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION
COMMISSION OF KINGS COUNTY.


AT _____ MINUTES PAST _____ O'CLOCK __. M.,
_____, 20__ IN VOLUME _____ OF LICENSED
SURVEYORS' PLATS, PAGE _____, KINGS COUNTY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

KRISTINE LEE
COUNTY RECORDER

BY: _____
DEPUTY



SITE




SCALE: 1"=200'



A PORTION OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER
OF SECTION 30, TOWNSHIP 18 SOUTH, RANGE
22 EAST, MOUNT DIABLO BASE & MERIDIAN.
CONTAINING 93.2 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

LINE TABLE			LINE TABLE			LINE TABLE		
LINE #	LENGTH	DIRECTION	LINE #	LENGTH	DIRECTION	LINE #	LENGTH	DIRECTION
1	1133.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	20	191.00'	N90° 00' 00"E	39	60.00'	N89° 50' 00" W
2	245.40'	N00° 14' 00"E	21	120.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	40	30.00'	S00° 10' 00" W
3	66.93'	N00° 29' 50"W	22	191.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	41	133.17'	S07° 14' 00" W
4	93.20'	S89° 28' 28"W	23	380.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	42	28.42'	S89° 50' 00" W
5	26.47'	S00° 14' 00"W	24	155.00'	N90° 00' 00"E	43	158.00'	N00° 00' 00" W
6	186.47'	N90° 00' 00"W	25	50.00'	N90° 00' 00"E	44	81.82'	S90° 00' 00" W
7	109.64'	N08° 15' 00"W	26	155.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	45	185.00'	S12° 43' 50" W
8	58.26'	N88° 51' 10"W	27	557.78'	N00° 00' 00"E	46	1468.24'	S89° 37' 30" W
9	8.11'	S00° 00' 00"E	28	160.00'	N90° 00' 00"E	47	1327.68'	S00° 01' 40" W
10	323.82'	N90° 00' 00"W	29	163.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	48	100.00'	N00° 16' 11" W
11	28.00'	N00° 55' 10"W	30	160.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	49	100.00'	N90° 00' 00" W
12	192.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	31	549.64'	N00° 00' 00"E	50	100.00'	S00° 16' 11" W
13	75.00'	S00° 55' 50"W	32	190.00'	S89° 35' 00"E	51	100.00'	N90° 00' 00" W
14	177.28'	N90° 00' 00"W	33	63.20'	S00° 00' 00"E	52	486.08'	S89° 37' 42" W
15	54.00'	S00° 00' 00"E	34	1189.58'	N89° 49' 30"E	53	264.90'	S00° 00' 08" W
16	162.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	35	501.63'	S07° 00' 10"W	54	486.07'	N89° 37' 42" W
17	75.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	36	161.23'	S15° 02' 00"W	55	268.99'	N00° 00' 08" W
18	366.00'	N90° 00' 00"W	37	77.54'	N89° 50' 00"W	CONTAINING 93.2± ACRES		
19	200.00'	N00° 00' 00"E	38	163.00'	N90° 00' 00"E			



SW COR.
SEC. 30-18/22

CIVIL ENGINEERS

**ZUMWALT
HANSEN INC.**

LAND SURVEYORS

609 N. IRWIN ST.

HANFORD, CA. 93230

PH. (559) 582-1056

FILE NO. 0783511

ONE SHEET ONLY

Kurt Lavenson & Lesly Avedisian

1842 Leimert Boulevard
Oakland, CA 94602
510-530-0970

January 9, 2023

Gabrielle de Silva Myers
Senior Planner
City of Hanford
317 N. Douty Street
Hanford, CA 93230
via email to: gmyers@cityofhanfordca.com

RE: **Annexation of County Island #4 (East Hanford)**
Specifically parcels:
014-221-020; 014-221-026; 014-221-009; 014-221-041
(note that some of these APN's have been recently edited by the Assessor
due to a land sale)

Dear Ms. de Silva Myers,

We are writing once again in response to a recent Notice of Public Hearing that we received from the Hanford Community Development Department, regarding Annexation of County Island #4, from Kings County into the City of Hanford. As we understand it, this annexation was scheduled to proceed in 2021 along with several other Islands, but #4 was held back pending a required change to the General Plan, which has now been approved by the City Council.

As discussed with you in prior conversations, we are in favor of annexation and we look forward to improved services while being productive members of the City and contributing to the resurgence of community development along E. Lacey Boulevard. We own 18 contiguous acres of mostly undeveloped land within the island, from E. Lacey Boulevard north to the rear yards of E. Ivy Street and east to Lassen Avenue. Our developed E. Lacey addresses range from #946 to #958 and our tenants of many years are well known local businesses: Joe's Tire, Orozco Mechanic and Saldaña's Muffler.


Please included this letter, and our voicing of support, in your Planning Department packet to be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review. Thank you again for your time and attention on these matters. We appreciate all of your efforts.

Sincerely,

Kurt Lavenson

Lesly Avedisian



MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
of the
CITY OF HANFORD

COUNCIL CHAMBERS
400 N. Douty St.
5:30 PM, Tuesday, January 10, 2023

Commissioners will meet in person in the Council Chambers. The meeting will also be livestreamed on the City's website: <http://livestream.hanford.city/>

CALL TO ORDER

Chair SANCHEZ called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dennis Ham		Present	4:59 PM
Richard Douglas		Present	4:57 PM
Martin Devine		Present	4:57 PM
Jacob Sanchez		Present	4:56 PM
Gunther Norris		Present	4:59 PM

INVOCATION

The invocation was led by Richard Balderama.

FLAG SALUTE

PUBLIC COMMENT

*This is the time for citizens to comment on subject matters not on the agenda and that are within the jurisdiction of the Commission. This is also the public's opportunity to request an item from the Consent Calendar be pulled for discussion purposes or to comment on any item on the agenda. Comments related to Public Hearing items will be heard at the time the item is discussed. A maximum of **three minutes** is allowed for each speaker. Please begin your comments by stating your name and providing your city of residence.*

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these matters unless a request is made and then the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar to be discussed and voted upon by a separate motion.

1. Approval of the Minutes of the October 12, 2021 Meeting

Commissioner HAM requested that Item 1 be pulled from the Consent Calendar, for separate consideration.

Motion to approve Item 1 of the Consent Calendar.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Martin Devine
SECONDER:	Richard Douglas
AYES:	Douglas, Devine, Sanchez
ABSTAIN:	Ham, Norris

2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 25, 2022

3. Approval of the Minutes of the December 13, 2022 Meeting

Motion to approve the Consent Calendar, Items 2 and 3.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Richard Douglas
SECONDER:	Martin Devine
AYES:	Ham, Douglas, Devine, Sanchez, Norris

PUBLIC HEARING

- 4. Vesting Tentative Tract 937: A request by DR Horton to subdivide 21.12 acres into a 95-lot single-family subdivision including an approximately 30,000 square-foot stormwater retention basin in the R-L-5 Low-Density Residential zone district. Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 2022-101: A request to certify that the project will have a less than significant impact on the environment with the incorporation of mitigation measures. The Project is adjacent to and fronts the south side of Hanford Armona Road and lies between 12th Avenue and 13th Avenue. APN: 011-040-007. Continuation to January 24, 2022 is requested**

Chair SANCHEZ opened the public hearing and called for the staff report. Senior Planner Myers presented staff's request that the item be continued to the next meeting, due to an unresolved issue between the applicant and City Engineering.

Motion to continue the item until the next meeting.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Richard Douglas
SECONDER:	Martin Devine
AYES:	Ham, Douglas, Devine, Sanchez, Norris

5. **Annexation No. 160, Part 4: A proposal to annex approximately 93.2 +/- acres into the City of Hanford from the Kings County jurisdiction. Prezone No. 2021-09: A proposal to prezone Annexation 160 Area 4 a combination of R-L-5 Low-Density Residential and MX-C Corridor Mixed Use, in accordance with the General Plan designation for the area – Low-Density Residential and Corridor Mixed Use. The project has been determined to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Categorical Exemption Class 19. LOCATION: The project is generally located east of 10th Avenue, South of Florinda, North of Lacey Boulevard.**

Chair SANCHEZ opened the public hearing and called for the staff report. Senior Planner Myers presented the staff report, recommended approval, and invited questions of staff.

Questions from Commissioner HAM:

- Will every existing use be grandfathered in, after the annexation? Ms. Myers replied that every use that was legally existing under the County's jurisdiction will be grandfathered in as legally existing in the City.
- Is Kings County Bowl a permitted use in the City? Ms. Myers noted that the business would be in an MX-C zone, and a bowling alley is a permitted use in that zone district.
- Are the residential properties paying school taxes, or will they see that change on their bills after annexation? Director Waters replied that they would still be within those school district boundaries within the City.

Chair SANCHEZ opened Public Comment:

IN FAVOR

Onan Champi, owner of 10 parcels within the annexation area. He was in favor of the annexation, but he was concerned that the prezone would be more restrictive than Kings County zoning. He was not in favor of that.

OPPOSED

None.

Chair SANCHEZ invited Commissioners' comments/questions.

Commissioner HAM asked if the resolution could be worded to accommodate Mr. Champi's concern, so that if he moved his business from one lot to another, leaving the first lot vacant temporarily, it would still be legal. Staff replied that they would have to rely on what the municipal code allowed regarding pre-existing uses, reiterating Ms. Myers' earlier comment that if the use was legally existing in the County, it would be considered legally existing in the City.

Commissioner HAM then asked Mr. Champi to clarify his question. Mr. Champi asked that if he left a business vacant temporarily, would it still be grandfathered in. Staff replied that, if there is a current business license for a use that was permitted in the County, the use would still be legal. Director Waters stated that, per the municipal code, if a business that was grandfathered is discontinued for six months, whatever the new use is would have to conform to the zoning. Mr. Champi then asked if he maintained a City business license, would the use still be permitted.

City Attorney Mizote stated that that would be a factor. He added that the business license would have to be tied to a particular property.

Motion to recommend adoption of the Notice of Exemption, in accordance with CEQA.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Richard Douglas
SECONDER:	Dennis Ham
AYES:	Ham, Douglas, Devine, Sanchez, Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2023-01, recommending approval of Prezone No. 2021-09 to the City Council.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Dennis Ham
SECONDER:	Richard Douglas
AYES:	Ham, Douglas, Devine, Sanchez, Norris

Motion to adopt Resolution No. 2023-02, finding the proposed Annexation No. 160, Part 4, consistent with the Hanford General Plan Policies L15, L16, and L17 and forward Annexation No. 160, Part 4 to the City Council, with a recommendation that an application be made to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) of Kings County.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Richard Douglas
SECONDER:	Dennis Ham
AYES:	Ham, Douglas, Devine, Sanchez, Norris

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Community Development Director Waters announced the following upcoming Requests for Proposal [RFPs] for Planning:

- GIS services, to expand mapping capabilities;
- Assistance with a large Annexation/Prezone project.

COMMISSIONERS' ITEMS OF INTEREST

At this time, any Commissioner may ask a question for clarification of matters within the Planning Commission's jurisdiction, make an announcement, or report briefly on activities in their role as a Planning Commissioner. In addition, subject to the Planning Commissioner's Handbook, Commissioners may request staff to report back to the Planning Commission at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter within Commissioner's jurisdiction (GC 54954.2).

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair SANCHEZ adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.


Respectfully submitted,

Diana Black, Recording Secretary

DRAFT

**LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF
KINGS COUNTY**

**HANFORD AREA
MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND
SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE**



MARCH 2021



DRAFT

HANFORD AREA MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE UPDATE

Prepared for:

Local Agency Formation Commission of Kings County
1400 West Lacy Boulevard
Hanford, CA 93230
Contact Person: Greg Gatzka, Executive Officer
Phone: (559) 675-7821

Consultant:



901 East Main Street
Visalia, CA 93292
Contact: Steve Brandt, Project Manager
Phone: (559) 733-0440

March 2021

Cover Photo Credit: Main Street Hanford's Website

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF KINGS COUNTY

Commissioners

Joe Neves, Chair, Kings County

Doug Verboon, Vice Chair, Kings County

Sid Palmerin, City of Corcoran

Francisco Ramirez, City of Hanford

Dan Chin, Public Member at Large

Richard Valle, County Alternate

vacant -Public Member Alternative

Alvaro Preciado - City Alternate

Staff

Greg Gatzka, Executive Officer

Chuck Kinney, Assistant Executive Officer

Legal Counsel

Diane Freeman, LAFCo Counsel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>SECTION 1 - Introduction.....</i>	<i>1-1</i>
1.1 - Municipal Service Review Purpose	1-1
1.2 - MSR Preparation, Review and Adoption Process	1-5
1.3 - Required Topic Areas of Analysis	1-5
1.4 - LAFCo Powers	1-7
1.5 - Key Considerations and Goals.....	1-7
1.6 - Services Provided.....	1-8
 <i>SECTION 2 - Growth and Population Projections</i>	 <i>2-11</i>
2.1 - Introduction	2-11
2.2 - History of Hanford	2-11
2.3 - Planning and Growth Projections.....	2-12
2.3.1 - County Islands	2-14
2.4 - Anticipated Service Needs.....	2-17
2.5 - Determinations	2-18
 <i>SECTION 3 - Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities.....</i>	 <i>3-1</i>
3.1 - Overview	3-1
3.2 - Determinations	3-3
 <i>SECTION 4 - City of Hanford Service Review.....</i>	 <i>4-1</i>
4.1 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Services, Including Infrastructure Needs or Deficiencies	4-1
4.1.1 - Capital Improvement Plan (Fiscal Years 2020 to 2024)	4-1
4.1.2 - Water.....	4-3
4.1.3 - Wastewater.....	4-10
4.1.4 - Fire Protection.....	4-17
4.1.5 - Law Enforcement	4-20
4.1.6 - Parks and Community Services	4-24
4.1.7 - Road Maintenance	4-30
4.1.8 - Flood Control/Drainage	4-34
4.1.9 - Public Transportation	4-41
4.1.10 - Solid Waste Disposal	4-44
4.1.11 - Plans for Future Services.....	4-47
4.2 - Financial Ability to Provide Services	4-48
4.2.1 - City Budget.....	4-48
4.2.2 - Rates and Fees.....	4-49
4.2.3 - Proposition 218	4-49
4.2.4 - Opportunities for Rate/Fee Restructuring.....	4-50
4.3 - Status of, and Opportunities for, Cost Avoidance and Shared Facilities.....	4-51

4.3.1 - Determinations	4-51
4.4 - Accountability for Community Service Needs, including Governmental Structure and Operation Efficiencies	4-53
4.4.1 - Organizational Structure	4-53
4.4.2 - Practices and Performance.....	4-56
4.4.3 - Determinations	4-57

SECTION 5 - Sphere of Influence Review..... 5-1

5.1 - Sphere of Influence Overview	5-1
5.1.1 - Present and Planned Land Uses	5-1
5.1.2 - Present and Probable Need for Public Facilities and Services	5-7
5.1.3 - Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities	5-7
5.1.4 - Present Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Services.....	5-7
5.1.5 - Existence of Any Social or Economic Communities of Interest.....	5-7
5.1.6 - Sphere of Influence Recommendations.....	5-8

SECTION 6 - Bibliography 6-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1 Regional Location	1-2
Figure 1-2 2035 Growth Boundary and Island Annexations	1-3
Figure 2-1 General Plan Map	2-13
Figure 2-2 Zoning Map.....	2-16
Figure 3-1 Median Household Income (2018)	3-2
Figure 3-2 Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community Areas.....	3-4
Figure 4-1 Hanford Existing Water System	4-4
Figure 4-2 Hanford Proposed Buildout of Water System.....	4-5
Figure 4-3 Hanford Existing Wastewater System	4-12
Figure 4-4 Hanford Proposed Wastewater System	4-13
Figure 4-5 Hanford Existing Storm Drainage System.....	4-35
Figure 4-6 Hanford Proposed Storm Drainage System.....	4-36
Figure 5-1 Proposed Sphere of Influence City of Hanford	5-2
Figure 5-2 Williamson Act Lands.....	5-4
Figure 5-3 California High-Speed Rail Authority Kings/Tulare Station	5-6

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1 Current, Authorized and Latent Powers Matrix	1-9
Table 1-2 Island Annexation Service Providers.....	1-10
Table 2-1 City of Hanford Growth Estimates	2-12
Table 4-1 Capital Improvement Plan Funding Breakdown by Category.....	4-1
Table 4-2 Number of Crimes Known by Hanford Police Department.....	4-21

Table 4-3 Comparison of Crimes per 1,000 Residents (2018).....	4-22
Table 4-4 Parkland within Hanford by Type (City of Hanford, 2020)	4-25

LIST OF CHARTS

Chart 4-1 Water Department Revenues and Expenditures (Maintenance and Operations).....	4-8
Chart 4-2 Sewer Department Revenues and Expenditures	4-15
Chart 4-3 Fire Department Revenues and Expenditures	4-18
Chart 4-4 Police Department Revenues and Expenditures	4-22
Chart 4-5 Parks and Recreation Department Revenues and Expenditures	4-28
Chart 4-6 Street Division Revenues and Expenditures	4-32
Chart 4-7 Storm Drainage Operations Revenues and Expenditures.....	4-39
Chart 4-8 Refuse Operations Revenues and Expenditures.....	4-45

SECTION 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Municipal Service Review Purpose

The Municipal Service Review (MSR) is a comprehensive assessment of the ability of existing local government agencies to effectively and efficiently provide municipal services to residents and users. The form and content of an MSR is specified by requirements in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) and in the State of California's Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) MSR Guidelines, published in August 2003.


The CKH Act requires all LAFCOs, including the Local Agency Formation Commission of Kings County (Kings LAFCo), to prepare an MSR for each of its incorporated cities and its special districts. The fundamental role of LAFCo is to implement the CKH Act, which was adopted into State law to encourage the logical, efficient, and most appropriate formation of local municipalities, service areas, and special districts. MSRs are to be completed every five years, and must be completed prior to, or in conjunction with, an update of a city or special district Sphere of Influence (SOI).

This MSR was initiated by Kings LAFCo in the beginning of 2020 and is intended to provide Kings LAFCo with the necessary and relevant information related to the operations and management of the municipal service providers within the City of Hanford's (the City or Hanford) proposed SOI update. The City of Hanford is the County seat of Kings County located in the San Joaquin Valley of California (Figure 1-1).

Kings LAFCo desires to review the local governing landscape of Hanford for service delivery and make recommendations that promote orderly growth and development while preserving surrounding agricultural and open space lands. In addition, the report will review the City of Hanford's request to amend its SOI and determine the feasibility of annexing eight County islands (Figure 1-2).

The City of Hanford last had a Municipal Service Review (MSR) and Sphere of Influence (SOI) Update conducted by Kings LAFCo in 2007. Since that time, the City has adopted a new General Plan. Given that there have been land use policy changes in its new General Plan, the City is requesting that Kings LAFCo adopt a new MSR and amend the SOI consistent with its new General Plan, specifically so that the SOI is coterminous with the City's 2035 Growth Boundary (Figure 1-2).

The City is also looking to annex neighborhood communities located within the unincorporated County areas that are completely surrounded by the City. The premise and guidance given by State law and local rules are that county islands should generally be annexed into a city so they may receive more efficient delivery of services, as a city is usually more equipped to provide urban level services than the county or other entity.






Figure 1-2
2035 Growth Boundary and Island Annexations

To facilitate the annexation of county islands to contiguous cities, the State legislature has adopted specific provisions in the Government Code that require LAFCo annexation approval and waiver of protest proceedings if LAFCo makes certain findings and determinations. Those determination are as follows:

Government Code Section 56375

(a)(4) A commission shall not disapprove an annexation to a city, initiated by resolution, of contiguous territory that the commission finds any of the following:

(A) Surrounded or substantially surrounded by the city to which the annexation is proposed or by that city and a county boundary or the Pacific Ocean if the territory to be annexed is substantially developed or developing, is not prime agricultural land as defined in Section 56064, is designated for urban growth by the general plan of the annexing city, and is not within the sphere of influence of another city.

(B) Located within an urban service area that has been delineated and adopted by a commission, which is not prime agricultural land, as defined by Section 56064, and is designated for urban growth by the general plan of the annexing city.

(C) An annexation or reorganization of unincorporated islands meeting the requirements of Section 56375.3.

Government Code Section 56375.3

(a) In addition to those powers enumerated in Section 56375, a commission shall approve, after notice and hearing, the change of organization or reorganization of a city, and waive protest proceedings pursuant to Part 4 (commencing with Section 57000) entirely, if all of the following are true:

(1) The change of organization or reorganization is initiated on or after January 1, 2000.

(2) The change of organization or reorganization is proposed by resolution adopted by the affected city.

(3) The commission finds that the territory contained in the change of organization or reorganization proposal meets all the requirements set forth in subdivision (b).

(b) Subdivision (a) applies to territory that meets all the following requirements:

(1) It does not exceed 150 acres in area, and that area constitutes the entire island.

(2) The territory constitutes an entire unincorporated island located within the limits of a city, or constitutes a reorganization containing several individual unincorporated islands.

- (3) It is surrounded in either of the following ways:
- (A) Surrounded, or substantially surrounded, by the city to which annexation is proposed or by the city and a county boundary or the Pacific Ocean.
 - (B) Surrounded by the city to which annexation is proposed and adjacent cities.
- (4) It is substantially developed or developing. The finding required by this paragraph shall be based upon one or more factors, including, but not limited to, any of the following factors:
- (A) The availability of public utility services.
 - (B) The presence of public improvements.
 - (C) The presence of physical improvements upon the parcel or parcels within the area.
- (5) It is not prime agricultural land, as defined by Section 56064.
- (6) It will benefit from the change of organization or reorganization or is receiving benefits from the annexing city.
- (7) This subdivision does not apply to any unincorporated island within a city that is a gated community where services are currently provided by a community services district.

1.2 - MSR Preparation, Review and Adoption Process

The process of developing the MSR began with the collection of planning documents, budgetary documents, and other records by QK, a consulting firm hired by the City of Hanford. QK also assisted the City in the preparation of its General Plan Update.

After review by the City, an administrative draft was presented to LAFCo staff for their review. Edits required by LAFCo staff and Counsel were made to LAFCo staff's satisfaction prior to public release of the draft MSR.

A hearing was scheduled by Kings LAFCo on _____, 2021, where comments from the public were heard and adoption of the MSR, including its Determinations and Recommendations, could be considered. After input and comment from the public, the Commission approved the MSR on _____, 2021.

1.3 - Required Topic Areas of Analysis

This MSR contains analysis and conclusions, referred to as Determinations, regarding six topic areas, as set forth in the CKH Act. These areas of analysis focus on the essential

operational and management aspects of the City of Hanford, and together constitute a complete review of Hanford's ability of to meet the service demands of its residents and businesses. The six topic areas used for analysis in this MSR are:

1. Growth and Population Projections
2. Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities
3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Services, Including Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies
4. Financial Ability to Provide Services
5. Status of, and Opportunities for, Shared Facilities
6. Accountability for Community Service Needs, Including Governmental Structure and Operational Efficiencies

An explanation of the specific operational and management aspects considered in each of these topic areas is provided below.

1. Growth and Population Projections

Service efficiency is linked to a service provider's ability to plan for the future needs of a city while also meeting existing service demands. This section reviews projected service demands and needs based upon existing and anticipated growth patterns and population projections. This is found in Section 2 – Growth and Population Projections.

2. The Location and Characteristics of any Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities Within or Contiguous to the Sphere of Influence

Unincorporated disadvantaged communities, as defined by Water Code Section 79505.5, may lack basic infrastructure, such as water, sewer, or fire protection, because they may have been overlooked due to their socioeconomic status. To promote equality and environmental justice in accordance with adopted local policy and Senate Bill 244, adopted in 2011, the proximity of any disadvantaged community to existing service providers is analyzed and discussed in order to determine if the community should be included in the SOI of the City. This is found in Section 3 – Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Services, Including Infrastructure Needs or Deficiencies

Infrastructure can be evaluated in terms of condition, capacity, availability, quality and relationship to operational, capital improvement, and finance planning. This section assesses the adequacy and quality of the service providers' physical infrastructure and analyzes whether or not sufficient infrastructure and capital are in place (or planned for) to accommodate planned future growth and expansions. This is found in Section 4.

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

This section analyzes the financial structure and health of the City with respect to the provision of services. Included in this analysis is the consideration of rates, service operations, and the like, as well as other factors affecting the City's financial health and stability, including factors affecting the financing of needed infrastructure improvements and services. Compliance with existing State requirements relative to financial reporting and management is also discussed. This is found in Section 4.

5. Status of, and Opportunities for, Shared Facilities

Practices and opportunities that may help to reduce or eliminate unnecessary costs are examined in this section. Occurrences of facility sharing are listed and assessed for efficiency, and potential sharing opportunities that would serve to better deliver services are discussed. This is found in Section 4.

6. Accountability for Community Service Needs, Including Governmental Structure and Operational Efficiencies

This section addresses the adequacy and appropriateness of the agency's existing boundaries and sphere of influence and evaluates the ability of the City to meet their service demands under their existing government structure. Also included in this section is an evaluation of compliance by the agency with public meeting and records laws. This is found in Section 4.

1.4 - LAFCo Powers

LAFCo has the power to determine the SOI for the City of Hanford. An SOI is a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency. It is represented by a boundary line on a map. The boundary line shows the territory that is expected to eventually be within the agency's boundary, as determined by LAFCo. It is by this method that LAFCo makes policy statements about its intent for the future probable boundaries of a city. If LAFCo chooses to not adopt an SOI for a city or district, meaning that it chooses to adopt a "zero" sphere, then it is making the policy statement that its plan is for that agency to eventually be consolidated into the city or another district. The preparation of an MSR is required prior to the amendment of a city or district's SOI.

1.5 - Key Considerations and Goals

The MSR will use the following goals to evaluate the potential government structure options for the Hanford area:

1. **Efficient provision of municipal services.** The ultimate goal of the preferred governance structure should be an efficient operating structure and stable fiscal basis required to effectively provide municipal services to the City of Hanford.

2. **Adequate revenue sources.** The ability to provide municipal services at adequate levels hinges upon stable revenue streams linked to the services for which the revenues are being collected.
3. **Proactive approach to governance structure.** Government agency reorganization proposals (e.g., municipal incorporations, major annexations, etc.) are necessarily complex procedures requiring substantial effort on the part of proponents, LAFCo and the affected agencies. These reorganizations are often more complex when contemplated on a reactive basis rather than a proactive basis. An understanding of a long-range approach to reorganization will assist in evaluating specific proposals to determine if they will bring the community closer to the desired result.
4. **Avoidance of intergovernmental conflicts, competition, or issues.** Conflicts between local jurisdictions over control and other impacts across jurisdictions and competition for resources (e.g., fiscal revenue generators) often consume resources and weaken incentives to cooperate on important regional issues like transit service, water quantity and quality, air quality, and habitat conservation.
5. **Local preference.** There is often more than one feasible government structure that can potentially provide local municipal services. The residents and businesses of the community must have the opportunity to participate in choosing the method, especially since a governmental structure change will likely require some sort of election process for it to be implemented. Local preference also may include agreements made between local agencies regarding where and how growth and development may occur within a region. These agreements have been identified within CKH as important for consideration during the MSR and SOI update process. The Commission “shall give great weight to the agreement to the extent that *it is consistent with [LAFCO] commission policies...* (emphasis added)” (Government Code §56425(b)).

1.6 - Services Provided

The City of Hanford is empowered as a general law city, governed by State law and local ordinances, to provide specific municipal services within its boundaries. The City of Hanford has several divisions, covering many municipal services, including Police, Fire, Emergency Response, Water, Wastewater, Flood Control/Drainage, Solid Waste, Street Maintenance, Street Lighting, and Parks and Recreation Maintenance. Some of the aforementioned services are provided to communities outside of the City’s jurisdiction.

There are three communities within a one-mile buffer of the City of Hanford’s Sphere of Influence. Armona Census Designated Place (Armona) is located approximately 0.95 miles west of the City of Hanford’s SOI and contains approximately 3,795 residents. The Armona Community Service District (CSD) provides water, wastewater, solid waste collection, limited flood control services, limited street maintenance, and street lighting services. Armona also receives law enforcement, fire, and emergency services from Kings County (Kings County). Home Garden Census Designated Place (Home Garden) is located approximately 0.35 miles southeast of the City and contains approximately 1,643 residents.

Home Garden CSD only provides water supply and distribution services. Home Garden CSD also receives law enforcement, fire and emergency service, flood control, street maintenance, and street lighting from Kings County. In addition, wastewater collection and disposal services are provided by the City of Hanford (Kings County). According to the Kings County Planning Department, the Census Designated Place of Grangeville (Grangeville) does not have a community service district or a public utilities district to provide municipal services. It is located approximately 0.85 miles west of the City and contains about 586 residents. The majority of services are provided by Kings County and water and wastewater services are provided by private wells and septic systems.

The 2018 American Community Survey estimated approximately 56,910 residents in the City of Hanford. The nearby communities' population is approximately is Home Garden with 1,643 residents, Grangeville with 586 residents, and Armona with 3,795 residents. The total population of these unincorporated residential communities is approximately 5,438 residents (American Community Survey, 2018).

The matrix in Table 1-1 specifies the services that the City provides. The matrix also includes two nearby community service districts that also provide some of the same services.

Table 1-1
Current, Authorized and Latent Powers Matrix

Municipal Service Type	City of Hanford	Armona Community Service District	Home Garden Community Service District
Law Enforcement	City	County	County
Fire and Emergency Service	City	County	County
Water Supply	City	District	District
Water Distribution	City	District	District
Wastewater Collection	City	District	City
Wastewater Disposal	City	District	City
Solid Waste Collection	City	District	District
Flood Control/Drainage	City	District (limited)	County
Street Maintenance	City	District (limited)	County
Street Lighting	City	District	County
Parks and Recreation Maintenance	City	District	N/A

Source: City of Hanford 2035 General Plan, Armona 2035 Community Plan, Home Garden Community Plan

**Table 1-2
Island Annexation Service Providers**

Municipal Service Type	Island Annexation							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Law Enforcement	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Fire and Emergency Service	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Water Supply	Private	City	City	City	City	City	City	Private
Water Distribution	Private	City	City	City	City	City	City	Private
Wastewater Collection	Private	City	City	City	City	City	City	Private
Wastewater Disposal	Private	City	City	City	City	City	City	Private
Solid Waste Collection*	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Flood Control/Drainage	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Street Maintenance	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Street Lighting	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County
Parks and Recreation Maintenance	County	County	County	County	County	County	County	County

Source: 2017 Water System Master Plan, 2017 Sewer System Master Plan, 2017 Storm Drain Master Plan City of Hanford, and 2035 City of Hanford General Plan

* Solid waste collection in the County islands is currently optional.

SECTION 2 - GROWTH AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS

2.1 - Introduction

The purpose of this section is to evaluate service demand based on existing and anticipated growth patterns and population projections. The MSR Guidelines call for LAFCo to determine historic and projected growth and absorption patterns in relationship to a service provider's boundaries and SOI. In addition, LAFCo is tasked with evaluating the impact and compatibility of such growth on and with land use plans, services, local government structures and growth patterns.

2.2 - History of Hanford

The City of Hanford started as a Chinese sheepherder's simple camp along the Southern Pacific Railway line from Goshen to Coalinga. The settlement was named for James Madison Hanford, auditor of the railroad, who also took lively interest in the sale of town lots. The sale of lots began on January 17, 1877. The settlement grew to a town and eventually the trading center of the area.

Through the early years, a series of devastating fires hampered the growth of the town. In 1887, the fire that destroyed most of the downtown spurred talk of incorporation, but the idea of additional taxes prevented any action. Then in June 1891, another fire destroyed the downtown business district once again. An election was held to determine whether the town should incorporate. The vote was 127 to 47, in favor of incorporation. On August 12, 1891, the City of Hanford was born. When Kings County was formed in 1893, Hanford became the County seat.

After the incorporation, Hanford continued to grow into a thriving town. For many years Hanford had the only opera house between the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas. In 1945, the first paid Fire Department was established, and the City Planning Commission was created. In 1950 the City Manager/City Council form of government was established.

Many of the historic buildings in the downtown area came to become underutilized. To combat that, the City Council established a Historic District. As a result of many activities in downtown Hanford, the restoration and rehabilitation program, and the cooperation between private citizens and City officials, in 1985 Hanford won the Helen Putnam Award for Excellence awarded by the League of California Cities. In 1986, American City and County Magazine chose Hanford as one of ten cities in the United States to receive its Award of Merit. Most recently, Rohm and Haas Paint Quality Institute of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania named the City as one of the country's "Prettiest Painted Places in America" (City of Hanford, 2009).

The last Municipal Services Review and Sphere of Influence Update for the City of Hanford was conducted in 2007. Per the Review, the Sphere of Influence was updated. The Sphere of Influence was reduced in three areas and expanded in one area. The current Sphere of Influence is shown in Figure 1-2 above.

2.3 - Planning and Growth Projections

The City of Hanford General Plan was adopted in 2017 by the Hanford City Council to provide land use development decision-making guidance and to provide a planning framework for the development of more detailed implementation plans and measures. A map depicting these planned land use patterns is shown in Figure 2-1.

After reviewing historical growth rates and projected growth trends available in 2014, a Citizens Advisory Committee determined that the General Plan Update would assume Hanford's average annual population growth rate would be 2.1 percent, which would result in an assumed population of 90,000 persons in the year 2035.


Despite the General Plan's projected growth rate of 2.1 percent, the actual annual growth rates from 2010 to 2019 have not been 2.1 percent. This can be seen below in Table 2-1. If the City starts to grow according to the General Plan, at a rate of 2.1 percent, starting in 2019, the estimated population of 2035 will be approximately 80,000.

The population estimates in the General Plan were generated utilizing historic growth rates and projected growth trends. There is currently available information that would allow for these estimates to be updated accordingly. In Table 2-1, population estimates have been updated to account for the more recent population information available.

Based on these updated figures, it is apparent that the infrastructure planning for the City would be able to support population growth beyond the 2035 horizon if current trends remain constant. The infrastructure plans described in the City's Master Plans accounted for a 2.1 percent population increase, per the General Plan. However, anomalies or unforeseen events may occur between now and 2035 that may spike growth in the City. To prepare for this, the population estimates utilized by the City in their Infrastructure Master Plans should be monitored to ensure that they are not being outpaced by the City's population growth.

Table 2-1
City of Hanford Growth Estimates

Forecast Year	Population Estimate	% Annual Growth	Forecast Year	Population Estimate	% Annual Growth
2010 Census	53,967		2019	57,703	1.4%
2011 (ACS)	53,891	-.14%	2020	58,915	2.1%
2012 (ACS)	54,205	.58%	2021	60,152	2.1%
2013 (ACS)	54,461	.47%	2022	61,415	2.1%
2014(ACS)	54,523	.11%	2023	62,705	2.1%
2015 (ACS)	54,790	.49%	2024	64,022	2.1%
2016 (ACS)	54,912	.22%	2025	65,366	2.1%
2017 (ACS)	55,599	1.25%	2026	66,739	2.1%
2018 (ACS)	56,910	2.3%	2027	68,140	2.1%
			2035	80,465	2.1%



Based on the actual data currently available and supplemented using the 2.1 percent annual growth rate, the population in 2035 would be approximately 80,000 residents, which is about 10,000 less than the population forecast within the General Plan. For infrastructure planning purposes, the estimates would be acceptable as the infrastructure would be able to accommodate growth beyond the planning horizon date of 2035.

2.3.1 - COUNTY ISLANDS

As shown in Figure 1-2, there are eight County islands within the bounds of city limits. It is in within the best interest of the City to consider annexation of these island to reduce inefficiencies and deficiencies of services provided. Population estimates were derived for each County island to estimate the demand for service. To calculate the estimated population, an aerial interpretation of residential structures was conducted. Then the amount of residential structures was multiplied by the City of Hanford's estimated person per household (3.04 persons) to produce an estimated population.

County Island #1

This island consists of 12 large residential properties. 11 out of 12 parcels are developed with residential structures. The existing land use for this island is rural residential, with parcels ranging in size from approximately 1.7 to 2.7 acres. The planned land use for these properties is Low Density Residential. The estimated population is 33 people.

County Island #2

The island consists of 48 parcels, one of which has a commercial use and one is vacant. There are 49 residential structures within this island area. The existing land uses are commercial and urban residential. The parcels sizes range from 0.07 to 0.87 acres, with an average size of 0.26 acres. The planned land use for these properties is Medium Density Residential. The estimated population is 149 people.

County Island #3

The island consists of 119 parcels. There are 102 residential structures within the island area. County island #3 is one of the larger annexation areas being proposed at over 100 acres. Parcel size consists of parcels within the range 0.09 to 5.85 acres, with an average of 0.75-acres. The existing land use is primarily urban residential and rural residential. In addition, there are some commercial uses and school facilities. The planned land uses are Low Density Residential, Mixed-Use Corridor, Open Space, and Educational Facilities. The estimated population is 310 people.

County Island #4

This island is one of the three larger islands totaling approximately 90 acres. This island consists of 172 parcels, 122 residential parcels, and 125 residential structures. The approximate average parcel size for this island is 0.46 acres. There are a few large parcels that are several acres large. The largest being 14 acres. The large parcels are primarily

vacant. The existing land use is urban residential with rural residential, commercial, and vacant land. The island is mainly urban with dense development and towards the southeast the parcels are larger with more vacant land. The planned land uses are Low Density, Medium Density Residential, Open Space, and Mixed-Use Corridor. The estimated population is 380 people.

County Island #5

The island is unique for the fact that the City's General Plan designated the entire island as Mixed-Use Corridor. The island consists of 45 parcels, 20 residential parcels, and 22 residential structures. The estimated average parcel size is 1.21 acres. The parcel size ranges from 0.09 to 16.85 acres. There are two vacant parcels that are larger than 10 acres. The existing land use is primarily urban residential, in addition to commercial and vacant parcels. As mentioned previously the entire island is designated as Mixed Use. The estimated population is 69 people.

County Island #6

The island consists of 77 total parcels, 63 residential parcels and 72 residential structures. The estimated average parcel size 0.38 acres. The parcel sizes range from 0.11 to 5.12 acres. The annexation area is split fairly evenly between Medium Density Residential and Low Density Residential. The annexation area is primarily urban with a few parcels that are vacant. The estimated population is 219 people.


County Island #7

This County island is unique in the sense that it only incorporates a single neighborhood. The island is approximately 350 feet wide and 2,650 feet long or roughly 21 acres. The island consists of 36 parcels that are all residential, which contain 36 residential structures. The average estimated parcel size is 0.45 acres; with ranges from 0.20 to 0.72 acres. The entire island has planned land use of Low Density Residential. The estimated population is 109 people.

County Island #8

Similar to County island #7, this island only incorporates one neighborhood. This island consists of eight parcels that consist of eight residential parcels with eight residential structures. The average estimated parcel size is 2.36 acres and ranges from 1.77 to 2.74 acres. The entire island has a planned land use of Low Density Residential. The estimated population is 24 people.

The total population for all the island annexations is approximately 1,293 people.



2.4 - Anticipated Service Needs

The Hanford area requires typical local municipal services, such as water service, sewer service, police and fire protection, storm drainage, street maintenance, parks and recreation, schools, communication infrastructure, and solid waste collection. The City has adopted an updated General Plan and corresponding Master Plans to accommodate future growth in an orderly manner until the year 2035.

This Municipal Service Review will review water service, wastewater service, fire protection, police protection, street maintenance, parks and recreation, public transportation, and solid waste. It will review the level of service in each area and analyze whether the City would have the ability to provide services to the County islands discussed in Section 1. The City conducts infrastructure master planning in the areas of water, sewer, and storm drainage. The County islands were not taken into consideration in those Master Plans, as there does not appear to be discussion about providing service in addition to no planned infrastructure shown on any of the buildout maps of the correspond systems. This MSR will take the level of service needed in those County islands into consideration, along with the predicted growth projections of the City, to conclude ability for the City to annex the islands.

The Water, Sewer, and Storm Drainage Master Plans have evaluated the ability for the City to accommodate both current and future populations. The population projections in these Master Plans is the same as is described in the General Plan. Recommendations in the Master Plans include but are not limited to:

- Addressing drainage basin capacity deficiencies with either the construction of a new drainage basin or an expansion of an existing basin;
- Pipeline improvements within a series of trunk sewer service areas;
- Replace existing pumps in two lift stations in the City;
- Replace one force main that is currently 12 inches in diameter with one that is 18 inches in diameter;
- Development of three new water storage facilities (Northeast, Southeast, and Industrial Park Storage Expansion);
- Development of two new water pump stations and an upgrade of one existing pump station; or
- Monitoring of well efficiencies on a frequent basis to adequately manage the groundwater supply.

The City's General Plan has three policies regarding annexations. Policy L15 describes the criteria that must be met when considering an initiation of an annexation. Policy L16 states that the City should "Initiate annexation of County islands when it is found that urban services are needed and can be provided or made available in the near future". Policy L17 states that future proposal must "Prepare and make publicly available a written Plan for Services that describes how urban services will be provided prior to initiating an annexation".

2.5 - Determinations

Determination 2-1 - U.S. Census data indicates that the City had a 2010 population of 53,967, a 2023 population (five-year increment from last Community Survey prediction) of 63,140, and a population projection of 87,429 by 2047, according to population projections from the General Plan.

Determination 2-2 - Based upon recent historical population trends from 2010 to 2015, the average annual growth rate was 0.3 percent for the City of Hanford. Therefore, the current population is trending below the projections of the General Plan.

Determination 2-3 - The City plans for future growth through the implementation of policies and standards set forth in its General Plan. The City's General Plan was updated in 2017 and is a long-range guide for attaining the City's goals within its ultimate service area and accommodating its population growth. The City's General Plan provides a policy base to guide future growth within the City.

Determination 2-4 - The City contains policies in their General Plan that regulate future annexations.

SECTION 3 - DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES

3.1 - Overview


Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUCs) are defined as inhabited territory (12 or more registered voters) that constitutes all or a portion of a community with an annual median household income of or below \$60,181 which is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median household income of \$75,227 in 2018 (California Department of Finance, 2018). Communities meeting this financial threshold were specifically identified as an area of concern by Senate Bill 244, adopted into State law in 2011. These communities may also lack essential municipal services such as water, wastewater, or stormwater drainage as they may have been developed prior to infrastructure being installed in proximity to them. Furthermore, structural fire protection may be inconsistent in these areas due to lack of agreements or memorandums of understanding that provide mutual aid from adjacent jurisdictions if there is a need. Kings LAFCo has not adopted a policy or more specific definition of DUCs, therefore, the criteria within State law will be utilized.

Pursuant to State law, LAFCo is required to identify any adjacent DUCs and determine if they should be included within any SOI amendment of an existing city or special district or potentially included during the consideration of any special district formation in the future (California Legislative Information, 2011).

The City of Hanford provides its own potable water service, wastewater, storm drain, and fire and emergency services within its jurisdiction. As it pertains to the previously mentioned services, the County islands primarily rely on the City for those services, with a few exceptions as detailed in Table 1-2. All of the County islands receive services pertaining to water, wastewater, storm drain and fire and emergency services from either private source, the City, or the County.

Outside the city limits, fire protection and emergency service are provided by Kings County. The City of Hanford provides water service to County islands 2 through 7, provides wastewater collection to Islands 2 and 3 through 7. Hanford provides wastewater disposal services to County islands 1 through 6 and 8. Storm drain/Flood Control is provided by the County to all County islands. Furthermore, Home Garden is the only established community receives water and wastewater services from Hanford.

As shown in Figure 3-1, the majority of the area within the bounds of the city limits and SOI has a median household income that is less than 80 percent of the California's median household income or near that threshold. Although these areas are below the median income level, the appropriate services are currently being provided. However, there are several areas outside of the city limits that are below the 80 percent threshold for median household income, including several County islands. All of the County islands are considered inhabited because they have more than 12 registered voters. As identified in Table 1-2, the County islands that do not receive services, shall be determined a disadvantaged unincorporated community. This is one of the reasons why the County islands are proposed for annexation.



As shown in Figure 3-2, Home Garden CSD is the only CSD within the City's SOI. The CSD provides its own potable water services to its residents. Home Garden relies on the City of Hanford for wastewater services and Kings County for police and fire and emergency services.

Therefore, most of the land within the SOI, excluding Home Garden, can be considered as a DUC as their median income is below 80 percent of the statewide average. Furthermore, as some of these neighborhoods receive private water services or maintain their own private wastewater system, they are considered disadvantaged as they do not receive the benefit of having municipal level services. Lastly, fire protection is provided to these areas by the County currently, so they are not disadvantaged with respect to lacking structural fire protection. The Kings County Fire Department serves the unincorporated areas of the County including the four communities of Armona, Home Garden, Kettleman City, and Stratford (Kings County General Plan, 2010).

In addition, there are several parcels outside the western extent of the city limits (within the City's SOI) which may become a DUC as shown in Figure 3-2. This area is near the level of income that can establish them as a DUC, outside of the water, wastewater, and fire and emergency service boundary of the City, and is not within a service provider's boundary.

3.2 - Determinations

Determination 3-1 - There are Census Block Groups within the City of Hanford that have a median household income below \$60,181(80 percent of the statewide median household income).

Determination 3-2 - There are areas currently within the City's SOI that can be considered unincorporated disadvantaged communities due to median household income being below 80 percent of the statewide average.

Determination 3-3 – The community of Home Garden is within the City of Hanford's SOI and currently provides potable water service. Wastewater service is provided by the City and fire and emergency protection services from Kings County. These areas would only be considered disadvantaged based on income, not from a service delivery standpoint.

Determination 3-4 – There are areas within the SOI that currently receive water and/or sewer through private facilities, such as wells and septic tanks, while receiving fire and emergency protection services from Kings County and are below the 80 percent threshold of medium household income. These areas would be considered disadvantaged from a service delivery and an income standpoint and should be evaluated on a case by case basis when there is a neighborhood of 12 or more registered voters that could be included in a future annexation, per State law.

Determination 3-5 – Areas designated as having potential to become a DUC should be monitored and reviewed during the next municipal service review for the City.



Figure 3-2
Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community Areas

SECTION 4 - CITY OF HANFORD SERVICE REVIEW

4.1 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Services, Including Infrastructure Needs or Deficiencies

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the infrastructure needs and deficiencies of the City of Hanford in terms of availability of resources, capacity to deliver services, condition of facilities, planned improvements, service quality, and levels of service.

LAFCo is responsible for determining that an agency requesting an SOI amendment is reasonably capable of providing needed resources and basic infrastructure to serve areas within the City and its SOI. It is important that these findings of infrastructure and resource availability are made when revisions to the SOI and annexations occur. LAFCo accomplishes this by evaluating whether resources and services are being expanded in line with increasing demands.

4.1.1 - CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (FISCAL YEARS 2020 TO 2024)

The City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) involved collaboration by the Engineering and Community Development Departments to evaluate the City's capital improvement needs to accommodate the community both now and in the future. The five-year CIP is reviewed annually and includes projects from nine categories: Airport, Industrial Park, Facilities and General Projects, Parks and Recreation, Transportation, Storm Drainage, Wastewater, Water, and Downtown Projects. The largest contribution of funds for Fiscal Year 2019-2020 goes to water projects (approximately \$3.48 million or 34 percent of total CIP budget)(City of Hanford, 2020).

Table 4-1
Capital Improvement Plan Funding Breakdown by Category

Project Category	Project Funding	Overall Percentage
Facilities and General Projects	\$972,500	9%
Parks & Recreation Projects	\$662,000	6%
Transportation Projects	\$2,965,000	29%
Storm Drainage Projects	\$560,950	6%
Wastewater Projects	\$220,000	2%
Water Projects	\$3,480,000	34%
Downtown Projects	\$140,000	1%
Airport Projects	\$1,160,000	11%
Industrial Park Projects	\$175,000	2%
Total	\$10,335,450	100%

Source: City of Hanford - Capital Improvement Plan - Fiscal Years 2020 to 2024

Current and potential projects are listed by project title and funding source. In the event of budget shortfalls, there is not a guiding policy that indicates how priorities would be derived. The development of clear policies and quantifiable goals for the CIP would aid in its development of clear, justified projects and allow for year to year evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the CIP for staff, elected officials, and the public. The City has adopted some policies for the general budgeting process as well as adopted some visioning principles in the General Plan. The establishment of benchmarks and/or performance indicators would allow for the City to hold itself accountable on its progress and implementation of the adopted CIP.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.1-1 – The City annually adopts a Capital Improvement Plan that identifies key capital projects that are needed to enhance services to residents.

Determination 4.1.1-2 – The Capital Improvement Plan could include milestones, performance indicators and/or specific goals consistent with the visioning principles of the General Plan to benchmark its progress in achieving specific levels of service for its residents.

4.1.2 - WATER

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

The 2007 MSR identified that Hanford relies completely upon groundwater for its domestic use, and the City was operating 19 groundwater wells. The groundwater basin underlying the City is the Tulare Lake Basin, which is part of the Tulare Hydrologic Region within the San Joaquin Valley. The total storage capacity of the subbasin is 17,100,000 acre-feet to a depth of 300 feet and 82,500 acre-feet to the base of fresh groundwater.

At the time of the previous MSR, the City had just updated the Water Master Plan in February 2006. That Master Plan identified the 1995 Level Overdraft for the Tulare Lake Region at 820,000 acre-feet. According to the Master Plan, groundwater overdraft is expected to decline to 670,000 acre-feet during the 2020 average and drought years.


The Federal Arsenic Minimum Containment Level of 0.010 milligrams per liter was established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and went into effect in January of 2006. At that time of the previous MSR, the City of Hanford had received a Notice of Violation from the California Department of Health Services informing the City that five of their wells do not comply with the new Federal Arsenic MCL. The non-compliance notice did not require termination of the use of the identified wells but did require the City to provide quarterly monitoring reports and public notice of non-compliance. When the previous MSR was published, the City's water system and water quality were in compliance with the new Federal Standards. The City implemented a plan for reducing arsenic in its groundwater supply system.

The City's municipal water system pumping capacity was 24,455 gallons per minute or 35.2 million gallons a day according to the 2005 Urban Water Management Plan. The total storage capacity was 2.8 million gallons (Kings County LAFCo, 2007).

Current Conditions


The City completed an updated Water System Master Plan in 2017 that updated much of the information identified in the prior 2007 MSR. Figure 4-1 shows the extent of the existing water system. Figure 4-2 shows the planned system intended to serve the entire area planned for growth in the General Plan.

The City's municipal water system currently consists of 14 active groundwater wells, three storage reservoirs that have a cumulative capacity of 3.5 million gallons, 217 miles of distribution pipelines, and fire hydrants (City of Hanford, 2017). The City's generally flat topography slopes from the northeast to the southwest from approximately 255 feet in the northeast to approximately 225 feet in the southwest. With this generally flat topography, the City operates two pressure zones, with the primary pressure zone covering areas north of the Kings Industrial Park and the remaining pressure zone serving the Kings Industrial Park, located south of Iona Avenue.



Akel
Engineering
Group, Inc.

Figure 4-1
Hanford Existing Water System



Akel
Engineering
Group, Inc.

Figure 4-2
Hanford Proposed Buildout of Water System

The City continues to use groundwater as the sole source of water supply. The City's current total rated supply is 34.9 million gallons per day (mgd). Consistent with the system performance and design criteria the firm capacity was calculated as the capacity with the largest well out of service and is equal to 32 mgd. Each tank is briefly discussed in the following:

- Tank 4 is a 0.5 MG ground level steel storage tank at the intersection of 11th Avenue and Iona Avenue that serves the Industrial Park to satisfy normal domestic demands plus fire flows. The tank is filled from the Main Pressure Zone through an altitude valve connected to a 12-inch pipeline on 11th Avenue. Booster pumps supply the Industrial Park Pressure Zone from the tank, maintaining a downstream pressure of approximately 80 psi. The tank can be bypassed to serve the Industrial Park Pressure Zone in the event of an emergency or for normal tank maintenance.
- Tank 5 is composed of two interconnected 1.0 MG ground level steel storage tanks at the intersection of Grangeville Boulevard and Centennial Drive that serve the Main Pressure Zone to satisfy normal domestic demands. The tanks are directly filled from Wells 40, 42, 43, which are controlled by SCADA to maintain set levels within the tanks. Booster pumps supply the Main Pressure Zone from the tanks and are controlled by SCADA to turn on and off based on specific downstream pressures.
- Tank 6 is a 1.0 MG ground level steel storage tank at the intersection Fargo Avenue and the BNSF railroad that serves the Main Pressure Zone to satisfy normal domestic demands. The tank is filled from wells 41 and 44, which are controlled by SCADA to maintain set levels within the tanks. Booster pumps supply the Main Pressure Zone from the tanks and are controlled by SCADA to turn on and off based on specified downstream pressures.

Future storage requirements were identified based on the City's anticipated development through the horizon of the Master Plan. The Master Plan describes future domestic water demands and identifies operational fire storage requirements for each zone. The total required storage for future domestic water demand is 6.1 million gallons; the total capacity is currently 5.84 million gallons. The Water Master Plan describes three proposed storage reservoirs (Northeast Storage Facility, Southeast Storage Facility, and the Industrial Park Storage Expansion) that are planned to increase storage capacity to meet the future demand.

The 2013 maximum day and peak hour demands at 100 percent occupancy are calculated at 21.1 mgd and 30.2 mgd, respectively. The projected total maximum day demand and peak hour demand for the buildout of the Planned Area Boundary at 100 percent occupancy are 38.5 mgd and 55.0 mgd, respectively. Water demands vary with time of day and by account type according to the land use designation. These fluctuations were accounted for in the modeling effort and evaluation of the water distribution system. Daytime demand patterns affect the water levels in storage reservoirs and amount of flow through distribution mains. A daytime curve was used to model the demand patterns of existing customers. The peaks in the daytime pattern match the peaking factors recommended in the Master Plan.

The costs identified within the Water Master Plan are described in the Capital Improvement Program. In total, the CIP includes approximately 70 miles of pipeline improvements, 11 new wells, five new storage reservoirs, and three new booster stations, with a project cost totaling over \$95.2 million (City of Hanford, 2017).

As described in the last MSR, the City's groundwater supply has one water quality constituent that has historically required mitigation measures to ensure the supply is not limited, which is arsenic. Arsenic is concentrated in the clay strata beneath the City, and hydrogen sulfide, which may cause discoloration, adverse taste, and a smell typically compared to rotten eggs. The City has implemented a chlorination program for the water supply, and hydrogen sulfide is no longer considered a water constituent of concern.

Through the preparation of several studies, the City has determined the best methods for reducing the levels of arsenic in their water supply. The City has considered different methods to reduce arsenic concentrations below the maximum contaminant level. Considerations included:

- Abandon high arsenic wells and drill replacement wells with lower concentrations;
- Blend water from wells with higher concentrations with wells of lower concentrations;
- Install well head treatment; and
- Rehabilitate wells that produce water with high arsenic concentrations to a block of strata with low concentrations, producing water low in arsenic.

A non-treatment-based approach was determined to be the most cost effective for the City and was comprised of the following three improvement projects:

- Abandon six shallow wells with low production and high arsenic concentration. Replace the abandoned wells with two wells of a higher production capacity and lower arsenic concentration;
- Abandon and replace three wells that could not be rehabilitated with new wells with higher production capacities and acceptable arsenic conditions; and
- Rehabilitate three deep wells to ensure they only extract groundwater from a zone with lower arsenic concentrations.

Upon the implementation of these arsenic improvement projects, The City's water supply can reliably produce water below the maximum contaminant level for arsenic. Based on the current arsenic levels the long-term reliability of the City's water supply is not affected.


WATER DEPARTMENT FUNDING

Within Public Works, the Water Department revenues are comprised of enterprise funds collected through user fees. As an enterprise fund, this service typically does not impact the General Fund as it generates revenues that can only be used to provide the identified service, in this case water delivery and supply. Revenue budgeted for water utility related activities

total \$5.61 million in 2018-19, a decrease of approximately 1.3 percent under the prior year's actual revenues.

As shown in Chart 4-1, the revenues of the department often outpace expenses in order to fund capital projects. Since the water utility operates as an enterprise fund, the department is not dependent on General Fund and special revenues (City of Hanford, 2020).

Chart 4-1
Water Department Revenues and Expenditures (Maintenance and Operations)¹



SOURCE: CITY OF HANFORD 2020 **ABILITY TO SERVE ANNEXED POPULATION**

The City currently supplies and distributes water to six of the eight County islands proposed to be annexed. The population of the other two islands that currently use private wells is 57. Were the City to annex the islands, it would need to strategize a way to provide water to 57 more residents.

The City's Water System Master Plan sought to plan for the future population of Hanford, with an anticipated 2035 population of 90,000 (City of Hanford, 2017). The predicted 2018 population according to the Master Plan was 60,538, which is 3,628 more than the actual population according to the American Community Survey. Given the difference between planned and actual population, the addition of the 57 residents to the water system is more

¹ The values illustrated in the chart are the gross values from the FY 2019-2020 Budget. These values represent an accurate portrayal of the departments solvency due to the municipality balancing the department's budget, also known as a "zero sum budget". All other charts in this document follow this same format.

than feasible if the City achieves the proposed goals of the Water System Master Plan to account for its anticipated future population.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.2-1 – The City operates a municipal water enterprise that services its residents.

Determination 4.1.2-2 – The City has completed and adopted a Water System Master Plan in September 2017 to better identify and improve operations of the water system and plan for future needs of the City in accordance with population projects.

Determination 4.1.2-3 – The City should monitor the well efficiencies on a frequent basis to adequately manage the groundwater supply.

Determination 4.1.2-4 – The City would be able to adequately serve the increased population of 57 residents, were the City to annex the County islands.

4.1.3 - WASTEWATER

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

The 2007 MSR identified that the City has the ability to discharge up to eight million gallons per day of treated wastewater effluent. The Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) is a two-stage trickling filter and extended aeration facility that was originally constructed in 1948 (Kings County LAFCo, 2007). Five upgrades and expansions have occurred since then, the most recent of which was in 2004.

The City initiated a program to ensure long-term reuse for treated disinfected wastewater for agricultural purposes and recharge of groundwater supplies for agriculture. The City has obtained a “Master Reclamation Permit” from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board for this purpose. Approximately 70 to 80 percent of the influent to the wastewater facility is reused for agricultural irrigation as allowed under the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Master Reclamation Permit. Effluent is used to irrigate crops on privately owned land.

Hanford’s system includes 8” to 30” pipes with 12” mains laid out on an approximate one-mile grid. Expansion will involve continued looping of lines and expansion of fire flow response facilities. The City has determined that there are few system constraints for future development.

Current Conditions

The City most recently updated their Sewer System Master Plan in 2017. The planning boundary and horizon for the Master Plan were developed in accordance with the City’s recently adopted General Plan. The Master Plan takes into consideration the population growth of the city, and documents growth assumptions and known future developments (City of Hanford, 2017).

The City’s wastewater treatment plant treats nearly 1.9 billion gallons of sewage each year. The most recent expansion upgrade in 2004 increased the treatment capacity from 5.5 to 8.0 million gallons a day, allowing the plant to serve the equivalent of over 8,000 new single-family dwellings. The expansion included a new influent pump station, head works, grit removal, oxidation ditch, and irrigation pump station, as well as several modifications to existing buildings and structures (City of Hanford, 2017).

The new irrigation pump station allows the City to discharge secondary treated disinfected effluent to Lakeside Ditch Company for crop irrigation of over 10,000 acres through a reclamation permit issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. City staff is currently in the process of developing a new long-term reclamation project agreement with Lakeside Ditch Company.

In an effort to control the high cost of effluent sludge storage and disposal, the City has budgeted to purchase a solid dewatering system, otherwise known as a centrifuge unit. This

facility will reduce the need for additional drying beds in the future. Drying time and processing the sludge will be reduced by removing liquid before final drying in the existing sludge beds. This process will allow the City to produce a Class A sludge for disposal at a licensed composting facility (City of Hanford, 2017).

The City completed an updated Sewer System Master Plan in 2017 that addressed many of the action items identified in the prior 2007 MSR. Figure 4-3 shows the extent of the existing system. Figure 4-4 shows the planned expansion in the Master Plan and will service the growth anticipated in the General Plan.


The City's sewer system services residential and non-residential lands within the service area. This service area includes:

- 6,059 acres of developed lands inside the city limits,
- 2,765 acres of undeveloped lands inside the city limits, and
- 265 acres of underutilized lands inside the city limits that are expected to redevelop.

The capacities of pump stations are evaluated and designed to meet the peak wet weather flows with one standby pump having a capacity equal to the largest operating unit. The standby pump provides a safety factor in case the duty pump malfunctions during operations and allows for maintenance.


Based on the City's topography, the sewer system is divided into six separate dendritic sewer collection basins, each defining the boundaries of a sewer collection trunk system. The following are the six major wastewater collection basins:

- The 10th Avenue Collection Basin encompasses 3,023 acres in the northeast portion of the City. This basin collects flows along 10th Avenue, starting at Encore Drive, where a 10-inch trunk conveys flow south to Lift Station 52, at the Fargo Avenue. Flows are pumped through a 6-inch force main to a 12-inch trunk beginning at Birch Avenue, where flow continues south to Lakewood Drive, where it continues as a 15-inch south to Florinda Street. At Florinda Street, the 15-inch trunk increases in size to an 18-inch trunk and continues along 10th Avenue to Fourth Street, where it turns west and continues on Fourth Street before joining the 30-inch trunk in Irwin Street.
- The 10 ½ Avenue Collection Basin encompasses 2,954 acres in the east-central part of the City. This basin collects flows generally east of 10 ½ Avenue, between Highway 198 and Houston Avenue. The main trunk begins at the intersection of Fourth Street and Irwin Street, where a 30-inch trunk crossing Highway 198 conveys flow south to a 24-inch trunk at Third Street. The pipe continues south along 10 ½ Avenue until reaching Houston Avenue where it connects a 30-inch trunk. This 30-inch trunk then conveys flow west along Houston Avenue, increasing in size to 36 inches. The 36-inch trunk then increases to a 48-inch diameter trunk at the WWTP property prior to discharge at the headworks.



Akel
Engineering
Group, Inc.

Figure 4-3
Hanford Existing Wastewater System



Akel
Engineering
Group, Inc.

Figure 4-4
Hanford Proposed Wastewater System


- The 11th Avenue Collection Basin encompasses 3,243 acres in central and north-central Hanford. This basin collects flow generally between 12th Avenue and 10th Avenue, starting at Flint Avenue and conveying flow south to Houston Avenue. Starting at Flint Avenue, flow is collected along 11th Avenue in 8-inch, 10-inch, and 12-inch pipelines before entering a 15-inch at Pepper Drive. Flow continues south in a 15-inch pipeline before increasing in size to a 24-inch trunk at Corner Street. Flow continues south along 11th Avenue before increasing in size to a 30-inch trunk at Lacey Boulevard, where it continues until joining a 39-inch trunk at Houston Avenue, where it continues to the WWTP.
- The 12th Avenue Collection Basin encompasses 4,218 acres in the western part of the City. This basin flows generally between 13th Avenue and 12th Avenue, starting at Fargo Ave and continuing south until the City WWTP. Starting at Fargo Avenue flow is collected along a 12th Avenue in a 24-inch trunk before increasing in size to a 27-inch trunk at Grangeville Boulevard. Flow continues in a 27-inch trunk south along 12th Avenue until increasing in size to a 30-inch trunk at Lacey Boulevard, where it continues to Lift Station 52 at Glendale Avenue. Flows are pumped through a 14-inch force main to Hayden Avenue, where it transitions to gravity flow in a 30-inch trunk and continues south to Hume Avenue. From Hume Avenue, flows continue south along 12th Avenue in a 33-inch trunk before turning west at Houston Avenue, where it continues to 11th Avenue. At 11th Avenue, the trunk diameter increases in size to a 39-inch, before continuing to the WWTP.
- The Irwin Collection Basin encompasses 670 acres in the central portion of the City. It is bound to the north by Terrace Drive and to the south by Third Street. The basin is generally bound to the east and west by the 10th Avenue and 11th Avenue, respectively. Starting at Terrace Drive flow is collected in a 12-inch trunk before increasing in size to a 15-inch trunk at Grangeville Boulevard. Flow continues south along Irwin Street in a 16-inch trunk at Ivy Street, which continues south to Lacey Boulevard. At Lacey Boulevard, the trunk diameter increases to a 20-inch for a short distance, before once again increasing in size to a 24-inch trunk north of Sixth Street. Flows continue south and combine with the 10 ½ Avenue collection basin at Fourth Street.
- The Industrial Area Collection Basin encompasses 4,131 acres in the southern portion of the City. This basin is bound to the north by Houston Avenue and to the south by Jackson Avenue, respectively. 12th Avenue and 9th Avenue serve as the western and eastern limits of this basin. Flows are generally conveyed by gravity along Idaho Avenue in 8-inch, 10-inch, and 15-inch gravity trunks before being conveyed to Lift Station 65, where they are pumped through a 10-inch force main to Lift Station 41. Additional flows are collected along Industry Avenue and BNSF railway and conveyed by gravity in 10-inch, 12-inch, and 15-inch trunks to Lift Station 41. Flows from tributary to Lift Station 41 and pumped from Lift Station 65 are combined at Lift Station 41, where they are pumped through a 12-inch force main to the WWTP.

The City currently maintains 21 lift stations in the sewer collection system. The oldest lift station was built in 1959, and the most recent station was built in 2004. The lift stations are operated to turn “on” or “off” based on the levels in their wet wells.

SEWER DEPARTMENT FUNDING

Within Public Works, the Sewer Department revenues are comprised of enterprise funds collected through user fees. As an enterprise fund, this service typically does not impact the General Fund as it generates revenues that can only be used to provide the identified service, in this case sewer service. Revenue budgeted for wastewater utility related activities total \$4.41 million in 2018-19, an increase of approximately 41.9 percent over the prior year’s actual revenues.

Chart 4-2
Sewer Department Revenues and Expenditures



Source: City of Hanford 2020

As shown in Chart 4-2, the department revenues have outpaced expenses in the past. The department is aware of the decline in revenue, however, the department is expecting to have sufficient funds to meet their expenditures going forward, which is supported by a solvent rate structure. Since the wastewater utility operates as an enterprise fund, the department is not dependent on General Fund and/or special revenues (City of Hanford, 2020).

ABILITY TO SERVE ANNEXED POPULATION

The City currently provides wastewater collection service to five of the eight County islands proposed to be annexed and provides wastewater disposal to seven of the eight County islands proposed to be annexed. The population of the three islands that have private wastewater collection is 367, and the population of the one island with private wastewater disposal is 109. If the City were to annex the islands, it would need to strategize a way to provide wastewater collection and disposal for an additional 476 persons.

The City's Sewer System Master Plan sought to plan for the future population of Hanford, with an anticipated 2035 population of 90,000 (City of Hanford, 2017). The predicted 2018 population according to the Plan was 60,538, which is 3,628 more than the predicted population per American Community Survey. Given the difference in estimated population, the addition of 476 residents for wastewater collection and disposal is feasible if the City achieves the proposed goals of the Sewer System Master Plan.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.3-1 – The City operates a municipal sewer enterprise that services its residents.

Determination 4.1.3-2 – The City has completed and adopted a Sewer System Master Plan in September 2017 to better identify and improve operations of the water system and plan for future needs of the City in accordance with population projects.

Determination 4.1.3-3 – The City would be able to adequately serve the increased population of 476 residents who do not already receive either wastewater collection or disposal services from the City were the City to annex the County islands. The level of service will be adequate if the City achieves its proposed goals of the Sewer System Master Plan.

4.1.4 - FIRE PROTECTION

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

Fire suppression services were reviewed by LAFCo in 2007 as part of the comprehensive MSR. The City of Hanford provides fire protection services to all the incorporated area. Since the adoption of the last MSR, a new fire station was built in 2019. The previous MSR described future capital improvements to include the construction of two additional fire stations (Stations 3 and 4 on the western portion of Hanford, and the addition of 18 fire personnel and equipment.

The previous MSR described some benefit in incorporating various departments under one “government center” to facilitate with administrative tasks and coordination. The City coordinates very closely between law enforcement and fire protection.

Current Conditions

The Hanford Fire Department provides emergency and fire protection services for residents and buildings within the city limits. Emergency services provided by the Fire Department include technical rescue, hazardous materials response, emergency medical services, and emergency disaster management.

The mission statement of the Hanford Fire Department is “to protect residents and visitors of Hanford from conditions that would pose a threat of life, environment, and property by utilizing aggressive prevention techniques and, when needed, respond to all emergencies in a safe, swift, and efficient manner” (City of Hanford, 2020). The total call volume for 2018 was 6,378. This includes medical, fire, mutual aids, and other emergency responses. The Hanford Fire Department has a total of 33 personnel (Hanford, 2020).

The General Plan does not establish a goal for a minimum fire insurance services organization (ISO) rating. The Fire ISO rating appraises cities and counties on their fire protection services (ISO rating is on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being best). The level of fire protection according to Insurance Services Office Inc., is 2 (The Sentinel, 2016).

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The City has three fire stations. Station 1 is located at 350 W. Grangeville Boulevard, Station 2 at 10553 Houston Avenue, and Station 3 at 1070 South 12th Street. Station 3 is the most recent one, built in 2019. Hanford owns an additional two sites designated for future fire stations. The first future station is planned at Centennial Drive and Berkshire Lane in the city’s northwest quadrant. An eastside fire station is also planned at 9 ¼ Avenue and Florinda street.


The current facilities were not identified as having any deficiencies during the last MSR cycle that reviewed the Fire Department infrastructure. In the Fiscal Year (FY) 2020-24 Capital

Improvement Plan (CIP) Budget, the CIP did not identify any major projects pertaining to the Fire Department facilities and its needs.

FIRE DEPARTMENT FUNDING

The Fire Department revenues are comprised of the General Fund, Grants, and Fire Department Service Fees, among other miscellaneous things. Ninety-seven percent of the budget of the Fire Department is for Fire Administration, and three percent is for Fire Prevention (City of Hanford, 2020). Revenue budgeted for the Fire Department totals \$530,500 in 2018-19, an increase of approximately 26.5 percent over the prior year's budget.

Chart 4-3
Fire Department Revenues and Expenditures



Source: City of Hanford 2020

As shown in Chart 4-3, the department is not a revenue generating department and is largely dependent on General Fund and special revenues. Of all expenditures citywide, the Fire Department comprises 7.4 percent of total expenditures (California State Controller's Office, 2018).

ABILITY TO SERVE ANNEXED POPULATION

The County is currently responsible for emergency and fire protection of the eight County islands proposed to be annexed. The population of these islands is 1,293. Were the City to

annex the islands, it would need to strategize a way to provide emergency and fire protection to the 1,293 new residents.

The City's current ISO rating is 2 (ISO rating is on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being best). Due to the City's ability to provide such services to its current population, there is no evidence indicating that the addition of 1,293 residents would be too great for the City to adequately serve. According to the Memorandum of Understanding, signed between the City of Hanford and the County of Kings in 2019, the mutual aid agreement between the fire services executed by the City and the County will not be amended. The City continues to be able to use the County's fire services in times of need, therefore the overall fire service capacity will not be affected.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.4-1 – The Hanford Fire Department provides emergency and fire protection services for residents and buildings within the city limits. Emergency services provided by the Fire Department include technical rescue, hazardous materials response, emergency medical services, and emergency disaster management.

Determination 4.1.4-2 – The City provides fire services through the use of General Fund, service fees, and other miscellaneous funds.

Determination 4.1.4-3 – The City did not have any facility upgrade projects listed in the most recently CIP.

Determination 4.1.4-4 – The City should continue to program repairs to existing facilities and continue plans for the construction of a fourth and fifth fire station in order to meet the needs of staff in order to provide a level of service acceptable to residents.

Determination 4.1.4-5 – The City should establish, maintain, and monitor a set of level-of-service criteria for fire protection services as a tool to assess the ability of the City to service growth.

Determination 4.1.4-6 – The City would be able to adequately serve the increased population of 1,293 residents, were the City to annex the County islands, due to the continued mutual aid agreement with the County.

4.1.5 - LAW ENFORCEMENT

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

Police and law enforcement services were reviewed by LAFCo in 2007 as part of the comprehensive MSR. At the time of the last MSR, the City of Hanford Police Department consisted of 71 full time personnel including forty-nine uniformed officers, and 22 non-sworn personnel. Most crimes in the City are property-oriented (i.e. theft and vandalism). The City standard for police per population is 1.5 officers per 1,000 populations. Indicator of service levels and the need for new personnel and facilities are provided by analysis of the number of service calls, response times, and population growth.

At the time of the last MSR the department provided police services to the City with 22 full time officers patrolling 29.5 square mile area 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In 2002, the department reorganized its command staff, and this change was considered to help facilitate supervision, customer service, and program accountability. At the time of this MSR there were no plans for capital improvements for additional services. The City was planning for a new police station by 2010.

Current Conditions

According to the City's General Plan Background Report, the Hanford Police Department's actual average response times are 6:30 minutes for Priority 1 Incidents with an average of 32 Priority 1 Incidents per day and a response time of 17:19 minutes for all incidents with an average of 144 incidents per day. The department seeks to maintain a response time of less than 2:30 minutes. The Hanford Police Department dispatches both for police and fire services (City of Hanford, 2014).

The new police station that the last MSR described has not yet been built. The current 8,600-square foot police station on Irwin Street was built in 1976, with a projected 20-year life span. It is now in its 44th year. The Hanford Police Department has had to expand its operation into several vacant buildings that required renovations. Buildings added to the City of Hanford's Police Department are the new Records Building, the Specialty Units Building, the Evidence Building, the two-story investigations building, and a new national guard armory that will house special police unit equipment. These expansions have all occurred in that last 10 years, according to the Police Department Chief Parker Sever (Sever, 2020). Considering these expansions, the Police Department does not forecast the acquisition and development of a new police station. Additionally, the department faces increased calls for service caused in part by AB-109 prison realignment and growing problems with gangs and drugs. Hanford's population continues to grow, as does the calls for service. In 2013, despite the growing need, the number of sworn officers was reduced from 57 to 55 (City of Hanford, 2014).

In 2020, the number of sworn officers is 62 which makes for a ratio of 1.09 police officers per 1,000 residents (assuming a total population of 56,910 residents per the American Community Survey of the U.S. Census). According to the City's General Plan, for cities with a

population the size of Hanford that are not surrounded by larger urban areas, a ratio of 1.1 to 1.2 sworn officers per 1,000 residents is typically employed.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The Police Department facility maintains its location at 425 North Irwin Street. This facility is also in close proximity to the Hanford Civic Auditorium and the Veteran's Memorial Building.

As stated before, the Hanford Police Department has identified upgrades to its police station. In the FY 2020-2024 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Budget, the CIP identified a "Police Department Parking Lot Expansion" project, with a budget of \$30,000. The source of the funding is the Police Department impact fee (City of Hanford, 2019).

CRIME STATISTICS

Crime statistics for the City were obtained from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States database and are shown in Table 4-2 below.

Table 4-2
Number of Crimes Known by Hanford Police Department

Category	2015	2016	2017	2018
Violent Offenses	315	266	284	274
Murder	1	2	2	2
Rape	23	21	28	32
Robbery	58	44	54	41
Aggravated Assault	233	199	200	199
Property Crime	2,012	1,496	1,359	1,264
Burglary	275	222	197	145
Larceny Theft	1,504	1,059	916	945
Motor vehicle Theft	233	215	246	174
Arson	5	7	21	7
Total	4,659	3,531	3,307	3,083

Source: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States,
<https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s>

Despite the growing population of the City, the total number of crimes has been going down in number since 2015. In comparison with California as a whole in 2018, violent crimes are about the same as the State average, and property offenses in Hanford are actually slightly lower than the State average (per 1,000 residents).

Table 4-3
Comparison of Crimes per 1,000 Residents (2018)


Category	Hanford	California
Violent Offenses per 1,000 residents	4.2	4.5
Property Offenses per 1,000 residents	22.2	23.8

Source: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Crime in the United States, <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s>

POLICE DEPARTMENT FUNDING

The Police Department revenues are comprised mostly of General Fund. Some other sources of revenue are various grants, court fines, and “miscellaneous revenue” as defined in the budget (City of Hanford, 2020). Expenses for police programs in 2018-19 was approximately \$13.0 million. There has not been a large increase or decrease in Police Department expenses and revenues for the past few years.

Chart 4-4
Police Department Revenues and Expenditures



Source: City of Hanford 2020As shown in Chart 4-4, the department is not a revenue generating department and is largely dependent on General Fund. Of all expenditures citywide, the Police Department comprises of approximately 66.2 percent of the public safety

expenditures, and approximately 17.6 percent of total expenditures (California State Controller's Office, 2018).

ABILITY TO SERVE ANNEXED POPULATION

The department's current staffing ratio is just shy of what the General Plan determines as adequate. The current ratio is 1.09 officers per 1,000 residents while the General Plan Background Report suggests a ratio of 1.1 to 1.2 is appropriate for similar cities of the size of Hanford. Annexation of the County islands will result in an increase in population of 1,293 persons who will need to be served by the City's Police Department. This would increase the total population to 58,203. The ratio will then be 1.06 officers per 1,000 residents. The Police Department would need to increase its total officers to 65 (hire 3 new officers) to have ratio of 1.1 officers per 1,000 residents.

According to the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Hanford and County of Kings established in 2019, The County Sheriff's Office will provide police services to the County islands for a two-year period beginning on the date of annexation of the County islands, after which time, the City will be responsible for providing such services in perpetuity. This two-year period gives the City time to hire additional officers to meet the ratio goal of sworn officers to residents.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.5-1 – The City utilizes a variety of financing sources in order to offset the expenditures utilized by law enforcement.

Determination 4.1.5-2 – The Police Department has identified upgrades to its police station and making additions as funding becomes available.

Determination 4.1.5-3 – The City should monitor crime statistics in years immediately following 2018 to determine if there is a need for additional patrol personnel to curtail the increase in crimes.

Determination 4.1.5-4 – The City's current ratio of sworn officers to residents is slightly below the ratio of 1.1 officers per 1,000 population and would be further below this ratio with the increase in population of the annexed areas. The City may need to hire additional officers or employ other strategies to achieve acceptable levels of service in conjunction with an expansion of its service area with the annexation of the eight County islands within the next two years.

4.1.6 - PARKS AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

According to the previous MSR, in 2007 the City of Hanford owned and operated 18 neighborhood parks comprising a total of 36.8 acres. The City's Recreation Department and Parks Division is responsible for operations and maintenance of the City owned parks. Eleven of the City's parks were developed in 2007. The City had three community parks (Centennial Park, Youth Athletic Complex, and Hidden Valley Park). Community parks and sports fields occupy approximately 94.2 acres within the City.

Each of the park sites contained various types of facilities, which are based on the needs of the residents served by the park, park size, and geographic characteristics. Specialized recreational facilities (e.g., tennis courts, swimming pool, ball fields) exist at seven of the City's facilities. The most common specialized facilities are lighted ballfields.

Current Conditions

According to the Human Resources Department in 2020, the Hanford Parks and Recreation Department is comprised of 26 full-time employees and 42 part-time employees. These numbers include Parks and Community Services Department employees. The departmental responsibilities include maintaining the aesthetic and recreational value of over 229.17 acres of property including parks, landscaped street medians, athletic fields, the City's urban forest, and other landscaped areas; constructing streetscape enhancement improvements within the downtown area; coordinating the City's annual Tree City U.S.A. recertification program; administering contracts and inspecting maintenance for 40 landscape assessment districts; and performing playground safety inspections and upgrading existing playgrounds. (City of Hanford, 2020).

According to the Hanford Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Master Plan of 2020, the City has 299.70 acres of parkland. This consists of approximately 154 acres of City owned parkland, 40 acres of sports complex provided at Soc-Com, and 50 percent of the 210 acres of school parks provided by the Hanford Joint Union High School District and the Hanford Elementary School District (105 acres).

The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) provides a template of typical park classifications, number of acres a system should have, and recommended service levels based on population. For a public park provider the NRPA guidelines suggest, "A park system, at a minimum, should be comprised of a 'core' system of park lands, with a total of 9.9 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 population" (National Recreation and Park Association, 2020).. According to the 2020 Parks Master Plan, the City has 5.06 park acres per 1,000 residents. If the NRPA guidelines were being met, Hanford should have approximately 563 acres of park land. The park inventory deficiency would be 263.acres. The shortfalls do not take into consideration church properties, private schools, or those outside the boundaries of the City of Hanford.

Table 4-4
Parkland within Hanford by Type (City of Hanford, 2020)

Category	Acres
Mini Parks	15.6
Neighborhood/School Parks	19.2
Sports Complex	57.2
Community Parks	54.9
Special Use Parks	7.1
Indoor Facility	0.52
School Playfield	136.5 ²
Developed Parkland	309.9

Note: This inventory consists of parkland only provided by the City of Hanford

According to the General Plan, the calculation for the parkland ratio has been updated. When determining the parkland ratio of acres per 1,000 population, City policy is to include the acreage of city-owned mini, neighborhood, community, regional, special use, and stormwater basin parks, along with 50 percent of the acreage of school playgrounds and play areas within the Planned Area Boundary (City of Hanford, 2017). All school sites have limited public access since their primary purpose is to support their educational mission. These facilities are sometimes accessible to the public after school hours. According to the General Plan, there are 210 acres of school playfields in the City, of which 105 acres, or 50 percent of 210 acres, is calculated in the total developed parkland of the City. By using this calculation as outlined in the General Plan, the City's current park ratio is 5.06 acres per 1,000 residents. This ratio is still below the NRPA's goal of 9.9 but it does meet the City's goal set in their General Plan, which is 3.5 acres per 1,000 residents.³

According to the California Department of Parks and Recreation, the City currently has approximately 63 percent of its residents living more than a half mile from park facilities (California Department of Parks and Recreation, 2015). A half-mile walking radius is considered the maximum distance for viable walkable access to facilities, according to the American Planning Association. Additionally, the State also states that 75 percent of the City's residents live in areas with less than three acres of parks or open space per 1,000 residents. As a result, it would appear that most of the City may be somewhat inconsistent with the General Plan policy for providing park space at a ratio of 3.5 acres per 1,000 residents within a half mile, however, the State did not take into consideration the 105 acres of school playfield space that the City considers in its parkland ratio calculation. Lastly, the

² School Playfield parkland was calculated by taking 50% of the acreage of school playgrounds and play areas within the Planned Area Boundary. This calculation was originally established in the General Plan

³ According to the General Plan, Goal 09 of Section 5.7 (Parks and Recreation), Parks are to be provided at a combined ratio of 3.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

General Plan policy is applied citywide and is found to be in compliance, but, the City could strive to more evenly distribute park and open space areas to increase access throughout the City to residents, as shown by the California Department of Parks and Recreation statistics.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The City currently operates and maintains the following park facilities (City of Hanford, 2014):

- Mini-Park
 - Airport Park
 - Encore Park
 - Gateway Park
 - Glacier Park
 - Hye Park
 - Lakewood Park
 - Quail Run Estates
 - Quail Park
 - Sherwood Park
 - Vineyard Park
- Neighborhood Parks
 - Coe Park
 - Earl F. Johnson Park
 - Lacey Park
 - Redwood Park
 - Vineyard Park
 - Independence Park
 - Silver Oaks Park
- Community/Special Use Park
 - Bob Hill Youth Athletic Complex
 - Centennial Park
 - Civic and Courthouse Grounds
 - Freedom Park
 - Hidden Valley Park
- Regional/Special Use Park
 - Hanford Joint Use Softball Complex
 - BMX Track
 - Hanford Adult Learning Center/Softball Complex
 - Harris Street Ball Park
 - The Plunge and Ford Hill Skate Park
 - Rotary Field
- Indoor Facility
 - Civic Center
 - Coe Hall
 - Goodwill Senior Center
 - Longfield Center
 - Old Courthouse
 - St. Brigids' Teen Center
 - Veterans-Senior Center

Within these facilities, the City also maintains additional recreational facilities, such as basketball courts, soccer and baseball/softball fields, and tennis and volleyball courts.

In the FY 2020-24 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Budget, the CIP identified 11 projects for the Parks and Recreation Department for five years (City of Hanford, 2020). The total cost of all the projects is \$8,932,000. The three funding sources for the projects are park impact fees, accumulated capital outlay, and refuse capital. Eight projects are planned to be achieved in the 2020/2021 fiscal year. These improvements are described below:


- Park Development Oversizing Requirements (\$150,000 per year for five years)
 - These funds will be used to reimburse developers for costs associated with park construction in excess of their park impact fee assessment.

- ADA Parks/Recreation Modifications (\$35,000 per year for five years)
 - These funds will be used to upgrade the parks and recreation facilities to conform with ADA requirements. Improvements will include modifications to restroom and playground facilities, installation of concrete pathways to various facilities and purchase of handicap accessible picnic equipment and tables.
- Park Refuse Enclosures – Civic Park (\$42,000)
 - Construction of a concrete block trash enclosure at the Old Courthouse Parking Lot, which is currently an old dilapidated wooden enclosure.
- Street Median Landscape Renovation (\$150,000 in 2020 and 2022 - \$300,000 total)
 - Remove the existing landscaping and terminate the irrigation to install stamped concrete in the turn pockets until the width of the landscape area is a minimum of 8 feet in width. Project will upgrade portions of median islands as funding allows with new plant materials and landscape bark.
- New Pocket Park (\$390,000)
 - Design and construct a new small park at the site of the Old Fire Station located at Lacey Boulevard and Kaweah Street.
- Centennial Park Pathway Construction Project (\$230,000)
 - Upgrade and construct an all connecting eight (8') foot wide concrete sidewalk/pathway and address ADA accessibility from Hanford-Armona Road into the park and connect to all amenities to include picnic arbors, splash pad, playgrounds, dog facilities, and restrooms.
- New Playground at Civic Park (\$285,000)
 - Design and construct a new playground adjacent to the Carousel at the Civic Park to increase activity within the Park

PARKS AND COMMUNITY SERVICES DEPARTMENT FUNDING

The Parks and Recreation Department revenues are comprised of General Fund, various grants, and donations. Total expenditures for each year are based on maintenance of parks, facilities management, youth and adult services, and construction of new parks (City of Hanford, 2020).

Chart 4-5
Parks and Recreation Department Revenues and Expenditures



Source: City of Hanford 2020

As shown in Chart 4-5, the department generates a small percent of the revenues needed for department and is still dependent on General Fund revenues and grants. Of all expenditures citywide, the Parks and Recreation Department comprised 6.07 percent of total expenditures (California State Controller's Office, 2018).

ABILITY TO SERVICE ANNEXED POPULATION

The County islands proposed to be annexed are not served by the City regarding parkland. Parks are a more difficult service to analyze, as the residents of the County islands already have access to the parks, as they are all public parks. The addition of the 1,293 persons to the City will, however, decrease the parkland ratio of acres per 1,000 population.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.6-1 – The City actively maintains parks and provides recreational services to the residents of Hanford.

Determination 4.1.6-2 – Parks and recreational facilities within the City amount to approximately 309.9 acres of land. This amounts to a ratio of roughly 5.4 acres per 1,000 persons (based on 2020 population estimate of 56,910), which meets the standard identified in the City's Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Determination 4.1.6-3 – The City utilizes the Capital Improvement Plan to maintain and repair its numerous recreational facilities within the city limits to promote an active lifestyle to its residents.

Determination 4.1.6-4 – The City’s General Plan and Parks Master Plan both identified a need for additional park and recreation space to serve residents of the City.

Determination 4.1.6-5 – The City’s current parkland ratio of acres per 1,000 population is below the NRPA’s guidelines and will be even more so with the addition of the population of the eight County islands.

Determination 4.1.6-6 - The City may need to employ strategies such identification of new parks in the Capital Improvement Program or obtaining grant funds for additional facilities to achieve adopted levels of service in conjunction with an expansion of its service area with the annexation of the eight County islands in order to reach the goals of the General Plan.

Determination 4.1.6-7 – The City should strive to improve proximity and distribution of parks and open space throughout the City so that all areas of the City meet the General Plan goal of 3.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

4.1.7 - ROAD MAINTENANCE

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

Road Maintenance was not reviewed by LAFCo in 2007 as part of the Roads and Circulation section of the comprehensive MSR.

Current Conditions

The Hanford Public Works Department is responsible for maintaining the City's roads through its Street Division. The Street Division provides maintenance of more than 207 centerline miles of roadway and all of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk within the City's jurisdiction (City of Hanford, 2020). The Street Maintenance Division performs nearly 500,000 square feet of cape seal treatment, 325,000 square feet of residential slurry seal treatment, 30,000 square feet of deep patching, and applies more than 200,000 pounds of crack seal each fiscal year. In addition to traditional roadway improvements, the Street Maintenance Division installs approximately 1500 linear feet of curb and gutter and 30,000 square feet of sidewalk each year. The division has two more specific programs:

Street Sweeping Program

The City sweeps the residential streets once a week and the downtown area on a five-day-a-week basis. Each year approximately 30,000 centerline miles of streets are swept (City of Hanford, 2020). This program also assists in the implementation of the Stormwater Management Plan by keeping dirt and debris out of the City's basins and canals.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The FY 2020-24 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Budget includes several projects that would provide upgrades to existing road infrastructure and help plan for future projects (City of Hanford, 2020). Funding sources for these projects include: Gas Taxes; Transportation Impact Fees; Storm, Wastewater, and Water Capital; and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality. These improvements are described below:

- Sidewalk and Miscellaneous Concrete Repairs (\$40,000/year for all five years)
 - These funds will be used to repair sidewalks, drive approaches, and other concrete improvements where City crews will be completing street reconstruction projects or in areas where the improvements are damaged by tree roots.
- New Sidewalk and ADA Improvements (\$50,000/year for all five years)
 - These funds will be used to install sidewalks and other concrete improvements in areas currently void of such improvements.


- Street Division Maintenance (\$450,000/year for all five years)
 - Street maintenance is performed by the Public Works Street Maintenance Division through the City's General Fund. This project account is established to record that portion of annual street maintenance which will be allocated to gas tax funds.
- Unscheduled Arterial Upgrades & Traffic Signal Installation (\$200,000/year for all five years)
 - This fund will be used to reimburse developers who are required to construct qualifying arterial street improvements that exceed their project's transportation mitigation impact fee share.
- Survey Monumentation/Mapping (\$15,000/year for all five years)
 - These funds will be used to re-establish survey monumentation on street re-surfacing projects and to update the survey benchmark datum and mapping
- Pavement Resurfacing Treatment (\$1,200,000 in 2020, \$950,000 2021-2024)
 - Pavement Resurfacing Treatment is a surface protection and pavement preservation treatment for City streets. The treatments will extend the useful life of asphalt concrete pavement surfaces thereby reducing street maintenance costs. The project will provide surface treatment for approximately seven miles of roadways.
- East Lacey Boulevard Widening/Reconstruction, 10th Avenue to Sierra Drive (\$9,610,000)
 - This project will involve the widening and reconstruction of East Lacey Boulevard, between 10th Avenue and Sierra Drive, to facilitate two lanes in each direction of travel plus turn lanes. This project will improve traffic flow capacity and safety by providing additional travel lanes and a protected left turn lane and the installation of a traffic signal system at the intersection of East Lacey Boulevard/Ninth Avenue.
- 12th Avenue Widening, Springcrest St. to 500 feet south – West side (\$290,000)
 - This project will involve the installation of curb, gutter, sidewalk, and roadway widening along 12th Avenue (west side), from Springcrest Street to a point approximately 500 feet south of Springcrest Street. This project will improve traffic flow capacity and safety by providing an additional travel lane and installing curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street lighting improvements
- Traffic Signal at 12th Avenue and Hume Avenue (\$453,000)

- This project will consist of the installation of a traffic signal system at the intersection of 12th Avenue and Hume Avenue. This project will increase traffic flow efficiency and reduce intersection congestion by allowing more free flow traffic movements through the intersection.

ROAD MAINTENANCE FUNDING

Road maintenance is generally funded and scheduled through the City's CIP. Street maintenance revenues are comprised of the General Fund and special revenues. The actual revenue budgeted for streets totaled \$54,830 in 2018-19, an increase of approximately 17 percent over the prior year's actual revenue. This increase is the result of planned capital and infrastructure projects.

Chart 4-6
Street Division Revenues and Expenditures



Source: City of Hanford 2020

As shown in Chart 4-6, the department generates all the revenues needed for street services through special revenues. Of all expenditures citywide, the Street Services Division comprises 2.9 percent of total expenditures (California State Controller's Office, 2018).

ABILITY TO SERVE ANNEXED POPULATION

The County islands proposed to be annexed are currently not served by City street maintenance. The City's Street Division of the Public Works Department has been adequate for many years, with a balanced budget and adequate funding for the Capital Improvement

Programs. Due to the City's ability to provide such services to its current population, there is no evidence indicating that the addition of 1,293 residents would be too great for the City to adequately serve.

Additionally, according to the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Hanford and County of Kings established in 2019, the County will request that the Kings County Association of Governments (KCAG) annually allocate \$125,000 in regional transportation funding, which would normally be transferred to the County, to the City for a period of two years. The total cumulative amount allocated to the City shall not exceed \$250,000. The City shall use the Annual Payments, if so, allocated by KCAG, for road maintenance costs within the County islands. This will help with any previously unknown costs associated with the addition of such roadways.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.7-1 – The City actively maintains the existing road systems and provides street sweeping within the city limits.

Determination 4.1.7-2 – The City utilizes a Capital Improvement Plan and reimbursements from the Gas Tax to aid in the repair and maintenance of existing roadways within the city limits.

Determination 4.1.7-3 – The City would be able to adequately serve the increased population of 1,293 residents, were the City to annex the County islands.

4.1.8 - FLOOD CONTROL/DRAINAGE

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

The 2007 MSR identified that stormwater drainage is accomplished in the City through a system of curbs and gutters, and a limited number of stormwater collection lines and stormwater drainage basins. Controlled discharge from drainage basins are allowed into designated canals owned and operated by People's Ditch Company irrigation canal. Hanford has relied on surface drainage systems to contain and transport stormwater run-off. During normal storm events drainage systems function at an acceptable level of service. The City's Planning Area lies outside any major flood prone areas, per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). There are small localized areas within the Planning Area where it is shown within the 100-year flood plain.

Flood inundation from potential dam failure could result from Terminus Dam, Success Lake Dam, and Pine Flat Dam (located in the Sierra Nevada east of the valley floor on the Kaweah, Tule, and Kings River). Additional improvements made to other flood control facilities in the Kings County area, have significantly reduced local natural flood hazards.


According to the Army Corps of Engineers inundation maps for Kings County, a breach by any of the dams listed above will not affect the City of Hanford. Through the City's General Plan, the City Council has adopted runoff/discharge policies that have strict controls to meet the National Pollution Discharge Elimination system for development projects.

Current Conditions

According to the City's website, the storm drainage system consists of 30 pump stations, 56 miles of pipelines ranging in size from six inches to 60 inches, 138 inverted siphons, 974 drainage inlets, and 181 acres of drainage basins and drainage ditches. The storm drainage system removes rainfall from surface streets and disposes the accumulated stormwater in drainage basins (City of Hanford, 2020).


The City completed an updated Storm Drainage Master Plan in 2017 that updated much of the information identified in the prior 2007 MSR. The City's water system services residential and non-residential lands within the city limits. The service area includes 6,059 net acres of developed lands, 2,765 net acres of undeveloped lands, and 265 net acres of underutilized lands inside the city limits (City of Hanford, 2017). The City's General Plan anticipates approximately 16,900 net acres of residential and non-residential development at ultimate buildout of the Planned Area Boundary. A map of the existing storm drainage system is shown in Figure 4-5. The Master Plan to service the area planned for development in the General Plan is shown in Figure 4-6.

The modeled storm drainage system includes approximately 65 miles of stormwater conveyance to local retention systems or ditches. Pipes range from 8 inches to 60 inches in diameter. The storm conveyance system is predominantly composed of 12-, 15-, and 18-inch pipelines (City of Hanford, 2017).



Akel
Engineering
Group, Inc.

Figure 4-5
Hanford Existing Storm Drainage System



Akel
Engineering
Group, Inc.

Figure 4-6
Hanford Proposed Storm Drainage System

The City currently operates approximately 60 detention and retention basins. These facilities include slough remnants. The other basins located within the existing service area are man-made detention and retention facilities, and serve as dedicated stormwater receiving facilities, or dual-purpose park facilities, that can fill with excess stormwater runoff during the wet season. These drainage basins range in size from approximately 3.5 acre-feet (AF) to 94 AF (City of Hanford, 2017).

The City currently owns and operates 30 pump stations within the city limits. The pump stations vary in size and discharge to varying locations, which include canals, pipelines, and other conveyance facilities located throughout the City (City of Hanford, 2017).

Some facilities were identified as needing improvements in the Storm Drainage System Master Plan. After evaluation of the system, 12 basins were identified as needing new pipes, four existing retention basins needed to be expanded, and one lift station needed to be replaced. The future system improvements identified were 14 new pipes and 14 new retention basins (City of Hanford, 2017).

In the FY 2020-2024 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Budget, the CIP identified 11 projects that would provide some upgrades to existing facilities. The funding for these projects will come from the City's storm drainage capital and storm drainage impact fees. Total cost of all the projects for the five-year period is \$2,431,450, which will be entirely funded by the capital and impact fees mentioned above (City of Hanford, 2020).

These improvements are described below:

- Curb and Gutter Installation (\$20,000/year for all five years)
 - Installation of new or replacement of concrete curb & gutter to facilitate proper street drainage. Projects may include replacement of existing dilapidated curbs & gutter or installation of new curb & gutter in existing developed areas currently void of these improvements.
- Increase Flow Capacity of Main Branch of People's Ditch (\$25,000/year for all five years)
 - The City has drainage rights with People's Ditch Company which allows discharge in People's Ditch under certain parameters. Projects would be performed in cooperation with People's Ditch Company and would include culvert repair/enlargements, ditch realignment and piping, turn-out basins, control structure modifications, and additional ditch maintenance.
- Storm Drainage System Oversizing Requirements (\$50,000/year for all five years)
 - The City reimburses developers that are required to upsize their storm drainage improvements to provide additional capacity in compliance with the Storm Drainage Master Plan.


- Gate Crossing Security/Locks (\$18,450)
 - The City is responsible for all crossings and intersections between any City street or other ditch crossing, including fences, bridges, pipelines, or other appurtenances. The proposed tamper proof locks will prevent the cutting of locks along the ditch line and greatly reduce liability for the City of Hanford.
- Bonneyview Basin – Sand Slough Basin (\$262,500)
 - The Bonney View Estates Basin is inter-connected with the Sand Slough Basin to the north and the Live Oak Basin to the south and ultimately to the Houston/Iona Basin. This project is necessary to increase system reliability and increase the amount of storm runoff water that can be captured by both rainfall and diversions from People's Ditch.
- Tree Trim/Removal Program (\$690,000)
 - Many of the ponding basins have trees which prohibit the maintenance of the basin slopes and bottoms. The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System requires certain maintenance and testing. This program, implementing over the next couple of years, will remove trees to allow proper maintenance and prevent future growth.
- Mussel Slough/Laura Ln. Pump Installation (\$187,500)

This project consists of equipping the YMCA Basin with an electrical service, control panel, pump, diversion gates, and connection to existing piping for dewatering the basin to accommodate additional development and routine maintenance. This project will provide for dewatering of the basin and installation of new diversion gates to provide routine maintenance, assist in mosquito abatement activities, and increase storage capacity.

FLOOD CONTROL/DRAINAGE DEPARTMENT FUNDING

The Storm Drainage Operations is a division of the Public Works Department. Revenues are comprised of service fees. Fiscal Year 2016-17 saw a slight increase in expenditures. This is due to a slight increase in Personnel Services, according to the budget (City of Hanford, 2020).

Chart 4-7
Storm Drainage Operations Revenues and Expenditures



Source: City of Hanford 2020

As shown in Chart 4-7, the department revenues outpace expenses in order to fund capital projects. Since the Flood Control Department does operate as an enterprise fund, the department is not solely dependent on General Fund and special revenues. In the proposed budget for 2018-19, Storm Drainage expenditures comprised approximately 3.4 percent of the City's budget, which is an increase from approximately 1.5 percent in 2017-18 (City of Hanford, 2020). This is likely due to the number of projects in the CIP for the year 2020. The storm drain projects account for 6 percent of the total Capital Improvement Projects in FY 2019-2020.

ABILITY TO SERVE ANNEXED POPULATION

The County is currently responsible for stormwater drainage in the eight County islands proposed to be annexed. Were the City to annex the islands, it would provide storm drainage services to the 1,293 new residents.

According to the City's Storm Drain Master Plan, the Plan anticipates necessary growth of the system due to the growth of the City. One of the tasks of the Plan was to document growth planning assumptions and known existing neighborhoods, such as the islands, and future developments (City of Hanford, 2017). The planning boundary and horizon for the Master Plan were developed in accordance with the City's recently adopted General Plan. Based on General Plan population projections, the addition of the 1,293 residents to the stormwater

residents is feasible as long as the City achieves the proposed goals of the Storm Drainage Master Plan in order to account for its anticipated future population.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.8-1 – The City provides municipal storm drainage services for its residents.

Determination 4.1.8-2 – The City has completed and adopted a Storm Drainage Master Plan in 2017 to better identify and improve operations of the storm drainage system and plan for future needs of the City in accordance with population projections.

Determination 4.1.8-3 – The City would be able to adequately serve the increased population of 1,293 residents, were the City to annex the County islands, as long as the City achieves its proposed goals of the Storm Drainage Master Plan.

4.1.9 - PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

Transit services were reviewed by LAFCo in 2007 as part of the Roads and Circulation section of the comprehensive MSR.

According to the previous MSR, the City of Hanford and surrounding areas provide and are served by a number of public, private, and social service transportation organizations. The social service transportation organizations were not discussed in the 2007 MSR.

Kings Area Rural Transit (KART) is the largest provider of public transit services within Kings County. KART serves the transit needs throughout Kings County and parts of adjacent counties. The fixed route provides transit service between the cities of Avenal, Armona, Lemoore, Naval Air Station Lemoore, Visalia, Corcoran, Stratford, Kettleman City, and Hanford, which is the KART hub for the County. At the time of the previous MSR (2007), KART was estimated to serve 47,000 riders per month (Kings County LAFCo, 2007).

KART also provides Dial-A-Ride services for residents traveling more than a half mile from an existing bus route for those riders certified by KART as disabled. Dial-A-Ride (door to door) service is available Monday through Friday between 11:00 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. All rides from home must be scheduled one day in advance.

Private transit Services are provided in Hanford by three taxi-cab services (Hanford taxi, Marathon Cab, and Central Valley Cab). Orange Belt States provide east/west bus services and offers a daily scheduled bus service four times a day to Goshen and Visalia, one bus per day to Paso Robles and Fresno. Greyhound provides the link to the coastal communities and northern and southern destinations.

Current Conditions

The largest single provider of public transportation within Kings County is operated by Kings County Area Public Transit Agency (KCAPTA), a Joint Powers Agency comprised of the County and the cities of Hanford, Lemoore, and Avenal. KCAPTA oversees the operation of the Kings Area Rural Transit (KART) system. KCAPTA establishes the operating policies and defines the services to be provided by KART including service hours and days, fares, and routes (Tulare County Association of Governments, 2018). KART provides transportation services to Armona, Avenal, Corcoran, Grangeville, Hardwick, Hanford, Kettleman City, Laton, Lemoore, Naval Air Station Lemoore, and Stratford. KART Paratransit is available to eligible certified ADA passengers. In addition, KART provides regular transportation service to Fresno and Visalia (Kings Area Rural Transit, 2020).

KART provides Hanford with six interconnected half hours routes, regular service to most other communities in the County and weekday service to Visalia. Dial-A-Ride (demand response) service is available for only those residents of Hanford, Lemoore, Armona, and Avenal traveling more than half of a mile from an existing fixed bus route or for those riders

certified by KART as disabled. There is also a Hanford-Fresno fixed route within fourteen vehicles that runs every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, with limited service on Saturdays.

FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The existing KART Transit Station in Hanford is located adjacent to the Hanford Amtrak Station. Approximately 2,000 riders access the station each day (Mott Macdonald, 2018). All but two KART bus routes service the station and are all timed to meet the station in 30-minute loops. There are currently nine fixed routes that circulate throughout Hanford. At least four commuter routes to outlying areas, including intercounty services, also circulate through the KART terminal. The scheduled bus service operates Monday through Friday from 6:30 a.m. to 9:45 p.m. with partial Saturday service.

Facility and infrastructure were not discussed during the last MSR cycle that reviewed Public Transportation. The Kings County Area Public Transit Agency has considered constructing a new larger transit station in downtown Hanford. An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project was released in November of 2019.

Hanford is also one city of multiple cities (and the County) that contribute to the operation of KART. KART or public transportation were not included in the FY 2019/2020 budget. The City's General Plan describes two public transit goals and seven policies pertaining to public transit. The two goals are:

1. A citywide and regional transportation system that has the downtown as its hub; and
2. A convenient and efficient transit system that serves as an alternate to automobile travel and meets basic transportation needs of the transit dependent.

The policies in the General Plan pertaining to public transportation are:

- Adequate Transit Service Availability
 - Maintain a proactive working partnership with KART to ensure that adequate public transit service is available.
- KART Expansion
 - Pursue improvements and funding to increase transit ridership, increase transit frequencies on key corridors, and expand regular transit service in portion of Hanford that currently have no public transit.
- Transit Stops
 - Where right-of-way allows, arterial and major collector streets shall be designed to allow transit vehicles to pull out of the travel land when stopping.

- Improve Access to Transit Stops
 - Remove physical barriers to improve access to transit facilities for the elderly, disabled, and other transit-dependent groups.
 - Long Range Transit Plan
 - Coordinate and collaborate with KART and KCAG on development of long-range transit plan that considers special emphasis on new or enhanced transit services and amenities in the downtown core, and service to identified mixed use neighborhoods and corridors.
 - Vanpool Programs
 - Support the KART vanpool program for the area's farmworkers and other commuters.

TRANSIT FUNDING

The City of Hanford's FY 2019/2020 budget did not include funds for public transportation. According to KART's 2019-2020 budget, most of the funding for KART comes from fares, collection of local taxes and federal funds. The City of Hanford is not listed as a source of revenue.

ABILITY TO SERVE ANNEXED POPULATION

The City will not need to serve the newly annexed population with regard to public transportation, as public transportation is currently provided to the City by the County, through the KART system. The County islands will continue to be served by the KART system.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.9-1 – The City, in conjunction with other cities and Kings County, provides fixed route and dial-a-ride service to its residents within the city limits and urban area boundary through the Kings Area Rural Transit (KART) system.

Determination 4.1.9-3 – The City's transit capital and service goals and policies are identified in the City of Hanford General Plan.

Determination 4.1.9-3 – The City will continue to utilize the public transportation system provided by the County through KART and will not have an increased number of persons served with the annexation of the County islands.

4.1.10 - SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

Summary of Prior MSR Findings

Solid waste services were reviewed by LAFCo in 2007 as part of the comprehensive MSR. At the time of the previous MSR (2007), there were no active solid waste disposal facilities within the Planning Area. The Kings Waste Management Authority (KCWMA) was formed in September 1998 by agreement between the cities of Hanford, Lemoore, Corcoran, and the County of Kings in order to provide a regional approach to all waste management activities in Kings County. Solid waste from the City of Hanford is transported to the Kings Waste and Recycling Authority (KWRA) Materials Recovery Facility in Hanford.

The existing KWRA landfill southeast of the City of Hanford was closed in 1998. The KWRA does not operate an active landfill. Waste is hauled by transfer trucks from the Material Recover Facility (MRF) to the State permitted Chemical Waste Management Landfill site in Kettleman Hills (45 miles southwest of the MRF).

The landfill is inspected on a monthly basis. The permitted capacity is 4,200,000 million cubic yards and remaining capacity is 1,901,860 million cubic yards. The permitted throughput tons/day and the estimated closure date of the landfill was 2010. Residential customers pay a flat rate for services, and commercial rates are based on size of pickups per week.

Current Conditions

The City continues to provide refuse collection, along with segregated green waste and recyclable collection within the incorporated limits of the City and in designated County areas. Hanford still participates in the Kings Waste and Recycling Authority. The Authority has a five-member Board, which has one representative from each of the City Council and two representatives of the Kings County Board of Supervisors. The Authority also has seven staff members.


FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The facility that was described in the previous MSR as needing to be closed in 2010 was instead expanded. The facility's permit was modified in 2014 to allow for the construction and operation of Landfill B-18 Phase III. On August 27, 2019 the EPA proposed an approval (permit) for the Kettleman Hill Facility to be able to store, treat for disposal, and dispose of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) waste (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2020).

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL FUNDING

The Refuse Operation Fund is an enterprise fund primarily funded by user fees. Waste Disposal Department budgeted expenditures totaled \$7.51 million in 2018-19, up 7.66 percent from 2017-18.

Chart 4-8
Refuse Operations Revenues and Expenditures



Source: City of Hanford 2020

As shown in Chart 4-8, refuse operations had a surplus in revenue in years 2015 to 2018. Expenditures have been increasing from Year 2015 to 2018 illustrates an increase in expenditures, resulting in the department to add \$335,473 of contributions from its cash reserve in order to zero out the 2017 to 2018 budget. The projected budget increased 15 percent from 2016 to 2017 and then another 15 percent from 2017 to 2018. According to the FY 2019/2020 budget, the increase is likely due to personnel services (City of Hanford, 2019).

ABILITY TO SERVE ANNEXED POPULATION

Solid waste collection in the County island is currently optional. Due to the Kings Waste and Recycling Authority's Joint Power Authority, there will be no change in service for the County or the City.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.10-1 – The City provides residents and commercial properties with solid waste collection and disposal through a JPA with Kings Waste and Recycling Authority.

Determination 4.1.10-2 – The City’s Refuse Operations revenues and expenditures have been balanced.

Determination 4.1.10-3 – The City should continue to participate in the joint powers authority and review the rates established to ensure they provide equal levels of service to throughout the service area.

Determination 4.1.10-3 – The City will continue to utilize the Joint Power Authority with the Kings Waste and Recycling Authority, and there will be no change of service by the County or City with the annexation of the County islands.

4.1.11 - PLANS FOR FUTURE SERVICES

The City's General Plan has calculated growth rate projections. The growth rate projection has major implications on the amount of land that will be designated for future growth and the ability for current services to accommodate that growth. The General Plan quantified a few methods to anticipate Hanford's future population.

The first method was the Straight-Line Growth Rate Method, which estimated the population of Hanford to be 107,100 or 102,4000 in the year 2035. The second method was the Proportion of Projected County Growth Method, which estimated the population of Hanford to be 83,500 in 2035 with an annual growth rate of 1.8 percent. As the two methods provided varying population projections, it was decided that the General Plan would plan for a future population of 90,000 people in 2035, which translates roughly into a 2.1 percent average annual growth rate (City of Hanford, 2014).

The Water, Sewer, and Storm Drain Master Plans also utilized these population projections of the General Plan when accounting for the anticipated future level of service. Therefore, implementation of these Master Plans would properly provide the adequate extension of services to the growth areas of the City, namely the additional population of the County islands and the areas in the proposed Sphere of Influence.

One of the policies of the General Plan (Policy L16) is to consider the initiation of annexation of land into the City of Hanford when the following criteria are met (City of Hanford, 2014):

1. The land is within the Primary Sphere of Influence;
2. The capacity of the water, sewer, fire, school, and police services are adequate to service the area to be annexed or will be adequate at the time that development occurs;
3. Land for development within the city limits is insufficient to meet the current land use needs; and
4. The territory to be annexed is contiguous to existing development areas.

In all, the City has done ample infrastructure planning to accommodate growth projections in the City. The infrastructure documents mentioned above also include improvements and recommendations needed to improve any possible deficits in water, sewer, and storm drainage capacity within the existing systems.

Determinations

Determination 4.1.11-1 – The City's General Plan and subsequent Water, Sewer, and Storm Master Plans have calculated and planned for service accommodation for the future population of the City.

Determination 4.1.11-2 - Present needs for public facilities and services are currently being met. Probable needs for public facilities and services are not currently anticipated to vary from present needs, as future demands are expected to remain relatively the same.

Population increases are not currently anticipated to affect the City's ability to provide of services as growth is anticipated within the General Plan.

Determination 4.1.11-3 – Implementation of Master Plans would properly provide the adequate extension of services to the County islands, were they to be annexed.

4.2 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

This section analyzes the financial structure and health of the City of Hanford with respect to the provision of services. Included in this analysis is the consideration of rates, service operations, and the like, as well as other factors affecting the City's financial health and stability, including factors affecting the financing of needed infrastructure improvements and services.

An examination of financing includes an evaluation of the fiscal impacts of potential development, and probable mechanisms to finance needed improvements and services. Evaluating these issues is important to ensure new development does not excessively burden existing infrastructure and the ability of the City to fund existing improvements and services.

An examination of rate restructuring should identify impacts on rates and fees for services and facilities and recognize opportunities to positively impact rates without decreasing service levels. The focus of this required element of the MSR is whether there are viable options to increase the city's efficiency through rate restructuring prior to any city limit or SOI adjustment.

Annual audit reports and financial statements for the City were reviewed in accordance with the MSR Guidelines. The purpose of this review is to determine fiscal viability, suitability of current funding practices, and potential fiscal impacts resulting from new legislation.

4.2.1 - CITY BUDGET

The FY 2019-2020 Budget reflects the City Council's goals and continues funding sufficiently to maintain basic service levels. The budget is built upon guiding policies and is prepared in stages by fund type, allowing each fund's budget to be presented to City Council and discussed individually. The City's projected revenue for all funds in 2020 is \$70.9M. The projected expenditures in 2020 total \$65.46M (City of Hanford, 2019). The surplus in 2020 is likely to compensate for the deficit of the budget in 2019 (\$68.56 revenues and \$74.07 expenditures). The surplus in 2020 and the deficit in 2019 are quite similar, rounding to \$5.5 million each.

The City did not identify any major factors and obstacles affecting the FY 2019-2020 budget. The City did, however, list a series of budget strategies and fiscal policies, including flexible and cost-effective responses, contingency reserves, appropriation control, debt management, and fees.

The two primary sources of revenue for the City consist of the sales tax and property tax, which combined, total 72 percent of the General Fund revenue for the City (City of Hanford, 2019). Other revenue sources include licenses, permits, and fines. The City also pursues additional sources of funding from outside agencies with grants.

The primary sources of expenses for the City are the Police and Fire Department, when combined, total 62 percent of General Fund expenses for the City (City of Hanford, 2019). Other expenses include the Public Works Department (Admin/Engineering & Street Maintenance), and Parks and Recreation. Within these expenses, the salaries and benefits of all employees are included.

Overall, the City has adopted policies and strategies that drive the development of a sound budgetary structure. The City maintains goals and performance measures to gauge their effectiveness from year to year.

4.2.2 - RATES AND FEES

The City periodically sets rates and fees for various services it provides through the Master Fee Schedule. The most current fee schedule was updated in 2020. The listed fees include:

- Building permit fees for review and inspection,
- Fire inspection fees,
- Planning and environmental review fees,
- Engineering review and inspection fees,
- Code violation fines,
- Business license fees,
- Police service and various permit fees, and
- Development impact fees.

4.2.3 - PROPOSITION 218

Proposition 218 (Prop 218) restricts local government's ability to impose assessment and property related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue raising methods. This initiative, approved in 1996, applies to nearly 7,000 cities, counties, special districts, schools, community college districts, redevelopment agencies, and regional organizations. It ensures that all new taxes and most charges on property owners are subject to voter approval and especially to the tools of using property related fees to fund governmental services instead of property related services. Of potential concern is the long-term effect the proposition has created in a local government's ability to fill the growing divide between infrastructure needs and the provision of governmental services for the new infrastructure.

In 2014, a city sales tax increase, Measure S, was voted down by Hanford voters. Measure S would have raised Hanford's sales tax rate from 7.5 percent to 8.5 percent, bring about \$159 million of revenue over the measure's 20-year lifespan. It had been proposed that 70 percent

of the proceeds would have been used to bolster police and fire services. The rest was to be spent to improve services including parks maintenance and street repairs (Eiman, 2014).

4.2.4 - OPPORTUNITIES FOR RATE/FEE RESTRUCTURING

The City's Fee Schedule is subject to periodic comprehensive revisions and updates. The fee schedule was last updated in January of 2020 (City of Hanford, 2020). The City's Financial Budget Policies include the following revenue policy to ensure that rates and fees are adequate to cover the costs associated with the operations and infrastructure needs of City services:

- The City Council will annually adopt a schedule of fees and charge. The fees and charges will be set to provide adequate resources for the cost of the program or service provided.

In addition, last year the City reviewed and updated its Development Impact Fees in accordance with the provisions in AB 1600. There is no evidence to suggest that the City would not be able to provide services to the County islands to be annexed in the City, and charge fees consistent with the citywide fees for such services. Further, since the City's common practice is to review these fees periodically, it can be assumed that future years will follow the same review and update procedure to ensure that full cost recovery is obtained for services rendered.

Determination 4.2-1 – The City annually conducts an open, transparent budgeting process aimed at balancing the needs of the City with the financial resources available.

Determination 4.2-2 – The City attempts to utilize other forms of revenue available besides sales/property taxes and fees, such as grants, to supplement its revenue stream.

Determination 4.2-3 – The City levies a series of fees and rates to offset the operations, maintenance, and infrastructure costs of the services it provides.

Determination 4.2-4 – The services provided by the City are subject to Proposition 218.

Determination 4.2-5 – There is no evidence suggesting that the City would be unable to provide services to the County islands to be annexed to the City, and charge fees consistent with citywide fees for services. Since the City's common practice is to review these fees and adopted revised fees on a periodic basis, it can be assumed that future years will follow the same review and update procedure in order to ensure that full cost recovery is obtained for services rendered.

4.3 - Status of, and Opportunities for, Cost Avoidance and Shared Facilities

Practices and opportunities that may help to reduce or eliminate unnecessary costs are examined in this section, along with cost avoidance measures that are already being utilized. Occurrences of facilities sharing are listed and assessed for efficiency. Potential sharing opportunities that could result in better delivery of services is also discussed.

An examination of cost avoidance opportunities should identify practices and opportunities that may help eliminate unnecessary or excessive costs to provide services. Such costs may be derived from a variety of factors including duplication of service efforts and facilities; inefficient budgeting practices; higher than necessary administration and operating cost ratios; inefficient use of outsourcing opportunities; and inefficient service boundaries.

An examination of opportunities for shared facilities should determine if public service costs can be reduced as a result of identification and development of opportunities for sharing facilities and resources. The benefits of sharing costs for facilities are numerous, including pooling of funds to enjoy economies of scale; reduced service duplications; diversion of administrative functions of some facilities; reduced costs; and providing better overall service.

Maximizing opportunities to share facilities allows for a level of service that may not otherwise be possible under normal funding constraints; however, facilities sharing opportunities are not without their challenges. When a municipality enters into a shared agreement, it generally relinquishes a portion of its control of the facility. Additionally, the facility may not be entirely suited to accommodate the municipality's needs.

The City has demonstrated its desire to work with surrounding agencies to provide quality service to residents in a cost-effective manner. The Hanford Fire Department maintains a mutual aid agreement with Kings County. The City also participates in the Kings County Area Public Transit Agency, a Joint Powers Agency comprised of the County and the cities of Hanford, Lemoore, and Avenal, in order to provide public transportation to its residents. Hanford also is a member of the Kings Waste and Recycling Authority, which is a Joint Powers Authority comprised of Hanford, Lemoore, Corcoran, and the unincorporated portion of Kings County, in order to provide refuse disposal to its residents.

Therefore, although there is much collaboration already between the City and other agencies, the City should consider reviewing their agreements annually to determine if further cost savings could be realized beyond the current economies of scale.

4.3.1 - DETERMINATIONS

Determination 4.3-1 – The City participates in a mutual aid agreement with the Kings County Fire Department for additional fire protection service.

Determination 4.3-2 – The City participates in the Kings County Area Public Transit Authority to provide public transportation to its residents.

Determination 4.3-3 – The City is a member of the Kings Waste and Recycling Authority to provide refuse disposal to its residents.

Determination 4.3-4 – The City should annually review the agreements of which the City participates to establish if further cost savings could be realized beyond the current economies of scale.

4.4 - Accountability for Community Service Needs, including Governmental Structure and Operation Efficiencies

This section addresses the adequacy and appropriateness of the City of Hanford's existing boundary and SOI, assesses the management structure and overall managerial practices of the City, and evaluates the ability of the City to meet its service demands under its existing government structure. Also included in this section is an evaluation of compliance by the City with public meeting and records laws.

An examination of government structure should consider the advantages and disadvantages of various government structures that could provide public services. In reviewing potential government structure options, consideration may be given to service delivery quality and cost, regulatory or government frameworks, financial feasibility, operational practicality, and public preference.

An examination of local accountability should evaluate the accessibility to and levels of public participation with the agency's management and decision-making processes. The MSR Guidelines note measures such as legislative and bureaucratic accountability, public participation, and easy accessibility to public documents and information as important in ensuring public participation in the decision-making process.

4.4.1 - ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The City of Hanford operates under the City Manager/City Council form of government. The City Council sets policy for the City and appoints a City Manager to oversee day-to-day operations. Hanford's City Manager is responsible for the overall administrative direction of the City. This includes the quarterly review of all management performance plans to ensure that major goals and objectives of the City are achieved. The City Manager is also responsible for the development and implementation of the annual budget and the development of positive relationships with community organizations, employee groups, and other governmental agencies (City of Hanford, 2020). The current City Manager is Mario Cifuentez.

Council members are the leaders and policy makers elected to represent the community and to develop policies that meet the needs of the City's residents. Members of the Hanford City Council are selected directly by the electorate to serve as the policy making board of the City. The City Council is comprised of five members elected by districts and serve four-year staggered terms. Each year the City Council members select a Mayor and Vice-Mayor from amongst themselves (City of Hanford, 2020). The current members of the Hanford City Council are:

- Mayor Francisco Ramirez (District D)
- Vice-Mayor Diane Sharp (District C)
- Council Member John Draxler (District A)
- Council Member Kalish Morrow (District B)
- Council Member Art Brieno (District E)

The City operates with a budgeted number of employees approximately 275 regular, full-time employees, and 57 part-time/seasonal staff. The City also collaborates with community organizations to supplement staff services through the use of volunteers.

There are three appointed advisory commissions who assist the City Council in making policy decisions:

- Parking and Traffic Commission,
- Parks and Recreation Commission, and
- Planning Commission.

Citizens have an opportunity to participate in the implementation of local policies by serving on a commission. Each commission is comprised of citizens who work to provide services to the community while assisting the Council in achieving goals established by the citizens and elected officials.

A summary of the City's departments and the various services they provide to the residents of Hanford is provided below. The following information about each department was taken directly from the City's website.

City Administration

The Administration Division is responsible for the supervision and administration of the Public Works Department, City Clerk's duties, Human Resources, Risk Management, Health Insurance, Liability Risk.

Finance Department

The Finance Department is comprised of two divisions – Accounting and Utility Billing. The Accounting Division provides financial services to all City departments, including:

- cash management,
- preparation of financial reports,
- budget preparation and control,
- revenue and expenditure control,
- accounts receivable,
- payroll,
- purchasing,
- liability and property insurance,
- business licenses,
- general accounting, and
- financial advice.

The Utility Billing Division provides customer billing services for water, refuse, and sewer. The position of Finance Director and Treasurer for the City of Hanford is currently vacant.

Human Resources Department

The Human Resources Division is responsible for all aspects of the City's human resources system including recruitment, testing, selection, classification, administration, labor relations, benefit administration, workers compensation, safety administration, risk management, and employee development.

Community Development Department

The Community Development Department consists of Planning, Building, and Housing divisions. The City's Community Development Block Grant Consolidated Plan is managed through this department.

The Planning Department is responsible for long range planning within the city, the maintenance and application of the City's Zoning Ordinance and the processing and approval of site-specific development proposals to include rezoning, tentative maps, use permits and site plan reviews.

The main goal of the Building Division and the Code Compliance Section is to ensure compliance with national, State, and local building, and health and safety codes to safeguard life, health, and property for the residents of Hanford and the public in general. The Building Division performs plan reviews, issues building permits, and performs field inspections on all construction projects located within the city limits.

Public Works Department

The Public Works Department is responsible for maintaining and managing operations for the City's public utility systems. Services provided by the department include ensuring sufficient clean fresh water; reliable sewer services; street maintenance; storm drainage systems; street cleaning; and maintenance of street pavement, traffic signals. The department is composed of the following divisions: Fleet Maintenance, Refuse Collection, Street Maintenance, Utilities, Wastewater Treatment, and Engineering. The Engineering Department is also combined with the Public Works Department. John Doyel is the Director of Public Works for Hanford.

Parks and Community Services Department

The Parks and Recreation Department is responsible for coordinating activities for the City's residents, including special classes, youth programs, older adult activities, sports for youth and adults, and community events. The department is responsible for maintaining aesthetic and recreational value of over 208.5 acres of property including parks, landscaped street medians, athletic fields, the City's urban forest, and other landscaped areas including Downtown, Courthouse square, City parking lots, Industrial Park, Airport, and Intermodal Station.

The Department constructs streetscape enhancement improvements within the downtown area; coordinates the City's annual Tree City U.S.A recertification program; administers contracts and inspects maintenance for 37 landscape assessment districts; and performs playground safety inspections and upgrades existing playgrounds to meet ADA requirements. The department is also responsible for administering contracts and inspecting the maintenance of 29 landscape assessment districts.

Police Department

The City of Hanford currently employs a total of 62 sworn police officers. Some specialized divisions of the department include: Records & Fees, Investigations, and Operations.

The Records Unit consists of one Records Supervisor, one Senior Records Clerk, one Police Service Officer, and three records clerks. Records personnel perform a variety of duties that range from administrative and clerical support to Hanford Police staff and officers to assisting the general public at the front counter and on the telephone.

The Investigations Unit is called upon to investigate serious crimes within the community. These crimes cannot typically be handled by patrol officers due to the complexity or seriousness of the crime. The Detectives assigned to the unit receive specialized training in the techniques that the series crimes entail.

The Operation Division consist of those divisions which provide the basic police function. Most of these units are uniformed assignments and are those assignments that typically have regular, routine contact with the public. The Operations Division consists of four demand staff and 39 patrol officers.

Fire Services Department

The Hanford Fire Department provides emergency and fire protection services for residents and buildings within the city limits. Emergency services provided by the Fire Department include technical rescue, hazardous materials response, emergency medical services, and emergency disaster management. The Kings County Fire Department also provides additional services for the unincorporated areas, as well as serving as the Office of Emergency Management for all of Kings County.

4.4.2 - PRACTICES AND PERFORMANCE

The Mayor presides over Council meetings, which are held on the first and third Tuesday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall located at 400 N. Douty Street. The City follows the open meeting law set forth in the Brown Act (California Government Code Section 54950 et seq.). The intent of this legislation is to ensure that deliberations and actions of a legislative body be conducted openly and that all persons be permitted to attend any meeting except as otherwise provided in the law. Agendas are posted at least 72 hours in advance of a meeting and information made available to the Council is also made available to the public.

There appear to be ample opportunities for public involvement and input at regularly scheduled meetings. The agenda is posted at City Hall and posted on the City's website. Council agendas and packets are posted and available for Final at least 72 hours before each regularly scheduled Council meeting. Public notices (pursuant to the Government Code) are published to advertise certain types of hearings and press releases are issued to inform the public on significant citywide issues and projects. The City also communicates with the public through direct mailed notices, contributed articles in the local newspaper, utility newsletters, and social media.

The City and its departments follow various policies and procedures related to personnel, provision of services, customer relations and relationships with other agencies. Through the annual budget process, the City employs various techniques aimed at improving operational efficiency, such as eliminating duplicate services, personnel and equipment, reducing administrative costs when possible, and prioritizing service delivery needs to facilitate the use of limited resources to meet the highest priority need.

The management structure of the City is relatively simple and is well suited to the type of operations undertaken by the City; the linear management structure ensures an appropriate reporting mechanism and accountability. Furthermore, it allows for clear delineation of duties throughout the City for which the public can easily identify and bring forward their own issues, questions, or projects. The existing structure is considered appropriate for the City.

The City's budget process is a key mechanism used to review efficiencies in the management of City services and programs. The annual budget process includes a review of previous year accomplishments, upcoming year goals and programs, and specific funding to carry out those programs. The budget is adopted through a public hearing process by the City Council.

As a municipality, the City is structured to meet the needs and expectations of urban/suburban levels of development. As a multiple service provider with established service systems, the City efficiently provides a comprehensive range of services. With existing and planned development within the Sphere of Influence, including the annexation of the eight County islands, the extension of infrastructure and services into these areas would be logical and generally more efficient than if provided by other entities. Provision of services and infrastructure by the City into the Sphere of Influence should not overlap or conflict with other service providers. The inclusion of the County islands into the City is not anticipated to require changes to the governmental structure of the City.

4.4.3 - DETERMINATIONS

Determination 4.4-1 – The City operates under the City Manager/City Council form of government. Each year the Council members select a Mayor and Vice-Mayor from amongst themselves.

Determination 4.4-2 – The City conducts open meetings in compliance with the Brown Act that allows for complaints and comments regarding services and potential conflicts or inefficiencies to be identified to the City Council by residents.

Determination 4.4-3 – The City utilizes an organizational structure that obtains efficiency through departments heads who oversee multiple divisions.

Determination 4.4-4 – The City makes Council agendas and other information that details operations and services provided by the City available to the public at City Hall and on its website (Council agendas).

Determination 4.4-5 – The current City structure is efficient, transparent, and meets expectation of its residents with the resources available.

SECTION 5 - SPHERE OF INFLUENCE REVIEW

5.1 - Sphere of Influence Overview

As part of any Sphere of Influence review, LAFCo is required to consider all the information presented in the Municipal Service Review conducted for that agency. Additionally, LAFCo must also make written statement of its determinations for that agency regarding the following:

1. The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands;
2. The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area;
3. The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide;
4. The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency; and
5. The present and probable need for those public facilities and services of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within the existing Sphere of Influence.

After a written determination has been made with respect to the aforementioned areas of review, LAFCo may adopt a Sphere of Influence (SOI) that is appropriate for the agency's provision of service.


This section meets the requirements of Government Code Section 56425 and allows LAFCo to adopt an SOI that is consistent with the written determinations for the City of Hanford.

5.1.1 - PRESENT AND PLANNED LAND USES

The City has adopted a General Plan that dictates present and future land use policy for City growth. The City's General Plan includes areas for immediate development as well as reserve areas to accommodate growth of the period of the document, at least 20 years and possibly beyond.

The City's General Plan identified a 2035 Growth Boundary to serve as the limits of the area to be developed with urban uses during the 2015 to 2035 planning period. Hanford's Sphere of Influence delineates the City's probable physical boundary and service area. The Primary Sphere of Influence determines the areas to be annexed, and the Secondary Sphere of Influence identifies areas where LAFCo recommends land use coordination between the City and County.

According to Policy L7 of the General Plan, the City will support and pursue an amendment of the City of Hanford's Primary Sphere of Influence to be coterminous to the Planned Area Boundary. The proposed Sphere of Influence is shown in Figure 5-1.



The Williamson Act

The California Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly referred to as the Williamson Act, enables local governments to restrict the use of specific parcels of land to agricultural to related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments that are much lower than normal. This is a voluntary program. Landowners enter into contracts with participating cities and counties and agree to restrict their land to agriculture or open space for a minimum of 10 or 20 years.

There are 2,473 acres of land currently subject to a Williamson Act Contract within the City's SOI (see Figure 5-2). Of that amount, there are 292 acres under non-renewal and were scheduled to be removed from the provisions of the Williamson Act between 2014 and 2017.

The City should review the current Williamson Act contracts to make sure that the areas mentioned above were indeed removed from the Williamson Act between the years of 2015 and 2017, particularly the contract within the Primary SOI.

Figure 5-2: Williamson Act Lands




Figure 5-2
Williamson Act Lands

High Speed Rail

The California High Speed Rail Authority has identified a site east of Highway 43 and north of Highway 198 for a future station for the proposed high speed rail system. The City of Hanford has established this area as an Area of Interest in its General Plan. An Area of Interest is a geographic area within the Hanford General Plan that is integral to Hanford's future City planning even though no specific land uses are designated. Policy L105 of the City's General Plan explains it as such:

"Policy L105 Location of Area of Interest Land Use Designation

Locate an Area of Interest land use designation on the square mile bounded by Grangeville Boulevard, Lacey Boulevard, 7th Avenue, and 8th Avenue to reserve the area for future, but currently unknown land uses that may be associated with a high speed rail station."

The City of Hanford's General Plan also includes policies regarding the potential High Speed Rail Station. These policies include:

- *Policy T80* - Consider a station area planning study that considers locating most of High-Speed Rail support services west of 10th Avenue to support downtown Hanford.
- *Policy T81* - Ensure that effective transit linkages are in place between the High-Speed Rail Station and the City's downtown and employment centers.
- *Policy T82* – Ensure that financial, environmental, and agribusiness impacts of the project are mitigated for the citizens of Hanford.
- *Policy T83* – Aggressively seek State and federal funding for improvements and expansion of roads, water lines, sewer lines, storm drainage, public facilities, and utilities associated with High-Speed Rail.
- *Policy T84* – Ensure that the High-Speed Rail alignment through the Planning Area does not disrupt other transportation corridors identified in Hanford's circulation element.

Despite the uncertainty of the High-Speed Rail Station's timing and exact location, the City would like this Area of Interest included in its Sphere of Influence so that the area can be annexed into the City when and if needed to provide municipal services for the station. The No plans have been finalized on the type of surrounding land uses. The City recognizes that prior to considerations of the annexation of this Area of Interest the City will need to conduct a station area planning study that studies whether the City has adequate capacity to serve this area once annexed and a General Plan amendment to adopt specific land use designations and rezoning.




Figure 5-3
California High-Speed Rail Authority Kings/Tulare Station

5.1.2 - PRESENT AND PROBABLE NEED FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The City provides a wide range of services to its residents while being supplemented by other agencies within its city limits. The City also coordinates through secondary agreements to collaborate with neighboring agencies, such as the County or special districts, to best provide services in a comprehensive manner.

The City will continue to utilize its agreements with the County for public transportation and solid waste collection and disposal. The City has undertaken significant efforts to implement the Master Plan infrastructure to areas within the City. The current public facilities serving the city limits and SOI will continue as is, with no need for a change of services.

5.1.3 - DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES

As mentioned in Section 3, the City provides water, wastewater, and fire and emergency services within its city limits and within several of the County islands. However, the majority of area within the SOI (outside the city limits), does not have a service provider, with the exception of the Home Garden CSD. As shown in Figure 3-2, the areas depicted as a DUC are below the 80 percent of California's median household income and do not receive water, wastewater, and fire and emergency services from the City of Hanford or another service provider. However, given the fact that the City has extended services beyond its limits within some of these areas, future annexations should be reviewed on a case by case basis to determine if there is a neighborhood needing services that would warrant a subsequent annexation.

5.1.4 - PRESENT CAPACITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC SERVICES

The City currently provides a level of service which appears satisfactory to meet the needs of its current residents. The City will need to determine the ability to provide public services to any areas to be annexed into the City from the Sphere of Influence.

5.1.5 - EXISTENCE OF ANY SOCIAL OR ECONOMIC COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST

As stated in Section 3, there are currently areas of social or economic interest within the existing SOI, denoted as DUCs or potential DUC, most notably the community of Home Garden. These areas have been identified and will need subsequent review for inclusion on future annexations. Areas which already receive water, wastewater, and fire and emergency service may still need to be included in follow-up annexations to the City in order to provide equitable police and fire and emergency services. Police service levels should be reviewed as part of annexation proposals that are in proximity to DUCs.

Additionally, other municipal services that would be extended to an annexation proposal should be compared with the adjacent DUCs area to determine if there would be a benefit or improvement in service levels to the neighborhood with a follow-up annexation. If the proposal would be cost prohibitive, the DUC area should be forwarded to the County to

attempt to bring the services through available funding sources, such as grants or loan interest loan programs, in order to facilitate transition to the City.

5.1.6 - SPHERE OF INFLUENCE RECOMMENDATIONS

As shown in the MSR and throughout the determinations of this document, the City of Hanford is currently providing services at an acceptable level to its citizens. The City is also accountable to its customers through the City Council, which are elected at-large. It has conducted appropriate reviews of the infrastructure systems both through the annual CIP process as well as updating the Water, Sewer and Storm Drainage Master Plans in 2017.

The growth envisioned within the General Plan includes an area northwest of the current Sphere of Influence and another area east of the City. The area east of the City is predicted to eventually be the location of Hanford's High-Speed Rail Station. The City will need to plan for infrastructure to serve this area if and when the City proposes to annex this area.

In conclusion, based on the analysis provided within this report, the SOI for the City of Hanford may be amended to adequately comply with the goals of the General Plan.

Recommendation 8-1 – It is recommended that the City of Hanford's Sphere of Influence be amended as shown in Figure 5-1.

Recommendation 8-2 - The City should prepare a special plan for services, a General Plan amendment to add specific land use designations, and rezoning if and when the City proposes to annex the area planned for Hanford's High-Speed Rail Station.

SECTION 6 - BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Community Survey. (2018). *United States Census Bureau*. Retrieved from ACS Demographic and Housing Estimates: https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=grangeville,%20ca&g=1600000US0630686&hidePreview=false&table=DP05&tid=ACSDP5Y2018.DP05&layer=place&cid=D P05_0001E&vintage=2018&lastDisplayedRow=17
- California Department of Finance. (2018). *California Department of Finance MHI*. Retrieved from California Department of Finance: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Economics/Indicators/Income/>
- California Department of Parks and Recreation. (2015). *Parks for All Californians*. Retrieved from Parks for California: <https://www.parksforcalifornia.org/parkaccess>
- California Legislative Information. (2011, October 7). *SB - 244 Local government: Land use: general plan: disadvantage unincorporated communities*. Retrieved from http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201120120SB244
- California State Controller's Office. (2018). *Hanford*. Retrieved from City Data: https://cities.bythenumbers.sco.ca.gov/#!/year/2018/operating/0/entity_name/Hanford/0/category/General+Government+and+Public+Safety/0/subcategory_1/Public+Safety/0/subcategory_2?vis=pieChart
- California State Controller's Office. (2018). *Hanford Expenditures*. Retrieved from Cities By the Numbers: https://cities.bythenumbers.sco.ca.gov/#!/year/2018/operating/0/entity_name/Hanford/0/line_description?vis=barChart
- City of Hanford. (2009). *City of Hanford*. Retrieved from City of Hanford California: https://www.cityofhanfordca.com/residents/about_hanford/history.php
- City of Hanford. (2009). *Hanford Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan*. Hanford.
- City of Hanford. (2014). *City of Hanford General Plan*. Hanford .
- City of Hanford. (2014, March). *General Plan Background Report*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: http://cms6.revize.com/revize/hanfordca/document_center/Planning/General%20Plan/2034%20General%20Plan%20Background%20Report.pdf
- City of Hanford. (2017). *2035 General Plan Policy Document*. Hanford .
- City of Hanford. (2017). *City of Hanford Water System Master Plan*. Hanford: AKEL Engineering Group.

- City of Hanford. (2017). *Sewer System Master Plan*. Hanford: City of Hanford.
- City of Hanford. (2017). *Storm Drainage System Master Plan*. Akel Engineering Group.
- City of Hanford. (2017). *Wastewater Treatment*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: https://www.cityofhanfordca.com/departments/public_works/wastewater_treatment.php
- City of Hanford. (2018). *Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Annual Budget*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: http://cms6.revize.com/revize/hanfordca/document_center/Finance/Financial%20Documents/FY19%20Annual%20Budget%20Publication1%20080818.pdf
- City of Hanford. (2019). *City of Hanford Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Annual Budget*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: http://cms6.revize.com/revize/hanfordca/document_center/Finance/Financial%20Documents/FY20%20Annual%20Budget%20%20-%20Final_proof.pdf
- City of Hanford. (2020, January 6). *Application, Filing, and Processing Fees*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: [https://cms6.revize.com/revize/hanfordca/document_center/Planning/1-6-2020%20Fee%20Schedule%20\(1-22-2020\).pdf](https://cms6.revize.com/revize/hanfordca/document_center/Planning/1-6-2020%20Fee%20Schedule%20(1-22-2020).pdf)
- City of Hanford. (2020). *City Council*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: https://www.cityofhanfordca.com/government/city_council/index.php
- City of Hanford. (2020). *City Manager*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: https://www.cityofhanfordca.com/government/city_manager/index.php
- City of Hanford. (2020). *City of Hanford FY 2020 Budget*. Hanford.
- City of Hanford. (2020). *Fire*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: <https://www.ci.hanford.ca.us/departments/fire/index.php>
- City of Hanford. (2020). *Parks and Recreation*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: https://www.cityofhanfordca.com/departments/parks_and_recreation/index.php
- City of Hanford. (2020). *Public Works - Street Division*. Retrieved from City of Hanford: https://www.cityofhanfordca.com/departments/public_works/street_division.php
- City of Hanford. (2020). *Storm Drainage Information*. Retrieved from City of Hanford : https://www.cityofhanfordca.com/departments/utilities_and_engineering/utilitiy_division/storm_drainage_information.php
- Eiman, M. (2014, November 5). Hanford Voters Defeat Measure S. *Hanford Sentinel*.
- Hanford, C. o. (2020, April 13). Hanford Personnel. (QK, Interviewer)

- Kings Area Rural Transit. (2020). *About*. Retrieved from Kings Area Rural Transit: <https://www.kartbus.org/about/>
- Kings County. (n.d.). *Armona Community Plan*. Retrieved from Community Development Agency: <https://www.countyofkings.com/home/showdocument?id=13505>
- Kings County General Plan. (2010, January 26). *Community Development Agency*. Retrieved from <https://www.countyofkings.com/home/showdocument?id=13515>
- Kings County. (n.d.). *Home Garden Community Plan*. Retrieved from Community Development Agency: <https://www.countyofkings.com/home/showdocument?id=13505>
- Kings County LAFCo. (2007, October). *Municipal Service Reviews for Cities and Community Districts*. Retrieved from Kings County LAFCo: <http://www.kingslafco.com/Documents/2007%20KC%20MSR%2010-24-07%20plus%20resolution.pdf>
- Mott Macdonald. (2018). *KART Transit Station Site Selection Study*. Kings County Association of Governments .
- National Recreation and Park Association. (2020, January 1). *NRPA park metrics*. Retrieved from <https://www.nrpa.org/publications-research/ParkMetrics/>
- Sever, C. o. (2020, 9 17). Police Chief . (A. P. Trevor Stearns, Interviewer)
- The Sentinel. (2016, August 17). Hanford Fire Rating Could Lower Insurance Bills. Hanford, California.
- Tulare County Association of Governments. (2018). *Cross Valley Corridor Plan*.
- United States Environmental Protection Agency. (2020). *Kettleman Hills*. Retrieved from EPA in California: <https://www.epa.gov/ca/kettleman-hills>



MAYOR
FRANCISCO RAMIREZ
VICE MAYOR
DIANE SHARP
COUNCIL MEMBERS
AMANDA SALTRAY
KALISH MORROW
ART BRIENO
CITY MANAGER
MARIO CIFUENTEZ

June 28, 2021

To: Property Owners within County Island #4

Re: Effect of Annexation on County Islands

This letter serves as notice that the City of Hanford is proposing to initiate the annexation of county-islands, in accordance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) and the State of California's Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) guidelines.

There are eight County islands within the bounds of the City of Hanford city limits. The City and County have agreed that it is in both parties' best interest to annex these islands to reduce inefficiencies and deficiencies of services provided.

Prior to initiation of the annexation of the County islands, the City of Hanford wishes to inform property owners within the County islands of the effect of annexation into the City limits. This letter provides answers to some of the most frequently asked questions associated with annexation. Please review the information below.

Should you have any questions not addressed by this letter, or wish to discuss further, please contact the staff-member associated with the topic you wish to discuss.

Any remaining questions will be addressed during an open-forum community meeting, which will be held on **Wednesday, August 4, 2021 at 5:00 p.m. in the Civic Auditorium, 400 N. Douty Street, Hanford, CA 93230.**

PUBLIC COMMENT: All interested parties are invited to attend the meeting and/or send written comments to Natalie Corral, City Clerk, City of Hanford, 319 N. Douty Street, Hanford CA 93230; NCorral@cityofhanfordca.com. To ensure comments will be considered, all comments are requested to be submitted to the City by 12:00 p.m. the day of the meeting. Verbal and written comments may be submitted until the close of the public hearing.

Frequently Asked Questions:

1. What is annexation?

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 governs annexation of unincorporated areas to a City. Annexation is a reorganization that changes the governmental authority from one jurisdiction (the County) to another (the City). The Kings County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) reviews and approves annexation requests. For more information regarding LAFCO, please visit the website at <http://www.kingslafco.com/>

2. What is an island?

An unincorporated "island" is a relatively small pocket of land currently served by the Kings County, but substantially surrounded by the City of Hanford. Generally, in accordance with Section 56375.3 of the Government Code, LAFCO characterizes an "island" as follows:

- a. the land is substantially surrounded by a city, is substantially developed or developing, is not prime agricultural land, is designated for urban growth in the city's general plan, and is not within the Sphere of Influence of another city, and
- b. the land is located within an urban service area designated by the LAFCO, is not prime agricultural land, and is designated for urban growth in the city's general plan, and
- c. the land area does not exceed 150 acres.

Although islands are completely or substantially surrounded by a city, they remain under the land use and service authority of the County. The State Legislature determined that the continued existence of these islands created problems for cities, counties, island residents, adjacent city residents, and various agencies and special districts responsible for providing services and facilities. *Consequently, the State modified the procedures to encourage cities to undertake island annexations by limiting the due process otherwise afforded other types of annexations.*

3. What is the streamlined process for island annexation?

In 1999, the California Legislature adopted AB 1555 (codified in Government Code Section 56375.3) that encouraged cities to annex small unincorporated islands. The law allows cities to annex islands without protest proceedings or elections, provided the island meets special criteria. By law, LAFCO must approve an annexation request submitted by a city if all of the criteria mentioned in Question #2 above are satisfied.

All islands proposed to be annexed by the City of Hanford satisfy the specified criteria; therefore, protest proceedings are not required.

Finance Department

Contact Finance, Utility Billing via phone (559)585-2510 or email, finance@cityofhanfordca.com, regarding the information below:

1. Will my utility bills increase?

Overall, customers can expect to pay less in water, however the County refuse service is lower than the City's, because street sweeping costs are not applied to County services. On average, the cost to the resident will be less in the City, than in the County.

	Inside the City @ 11 Units of Water	Outside the City @ 11 Units of Water
Water Service	15.41	16.96
Water Consumption	14.74	16.17
Sewer Service	17.86	17.86
Storm Drain Service	5.04	5.04
Trash Service	25.20	23.80
Total	78.25	79.83

2. Will my property taxes increase?

No change will occur. All properties are taxed at the same rates whether annexed to the City or not (approximately one percent of assessed value). That is, City and County property owners pay the same tax rates. Thus, property tax assessments will not be affected by annexation. However, if the property is resold, or if new improvements to the property are constructed, the assessed value of the property will most likely increase. This increase, however, has nothing to do with a property being in the City or the County.

Public Works Department

Contact the Public Works Department via phone (559)585-2550 or email, PublicWorks@cityofhanfordca.com, regarding the information below:

1. Must I hook up to the City's sewer system if I already have a septic system?

Not at this time. Neither the County nor the City can require you to have sewer service if you are using a properly operating septic system. However, if your septic system violates State and/or local health and building codes, both County and City ordinances require most homeowners to connect to a sewer system if one is available within 200 feet of the property.

2. Can I replace my septic tank or do substantial work on the leach field once I am in the City?

The city will issue permits for new septic tank work or substantial work on the leach field only if the sewer line is not adjacent to your property. Minor work on the leach field is allowed.

3. Can I keep my existing well and continue to use it after annexation to the City?

Yes. Existing wells can be retained after annexation. The City encourages property owners to hook up the house to city water, but the existing well can be retained long term for watering the property as long as a backflow device is installed on your domestic water service.

4. Is there a time in which I must connect the house to city water?

No. You will only be required to connect to city water when major work on the well is needed. Minor work, such as cleaning or pump replacement, will not require connection.

5. If I already have City water and sewer service, will my water and sewer bills go up after annexation?

No. Actually, the water and sewer portion of the bills will be reduced by 10% upon annexation into the City. The City will begin street sweeping the annexed areas and that charge will now appear on your bill.

6. What about curbs, gutters, sidewalks, street trees, storm drains, or streetlights?

There is no requirement that curbs, gutters, sidewalks, street trees, storm drains, or streetlights be installed as part of the annexation. The City may require a developer to make off-site improvements, which may include improvements along the frontage of individual properties. If a property owner undertakes substantial building remodeling or new building construction on an individual lot basis after annexation, then curbs, gutters, sidewalks, street trees and street lights must be constructed along the frontage of property. If desired by a neighborhood, a special district could be established to install these items at the cost of the property owners. The City may also establish a special district in an existing neighborhood to install such public improvements to be paid for by the property owners over time.

7. I now have trash service from a private contractor, can I keep my existing service and for how long?

You would have 12 months after annexation before you are required to sign up for City trash service. Currently, the city trash service for solid waste, and recycling and green waste is \$26.81 per month (fees subject to change). The City also provides a spring clean-up for a free pickup truck load to the dump. This service is included in the normal service fees.

Fire Department

Contact the Fire Department via phone (559)585-2545 or email, FirePrevention@cityofhanfordca.com, regarding the information below:

1. Who will be responsible for Fire protection?

Fire protection service will be provided by the City Fire Department upon annexation. The City has an excellent fire protection rating and fire insurance rates are generally lower in the City than in the County.

Police Department

Contact the Police Department, via phone (559)585-4540 or email, PoliceAdministration@cityofhanfordca.com, regarding the information below:

1. Who will be responsible for Police protection?

Police protection service would be provided by the County Sheriff for the first two years after annexation, based upon the agreement between the City and the County. After that, the City Police Department will be responsible for Police protection. The department has a highly trained staff of police officers.

Kings County Elections Office

Contact the Kings County Elections Office via phone (559)852-4401 or email, elections@countyofkings.com, regarding the information below:

1. What changes will annexation have on elections?

The Kings County Elections Department conducts Federal, State, School, County, City and Special District elections. After annexation, residents of the areas affected would become citizens of the City, entitled to vote in City elections, and eligible to hold elective and appointive positions.

Community Development Department – Planning Division

Contact Senior Planner, Gabrielle Myers, via phone (559)585-2578 or email, gmyers@cityofhanfordca.com, regarding the information below:

1. What effects will annexation have on zoning?


The county islands will be pre-zoned, based on the General Plan Designation for the area.

The ordinance can be viewed at this address: <http://qcode.us/codes/hanford/>

Island Number	General Location	General Plan Designation	Pre-Zoning
4	East of 10 th Avenue, South of Florinda, North of Lacey Boulevard	Corridor Mixed Use; Low-Density Residential; Medium-Density Residential	MX-C Corridor Mixed Use; R-L-5 Low-Density Residential; R-M Medium-Density Residential

County Island #4:

General Plan Designation: Corridor Mixed Use, Low-Density Residential, Medium-Density Residential
Pre-Zone: MX-C Corridor Mixed Use, R-L-5 Low-Density Residential, R-M Medium-Density Residential



2. What effects will annexation have on the uses allowed? If a use is allowed in the County, but not allowed in the City, what happens?

A use shall be deemed nonconforming if it was lawfully commenced while under the jurisdiction of Kings County, but which, after annexation of the site into the City, does not conform to the use regulations of this title.

For example: If you are legally operating (have a valid business license and all required permits for operation/structures) a vehicle repair shop in Kings County, currently, but upon annexation the use is not allowed in the zone district, you may still operate. However, if you discontinue the use for a period of six months or more, the non-conforming use shall not be able to reestablish. A nonconforming use may be expanded by up to 10% of its exiting floor area if a conditional use permit is granted. The expansion of a nonconforming use or structure may be allowed only one time per use.

3. What is the permitting process like in the City?

The permitting and entitlement process is a similar process and requirements as Kings County.

4. I have various animals in the County, can I keep them in the City?

An animal raising use that is nonconforming due to annexation or adoption or amendment to this title shall be allowed to continue, provided that the intensity of the animal raising use (i.e., type and number of animals) shall not change or increase. The provisions for abandonment or discontinuance shall not apply. **Please note that you are limited to the allowances approved by Kings County.**

Contact Building Official, Tom Webb, via phone (559)585-2584 or email, twebb@cityofhanfordca.com, regarding the information below:

1. Does the City of Hanford have Code Enforcement?

Yes, the City of Hanford does have Code Enforcement officers and will enforce the City ordinances upon annexation on a complaint-basis. Code enforcement issues include:

- a. Abandon vehicles
- b. Junk and debris
- c. Property maintenance
- d. Building without permits

2. Will my address be changed?

It depends, if you currently do not have a City-style address, you will be reassigned one; City-style addressing is typically four numbers verses County-style, which is five.

- a. The City will notify you and the post-office of the change


Community Development Department – Housing Division

Contact Housing Analyst, Sandra Lerma-Martinez, via phone (559)585-4766 or email, slerma@cityofhanfordca.com, regarding the information below:

- 1. Upon annexation, home owners will now be eligible to apply for City assistance programs (formerly, while being located outside of city limits, owners were not eligible for these programs).

Should you have any questions not addressed by this letter, or wish to discuss further, please contact the staff-member associated with the topic you wish to discuss. Thank you!

Sincerely,



Mario Cifuentes
City Manager
319 N. Douty Street
Hanford, CA 93230
(559)585-2516
mcifuentes@cityofhanfordca.com

Notice of Exemption 2023-01

To: ☐ Office of Planning and Research
P.O. Box 3044, Room 212
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

☒ County Clerk
County of Kings
Kings County Government Center
Hanford, CA 93230

From: City of Hanford
317 North Douty Street
Hanford, CA 93230

Project Title: Annexation 160 – County Island #4; Prezone 2021-09

Project Location – Project Location:

The annexation is located in the eastern portion of the City. The island area is northeast of the N. 10th Avenue and Lacey Boulevard intersection. The island is approximately 92 acres and consists of 172 parcels.

Project Location – City: Hanford **Project Location – County:** Kings County

Description of Nature, Purpose and Beneficiaries of Project: The City is proposing to annex all of the County Islands within the extent of the City's boundary. There are currently eight County Islands that are proposed to be annexed. These islands are characterized as territory which is located within the unincorporated county but substantially surrounded by the City. The premise and guidance given by state law and local rules are that islands should generally be located within the City so they may receive more efficient delivery of services, as the City is usually more equipped to provide urban level services than the County or other entity.

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: City of Hanford

Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project: City of Hanford

Exempt Status: **(check one)**

- ☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 152698);
☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269 (a));
☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
☒ Categorical Exemption: State type and section number: 15319(a) – Existing Facilities
☒ Statutory Exemption. State code number: 15061(b)(3) General Rule – Common sense Exemption

Reasons why project is exempt:

This project will be considered Exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) the Common-Sense Exemption and Categorical Exemption Section 15319(a), the Annexation of Existing Facilities and Lots for Exempt Facilities Exemption. The project proposes to incorporate the approximate 100-acre island into the City of Hanford City Limits. As it relates to the Common-Sense Exemption, it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environments. The Island is primarily built out and will not require any further improvements with the exception of the vacant parcels. The potential development of said parcels shall be evaluated on a project by project basis due to the fact that no development is being proposed as a part of this project. However, the development within the island is receiving services provided by the City that would require infrastructure installation. Furthermore, as already mentioned since there is no further construction required as a part of the annexation, then the Class 19 Exemption is applicable. The project currently does not propose development, therefore, will involve negligible or no expansion of use.

Lead Agency Contact Person: Gabrielle Myers

Area Code/ Telephone: (559) 585-2578 Date:

Signature: _____ February 21, 2023 Title: Senior Planner

☒ Signed by Lead Agency Date received for filing at OPR: _____

☐ Signed by Applicant

Notice of Exemption**Appendix E**

To: Office of Planning and Research
P.O. Box 3044, Room 113
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

County Clerk

County of: _____

From: (Public Agency): _____

(Address)

Project Title: _____

Project Applicant: _____

Project Location - Specific:

Project Location - City: _____ Project Location - County: _____

Description of Nature, Purpose and Beneficiaries of Project:

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: _____

Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project: _____

Exempt Status: **(check one):**

- ☐ Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);
- ☐ Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a));
- ☐ Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
- ☐ Categorical Exemption. State type and section number: _____
- ☐ Statutory Exemptions. State code number: _____

Reasons why project is exempt:

Lead Agency _____

Contact Person: _____ Area Code/Telephone/Extension: _____

If filed by applicant:

1. Attach certified document of exemption finding.
2. Has a Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Signature: _____ Date: _____ Title: _____

☐ Signed by Lead Agency ☐ Signed by Applicant

Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21110, Public Resources Code.
Reference: Sections 21108, 21152, and 21152.1, Public Resources Code.

Date Received for filing at OPR: _____

Island 4 NOE Attachment

Project Location:

The annexation is located in the eastern portion of the City. The island area is northeast of the N. 10th Avenue and Lacey Boulevard intersection. The island is approximately 92 acres and consists of 172 parcels. There are approximately 122 residential parcels within the island. The existing land use is urban residential with rural residential, commercial, and vacant land. There are six vacant parcels. The island is mainly urban with dense development and towards the southeast the parcels are larger and vacant.

Description of the Nature, Purpose and Beneficiaries of Project:

The City is proposing to annex all of the County Islands within the extent of the City's boundary. There are currently eight County Islands that are proposed to be annexed. These islands are characterized as territory which is located within the unincorporated county but substantially surrounded by the City. The premise and guidance given by state law and local rules are that islands should generally be located within the City so they may receive more efficient delivery of services, as the City is usually more equipped to provide urban level services than the County or other entity.

Reasons why project is exempt:

This project will be considered exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) the Common Sense Exemption and Categorical Exemption Section 15319, the Annexation of Existing Facilities and Lots for Exempt Facilities Exemption. The project proposes to incorporate the approximate 80-acre island into the City of Hanford City Limits. As it relates to the Common Sense Exemption, it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environments. The Island is primarily built out and will not require any further improvements with the exception of the vacant parcels. The potential development of said parcels should be evaluated on a project by project basis due to the fact that no development is being proposed as a part of this project. However, the development within the island is receiving services provided by the City that would require infrastructure installation. Furthermore, as already mentioned since there is no further construction required as a part of the annexation, then the Class 19 Exemption is applicable. The project involves negligible or no expansion of use.



AGENDA STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: 2/21/2023

AGENDA SECTION: Successor Agency for the discussion of the following

SUBJECT:

Review And Approval Of The Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 23-24) For The Period July 1, 2023 To June 30, 2024

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommendation: That the RDA Successor Agency, by motion, approve the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 23-24) for the period July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024.

BACKGROUND:

AB 1484 and amendments under SB 107 require Redevelopment Agency (RDA) Successor Agencies to prepare a Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS) annually and submit the ROPS to the State Department of Finance (DOF). The ROPS 23-24 is a list of obligations or payments that are, or may be, due within the twelve-month period. The attached ROPS is for the period of July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024. Once all obligations are paid in full, the Agency can file a dissolving statement with the DOF and future ROPS statements will no longer need to be filed.

Approval of the City of Hanford's ROPS 23-24 by the Kings County Oversight Board took place at the January 25, 2023 meeting. This approval is necessary in order to submit the ROPS to the State Department of Finance (DOF) by the February 1, 2023 deadline.

The Agency owes Kings Economic Development Corporation (EDC) principal on a loan for purchase of land in the Kings Industrial Park plus appreciated value. The EDC will also be entitled to a portion of the "appreciation" in accordance with the terms of its Promissory Note. As instructed by the DOF, since the amount of appreciation will not be realized until the date of sale the Agency shall report the outstanding debt as \$0.

The subject land was in a long pending lawsuit which was settled with final City Council approval at a Special Meeting held on January 31, 2023. While the lawsuit did not legally prevent other potential buyers from purchasing the land it did have discouraging effects. Interested parties indicated a desire to continue negotiations once all legal matters were resolved.

The \$5,000 loan listed on the ROPS is for proposed administrative expenses of the Successor Agency to wind down the activities of the former Redevelopment Agency once the final debt to the EDC is paid off.

Staff is requesting the (City Council serving as) RDA Successor Agency Board approve the ROPS

23-24 for the period July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None until sale of land occurs.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. CITY OF HANFORD ROPS 23-24

Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 23-24) - Summary
Filed for the July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024 Period

Successor Agency: Hanford

County: Kings

Current Period Requested Funding for Enforceable Obligations (ROPS Detail)	23-24A Total (July - December)	23-24B Total (January - June)	ROPS 23-24 Total
A Enforceable Obligations Funded as Follows (B+C+D)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
B Bond Proceeds	-	-	-
C Reserve Balance	-	-	-
D Other Funds	-	-	-
E Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) (F+G)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
F RPTTF	-	-	-
G Administrative RPTTF	-	-	-
H Current Period Enforceable Obligations (A+E)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Certification of Oversight Board Chairman:

Pursuant to Section 34177 (o) of the Health and Safety code, I hereby certify that the above is a true and accurate Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for the above named successor agency.

Aubrey Carri Acct Tech
 Name Title

/s/ _____
 Signature Date

Hanford
Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 23-24) - ROPS Detail
July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	
Item #	Project Name	Obligation Type	Agreement Execution Date	Agreement Termination Date	Payee	Description	Project Area	Total Outstanding Obligation	Retired	ROPS 23-24 Total	ROPS 23-24A (Jul - Dec)						ROPS 23-24B (Jan - Jun)						23-24B Total
											Fund Sources						Fund Sources						
											Bond Proceeds	Reserve Balance	Other Funds	RPTTF	Admin RPTTF	Bond Proceeds	Reserve Balance	Other Funds	RPTTF	Admin RPTTF			
								\$-		\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-					
1	KINGS EDC LOAN	Third-Party Loans	05/04/2000	06/30/2043	KINGS EDC	LOAN FOR LAND PURCHASE	INDUSTRIAL PARK	-	N	\$-	-	-	-	-	-	\$-	-	-	-	-	-	\$-	
3	SUCCESSOR AGENCY ADM	Admin Costs - Litigation	07/01/2019	06/30/2043	CITY OF HANFORD	ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	ALL AREAS	-	N	\$-	-	-	-	-	-	\$-	-	-	-	-	-	\$-	

Hanford
Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 23-24) - Report of Cash Balances
July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021
 (Report Amounts in Whole Dollars)

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 34177 (l), Redevelopment Property Tax Trust Fund (RPTTF) may be listed as a source of payment on the ROPS, but only to the extent no other funding source is available or when payment from property tax revenues is required by an enforceable obligation.									
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H		
	ROPS 20-21 Cash Balances (07/01/20 - 06/30/21)	Fund Sources						Comments	
		Bond Proceeds		Reserve Balance	Other Funds	RPTTF			
		Bonds issued on or before 12/31/10	Bonds issued on or after 01/01/11	Prior ROPS RPTTF and Reserve Balances retained for future period(s)	Rent, grants, interest, etc.	Non-Admin and Admin			
1	Beginning Available Cash Balance (Actual 07/01/20) RPTTF amount should exclude "A" period distribution amount.			243,841					
2	Revenue/Income (Actual 06/30/21) RPTTF amount should tie to the ROPS 20-21 total distribution from the County Auditor-Controller						-		
3	Expenditures for ROPS 20-21 Enforceable Obligations (Actual 06/30/21)						1,155		
4	Retention of Available Cash Balance (Actual 06/30/21) RPTTF amount retained should only include the amounts distributed as reserve for future period(s)								
5	ROPS 20-21 RPTTF Prior Period Adjustment RPTTF amount should tie to the Agency's ROPS 20-21 PPA form submitted to the CAC			No entry required					
6	Ending Actual Available Cash Balance (06/30/21) C to F = (1 + 2 - 3 - 4), G = (1 + 2 - 3 - 4 - 5)	\$-	\$-	\$243,841	\$-	\$-	\$(1,155)		

Hanford
Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 23-24) - Notes
July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024

Item #	Notes/Comments
1	
3	

Council Future Agenda Items				
Originated Date	Item	Originator	Staff Lead	Date Estimate
11/29/2022	Discussion regarding the 2023 State Legislative Platform	City Manager	Mario Cifuentez	3/7/2022
12/20/2022	Presentation to City Council regarding Youth Sports Activities and related field usage and level of services provided after the formation of the Field Sports Advisory Committee	Council Consensus	Brad Albert	4/4/2023
12/20/2022	Presentation to Council on the status of funding in the Various Landscape Assessment Districts and the ability for residents to request additional amenities or improvements	Council Consensus	Brad Albert	3/7/2023
1/9/2023	Recommendation to Council for selection of Design Firm for the Downtown Improvement Project	City Manager	Jason Waters	4/18/2023
2/7/2023	Discussion regarding Title 12 "Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places" of the City's Municipal code and Uses and Obligations of property owners within the City's Right of Way	Council Consensus	Jason Waters	3/7/2023