

**TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF STATUTORY AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

Government Code §56668 and LAFCO Policies require that the review of a proposal shall consider the following factors:

| FACTOR TO CONSIDER  | COMMENT   |
|---|---|
| 1. Need for organized services, probable future needs [Policies 3.1.4(b), 6.1.7; §56668(b)]                           | <b>Consistent.</b> Annexation into the GVFPD is necessary in order to receive structural fire protection and emergency medical services for the subject parcels.  |
| 2. Ability to serve, level and range of service, time frames, conditions to receive service [Policy 3.3, §56668(j)]   | <b>Consistent.</b> GVFPD's Station 51, located at 4860 Marshall Road in Garden Valley is approximately 9.1 miles and 20 minutes from the annexation site. GVFPD also has access to two 5,000 water storage tanks located within one quarter mile of the site. |
| 3. Timely availability of adequate water supply [§56668(k)]   | <b>Consistent.</b> The subject parcels receive water via private wells. The proposed annexation will not have any effect on the provision of water service to the area.   |
| 4. Alternatives to service, other agency boundaries, and local gov't structure [Policies 3.3.2.2(g), 6.1.3]           | <b>Consistent.</b> The subject parcels are within the western boundaries of the El Dorado National Forest and surrounded by Federally owned land. GVFPD provides automatic aid to, and receives it from the USFS.   |
| 5. Significant negative service Impacts [Policy 6.2.4, §56668.3(b)]   | <b>Consistent.</b> There are not expected to be any negative impacts to the current level of service for existing GVFPD customers.  |
| 6. Coordination of applications [Policy 3.1.9]  | <b>Consistent.</b> No additional services are needed by the subject properties. Parcels further down Eells Ranch Road are were not included in this petition but can submit their own petition for annexation.  |
| 7. Present cost/adequacy of governmental services, including public facilities [Policy 3.3.2.2]                       | <b>Consistent.</b> GVFPD is capable of providing service to the subject properties.   |
| 8. Effect of proposal on cost & adequacy of service in area and adjacent areas [§56668(b) and Policies 3.3 and 6.1.8] | <b>Consistent.</b> Property tax and special tax revenue from the annexing area will support the costs of service.   |
| 9. Effect of alternative courses of action on cost & adequacy of service in area and adjacent areas [§56668]          | <b>Consistent.</b> Disapproval of the annexation would still result in GVFPD being the first responder to the subject parcels; however, GVFPD would have no mechanism in place to recoup its cost of service.   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>10. Sufficiency of revenues, per capital assessed valuation [56668(j)]</p>  | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The annexation is expected to provide revenue that will offset the short- and long-term costs to GVFPD for providing structural fire protection and emergency medical services.</p>                             |
| <p>11. Revenue producing territory [Policy 6.1.1]</p>  | <p><b>Consistent:</b> Collected revenue is expected to offset the cost of providing structural fire protection and emergency medical services to the annexation area; however, the revenue is not expected to exceed those costs.</p> |
| <p>12. 56668.3 “best interest” [§56668.3]</p>  | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The annexation is in the best interests of the landowners and the GVFPD.</p>  |
| <p>13. Boundaries: logical, contiguous, not difficult to serve, definite and certain [Policies 3.9.2, 3.9.3, 3.9.4 §56668(f), §56741-cities]</p> | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The annexation site is adjacent to the GVFPD service area and services can be extended to the site without any foreseeable problems.</p>  |
| <p>14. Topography, natural boundaries, drainage basins, land area [Policies 3.9.6 and 3.9.7]</p>   | <p><b>Consistent:</b> There are no topographical features that will hinder service to this area.</p>  |
| <p>15. Creation of islands, corridors, irregular boundaries [Policies 3.9.3, 3.9.4, 3.9.7]</p>   | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The subject parcels are adjacent to the GVFPD service area and annexation will not create an irregular boundary.</p>  |
| <p>16. Conformance to lines of assessment, ownership [Policy 3.9.2]</p>  | <p><b>Consistent:</b> The boundaries of the proposed annexation conform to the existing lines of assessment and ownership of APNs 062-111-51, -52, -53, and -54.</p>  |
| <p>17. Spheres of Influence [Policy 3.9.1]</p>   | <p><b>Consistent:</b> The annexation area is currently within the GVFPD sphere of influence.</p>  |
| <p>18. Effect on adjacent areas, communities of interest [56668(c)]</p>  | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The annexation will have a minimal effect on adjacent areas.</p>  |
| <p>19. Information or comments from landowners or owners</p>   | <p><b>Consistent:</b> The annexation was initiated by landowner petition. 100% of the affected landowners have consented to the annexation.</p>   |
| <p>20. Effect on other community services, schools</p>   | <p><b>Consistent.</b> There are no negative impacts expected for other public service providers to the proposal area.</p>   |
| <p>21. Other agency comments, objections [Policy 3.1.4 (l), §56668(i)]</p>   | <p><b>Consistent.</b> Affected agencies were notified of the proposal, but no comments have been received to date.</p>  |
| <p>22. Fair share of regional housing needs [§56668(l)]</p>  | <p><b>Consistent.</b> This proposal with neither assist or detract from the County’s ability to achieve its RHNA targets.</p>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>23. Land use, information relating to existing land use designations [§56668(m)]</p>                         | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The annexation does not include a development proposal. The current land uses are consistent with the zoning (RL-10) and land use designation (RR).</p>   |
| <p>24. Population, density, growth, likelihood of growth in, and in adjacent areas, over 10 years</p>           | <p><b>Consistent.</b> There are currently seven registered voters residing in the proposal area. Three of the four parcels are already developed in accordance with the RL-10 zoning. Under the current zoning, future development of the subject parcels could potentially include one additional single-family residence and one secondary residence on the fourth parcel or a secondary residence on one of two already developed parcels.</p> |
| <p>25. Proximity to other populated areas [Policy 3.1.4 (a)]</p>  | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The annexation site is located in a Rural Region. The site is generally surrounded by existing and approved/proposed residential development.</p>   |
| <p>26. Consistency with General Plans, specific plans, zoning [Policy 3.1.4(g)]</p>                             | <p><b>Consistent:</b> No additional development is proposed at this time. The annexation and existing development are consistent with the current zoning (RL-10) and land use designations (RR) of the subject parcels.</p>   |
| <p>27. Physical and economic integrity of agriculture lands and open space [Policy 3.1.4(e), §56016, 56064]</p> | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The proposed annexation will have no effect on agricultural lands or open space.</p>  |
| <p>28. Optional factor: regional growth goals and policies [§56668.5]</p>                                       | <p><b>Consistent.</b> The annexation proposal does not include any type of new housing or other development; therefore, it will neither assist or detract from the County's ability to achieve its RHNA targets.</p>  |