

EL DORADO LAFCO

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

AGENDA OF FEBRUARY 27, 2013

REGULAR MEETING

TO: Ron Briggs, Chair, and
Members of the El Dorado County Local Agency Formation
Commission

FROM: José C. Henríquez, Executive Officer

**AGENDA ITEM #10: PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AND ADOPT THE
PROJECT PLAN FOR THE NEXT CYCLE OF MUNICIPAL
SERVICES REVIEWS**

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission consider the following information on the various options for the next municipal service review cycle and direct staff to implement the Commission's preferences. Staff's recommendations include:

1. Continue to conduct MSRs on a per-agency basis;
2. Adopt an eight-year project plan schedule; and
3. Continue to fund MSR studies as part of this agency's administrative functions.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

Beginning on or before January 2008, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act requires the Commission to update the spheres of influence for all agencies every five years. Prior to such updates, however, the Commission must conduct municipal service reviews. Because the next cycle begins in 2013, staff recommends the following project plan to manage this workload in a methodical manner.

BACKGROUND

As the Commission is aware, part of the responsibilities of LAFCO is the creation of two important studies, the Municipal Service Review (MSR) and the Sphere of Influence Study (SOI). Each of those analyses are required by Government Code §§56430 and 56425, respectively. Although these two studies perform different functions, they are related. The MSR is a snapshot in time, containing information as to how an agency is providing service and how it is doing financially. The SOI is the Commission's extrapolation of how much and how fast an agency may grow over time, with the MSR's

data, theoretically, providing the foundation justifying the SOI. Attachment A contains a useful summary of how and why LAFCO was required to create MSR and SOI. Please note that the determinations listed for each report have changed since 2010; however, the basis and history is still valid.

This LAFCO’s experience in the inaugural cycle of MSR/SOIs (2001-2008) was not pleasant. Because work had been delayed and unfunded, the Commission spent considerable resources in 2006-2008 to complete all of the necessary studies, including the hiring of consultants to supplement staff’s work. For the second cycle (2008-2013), the Commission expressed its unwillingness to enter into this cycle without instituting a methodical plan. After months of discussions, the Commission adopted the current MSR/SOI project plan to spread the work across five years (Attachment B).

Differences in Methodology of MSR/SOIs

	<u>Inaugural Set (2001-2008)</u>	<u>Second Cycle (2009-2013)</u>
Process	MSR studied a type of service across multiple agencies. Separate SOI documents were prepared for each agency.	Studied all services with an agency. Reports integrated SOI analysis, determinations and recommendations.
Funding	No dedicated source. Commission invested \$185,000 to hire consultants to supplement staff	No dedicated source. Commission added MSR/SOI work to administrative functions of staff.
Scope	All agencies were reviewed.	Commission categorized agencies into three groups: “Always,” “Assessment-only Agencies” and “By Score.”
Timing	No project plan. Most work completed between 2006-2008.	Commission adopted five-year project plan.

The table above summarizes the different methodologies the Commission used in the first two MSR/SOI cycles. The Process, Funding and Timing are self explanatory, but the categories behind Scope needs further explanation.

- Always – These agencies either provide vital services to residents, serve a significant percentage of county residents, or both. Agencies under this category will be studied in every cycle and include:
 - Cameron Park CSD
 - City of Placerville
 - City of South Lake Tahoe
 - El Dorado Hills CSD
 - El Dorado Irrigation District
 - Georgetown Divide PUD
 - Grizzly Flat CSD
 - South Tahoe PUD

- Assessment-only Agencies – These agencies were organized to levy assessments only, do not directly provide services, have no staff, and no staff salaries are dependent on these revenues. The Commission can determine that, since they do not provide any services that can be studied, agencies in this category do not have to be studied in the next cycle. These pass-through agencies include:
 - County Service Area Number 5 (on the other hand, General Government Services I MSR found that the revenues CSA 5 collected have not been expended on services for two years)
 - County Service Area Number 7
 - County Service Area Number 10
- By Score – For the remaining 46 agencies that could not be categorized under “Always” or under “Assessment-only Agencies,” staff created a ranking based on the total score of two dimensions. These dimensions were “activity level” and “number of issues that were found in the current set of MSRs.” The intent was to capture the Commission concern of concentrating resources on those agencies that were active and staff’s recommendation of determining service level trends:
 - Activity levels were ranked by “high” (3), “somewhat active” (2) and “little or no activity” (1). A level 3 would be given to agencies that have or will soon have pending applications to LAFCO. A level 2 was given to agencies that have potential applications based on information the agency provided to LAFCO staff and/or on the discussion found in the MSR. A level 1 was given to agencies that did not fall into either category.
 - Challenges were ranked based on whether the MSR found “multiple” challenges (3), an “average or moderate” number (2) or “little or no” challenges (1). An agency would be given a level 3 if the MSR found that the agency was having problems with significant items, such as service provision, financing, pending legal questions, “free riders” or with government and management. A level 2 would be given to an agency if its challenges encompassed no more than one or two of the challenges listed in level 3. Level 1 would be given to an agency that was found not to have any significant challenges.

These two dimensions created a spectrum where at one end, an agency is neither active or has any significant issues (combined score of “2”), and at the other end, an agency is very active and has a significant number of issues (combined score of “6”). For the Second Cycle, the Commission determined that it would study 34 “By Score” agencies whose combined score was three or higher. Twelve agencies, whose score was 2, were given a “To be studied as time allows” status (three of these were subsequently re-categorized and studied).

Progress Report

The direction from the Commission was to update the inaugural cycle of MSR/SOIs with new or current information, not to reinvent the proverbial wheel. While the plan made the update of MSRs and SOI manageable, time is running out before it is fully implemented. Due to other events, such as staff layoffs, complex and unforeseen projects (such as the Rancheria Reorganization and the administration of Citygate’s *Fire and Emergency Services Study*) and some projects taking longer than expected, staff is

behind in updating the MSR/SOIs from the inaugural cycle. The current status of the project plan is:

- **Fiscal Year 2008-2009** – All complete except for Fallen Leaf Lake CSD (FLL). The FLL MSR/SOI is complete and an administrative draft of the report was submitted to the district for review and comment on March 2012. No response has been received despite three attempts to contact district staff.
- **Fiscal Year 2009-2010** – All complete except for Rising Hill Road CSD, whose MSR/SOI was de-prioritized by LAFCO staff.
- **Fiscal Year 2010-2011** – Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills CSDs and Georgetown Divide PUD are complete. The Commission took action on South Tahoe PUD earlier in this agenda. Work on the Grizzly Flats CSD is in its initial stages. In 2010, the Commission instructed staff to allow the EID study to be updated/written by El Dorado Irrigation District staff.
- **Fiscal Year 2011-12** – Work on the City of Placerville is in its very initial stages. Work on South Lake Tahoe has not begun.
- **Fiscal Year 2012-13** – No work on any district has begun

Proposed Project Plan for Third Cycle

Staff recommends that the third cycle retain the following elements from the current project plan:

- **Process** – MSRs are conducted on a per agency basis covering all services provided by that agency. A comprehensive report on an agency allows the Commission and the public to gain insight on the agency without having to piece together information from multiple reports.
- **Funding** – Each fiscal year's budget will consider MSR/SOI work as part of the administrative function of the agency
- **Scope** – The current categorization methodology used to determine whether an MSR/SOI study is necessary

On the Timing element, staff does recommend deviating from current practice by recommending an eight-year project plan. In Attachment A, there is a discussion that the Legislature wanted the SOI's to be the LAFCO equivalents of a land use agency's general plan. Further, the Legislature included a five-year horizon in Government Code §56425 because it wanted the SOIs to be updated as regularly as general plans were updated. In 2000, the only general plan element required to be periodically required, specifically every five years, was the housing element. The connection the Legislature wanted to make between the housing elements and SOIs was clear: Housing is a significant force behind growth and LAFCO needed to be partners with the land use authorities and service agencies in order to accommodate and guide such growth and development in a logical manner. The local land use authorities (the two cities and the County) are in the process of updating their respective housing elements in 2013, which happens to coincide with the next cycle.

When the Legislature adopted SB 375 (Steinberg, the "Sustainable Communities Strategy" or SCS) in 2008, it changed the period for housing element updates from five

years to eight years. LAFCO Law, specifically Government Code §56425, was not similarly updated. It stands to reason that if the Legislature meant for a nexus to exist between 56425 and the housing element update requirement, then there is also a connection in the amount of time given for the updates to occur.

Staff is not alone in advocating for adjusting the SOI update horizon; the personnel at other LAFCOs share that sentiment. In late 2010, CALAFCO proposed the idea of extending the timeframe for MSR/SOIs to eight years in instances where the following parameters are met:

- There is an adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and SCS; and
- The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has approved the housing element from the local jurisdictions and those jurisdictions are placed in an eight-year element update cycle.

In addition to reducing LAFCO's annual cost for MSR/SOIs by spreading them out, the goal was to time these studies so they would be completed just prior to the local COG updating its regional SCS/RTP, ensuring that it had the most current information on spheres and agency performance.

While HCD and the COGs are supportive of the idea, there is the technical challenge that there is not a specific adoption date for each RTP. This is because the adoption dates for RTPs vary by COG location and are all over the calendar. Without a common RTP date, it became difficult to determine how GC56425 could be rewritten in a way so that it is specific on that date in which the MSR/SOI update cycles would begin and end and be applicable to all LAFCOs.

In addition, given staff levels – LAFCO has not had a Commission Clerk since 2008, reducing workforce power by 33% – and the experience with the second cycle, it is apparent that a five-year project plan is too short a time to complete updates on 45 agencies. The Fire MSR/SOI was delayed because of both its own inherent complexity plus the County and the fire districts asked your Executive Officer to administer the 2010 Fire and Emergency Services Study on their behalf. The Shingle Springs Rancheria Reorganization delayed your Policy Analyst from starting the Grizzly Flats CSD MSR/SOI. Consequently, one large project or a series of small projects prevents the existing staff from being able to work on MSR and SOIs.

For these three reasons, staff recommends that the Commission consider a project plan with a longer, eight-year horizon. The proposal includes:

- Carryover the completion of the studies for the two cities into FY2013-14;
- Taking the agencies that should have been studied in FY2012-13 and study them in FY2014-15;
- Re-evaluating the “By Score” agencies that were studied in the Second Cycle to determine whether they will be reviewed in the third cycle (refer to Attachment C);
- Study the “As time allows” agencies in the third cycle; and
- The project plan will recognize the Fire MSR/SOI and the study of larger districts take two fiscal years to complete.

Attachment D contains the project plan for the third cycle for the Commission's consideration and adoption.

Attachments

Attachment A: Summary of events leading to MSR/SOI requirement, as documented by staff memo and its attachments from the March 24, 2010 meeting

Attachment B: Second Cycle MSR/SOI Project Plan

Attachment C: Re-evaluation of the "By Score" agencies reviewed in the Second Cycle

Attachment D: Recommended Project Plan for the Third MSR/SOI Cycle (2013-2021)

EL DORADO LAFCO

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

AGENDA OF MARCH 24, 2010

REGULAR MEETING

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

FROM: José C. Henríquez, Executive Officer

AGENDA ITEM #5: PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO DISCUSS MUNICIPAL SERVICE
REVIEWS AND SPHERE OF INFLUENCE STUDIES

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission receive and discuss the following information on Municipal Service Reviews and Sphere of Influence updates to guide its decisions on the LAFCO budget.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDED ACTION

This Workshop was requested by Commissioner Sweeney to start a dialogue regarding the need to fund outsourcing Municipal Service Reviews and to spur a discussion between local and State officials regarding the MSR requirement.

BACKGROUND

Creation of LAFCOs

In order to better understand Municipal Service Reviews, it is important to go back to the beginning and to understand why LAFCOs exist. The creation of LAFCO was a legislative response to actions by local jurisdictions in the 1940s and 1950s. Agencies incorporated or annexed large, irregular portions of land in a manner resulting in irrational boundaries, including:

- Overlapping boundaries: Conflicts arose over which agency would provide service when multiple entities providing the same and similar services presided over the same area.
- Inefficient service boundaries: Agencies gerrymandered themselves to serve the “choice” areas (usually new development projects) and ignoring “less desirable” areas (typically already built out areas or minority neighborhoods). This practice caused extremely peculiar infrastructure networks that proved costly to maintain in

the long run and confusion among citizens as to which entity is actually providing services.

- Unnecessary conversion of prime agricultural land and isolated populations without efficient services or with no services at all: Land use entities were approving development projects without regard to the capacity and capability of providing service.

In 1959, former Governor Pat Brown created the Commission on Metropolitan Area Problems, whose charge was to study and make recommendations on the "misuse of land resources" and the growing complexity of local governmental jurisdictions. The Commission's recommendation was to create a single State agency to oversee all local governmental boundaries, but the Legislature changed LAFCO to be a State agency with local representation. Consequently, a LAFCO is not a body of appointed officials but a State regulatory agency overseeing the orderly and efficient provision of local services. In other words, LAFCOs are intended to implement State mandates, taking into account local circumstances. However, State Law advises LAFCO officials that their primary purpose is to carry out their duties as Commissioners:

"While serving on the commission, all commission members shall exercise their independent judgment on behalf of the interests of residents, property owners, and the public as a whole in furthering the purposes of this division. Any member appointed on behalf of local governments shall represent the interests of the public as a whole and not solely the interests of the appointing authority. This section does not require the abstention of any member on any matter, nor does it create a right of action in any person." (Emphasis added, Government Code §56325.1)

Main Duties of LAFCOs

LAFCOs were given four broad mandates (Government Code §56001). This section, and other code sections referenced in the discussion, will be attached to this report for reference:

- Promote orderly growth and development
- Discourage urban sprawl
- Preserve open space and agricultural resources
- Encourage efficient service areas for local governments

These four mandates can sometimes be in conflict with each other on a proposal-by-proposal basis; however, specific conflicts have not diminished the overall broad purpose of LAFCO, a role that has been recognized and reinforced in case law and has come to be defined as the "Legislature's Watchdog:"

"LAFCOs were created by the Legislature for a special purpose: to discourage urban sprawl and to encourage the orderly formation and development of local governmental agencies; such a commission is the 'watchdog' the Legislature established to guard against the wasteful duplication of services that results from indiscriminate formation of new local agencies or haphazard annexation of territory to existing local agencies." Fifth District: 274 Cal.App.2d 545. 1 July 1969 (City of Ceres v. City of Modesto)

To assist LAFCOs with determining how well individual proposals fit within those four mandates, the Legislature mandated that Commissions use 15 factors for the Commission to consider when evaluating proposals (Government Code §56668 and LAFCO staff further breaks the 15 factors into 28 smaller questions).

Spheres of Influence Mandate

The legislature first required LAFCOs to adopt spheres in response to criticism that LAFCOs were making boundary decisions without the guidance of long-range goals. “Spheres of Influence” (Government Code §56425) were intended to be used as policy and planning tools, taking a long range approach towards implementing the four broad mandates. Because they were designed to be a long range policy tool – similar to budgets or work plans - SOIs help inform and assist local agencies with their planning activities.

Described as the “constitution for LAFCO decisions,” SOIs are similar to general plans in that they are blueprints for the probable and foreseeable future boundaries of each agency. SOIs are supposed to coordinate services and plans and resolve turf issues by answering these four determinations [Government Code §56425(e)]:

- The area’s present and planned land uses, including agricultural and open space areas
- The area’s present and probable future need for public facilities and services;
- The agency’s present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services provided; and
- The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area.

El Dorado LAFCO’s Policies and Guidelines further clarify that SOIs will be subject to a periodic five-year review (Section 4.2) and this Commission’s goals for spheres for influence by stating that SOIs (Section 4.1):

- Serve as a master plan for the future organization of local government within the County by providing long range guidelines for the efficient provision of services to the public;
- Discourage duplication of services by two or more local governmental agencies;
- Guide the Commission when considering individual proposals for changes of organization;
- Identify the need for specific reorganization studies, and provide the basis for recommendations to particular agencies for government reorganizations.

Practices vary from LAFCO to LAFCO on how “probable and foreseeable future” is defined, with many LAFCO’s using the same time horizon in a city’s general plan for the sphere designations. In recent history, El Dorado LAFCO has utilized one of three different time horizons:

- Not specifying a time horizon for agencies, usually used on agencies not expected to grow;

- Specifying 10 and 20 year SOIs for large agencies that have had a recent history of growth; and
- Not specifying a time horizon for large agencies with historic growth patterns.

In addition, with the exception of approximately seven agencies, this Commission has not adjusted the historic SOIs for most agencies, choosing instead to affirm their existing sphere. These SOIs were drawn decades ago with little or no analysis on the resources or finances available to the agency.

Municipal Service Reviews Requirement

The initial SOI statutory mandate, in 1971, imposed no deadline for completing initial sphere designations. When most LAFCOs failed to act, legislation was enacted in 1984 requiring all LAFCOs to establish spheres of influence by 1985. All LAFCOs met that deadline; however, many of the sphere boundaries were set with little analytical basis and by the year 2000, only 30 of the 58 LAFCOs had completed comprehensive studies to update their spheres.

In 2000, the Legislature created the Commission on Local Governance for the 21st Century (CLGC), which analyzed, among other things, LAFCO Law and recommended changes to the way LAFCOs operated. Many of the Commission's recommendations were incorporated into the law that became the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act. Among the findings, the CLGC believed that carefully considered and up-to-date spheres of influence determinations are critical to LAFCO's responsibility to assure orderly growth and development and prevent sprawl within their jurisdictions. The twin challenges were to eliminate the sins of the past (outdated and/or incomplete SOIs) and ensure informed future decisions by LAFCOs. The CLGC reasoned that if the goal is viable public agencies that strike a balance between accommodating growth while preserving valuable resources and community character, then it follows that the goal can only be achieved through the possession of timely information that can be used to create spheres that direct growth consistent with that balance:

"Meaningful spheres will not be possible unless they are regularly updated based upon comprehensive studies and they incorporate actual and projected information on trends in growth and development, service capacities, and public preferences." (Commission on Local Governance for the 21st Century)

From this recommendation arose the municipal service review requirement, which is found in Government Code §56430. It states in part, *"In order to prepare and to update sphere of influence in accordance with Section 56425, the commission shall conduct a service review of the municipal services provided in the county..."* Each service review, must address six factors, which are:

- (1) Growth and population projections for the affected area.
- (2) Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs or deficiencies.
- (3) Financial ability of agencies to provide services.
- (4) Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities.

- (5) Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies.
- (6) Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy.

On January 30, 2008, the Commission voted to make "The potential effect of agency services on agricultural and open space lands" the sixth factor in an MSR.

In 2006 and 2007, the Commission allocated sufficient funds into its budget so that consultants would supplement staff in the completion of the MSR/SOI update project. The Commission adopted the last MSR in December 2007 and updated all but one SOI by March 2008 (Grassy Run CSD's SOI was not updated at the district's request, pending the successful settlement with the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians).

Discussion

Based on the rationale behind the CLGC's recommendation, and subsequent adoption by the Legislature and El Dorado LAFCO's adoption of Section 5 of its Policies and Guidelines, SOIs are intended to reflect realistically probable future boundaries of an agency. Also based on these documents, the impetus behind the MSR requirement is to provide information to the Commission and to the public to support the Commission's determination for those SOIs. Said in another way, the MSRs are intended to provide the big picture, or necessary background knowledge on the current state of an agency, to supplement the information the applicant has provided on individual applications. For example, an applicant may want to annex into a district and only provide information that is supportive of the annexation in the petition materials, but the MSR and SOI for that agency can be used as an objective tool to determine whether the annexation should be approved because MSRs are supposed to paint a more complete picture.

The way LAFCO staff describes the ideal relationship between MSRs and SOIs is that the MSR takes a snapshot in time to determine objectively where the agency is currently with resources and finances. It then uses that data to extrapolate where the agency should be within a time horizon based on long term trends and on land use preferences determined by the land use agency. For example, an SOI should direct growth towards areas where growth is expected and away from areas where it is discouraged (for example, agricultural zones). But the adequacy and effectiveness of MSRs and SOIs are what a LAFCO makes them to be.

The MSR and SOI differ from a general plan in that a general plan guides the growth and land development of a community, for both the current period and the long term. The General Plan is the foundation for establishing goals, purposes, zoning and activities allowed on each land parcel to provide compatibility and continuity to the entire region as well as each individual neighborhood. Depending on the jurisdiction, a general plan can be overly broad and may not contain sufficient, objective information relating service capacity and capability. Most importantly, because general plans are also intended to regulate land use, only cities and counties generate them.

For special districts that prepare annual reports, the information in these reports may be limited by the priorities of the board of directors. For example, in the Fire MSRs, LAFCO staff has utilized raw data from Camino Dispatch because each individual fire agency converts call data to address local preferences in how the data is reported. As

a result, there is no uniformity in definitions from one fire district to the other. In addition, not all agencies prepare these reports and the quality of data within these reports varies significantly. Some agencies prepare extensive, data-intensive reports with a prognosticative section that addresses resource planning; others simply summarize the events from the prior years and contain limited information which may or may not be used for long term planning.

MSRs and SOIs differ from Grand Jury reports in that grand juries only get involved when there is a question of misconduct on the part of the agency or of its representatives. They are rarely periodic and seldom used for long term planning. MSRs are not intended to investigate malfeasance.

As the Commission weighs the question of the relative value of MSRs, it should discuss the following:

- 1) Has the Commission used the MSRs when evaluating recent annexations?
- 2) Does the Commission find MSRs useful and valuable in general? If not, why not? What would make them more useful?
- 3) Several Commissioners expressed a willingness to create MSRs that are at a "bare minimum." Within the state requirements of addressing the six factors in Government Code 56430, what does "bare minimum" mean? If the MSRs are kept "at a minimum," what effect would that have on LAFCO's decision-making process?
- 4) If LAFCO does not compile a comprehensive MSR, then how comfortable is this Commission with relying on information provided by the applicant and/or another agency's data?
- 5) Should the Commission choose to have more comprehensive MSRs, would the Commission be supportive of making a stronger connection between the conclusions arrived at by the MSRs and the subsequent SOIs?
- 6) How active should this Commission be with long term planning?
- 7) What specific and concrete direction can be given to staff relating to MSR creation and data gathering?
- 8) What feedback does this Commission want to give to legislative representatives?

Attachments

Attachment A: Government Code §56001

Attachment B: Government Code §56668

Attachment C: Government Code §56425

Attachment D: LAFCO Policies & Guidelines Section 4

Attachment E: Government Code §56430

Attachment F: LAFCO Policies & Guidelines Section 5

Government Code 56001

The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state to encourage orderly growth and development which are essential to the social, fiscal, and economic well-being of the state. The Legislature recognizes that the logical formation and determination of local agency boundaries is an important factor in promoting orderly development and in balancing that development with sometimes competing state interests of discouraging urban sprawl, preserving open-space and prime agricultural lands, and efficiently extending government services. The Legislature also recognizes that providing housing for persons and families of all incomes is an important factor in promoting orderly development. Therefore, the Legislature further finds and declares that this policy should be effected by the logical formation and modification of the boundaries of local agencies, with a preference granted to accommodating additional growth within, or through the expansion of, the boundaries of those local agencies which can best accommodate and provide necessary governmental services and housing for persons and families of all incomes in the most efficient manner feasible.

The Legislature recognizes that urban population densities and intensive residential, commercial, and industrial development necessitate a broad spectrum and high level of community services and controls. The Legislature also recognizes that when areas become urbanized to the extent that they need the full range of community services, priorities are required to be established regarding the type and levels of services that the residents of an urban community need and desire; that community service priorities be established by weighing the total community service needs against the total financial resources available for securing community services; and that those community service priorities are required to reflect local circumstances, conditions, and limited financial resources. The Legislature finds and declares that a single multipurpose governmental agency is accountable for community service needs and financial resources and, therefore, may be the best mechanism for establishing community service priorities especially in urban areas. Nonetheless, the Legislature recognizes the critical role of many limited purpose agencies, especially in rural communities. The Legislature also finds that, whether governmental services are proposed to be provided by a single-purpose agency, several agencies, or a multipurpose agency, responsibility should be given to the agency or agencies that can best provide government services.

Government Code 56668

Factors to be considered in the review of a proposal shall include, but not be limited to, all of the following:

- (a) Population and population density; land area and land use; per capita assessed valuation; topography, natural boundaries, and drainage basins; proximity to other populated areas; the likelihood of significant growth in the area, and in adjacent incorporated and unincorporated areas, during the next 10 years.
- (b) The need for organized community services; the present cost and adequacy of governmental services and controls in the area; probable future needs for those services and controls; probable effect of the proposed incorporation, formation, annexation, or exclusion and of alternative courses of action on the cost and adequacy of services and controls in the area and adjacent areas.

"Services," as used in this subdivision, refers to governmental services whether or not the services are services which would be provided by local agencies subject to this division, and includes the public facilities necessary to provide those services.
- (c) The effect of the proposed action and of alternative actions, on adjacent areas, on mutual social and economic interests, and on the local governmental structure of the county.
- (d) The conformity of both the proposal and its anticipated effects with both the adopted commission policies on providing planned, orderly, efficient patterns of urban development, and the policies and priorities in Section 56377.
- (e) The effect of the proposal on maintaining the physical and economic integrity of agricultural lands, as defined by Section 56016.
- (f) The definiteness and certainty of the boundaries of the territory, the nonconformance of proposed boundaries with lines of assessment or ownership, the creation of islands or corridors of unincorporated territory, and other similar matters affecting the proposed boundaries.
- (g) A regional transportation plan adopted pursuant to Section 65080, and consistency with city or county general and specific plans.
- (h) The sphere of influence of any local agency which may be applicable to the proposal being reviewed.
- (i) The comments of any affected local agency or other public agency.
- (j) The ability of the newly formed or receiving entity to provide the services which are the subject of the application to the area, including the sufficiency of revenues for those services following the proposed boundary change.
- (k) Timely availability of water supplies adequate for projected needs as specified in Section 65352.5.

- (l) The extent to which the proposal will affect a city or cities and the county in achieving their respective fair shares of the regional housing needs as determined by the appropriate council of governments consistent with Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580) of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7.
- (m) Any information or comments from the landowner or owners, voters, or residents of the affected territory.
- (n) Any information relating to existing land use designations.
- (o) The extent to which the proposal will promote environmental justice. As used in this subdivision, "environmental justice" means the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the location of public facilities and the provision of public services.

Government Code 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 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 local governmental agency within the county and enact policies designed to promote the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere.
- (b) Prior to a city submitting an application to the commission to update its sphere of influence, representatives from the city and representatives from the county shall meet to discuss the proposed new boundaries of the sphere and explore methods to reach agreement on development standards and planning and zoning requirements within the sphere to ensure that development within the sphere occurs in a manner that reflects the concerns of the affected city and is accomplished in a manner that promotes the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere. If an agreement is reached between the city and county, the city shall forward the agreement in writing to the commission, along with the application to update the sphere of influence. The commission shall consider and adopt a sphere of influence for the city consistent with the policies adopted by the commission pursuant to this section, and the commission shall give great weight to the agreement to the extent that it is consistent with commission policies in its final determination of the city sphere.
- (c) If the commission's final determination is consistent with the agreement reached between the city and county pursuant to subdivision (b), the agreement shall be adopted by both the city and county after a noticed public hearing. Once the agreement has been adopted by the affected local agencies and their respective general plans reflect that agreement, then any development approved by the county within the sphere shall be consistent with the terms of that agreement.
- (d) If no agreement is reached pursuant to subdivision (b), the application may be submitted to the commission and the commission shall consider a sphere of influence for the city consistent with the policies adopted by the commission pursuant to this section.
- (e) In determining the sphere of influence of each local agency, the commission shall consider and prepare a written statement of its determinations with respect to each of the following:
 - (1) The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.
 - (2) The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.
 - (3) The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide.

- (4) The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.
- (f) Upon determination of a sphere of influence, the commission shall adopt that sphere.
- (g) On or before January 1, 2008, and every five years thereafter, the commission shall, as necessary, review and update each sphere of influence.
- (h) The commission may recommend governmental reorganizations to particular agencies in the county, using the spheres of influence as the basis for those recommendations. Those recommendations shall be made available, upon request, to other agencies or to the public. The commission shall make all reasonable efforts to ensure wide public dissemination of the recommendations.
- (i) When adopting, amending, or updating a sphere of influence for a special district, the commission shall do all of the following:
 - (1) Require existing districts to file written statements with the commission specifying the functions or classes of services provided by those districts.
 - (2) Establish the nature, location, and extent of any functions or classes of services provided by existing districts.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

4 SPHERE OF INFLUENCE (Adopted 11/5/98)

4.1 GENERAL

Government Code, beginning with §56425, requires the Local Agency Formation Commission to establish and maintain spheres of influence for all local agencies within its jurisdiction. A sphere of influence (SOI) is defined by statute as a “plan for the probable physical boundary and service area of a local government agency as determined by the commission” (§56076). Every determination made by a commission shall be consistent with the spheres of influence of the local agencies affected by that determination (§56375.5). A sphere of influence is primarily a planning tool that will:

- Serve as a master plan for the future organization of local government within the County by providing long range guidelines for the efficient provision of services to the public;
- Discourage duplication of services by two or more local governmental agencies;
- Guide the Commission when considering individual proposals for changes of organization;
- Identify the need for specific reorganization studies, and provide the basis for recommendations to particular agencies for government reorganizations.

4.1.1 LAFCO shall establish the nature, location, and extent of any functions or classes of service provided by existing districts as part of SOI update and service review processes (§56425, §56430). LAFCO may classify service types, where appropriate, pursuant to §56820.5.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

4.2 PERIODIC REVIEW AND MAINTENANCE

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.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES**4.3 LIMITED SERVICE SPHERE OF INFLUENCE**

Territory proposed for inclusion within the SOI of a multi-service provider agency which is also contained within the boundary of another limited purpose district (providing some but not all of the services which may be needed), may be included within the SOI of the multi-service agency and designated as a limited service sphere of influence area. Territory designated as limited service sphere may be considered for annexation to the multi-service agency, without concurrent detachment from the limited purpose district, when the following determinations are made by the Commission:

- No feasible or logical alternative arrangement exists for the provision of service in the territory proposed for inclusion within the SOI.
- The existing multi-service agency is the most orderly and logical provider of some of the services which will be needed in the future.
- Existing services provided by the limited purpose district are found to be adequate, cost effective and efficient.
- Inclusion of the territory in the SOI is in the best interests of local government organization and structure in the area.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

4.4 CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF SPHERE OF INFLUENCE AMENDMENTS
(§56425)

In determining the sphere of influence for each local agency the commission shall prepare a written statement of determinations with respect to each of the following:

- 4.4.1 The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.
- 4.4.2 The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.
- 4.4.3 The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services which the agency provides or is authorized to provide.
- 4.4.4 The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

Before making these determinations, the Commission will review the following:

- The service capacity, level and types of services currently provided by the agency and the areas where these services are provided, topographic factors, financial capabilities, costs of service, and social and economic interdependencies;
- Existing and planned land uses, land use plans and policies; consistency with county and city general plans; projected growth in the affected area , and potential effects on agricultural and open space lands;
- A description of the services that will be provided to any areas which may be added to the sphere, the timing and method for funding expansion of facilities or services;
- An analysis of the effects a proposed sphere of influence on other agencies and their service capabilities;

- 4.4.5 A substantial SOI amendment is an amendment that causes the SOI to be internally inconsistent, is inconsistent with provisions of the CKH Act, has the potential to cause significant adverse social, economic, environmental or other consequences, or has substantial adverse regional planning implications. Substantial SOI amendments shall not be processed until service reviews are completed (§56430) and the subject SOI is updated consistent with §56425.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

- 4.4.6 A substantial SOI amendment may be processed concurrently with a service review and incorporated into an SOI update. However, LAFCO will make service review determinations prior to considering a substantial SOI amendment (§56425, §56430).
- 4.4.7 A service review of all municipal services pertaining to the subject SOI will be prepared prior to, or in conjunction with, each SOI update (§56430) or substantial amendment unless the Commission determines that a prior service review is still adequate.
- 4.4.8 When determining which local agency should provide services, considerable weight will be given to an agency's ability and willingness to provide services. When more than one agency can serve an area, LAFCO shall also consider the conclusions of service reviews, each agency's service capacity, financial capabilities and costs of service, social and economic interdependencies, topographic, historic and environmental factors, input from affected communities and agencies, and pertinent LAFCO policies (§56668, §56430).
- 4.4.9 LAFCO shall prioritize pending or anticipated SOI actions and related services review, and consider preliminary work plans as part of its annual work plan and budget hearing processes. The Commission may also initiate related service reviews. If an SOI is not considered during budget hearings, LAFCO may consider it at a later meeting. The Commission may also need to review or approve final SOI work plans and other processing recommendations.
- 4.4.10 Agencies will be asked to participate in an SOI scoping session and complete SOI/service review questionnaires relating to its services and plans. The Agency will be required to complete and submit questionnaires within 90 days. Failure to respond within 90 days will be regarded as concurrence with Executive Officer recommendations.
- 4.4.11 LAFCO shall hear and consider the SOI, and related service reviews if any, at a noticed public hearing.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

4.5 OTHER RELATED POLICIES

- 4.5.1 When more than one agency can serve an area, LAFCO shall consider each agency's service capacity, financial capabilities, costs of service, social and economic interdependencies, topographic factors, LAFCO policies and input from the affected communities and agencies.
- 4.5.2 LAFCO will make every attempt to bring about amicable Spheres of Influence but ultimately, if a conflict should arise, LAFCO is the final determinant of that Sphere of Influence.
- 4.5.3 Inclusion within an agency's sphere of influence does not assure annexation to that agency.
- 4.5.4 In order to encourage orderly growth of urban areas, the Commission promotes infill development of incorporated vacant lands located adjacent to already developed areas.
- 4.5.5 Developed lands which benefit from municipal services and are contiguous to a city boundary should be annexed to the city that provides service.
- 4.5.6 Spheres of influence for cities and districts will promote the long term preservation and protection of the County's agricultural and open space resources.
- 4.5.7 When an application for a new sphere of influence involves a City, the City and County are required to meet prior to submitting the application to LAFCO, to attempt to reach a mutual agreement regarding the boundaries, development standards, and zoning requirements for the proposed sphere. These agreements are required to carry great weight in any LAFCO decision (§56425).

Government Code 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 sub-region, 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) Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs or deficiencies.
 - (3) Financial ability of agencies to provide services.
 - (4) Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities.
 - (5) Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies.
 - (6) 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.
- (c) 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.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES**5 SERVICE REVIEWS**

LAFCOS are required to comprehensively review all municipal services provided by agencies with SOIs. Service reviews are conducted before, or in conjunction with, but no later than the time LAFCO establishes or updates SOIs. Service reviews are not intended to be agency specific. Rather, they focus on all public and private service providers within an identified geographic area that provide the service under review. A service review process must include adoption of written evaluations of service related issues (§56430).

- 5.1** LAFCO shall conduct a service review of all municipal services provided in the county or other appropriate designated area. LAFCO shall include in the area designated for service review the county, the region, the sub-region, or other geographic area that makes sense from a public service provision standpoint (§56430).
- 5.2** LAFCO shall comprehensively review all of the agencies and private entities that provide the identified service or services within the designated area (§56430).
- 5.3** 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).
- 5.4** LAFCO shall utilize service reviews to:
- Promote orderly growth and development in appropriate areas with consideration of service feasibility, service costs that affect housing affordability, environmental justice, and preservation of open space, important agricultural land and finite natural resources;
 - Encourage infill development and direct growth to areas planned for growth in General Plans;
 - Learn about service issues and needs and update service provider records;
 - Provide tools to support perspectives or planning efforts that address regional, cross county or statewide issues and processes;
 - Develop a structure for dialogue among agencies that provide services and a support network for smaller or ill-funded districts that provide valuable services;
 - Develop strategies to avoid unnecessary costs, eliminate waste, and improve public service provision while planning for provision of the infrastructure needed to support healthy growth; and

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

- Provide ideas about opportunities to streamline service provision through use of shared facilities, approval of different or modified government structures, joint service agreements, shared resource acquisition, joint funding requests or strategies, or integrated land use planning and service delivery programs.

5.5 Service reviews do not replace designations or updates of SOIs, but should be conducted in the establishment or amendment of any SOIs.

5.6 LAFCO will attempt to minimize the number of required service reviews by clustering services or agencies as feasible and appropriate.

5.7 LAFCO shall work to streamline service review processes by:

- (1) integrating SOI proposal processing and related CEQA processes with service reviews where appropriate;
- (2) placing high priority on reviews of services affected by pending or anticipated proposals where feasible and fair;
- (1) working with city and county planners to identify areas where the short-term conduct of service reviews is needed to support orderly growth and development; and
- (2) requesting that technical information needed for service reviews be included in the General, Specific and Master Service Plans of land use agencies and special districts.

5.8 LAFCO shall use existing information resources, technical support from the county, cities and special districts when available and adequate, staging or tiering of reviews, and similar strategies to reduce service review processing costs and timelines. The intent is to avoid unnecessary processing costs and processing time while producing high quality technical reviews.

5.9 LAFCO shall encourage collaboration, cooperation and information sharing among service review stakeholders including participation in project scoping, designing the service review, negotiating funding strategies, developing information needs assessment and collection strategies, sharing Best Practices, identifying applicable industry standards, selecting consultants if appropriate, and evaluating technical drafts.

5.10 Service reviews shall include evaluations of issues related to activated and latent powers (§56430).

5.11 LAFCO shall encourage private service providers to fully participate in service review processes (§56430).

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

- 5.12** Service review boundaries may need to cross county lines in order to provide the best analysis of multi-agency service structures. LAFCO will work with affected LAFCOS to create a joint decision-making process including consideration of formal inter-LAFCO agreements for conducting service reviews.
- 5.13** To augment technical capabilities of agencies involved in service reviews, LAFCO should utilize mentor LAFCO resources as feasible and encourage cities, special districts and the county to develop methods for providing technical assistance to smaller districts that need to be reviewed.
- 5.14** LAFCO shall independently review and verify service review information compiled by other agencies. Appropriate local, state, federal and industry standards, identified during the scoping process, will be used to support analysis of technical data and conditions.
- 5.15** Service reviews shall contain conclusions and recommendations for SOI or other government structure changes needed to implement positive service changes.
- 5.16** LAFCO shall prioritize service reviews, provide preliminary work plans including stakeholder lists and identify funding resources as part of its annual work plan and budget hearing processes. If a service review is not considered during budget hearings, LAFCO will review and approve its preparation at a later meeting.
- 5.17** The Executive Officer will conduct scoping meetings, prepare a mailing list, develop and implement final work plans consistent with LAFCO's recommendations, and prepare, or cause to be prepared, and issue each required draft service review.
- 5.18** The Commission may need to consider final service review work plans and other processing recommendations if necessary and at regularly scheduled meetings. The Commission may also be asked to initiate service review related SOI updates as appropriate.
- 5.19** Collaborative scoping and information sharing meetings, and informational workshops for agencies being reviewed, will be conducted as needed.
- 5.20** An administrative draft of technical data, and related analysis, may be circulated to encourage the highest quality service review possible within fiscal or other constraints.
- 5.21** The Executive Officer shall issue a draft service review report, which includes service review conclusions and recommendations, and may include draft recommendations for required written determinations.
- 5.22** Written or electronic notice shall be provided to any party on the service review mailing list. A 21-day public review period shall be provided for a draft service review.

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

- 5.23** The Executive Officer shall prepare a staff report with general recommendations as well as recommendations for written determinations.
- 5.24** LAFCO shall hear and consider the draft service review report and recommendations at a noticed public hearing. At the hearing, the Commission may:
- (1) find that the draft service review report is adequate and final, approve appropriate recommendations and adopt written determinations;
 - (2) direct staff to address comments and concerns and prepare a final service review report; or
 - (3) continue the hearing.
- 5.25** For each service review, LAFCO shall adopt a written statement of its determinations with respect to each of the following:
- Infrastructure needs or deficiencies;
 - Growth and population projections for the affected area;
 - Financing constraints and opportunities;
 - Opportunities for rate restructuring;
 - Opportunities for shared facilities;
 - Government structure options, including advantages and disadvantages of consolidation or reorganization of service providers;
 - Evaluation of management efficiencies; and
 - Local accountability and governance.
- 5.26** A draft service review will be considered final if no substantive comments are received prior to the end of the hearing and LAFCO determines it satisfactory.
- 5.27** LAFCO may consider SOI actions that are based on an approved service review immediately after adoption of written determinations. Such action should be delayed if imminent requests for reconsideration are expected or oral or written requests for delay are received prior to the end of the service review hearing.
- 5.28** A request for reconsideration may be filed pursuant to policies and procedures contained in Section 3.7.

Agency Schedule/Timeline for the Second MSR Cycle

2008-09 Countywide	2009-10 Mid-County and Georgetown Divide	2010-11 Mid-County and Georgetown Divide	2011-12 Countywide	2012-13 South County	
Diamond Springs/El Dorado FPD	Kelsey Cemetery	Cameron Park CSD	City of Placerville	Cosumnes River CSD	
El Dorado County FPD	Knolls Property Owners CSD	El Dorado Hills CSD	City of South Lake Tahoe	Golden West CSD	
Garden Valley FPD	Audubon Hills CSD	El Dorado Irrigation District		Hillwood CSD	
Georgetown FPD	Cameron Park Airport District	Georgetown Divide PUD		Cameron Estates CSD	
Latrobe FPD	CSA #2	Grizzly Flat CSD		Connie Lane CSD	
Meeks Bay FPD	Georgetown Divide Recreation District	South Tahoe PUD		CSA #9	
Pioneer FPD	Grassy Run CSD			Holiday Lake CSD	
Rescue FPD	Greenstone Country CSD			Lakeview CSD	
El Dorado Hills County Water District	Mortara Circle CSD			Marble Mountain Homeowners CSD	
Lake Valley FPD	Rising Hill Road CSD			Nashville Trail CSD	
CSA #3	West El Largo CSD			Showcase Ranches CSD	
Fallen Leaf Lake CSD	Arroyo Vista CSD			Springfield Meadows CSD	
Mosquito FPD	El Dorado RCD			Tahoe Paradise Resort Improvement District	
CSA #7	Garden Valley Ranch Estates CSD			East China Hills CSD	
	Georgetown RCD			Sierra Oaks CSD	
	Happy Homestead Cemetery			CSA #5 (?)	
	Hickok Road CSD			CSA #10	
	Tahoe RCD				
Always	0	0	6	2	0
Score of 4+	8	2	0	0	3
Score of 3	2	9	0	0	10
Score of 2-	3	7	0	0	2
Not study	1	0	0	0	2
Total	14 agencies	18 agencies	6 agencies	2 agencies	17 agencies

Key

Always

Score of 4 and 5

Score of 3

Score of 2

Not to be studied

Summary of Three Categories for Determining Optional Agency Schedule/Timeline

Agencies that should always be studied

Cameron Park CSD
City of Placerville
City of South Lake Tahoe
El Dorado Hills CSD
El Dorado Irrigation District
Georgetown Divide PUD
Grizzly Flat CSD
South Tahoe PUD

Assessment-Only Agencies

CSA #5 (?)
CSA #7
CSA #10

Other Agencies	Level of		Combined	
	Activity	Challenges Identified		
Arroyo Vista CSD	1	1	2	These agencies were skipped in the Second Cycle. To be studied in the Third Cycle
CSA #3	1	1	2	
East China Hills CSD	1	1	2	
El Dorado RCD	1	1	2	
Fallen Leaf Lake CSD	1	1	2	
Garden Valley Ranch Estates CSD	1	1	2	
Georgetown RCD	1	1	2	
Happy Homestead Cemetery	1	1	2	
Hickok Road CSD	1	1	2	
Mosquito FPD	1	1	2	
Sierra Oaks CSD	1	1	2	
Tahoe RCD	1	1	2	
Audubon Hills CSD	1	1	2	
Cameron Park Airport District	1	1	2	
Cameron Estates CSD	2	1	3	Key Activity 3 High 2 Moderate 1 Little or none Challenges 3 Multiple 2 Average/Moderate 1 Little or none
Connie Lane CSD	1	2	3	
CSA #2	1	2	3	
CSA #9	1	2	3	
El Dorado Hills County Water District	2	1	3	
Greenstone Country CSD	1	2	3	
Holiday Lake CSD	1	2	3	
Kelsey Cemetery	1	2	3	
Lake Valley FPD	2	1	3	
Lakeview CSD	1	2	3	
Marble Mountain Homeowners CSD	1	2	3	
Mortara Circle CSD	1	2	3	
Nashville Trail CSD	1	2	3	
Rising Hill Road CSD	1	2	3	
Showcase Ranches CSD	1	2	3	
Rolling Hills CSD	1	2	3	
Tahoe Paradise Resort Improvement District	1	2	3	
Cosumnes River CSD	2	2	4	
Georgetown Divide Recreation District	2	2	4	
Golden West CSD	1	3	4	
Hillwood CSD	1	3	4	
Knolls Property Owners CSD	2	2	4	
Meeks Bay FPD	3	1	4	
West El Largo CSD	2	2	4	
Diamond Springs/El Dorado FPD	2	3	5	
El Dorado County FPD	2	3	5	
Garden Valley FPD	2	3	5	
Georgetown FPD	2	3	5	
Latrobe FPD	2	3	5	
Pioneer FPD	2	3	5	
Rescue FPD	2	3	5	

Agency Schedule/Timeline for the Third MSR Cycle

2013-14 Countywide	2014-15 City of Placerville City of South Lake Tahoe	2015-16 South County	2016-17 Countywide	2017-18 Countywide	2018-19 Mid-County and Georgetown Divide	2019-20 Mid-County	2020-21 West County and Georgetown Divide	
		Cosumnes River CSD Golden West CSD Hillwood CSD Cameron Estates CSD Connie Lane CSD CSA #9 Holiday Lake CSD Lakeview CSD Marble Mountain Homeowners CSD Nashville Trail CSD Rolling Hills CSD Showcase Ranches CSD Tahoe Paradise Resort Improvement District East China Hills CSD Sierra Oaks CSD CSA #5 (?) CSA #10	Arroyo Vista CSD CSA #3 East China Hills CSD El Dorado RCD Fallen Leaf Lake CSD Garden Valley Ranch Estates CSD Georgetown RCD Happy Homestead Cemetery Hickok Road CSD Mosquito FPD Sierra Oaks CSD Tahoe RCD	Diamond Springs/El Dorado FPD El Dorado County FPD Garden Valley FPD Georgetown FPD Lattrobe FPD Meeks Bay FPD Pioneer FPD Rescue FPD El Dorado Hills County Water District Lake Valley FPD CSA #3 Fallen Leaf Lake CSD Mosquito FPD CSA #7	Georgetown Divide Recreation District Knolls Property Owners CSD West El Largo CSD CSA #2 Kelsey Cemetery Greenstone Country CSD Mortara Circle CSD Rising Hill Road CSD Audubon Hills CSD Cameron Park Airport District	Grizzly Flat CSD El Dorado Irrigation District South Tahoe PUD	Cameron Park CSD El Dorado Hills CSD Georgetown Divide PUD	
Always	2		0 N/A		0		3	
Score of 4+	0		3 N/A		8	2	0	
Score of 3	0		10 N/A		2	9	0	
Score of 2-	0		2 N/A		3	7	0	
Not study	0		2 N/A		1	0	0	
Total	2 agencies		17 agencies	12 Agencies	14 agencies	10 agencies	3 agencies	3 agencies

Key
Always
Score of 4 and 5
Score of 3
Score of 2
Not to be studied