

EL DORADO LAFCO

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

AGENDA OF MAY 27, 2015

REGULAR MEETING

TO: Ken Humphreys, Chairman, and
Members of the El Dorado County Local Agency Formation
Commission

FROM: José C. Henríquez, Executive Officer

PREPARED BY: Erica Sanchez, Policy Analyst

AGENDA ITEM #10: **DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF CHANGES TO THE
LAFCO STAFF REPORT**

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission discuss and consider proposed changes to the LAFCO project staff report template, including consolidation of the 28 factors to consider when reviewing a reorganization proposal.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION AND BACKGROUND

The current staff report format for LAFCO projects has been used since the 1980s, with very little modification. In the past, Commissioner feedback to staff regarding the format has been mixed. The general consensus seems to be that the current staff report format contains an abundance of necessary information; however, the manner in which sections of the staff report are presented can be redundant and lengthy, ultimately making it difficult to navigate through. Staff agrees that the current structure of the staff report can be cumbersome and believes that the format can be improved upon by reorganizing and consolidating sections, without cutting out any pertinent information.

Included at the end of this memo are examples of our current and proposed staff report formats (Attachments A and B, respectively). Attachment A is an actual staff report from an earlier project (because the focus is on format, not content, project identifying information has been changed). Attachment B is the same staff report, containing the same content, rearranged in the new proposed format. The new format alters the presentation of the information, both in structure and organization, but does not delete any project-related content from the original staff report.

At the request of the Commission in 2011, a similar reformatting of the staff report structure was presented by staff to the Budget Ad Hoc Committee; however, the Committee ultimately decided to retain the current format without incorporating any of the recommended changes. Nevertheless, given Commission turnover in the past few years, the lack of current active LAFCO projects and recurring Commissioner feedback regarding the length and structure of the staff reports, staff is once again bringing the topic to the Commission for discussion and consideration.

28 Factors of Consideration

Government Code §56668 and El Dorado LAFCO Policies currently identify a total of 28 factors to consider when reviewing a reorganization proposal, which has grown over the years from ten factors.

Current Format: The current format individually lists each of the 28 factors to be considered within the report, followed by a response. The structure of this format ensures that each of the identified factors is addressed; however, it also compartmentalizes the analysis in such a way that can be less friendly for the reader to navigate through. Because many of the 28 factors are closely related to one another, it is often necessary to re-explain them in several sections to provide context within the segmented analysis. This creates a staff report that can be repetitive and tedious to read. The 28 factors are also summarized in a table in the current format, which is discussed in more detail further below.

Proposed Changes: Staff proposes to consolidate the 28 statutory and policy considerations into the following five main categories, with various sub-categories: I. Services, II. Cost and Revenues, III. Boundaries, IV. Potential Effect on Others and Comments, and V. Land Use Population and Planning. The intent of this consolidation is to create a more narrative-style staff report that integrates the specific factors into like categories for a more user-friendly staff report. All of the factors will still be addressed, but it will eliminate the need to repeat information within related sections for context.

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE REVIEW OF A PROPOSAL

CURRENT SECTIONS:	CONSOLIDATED INTO:
1. Need for organized services, probable future needs; Policies 3.1.4(b), 6.1.7; §56668(b)	<p>I. SERVICES</p> <p><u>Need for Services</u></p> <p><u>Existing and Necessary Infrastructure to Deliver Service</u></p> <p><u>Ability of Annexing District(s) to Provide Service (Timely Availability of Water Supply)</u></p> <p> Estimated service demand of project</p> <p> Availability of water supply</p> <p> Plan to provide service</p> <p> Negative service impacts to the district / residents</p> <p><u>Service Impacts to Existing District Customers</u></p> <p><u>Alternatives to Service</u></p> <p> Other providers</p> <p><u>Coordination of Applications</u></p>
2. Ability to serve, level and range of service, time frames, conditions to receive service; Policy 3.3, §56668(j)	
3. Timely availability of adequate water supply; §56668(k)	
4. Alternatives to service, other agency boundaries, and local gov't structure; Policies 3.3.2.2(g), 6.1.3	
5. Significant negative service Impacts; Policy 6.2.4, §56668.3(b)	
6. Coordination of applications; Policy 3.1.9	

<p>7. Present cost/adequacy of governmental services, including public facilities; Policy 3.3.2.2</p>	<p>II. COST AND REVENUES</p> <p><u>Cost to Provide Service</u></p> <p><u>Assessed Value / Property Tax Exchange Agreements</u></p> <p><u>Sufficiency of Revenues</u></p>
<p>8. Effect of proposal on cost & adequacy of service in area and adjacent areas; §56668(b) and Policies 3.3 and 6.1.8</p>	
<p>9. Effect of alternative courses of action on cost & adequacy of service in area and adjacent areas; §56668</p>	
<p>10. Sufficiency of revenues, per capital assessed valuation; 56668(j)</p>	
<p>11. Revenue producing territory; Policy 6.1.1</p>	
<p>12. 56668.3 “best interest”; §56668.3</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>III. BOUNDARIES</p> <p><u>Proximity to District Boundaries / Spheres of Influence</u></p> <p><u>Creation of Irregular Boundaries</u></p> <p><u>Topographical Information</u></p>
<p>14. Topography, natural boundaries, drainage basins, land area; Policies 3.9.6 and 3.9.7</p>	
<p>15. Creation of islands, corridors, irregular boundaries; Policies 3.9.3, 3.9.4, 3.9.7</p>	
<p>16. Conformance to lines of assessment, ownership; Policy 3.9.2</p>	
<p>17. Spheres of Influence; Policy 3.9.1</p>	
<p>18. Effect on adjacent areas, communities of interest; §56668(c)</p>	<p>IV. POTENTIAL EFFECT ON OTHERS AND COMMENTS</p> <p><u>Effect on Adjacent Areas</u></p> <p><u>Effect on Other Community Services</u></p> <p><u>Comments and/or Objections from Other Agencies and the Landowner(s)</u></p>
<p>19. Information or comments from landowners or owners</p>	
<p>20. Effect on other community services, schools</p>	
<p>21. Other agency comments, objections; Policy 3.1.4 (l), §56668(i)</p>	

22. Fair share of regional housing needs; §56668(l)	<p>V. LAND USE, POPULATION AND PLANNING</p> <p><u>Zoning and Land Use Designations, Consistency with General / Specific Plans</u></p> <p><u>Surrounding Land Uses</u></p> <p><u>Impact to Agriculture / Open Space</u></p> <p><u>Population and Growth in the Area</u></p> <p><u>Regional Housing Needs Considerations</u></p>
23. Land use, information relating to existing land use designations; §56668(m)	
24. Population, density, growth, likelihood of growth in, and in adjacent areas, over 10 years	
25. Proximity to other populated areas; Policy 3.1.4 (a)	
26. Consistency with General Plans, specific plans, zoning; Policy 3.1.4(g)	
27. Physical and economic integrity of agriculture lands and open space; Policy 3.1.4(e), §56016, 56064	
28. Optional factor: regional growth goals and policies; §56668.5	

Project Map

Current Format: The official project map (which gets submitted to the State Board of Equalization after project approval) is included at the end of the staff report as an attachment.

Proposed Changes: Staff proposes to include a project map imbedded within the body of the staff report on page one or two, for easier reference in the beginning of the document. The official project map that gets recorded will still be included as an attachment to the staff report.

Summary Table

Current Format: A table summary of the statutory and policy considerations is included at the beginning of the staff report (beginning on page 4 of Attachment A). The purpose of this table is to summarize each of the 28 factors to be considered for the proposal; however, it can be redundant, given a more in-depth response to each of the factors is located further down in the staff report.

Proposed Changes: Staff proposes to retain the table summary (if the Commission chooses), but instead of placing it in the body of the staff report, move it to the end as one of the attachments. Removing the table from the body of the report will eliminate redundancy within the report, and shorten the report by approximately 5-6 pages.

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A: Sample Staff Report—Current Format
- Attachment B: Sample Staff Report—Proposed Format
- Attachment B1: Table 1: Summary of 28 Factors of Consideration (Additional Attachment to Proposed Staff Report Format)