

***ATTACHMENT TO PROPOSED STAFF REPORT FORMAT***

**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:

<b>FACTOR TO CONSIDER</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>
1. Need for organized services, probable future needs [Policies 3.1.4(b), 6.1.7; §56668(b)]	<b>Consistent:</b> Water, fire protection and emergency medical services will be necessary for the proposed 19-lot residential subdivision. Annexation is a condition of approval.
2. Ability to serve, level and range of service, time frames, conditions to receive service [Policy 3.3, §56668(j)]	<b>Consistent:</b> EID will require the applicant to build a new booster pump station that is sized to serve the project, as well as adjacent projects. EDH Fire will require a Fire Safe Plan, minimum roadway widths, and 12 fire hydrants.
3. Timely availability of adequate water supply [§56668(k)]	<b>Consistent:</b> An estimated 59 EDUs will be required to serve the Example Estates Subdivision. After accounting for contractual commitments, EID has approximately 1,977 EDUs available for purchase in the EDH Supply Area through December 31, 2014; in 2015 water meter availability will be approximately 542 EDUs.
4. Alternatives to service, other agency boundaries, and local gov't structure [Policies 3.3.2.2(g), 6.1.3]	<b>Consistent:</b> Absent the reorganization, the proposed development would require private wells for each new parcel, and they would remain outside of a local fire agency for structural fire protection. The EDH Fire Department would continue to be the first responder to calls in this area; however, the District would not have the benefit of recouping costs through property taxes.
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 EID and EDH Fire residents.
6. Coordination of applications [Policy 3.1.9]	<b>Consistent:</b> The applicant is not requesting annexation into EDHCSD. Example Estates is one of four residential projects approved for the area. The other three have been approved by LAFCO for annexation into EID and/or EDH Fire.

**ATTACHMENT TO PROPOSED STAFF REPORT FORMAT**

<p>7. Present cost/adequacy of governmental services, including public facilities [Policy 3.3.2.2]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The applicant will be required to submit a Facility Plan Report to EID that addresses the expansion of facilities, including a new booster pump station to serve the Example Estates Subdivision and adjacent projects. No new fire service facilities would be required by EDH Fire to serve the project.</p>
<p>8. Effect of proposal on cost &amp; adequacy of service in area and adjacent areas [§56668(b) and Policies 3.3 and 6.1.8]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> Property tax revenue, development impact fees, facility connection charges and other charges will support the costs of service.</p>
<p>9. Effect of alternative courses of action on cost &amp; adequacy of service in area and adjacent areas [§56668]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> If the reorganization is denied by LAFCO, the applicant would need to explore the option of individual private wells to serve the subdivision. EDH Fire would still likely provide services to the area, but it would not receive property taxes, development impact fees and other direct charge revenue to offset the costs of providing these services.</p>
<p>10. Sufficiency of revenues, per capital assessed valuation [56668(j)]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> EID and EDH Fire should receive sufficient revenue for providing services to the proposed development.</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 water and fire protection services to the subject 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 reorganization is in the best interests of the future residents of the Example Estates Subdivision by providing essential services to the proposed residential development.</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 Example Estates project site is adjacent to both the EID and EDH Fire service areas 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>

**ATTACHMENT TO PROPOSED STAFF REPORT FORMAT**

<p>15. Creation of islands, corridors, irregular boundaries [Policies 3.9.3, 3.9.4, 3.9.7]</p>	<p><b>Inconsistent:</b> The reorganization, as proposed, will shrink an island in EDH Fire’s service area, but will create an island in EID’s service area. However, inclusion of APN 126-100-25 in the reorganization will not provide any practical changes to the provision of service to the water tank parcel, nor will it provide either EID or EDH Fire with any additional property tax or assessment revenue, nor will it provide any administrative benefit.</p>
<p>16. Conformance to lines of assessment, ownership [Policy 3.9.2]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The boundaries of the proposed reorganization conform to the existing lines of assessment and ownership of APN 126-100-24.</p>
<p>17. Spheres of Influence [Policy 3.9.1]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The boundaries of the proposed reorganization are fully contained within both the EID and EDH Fire spheres of influence.</p>
<p>18. Effect on adjacent areas, communities of interest [56668(c)]</p>	<p><b>To be Determined by the Commission:</b> Neighbors and residents from the surrounding area protested the Malcolm Dixon Road group of developments cumulatively during the County process, but no public comments have been received during the LAFCO process.</p>
<p>19. Information or comments from landowners or owners</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The landowner supports the reorganization petition.</p>
<p>20. Effect on other community services, schools</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> There are no negative impacts expected for the current public service providers in the area.</p>
<p>21. Other agency comments, objections [Policy 3.1.4 (l), §56668(i)]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> LAFCO has not received any comments from the affected agencies or the public in response to the proposed reorganization.</p>
<p>22. Fair share of regional housing needs [§56668(l)]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> Reorganization and development of the Example Estates Subdivision will increase the available market rate housing for the El Dorado Hills area.</p>
<p>23. Land use, information relating to existing land use designations [§56668(m)]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The reorganization and proposed development are consistent with the current zoning and land use designation. The subject territory has been rezoned RE-5 and has a land use designation of LDR.</p>
<p>24. Population, density, growth, likelihood of growth in, and in adjacent areas, over 10 years</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> Upon development, the Example Estates project will add 19 homes and approximately 57 new residents to the area. At full buildout, the four connecting Malcolm Dixon area projects will include 97 single-family residences, resulting in approximately 291 new residents.</p>

**ATTACHMENT TO PROPOSED STAFF REPORT FORMAT**

<p>25. Proximity to other populated areas [Policy 3.1.4 (a)]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed subdivision will conform to the surrounding zoning and land use designations. The Example Estates site is surrounded by Low Density Residential development, including the approved Alto, La Canada and Malcolm Dixon Estates projects.</p>
<p>26. Consistency with General Plans, specific plans, zoning [Policy 3.1.4(g)]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed subdivision is consistent with the current zoning (RE-5) and land use designations (LDR) of the subject parcels and with existing and approved residential development in the surrounding area.</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> There are no agricultural activities in or near the project area. The project site and neighboring properties are designated for low density residential development.</p>
<p>28. Optional factor: regional growth goals and policies [§56668.5]</p>	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The proposed subdivision will assist the unincorporated part of the County in achieving its RHNA goals by providing 19 units of either Moderate or Above Moderate housing.</p>