

# EL DORADO LAFCO

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

---

## *AGENDA OF DECEMBER 7, 2022*

### *REGULAR MEETING*

- TO:** John Hidahl, Chair, and  
Members of the El Dorado County Local Agency Formation  
Commission
- FROM:** Shiva Frentzen, Executive Officer
- AGENDA ITEM #2:** Staff and the Strategic Planning Ad-Hoc Committee recommend that the Commission approve the following:
- 1) Approve the changes to the Sphere of Influence (Section 4) of the El Dorado LAFCO Policies and Guidelines
  - 2) Approve the NON-MUNICIPAL Services Analysis Report for Special Districts to serve as completion of the third cycle and past due MSR/SOI enabling El Dorado LAFCO to start a new project review cycle that concurs with the updated Policies and Guidelines
  - 3) Approve the 5-year MUNICIPAL SERVICES MSR/SOI Project Cycle and the NON-MUNICIPAL SERVICES MSR/SOI Project Cycle; Add the El Dorado Hills Community Services District and the Cameron Park Community Services District to the MUNICIPAL SERVICES MSR/SOI Project Cycle
  - 4) Direct staff to complete the Municipal Services Review for the Greenstone Country CSD in Fiscal Year 22-23
  - 5) Direct staff to publish the updated information on the El Dorado LAFCO website
  - 6) Direct staff to document the completion of the Grand Jury findings and responses

---

#### **Discussion and Background**

The Strategic Planning Ad-hoc committee and staff have reviewed the Policies and Guidelines along with the current MSR/SOI project schedule dates to bring these recommendations to the Commission.

The Commission asked staff to bring a comprehensive plan for addressing the past due MSR/SOI reports and 5-year MSR/SOI Project Cycle.

Historically, the El Dorado LAFCO MSR project cycle has not been completed on time and has been the target of the Grand Jury investigation in 2022. By updating our Policies and Guidelines along with approving the Analysis Reports, El Dorado LAFCO can embrace a new MSR/SOI Project Cycle that is easy to follow and transparent for staff, Commission and the public.

Staff will publish the new documents on the web site for transparency and ease of access.

### **Attachment A: El Dorado LAFCO Policies & Guidelines Section 4 – Sphere of Influence**

The El Dorado LAFCO Policies and Guidelines have been modified by the Executive Officer and reviewed by LAFCO Counsel. Section 4 (Sphere of Influence) of the El Dorado LAFCO Policies and Guidelines needs to be approved by the Commission.

The Commission will review and update all spheres of influences every five years for each city and district providing municipal services and any other agencies as identified by the Commission. Municipal services include cities and districts providing police, fire protection, Emergency Medical Services (EMS), waste water, and water services. Sphere of influence changes initiated by a city or special district as defined in Gov. Code 56036 shall require either an updated or new service review. Spheres of Influence of districts not providing municipal services including, but not limited to, roads, recreation, hospital, resource conservation, cemetery, and airport shall be updated as necessary. As necessary shall include concerns such as long-term viability, active Board, etc. This policy does not preclude the Commission from undertaking special studies or service reviews when requested by an agency or initiated by the Commission.

### **Legal Authority**

The California Government Code states, in part:

**§ 56425.** (a) *In order to carry out its purposes and responsibilities for planning and shaping the logical and orderly development and coordination of local governmental agencies to subject to the jurisdiction of the commission to advantageously provide for the present and future needs of the county and its communities, the commission shall develop and determine the sphere of influence of each city and each special district, as defined by Section 56036, within the county and enact policies designed to promote the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere.*

(f) *Upon determination of a sphere of influence, the commission shall adopt that sphere of influence.*

(g) *On or before January 1, 2008, and every five years thereafter, the commission shall, as necessary, review and update each sphere of influence.*

**§ 56430.** (a) *In order to prepare and to update spheres of influence in accordance with Section 56425, the commission shall conduct a service review of the municipal services provided in the county or other appropriate area designated by the commission. The commission shall include in the area designated for service review the county, the region, the subregion, or any other geographic area as is appropriate for an analysis of the service or services to be reviewed, and shall prepare a written statement of its determinations with respect to each of the following:*

1. *Growth and population projections for the affected area.*
2. *The location and characteristics of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence.*
3. *Present and planned capacity of public facilities, adequacy of public services, and infrastructure needs or deficiencies including needs or deficiencies related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, and structural fire protection in any disadvantaged, unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence.*
4. *Financial ability of agencies to provide services.*

5. *Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities.*
6. *Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies.*
7. *Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy.*

*(b) In conducting a service review, the commission shall comprehensively review all of the agencies that provide the identified service or services within the designated geographic area. The commission may assess various alternatives for improving efficiency and affordability of infrastructure and service delivery within and contiguous to the sphere of influence, including, but not limited to, the consolidation of governmental agencies.*

*(e) The commission shall conduct a service review before, or in conjunction with, but no later than the time it is considering an action to establish a sphere of influence in accordance with Section 56425 or Section 56426.5 or to update a sphere of influence pursuant to Section 56425.*

State law precludes the Commission from approving proposals for a change of organization of territory outside an existing sphere of influence for an affected agency. If the affected territory is outside the agency's sphere of influence, a proposal to LAFCO must include a request for an amendment to the sphere of influence. The joint sphere and change of organization review is to maintain consistency in district boundaries and their spheres for the provision of services as it relates to proposed annexation sites.

LAFCO established spheres of influence to identify the probable physical boundaries and service areas of special districts. Spheres of influence are required to be updated every five (5) years and are amended as conditions warrant. The intent of this policy is to promote the efficient, effective, and equitable delivery of local and regional services for existing and future residents through spheres of influence and to encourage a collaborative process with agencies.

Almost 25 years ago, the courts explained that LAFCO could not approve a boundary decision if it failed to adopt the required spheres of influence (*Resource Defense Fund v. Local Agency Formation Commission* (1983)). If the Commission is to make decisions for annexations, reorganizations or an outside service area agreement, there must be legally compliant spheres of influence. In this respect, many features of Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg are similar to planning and zoning law (§65000). The legal requirements are that of "vertical consistency" rule, which requires local planning and subdivision decisions, be consistent with the county or city general plans. Counties and cities cannot approve entitlements if their general plans are incomplete or inadequate. Agencies have the implied duty to keep their general plans up to date.

An outdated sphere of influence is like an outdated general plan and does not provide the legal basis for making the statutorily required vertical consistency finding. The Commission supports maintaining up to date spheres while honoring the local agencies' planning efforts.

### **Attachment B: EI Dorado LAFCO NON-MUNICIPAL Services Analysis Report**

This attachment contains the summary of the highlights of the latest MSR report for all 33 NON-MUNICIPAL service providers. Approval of the NON-MUNICIPAL Services Analysis Report will serve as the completion of the third MSR cycle and gives EI Dorado LAFCO the ability to start a new MSR/SOI review cycle according to our updated Policies and Guidelines.

**Attachment C: El Dorado LAFCO Municipal Services Review/Sphere of Influence Project Cycle**

This attachment lays out the 5-year schedule for all Municipal Services providers and NON-MUNICIPAL Services providers consistent with the updated definition in section 4 of the Policies and Guidelines. This document will serve as the MSR/SOI Project Cycle moving forward. Staff is requesting that the Commission approve the addition of the El Dorado Hills Community Services District and Cameron Park Community Services Districts to the list of Municipal Services for the 5-year MSR cycle review.

Staff recommends that the Greenstone Country CSD be considered as a Municipal Service provider since they provide Wastewater (septic inspection) services. El Dorado LAFCO has the resources to prepare and complete the Greenstone Country CSD MSR in house by the end of FY 22-23.

**This item will conclude the following Grand Jury investigation action items:****Findings**

- F3. In violation of its policy and guidelines, El Dorado LAFCO has not made MSR preparation a priority and has not completed MSRs as required by State law and its project plan.

*Response: El Dorado LAFCO partially disagrees with this finding.*

*Explanation: El Dorado LAFCO has prioritized preparation of MSRs within available resources and the Covid emergency. However, we have not completed all MSRs as required by the Third MSR Cycle in accordance with our policies and guidelines and project plan.*

*Government Code Section 56425(g) states, "On or before January 1, 2008, and every five years thereafter, the commission shall, as necessary, review and update each sphere of influence." Each LAFCO interprets the "as necessary" portion of State law according to local policies and circumstances. El Dorado LAFCO Policy 5.3 states, "LAFCO shall complete service reviews for all municipal services provided by agencies with SOIs by January 1, 2008. After that date, service reviews shall be completed as necessary prior to, or concurrent with, SOI formations, updates, or substantial amendments (§56430)."*

- F4. El Dorado LAFCO changed the cycle for MSR preparation from five to eight years.

*Response: El Dorado LAFCO partially disagrees with this finding.*

*Explanation: The Commission has not changed its policies and guidelines to reflect an eight-year MSR cycle. At its February 27, 2013 meeting, the Commission adopted an eight-year MSR Project Plan for only its Third MSR Cycle (2013-2021).*

**Recommendations**

- R1. El Dorado LAFCO staff should present to the Commissioners a plan for the timely completion of MSRs and SOIs for the next cycle. The plan should be presented at a regular Commissioners' meeting by December 31, 2022.

*Response: This recommendation is in progress and is expected to be presented by the Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee at a regular LAFCO meeting by December 31, 2022. The Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee is working to address all 49 Special Districts and 6 County Service Areas in the next MSR plan to bring recommendations to the Commission for changes to its Policies and Guidelines.*

R2. El Dorado LAFCO should complete all MSRs that are delinquent by June 30, 2023.

Response: Refer to R1 response.

R3. El Dorado LAFCO should return to its MSR preparation cycle of five years.

Response: Refer to F4 and R1 responses.

R4. El Dorado LAFCO should have an updated MSR status report on its website by December 31, 2022, that specifies when the last MSR for each agency was completed and when the next one is due.

Response: This recommendation is in progress and is expected to be presented at a regular LAFCO meeting by December 31, 2022.

Attachment A: El Dorado LAFCO Policies & Guidelines Section 4 – Sphere of Influence

Attachment B: El Dorado LAFCO NON-MUNICIPAL Services Analysis Report

Attachment C: El Dorado LAFCO Municipal Services Review/Sphere of Influence Project Cycle

## 4.2 PERIODIC REVIEW AND MAINTENANCE

In updating spheres of influence, the Commission's general policies are as follows:

1. The Commission will review and update all spheres of influences every five years for each city and district providing municipal services and any other agencies as identified by the Commission. Municipal services include cities and districts providing police, fire protection, Emergency Medical Services (EMS), waste water, and water services.
2. Sphere of influence changes initiated by a city or special district as defined in Gov. Code 56036 shall require either an updated or new service review.
3. Spheres of Influence of districts not providing municipal services including, but not limited to, roads, recreation, hospital, resource conservation, cemetery, and airport shall be updated as necessary. As necessary shall include concerns such as long-term viability, active Board, etc.

~~This policy does not preclude the Commission from undertaking special studies or service reviews when requested by an agency or initiated by the Commission. The adequacy of each adopted SOI will be reviewed every five (5) years following the initial sphere determination or initial review of an original sphere. At approximately five-year intervals, a preliminary sphere evaluation will be conducted by staff. The evaluation will include a recommendation by the Executive Officer to either:~~

~~(1) proceed with a sphere update study or;~~

~~(2) affirm the existing sphere.~~

Each subject agency will be notified of the pending review of its SOI and will be requested to participate actively in any restudy efforts deemed necessary by the Commission. Each agency will complete a SOI questionnaire relating to its services and plans. Failure to respond will be regarded as concurrence with the Executive Officer's recommendation.

Changes in land use, planning policy, demographics, demand for public services, or service capabilities may justify the need to restudy and amend spheres of influence. The commission is responsible for the cost of LAFCO initiated review and revision of spheres. LAFCO will seek cooperative cost sharing agreements with the agencies involved.

LAFCO will, at any time, receive requests for amendments to spheres. If an agency, the County, or other party requests a review, study and/or amendment to a sphere, LAFCO will undertake the review as required by statute. Where possible within the scope of the budget, LAFCO will assist a requesting agency with the costs associated with the sphere study in the initial review of an original sphere.

Fees to cover the actual costs associated with a sphere review and amendment may be charged to the party requesting the review.

## NON-MUNICIPAL Services Analysis Report

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V
	Service	Special District	Revenue FY19/20	Total Wages 2020	Roadway in Miles	Voters	Active Board	District Boundary =SOI	Other Services	Website	Long-term Viable	Latent Powers	Service Notes	Public Roads	Service Area in Acres	Parcels	SOI Changed Since Formation	Max Future Growth	District Plans to Expand	DUC	MSR Year	MSR Month
1	Road	Arroyo Vista CSD	22,969		1	124	Yes	Yes	Bus shelter	No	No	P&R			335	66	No	9.00%	No	No	2018	9
2	Road	<a href="#">Audubon Hills CSD</a>	43,661		10	227	Yes	Yes	Snow plowing	<a href="http://www.audubonhillscsd.org/">http://www.audubonhillscsd.org/</a>		None			2560	140	No		No		2010	1
3	Road	<a href="#">Cameron Estates CSD</a>	209,922	27,680	16.5	584	Yes		Trail maintenance 16 miles/P&R, 3 security gates	<a href="http://www.cameronestates.net/">http://www.cameronestates.net/</a>		Water, fire, police, CC&R		No	1500	291	No	13.00%	No	No	2018	2
4	Road	<a href="#">Connie Lane CSD</a>	10,861		2	76	Yes	Yes		No		None			49.11	38	Yes	7.00%	No		2016	1
5	Road	<a href="#">Cosumnes River CSD</a>	38,964	GM & Guard	13	250	Yes	Yes	P&R Community Park	<a href="http://www.cosumnesrivercsd.org/">http://www.cosumnesrivercsd.org/</a>		None	Park rules enforcement		1349	192	Yes		No	No	2017	2
6	Road	<a href="#">East China Hill CSD</a>	13,754		1.5	101	Yes	Yes		No		None			475	60	No		No		2007	12
7	Road	<a href="#">Garden Valley Ranch Estates CSD</a>	43,590	GM	7.2	262	Yes	Yes		<a href="http://www.gardenvalleyranchestatescsd.specialdistrict.org">http://www.gardenvalleyranchestatescsd.specialdistrict.org</a>		None			1312	171	No	28.00%	No	No	2021	3
8	Road	<a href="#">Golden West CSD</a>	133,200	GM, admin, engineer	12	1400	Yes	Yes		<a href="http://www.gwcsd.org">www.gwcsd.org</a>		None			3276	456	Yes		No	No	2016	9
9	Road	<a href="#">Hickok Road CSD</a>	21,491		2.6	99	Yes	Yes		No		None	3 parcels outside SOI use the roadways		540	67	Yes	60.00%	No	No	2021	3
10	Road	<a href="#">Hillwood CSD</a>	49,941	GM	6	251	Yes	Yes		No		None	MWRIG HOA additional assessments; two service areas/levels		390	168	Yes		No	No	2016	8
11	Road	<a href="#">Knolls CSD</a>	15,254		1.9	53	No	No		No		None			188	29	Yes		Maybe		2009	9
12	Road	Ladew CSD	20,837			123	No, public complaints	Yes		No		Drainage, law enforcement LLAD, P&R, roadway maintenance			189	69	No		Maybe	No	2019	1
13	Road	<a href="#">Marble Mountain Homeowners CSD</a>	42,084	GM	7.5	136	Yes	Yes		No		None			840	73	Yes		No	No	2017	8
14	Road	<a href="#">Mortara Circle CSD</a>	20,477	GM/Secretary	2.7	65		Yes	Bulletin Board	No		None			297	31	No		No		2009	9
15	Road	<a href="#">Nashville Trail CSD</a>	22,208	GM	5.75	92	Yes	No		No		None	8 parcels removed from SOI during last MSR and still paying to the district. Two parcels added to the SOI are using the roads but not contributing/annexed		1534	71	Yes		No	No	2017	1
16	Road	<a href="#">Rising Hill Road CSD</a>	47,312	GM	2.25	210	No, irregular meetings	Yes		No		None	18 ft bridge		175		No		No		2007	12
17	Road	<a href="#">Rolling Hills CSD</a>	169,727	4,050	8	655	Yes	Yes	Roads, road maintenance, P&R, drainage, LLAD, weed abatement	<a href="https://rollinghillscsd.org/">https://rollinghillscsd.org/</a>		None	two Park maintenance		250	405	No		No	No	2018	9



## NON-MUNICIPAL Services Analysis Report

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	
	Service	Special District	Revenue FY19/20	Total Wages 2020	Roadway in Miles	Voters	Active Board	District Boundary =SOI	Other Services	Website	Long-term Viable	Latent Powers	Service Notes	Public Roads	Service Area in Acres	Parcels	SOI Changed Since Formation	Max Future Growth	District Plans to Expand	DUC	MSR Year	MSR Month	
19																							
20	Road	<a href="#">Showcase Ranches CSD</a>	31,940	GM	9.72	178	Yes	Yes	32-foot earthen dam, limited P&R with 4 small lakes	<a href="https://showcaseranches.specialdistrict.org/">https://showcaseranches.specialdistrict.org/</a>		None	Aukum View dam categorized as significantly hazardous		1500	145	No	10.00%	No	No	2020	2	
21	Road	<b>Sierra Oaks CSD</b>	6,373		1	82	No, irregular meetings	Yes		No	No	None				45	No		No	No	2021	3	
22	Road	<a href="#">West El Largo CSD</a>	7,192	GM	1	33	Yes	No		No		None			85	18	Yes		No	No	2010	1	
23	Airport	<a href="#">Cameron Park Airport District</a>	339,499	52,083		173	Yes	Yes		<a href="https://www.cameronparkairport.org/">https://www.cameronparkairport.org/</a>	Maybe	None	Single runway		100	143	No		Commercial operations	No	2010	10	
24	RCD	<a href="#">El Dorado County Resource Consvn Dist</a>	61,537	135,079		130,000	Yes	Yes		<a href="https://www.eldoradorcd.org/">https://www.eldoradorcd.org/</a>		None			617,241		No		Funding	Yes	2020	2	
25	Rec	<a href="#">Georgetown Divide Recreation District</a>	566,420	105,789		7,153	Yes	No				Parks and Recreation, Public Transportation	Public Transportation not provided		263,680		Yes		Maybe (Coloma/Lotus + Kelsey Cemetery)			2011	10
26	RCD	<a href="#">Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District</a>	7,369	81,876		20,000	Yes	Yes		<a href="https://www.eldoradorcd.org/">https://www.eldoradorcd.org/</a>		None			345,060		No		Funding	Yes	2020	2	
27	Cemetery	<a href="#">Happy Homestead Cemetery District</a>	437,007	188,066		32793		Yes		<a href="https://happyhomestead.specialdistrict.org/">https://happyhomestead.specialdistrict.org/</a>					9.84		No					2007	9
28	P&R	<a href="#">Holiday Lake CSD (public/private ownership issue)</a>	14,140	GM		136		Yes		No		None	recreational facilities 40 acre aquatic park, 30-acre lake, dam and 0.9-mile walking trail		140	67		7.40%		No		2018	1
29	Cemetery	<a href="#">Kelsey Cemetery District</a>	2,781			2000		Yes		<a href="https://www.kelseypioneer.cemetery.com/home">https://www.kelseypioneer.cemetery.com/home</a>					1.16		No					2009	9
30	CSA (Library)	<a href="#">Service Area #10</a>																				2007	11
31	CSA (Road)	<a href="#">Service Area #2</a>																				2010	4
32	CSA (Drainage)	<a href="#">Service Area #5</a>																				2008	2
33	CSA (Road, Cemetery)	<a href="#">Service Area #9</a>																				2020	12
34	P&R	<a href="#">Tahoe Paradise Park &amp; Recreation District</a>	69,135	50,032		2,500	Yes	No		<a href="https://www.tahoeparadisepark.com/">https://www.tahoeparadisepark.com/</a>	Maybe	None			6,400	2,200			No	Yes	2017	6	
35	RCD	<a href="#">Tahoe Resource Conservation District</a>	1,433,028	1,440,719		23,383	Yes	Yes		<a href="https://tahoebcd.org/">https://tahoebcd.org/</a>		None			240,000		No			Yes	2020	12	

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	<b>MUNICIPAL SERVICES MSR/SOI Project Cycle</b>					
2	<b><u>Policies and Guidelines for MSR/SOI Review (Sections 4 and 5)</u></b>					
3	<b>Municipal Services</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Latest MSR Year</b>	<b>Targeted MSR</b>	<b>Next MSR Year Cycle</b>
4	Yes	Wastewater, recreation	<a href="#">Greenstone Country CSD</a>	2010		2023 (FY 22-23)
5	No*	P&R, L&L	<a href="#">Cameron Park CSD (non-fire)</a>	2022		In Progress 2022
6	Yes	City	<a href="#">City of South Lake Tahoe</a>	2016		In Progress 2022
7	Yes	City	<a href="#">City of Placerville</a>	2017		In Progress 2022
8	No*	P&R, L&L	<a href="#">El Dorado Hills CSD</a>	2020		2025
9	Yes	Water	<a href="#">El Dorado Irrigation District</a>	2020		2025
10	Yes	Water	<a href="#">Grizzly Flats CSD</a>	2022	2025	2027
11	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Cameron Park CSD (fire)</a>	2022		2027
12	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">City of South Lake Tahoe (fire)</a>	2022		2027
13	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Diamond Springs/El Dorado Fire Protection District</a>	2022		2027
14	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">El Dorado County Fire Protection District</a>	2022		2027
15	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">El Dorado Hills County Water District</a>	2022		2027
16	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Fallen Leaf Lake Community Services District (fire)</a>	2022	2025	2027
17	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Garden Valley Fire Protection District</a>	2022	2025	2027
18	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Georgetown Fire Protection District</a>	2022		2027
19	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Lake Valley Fire Protection District</a>	2022		2027
20	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Meeks Bay Fire Protection District</a>	2022		2027
21	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Mosquito Fire Protection District</a>	2022	2025	2027
22	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Pioneer Fire Protection District</a>	2022	2025	2027
23	Yes	Fire	<a href="#">Rescue Fire Protection District</a>	2022	2025	2027
24	Yes	Water	<a href="#">Georgetown Divide PUD</a>	2022		2027
25	Yes	Water	<a href="#">South Tahoe PUD</a>	2022		2027
26	Yes	CSA (EMS)	<a href="#">County Service Area #3</a>	2022		2027
27	Yes	CSA (EMS)	<a href="#">County Service Area #7</a>	2022		2027
28	* As identified by the Commission					

	A	B	C	D	E	F
29	<b>NON-MUNICIPAL SERVICES MSR/SOI Project Cycle</b>					
30	<b>Municipal Services</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Latest MSR Year</b>	<b>Non-Municipal Services Analysis Report</b>	<b>Next SOI Year Cycle</b>
31	No	Road	<a href="#">Arroyo Vista CSD</a>	2018	2022	2023 (FY 23-24)
32	No	Road	<a href="#">Knolls CSD</a>	2009	2022	2023 (FY 23-24)
33	No	Road	<a href="#">Lakeview CSD</a>	2019	2022	2023 (FY 23-24)
34	No	Road	<a href="#">Rising Hill Road CSD</a>	2007	2022	2023 (FY 23-24)
35	No	Road	<a href="#">Sierra Oaks CSD</a>	2021	2022	2023 (FY 23-24)
36	No	Road	<a href="#">Audubon Hills CSD</a>	2010	2022	As Necessary
37	No	Road	<a href="#">Cameron Estates CSD</a>	2018	2022	As Necessary
38	No	Airport	<a href="#">Cameron Park Airport District</a>	2010	2022	As Necessary
39	No	Road	<a href="#">Connie Lane CSD</a>	2016	2022	As Necessary
40	No	Road	<a href="#">Cosumnes River CSD</a>	2017	2022	As Necessary
41	No	Road	<a href="#">East China Hill CSD</a>	2007	2022	As Necessary
42	No	RCD	<a href="#">El Dorado County Resource Consvn Dist</a>	2020	2022	As Necessary
43	No	P&R	<a href="#">Fallen Leaf Lake Community Services District (non-fire)</a>	2013	2022	As Necessary
44	No	Road	<a href="#">Garden Valley Ranch Estates CSD</a>	2021	2022	As Necessary
45	No	Rec	<a href="#">Georgetown Divide Recreation District</a>	2011	2022	As Necessary
46	No	RCD	<a href="#">Georgetown Divide Resource Conservation District</a>	2020	2022	As Necessary
47	No	Road	<a href="#">Golden West CSD</a>	2016	2022	As Necessary
48	No	Cemetery	<a href="#">Happy Homestead Cemetery District</a>	2007	2022	As Necessary
49	No	Road	<a href="#">Hickok Road CSD</a>	2021	2022	As Necessary
50	No	Road	<a href="#">Hillwood CSD</a>	2016	2022	As Necessary
51	No	P&R	<a href="#">Holiday Lake CSD (public/private ownership issue)</a>	2018	2022	As Necessary
52	No	Cemetery	<a href="#">Kelsey Cemetery District</a>	2009	2022	As Necessary

	A	B	C	D	E	F
53	<b>NON-MUNICIPAL SERVICES MSR/SOI Project Cycle</b>					
54	<b>Municipal Services</b>	<b>Service</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>Latest MSR Year</b>	<b>Non-Municipal Services Analysis Report</b>	<b>Next SOI Year Cycle</b>
55	No	Road	<a href="#">Marble Mountain Homeowners CSD</a>	2017	2022	As Necessary
56	No	Road	<a href="#">Mortara Circle CSD</a>	2009	2022	As Necessary
57	No	Road	<a href="#">Nashville Trail CSD</a>	2017	2022	As Necessary
58	No	Road	<a href="#">Rolling Hills CSD</a>	2018	2022	As Necessary
59	No	CSA(Library)	<a href="#">Service Area #10</a>	2007	2022	As Necessary
60	No	CSA(Road)	<a href="#">Service Area #2</a>	2010	2022	As Necessary
61	No	CSA(Drainage)	<a href="#">Service Area #5</a>	2008	2022	As Necessary
62	No	CSA(Road/Cemetery)	<a href="#">Service Area #9</a>	2020	2022	As Necessary
63	No	Road	<a href="#">Showcase Ranches CSD</a>	2020	2022	As Necessary
64	No	P&R	<a href="#">Tahoe Paradise Park &amp; Recreation District</a>	2017	2022	As Necessary
65	No	RCD	<a href="#">Tahoe Resource Conservation District</a>	2020	2022	As Necessary
66	No	Road	<a href="#">West El Largo CSD</a>	2010	2022	As Necessary