

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)]	Consistent. Annexation into the CECSD is necessary in order to gain access to the property through gated CECSD roads. CECSD-maintained Native Lane is the nearest improved roadway that could provide access to the Deubel property.
2. Ability to serve, level and range of service, time frames, conditions to receive service [Policy 3.3, §56668(j)]	Consistent. An Annexation Agreement between the landowner and CECSD specifies the terms and conditions of the annexation, including imposing limitations on development of the subject parcel and restricting access to District roads through the property.
3. Timely availability of adequate water supply [§56668(k)]	Consistent. 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]	Consistent. Native Lane is the only existing improved roadway that could feasibly be extended to provide access to the subject parcel at this time.
5. Significant negative service Impacts [Policy 6.2.4, §56668.3(b)]	Consistent. The level of services currently provided by CECSD within its service area is not expected to change as a result of this annexation.
6. Coordination of applications [Policy 3.1.9]	Consistent. Prior to taking action on the annexation, the Commission must first take action on Agenda Item #6 to add the Deubel property to the CECSD sphere of influence. (Refer also to Factor 17.)
7. Present cost/adequacy of governmental services, including public facilities [Policy 3.3.2.2]	Consistent. Existing roads located within the District are capable of providing access to the subject property, contingent upon property owner constructing new road improvements to connect the property to existing District roads.
8. Effect of proposal on cost & adequacy of service in area and adjacent areas [§56668(b) and Policies 3.3 and 6.1.8]	Consistent. Property tax and special tax revenue, from the annexing area will support the costs of service.

FACTOR TO CONSIDER	COMMENT
9. Effect of alternative courses of action on cost & adequacy of service in area and adjacent areas [§56668]	Consistent. Disapproval of the annexation would leave the subject parcel essentially landlocked for the time being. Access from Marble Valley Road to the south would be depended on many factors, and is not a timely, reliable alternative at this time.
10. Sufficiency of revenues, per capital assessed valuation [§56668(j)]	Consistent. The annexation is expected to provide revenue that will offset the short- and long-term costs to CECSO for providing roadway services.
11. Revenue producing territory [Policy 6.1.1]	Consistent: Collected revenue is expected to offset the cost of providing road and road maintenance services to the annexation area; however, the revenue is not expected to exceed those costs.
12. 56668.3 “best interest” [§56668.3]	Consistent. The Annexation Agreement between the landowner and CECSO ensures the terms of the proposed annexation are mutually beneficial.
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]	Consistent. The annexation site is adjacent to the CECSO service area and will not create an irregular service boundary for the District. Services can be extended to the site without any foreseeable problems.
14. Topography, natural boundaries, drainage basins, land area [Policies 3.9.6 and 3.9.7]	Consistent: There are no topographical features that will hinder service to this area.
15. Creation of islands, corridors, irregular boundaries [Policies 3.9.3, 3.9.4, 3.9.7]	Consistent. The subject parcels is adjacent to the CECSO service area on two sides and will not create an irregular boundary. The parcel is surrounded on the other two sides by the El Dorado Hills CSD service area.
16. Conformance to lines of assessment, ownership [Policy 3.9.2]	Consistent: The boundaries of the proposed reorganization conform to the existing lines of assessment and ownership of APN 109-010-03.
17. Spheres of Influence [Policy 3.9.1]	To be Determined by the Commission: The subject parcel is not currently within the CECSO sphere of influence. The Commission will consider adding the subject parcel to the CECSO SOI as part of Agenda Item #6.
18. Effect on adjacent areas, communities of interest [§56668(c)]	Consistent. The annexation will have a minimal effect on adjacent areas.

19. Information or comments from landowners or owners	Consistent: The annexation was initiated by landowner petition.
20. Effect on other community services, schools	Consistent. There are no negative impacts expected for other public service providers to the proposal area.
21. Other agency comments, objections [Policy 3.1.4 (l), §56668(i)]	Consistent. Affected agencies were notified of the proposal, but no comments have been received to date.
22. Fair share of regional housing needs [§56668(l)]	Consistent. This proposal with neither assist or detract from the County's ability to achieve its RHNA targets.
23. Land use, information relating to existing land use designations [§56668(m)]	Consistent. The proposed annexation does not include a development proposal. Per the terms of the Annexation Agreement, the subject parcel could be developed up to four parcels, with a maximum of eight total residential units.
24. Population, density, growth, likelihood of growth in, and in adjacent areas, over 10 years	Consistent. Potential future development of the subject parcel would be restricted to rural single-family residential development, consistent with the existing residential land uses to the north and east.
25. Proximity to other populated areas [Policy 3.1.4 (a)]	Consistent. The annexation site is located in a Rural Region south of the Cameron Park Community Region. The site is generally surrounded by existing and approved/proposed residential development.
26. Consistency with General Plans, specific plans, zoning [Policy 3.1.4(g)]	Consistent: No development is proposed at this time. The annexation and Annexation Agreement are consistent with the current zoning (RE-5) and land use designations (LDR) of the subject parcel and with existing and approved residential development in the surrounding area.
27. Physical and economic integrity of agriculture lands and open space [Policy 3.1.4(e), §56016, 56064]	Consistent. The proposed annexation will have no effect on agricultural lands or open space.
28. Optional factor: regional growth goals and policies [§56668.5]	Consistent. 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.