

PART III

PLACER LAFCO POLICIES

INTRODUCTION

Placer LAFCO was created by and operates under the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Government Code section 56000 et seq. –the “Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act”). LAFCO actions are also subject to other state laws such as special district principal acts and the California Environmental Quality Act. Together, these mandates provide the basis for LAFCO activities.

While the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act provides clear direction in its intent and in many cases provides specific procedural guidelines, it recognizes that unique local situations and issues require some flexibility in the law. Through the adoption of policies, each LAFCO may interpret and implement the law to reflect an area’s unique priorities, problems, and attributes.

LEGISLATIVE MANDATES AND POLICY STATEMENTS

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act provides the following basic guidelines and objectives:

1. To encourage the orderly formation of local governmental agencies and the efficient provision of governmental services. (This includes discouraging a duplication of services, controlling the proliferation of local governments, and encouraging multipurpose government agencies over single or limited purpose agencies.)
2. To preserve agricultural land and open space resources.
3. To encourage logical patterns of growth and discourage urban sprawl.

LAFCO AUTHORITY

As a means of implementing the legislative goals, LAFCO’s were given the authority to approve or deny the extension of services through the creation and amendment of local government boundaries. LAFCO’s were also given the authority to establish spheres of influence for the purpose of facilitating planning by local agencies.

The Legislature directs LAFCO to include in their consideration of jurisdictional changes the following factors:

- a. population and population density
- b. land area, land use, topography, and geographic features
- c. need for services and adequacy of services in the area
- d. the effect of the proposed change on adjacent areas and agencies
- e. the conformity of the proposal with mandates and local policies

- f. the effect of the proposal on agricultural lands
 - g. consistency with adopted spheres of influence
 - h. the distinction and certainty of the boundaries
 - i. comments of any affected local agency
 - j. the ability of the agency to provide the subject services
 - k. timely availability of water supplies adequate for projected needs
 - l. the extent to which the proposal will assist the agency in achieving regional housing needs
 - m. any information or comments from the landowner or owners
 - n. any information relating to existing land use designations
- In addition, the Commission may consider the regional growth goals and policies established by a collaboration of elected officials.

The Legislature directs LAFCO to consider the following four factors when making determinations involving spheres of influence:

- a. the present and planned land uses in the area
- b. the present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area
- c. the present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services
- d. the existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area

PLACER LAFCO POLICIES

The Placer Local Agency Formation Commission (“Placer LAFCO” or the “Commission”) adopted the following policies as a means of implementing the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act. They are categorized under four headings. Three reflect the Legislature’s policy guidelines and the fourth addresses miscellaneous administrative and procedural issues.

I. PLACER LAFCO ENCOURAGES THE ORDERLY FORMATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND THE EFFICIENT PROVISION OF GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

A. SERVICE PROVISION

Recognizing that the general purpose of government is to serve its citizens and that the purpose of LAFCO is to promote orderly and efficient forms of government, the consideration of service questions related to jurisdictional changes is paramount. Reflected in the following policies is the Commission’s concern: (1) that thorough service information be made available, (2) that each affected agency be made aware of the impacts of a jurisdictional change, and (3) that as development occurs a complete range of necessary services is accessible.

- (1) POLICY:** Requests for information from an applicant or the representative of an applicant, or from any affected agency or department thereof, shall provide complete and full disclosure of information deemed relevant to the subject proposal.
- (2) POLICY:** Every LAFCO Proposal Application and Justification form shall be signed by a responsible party, stating that the information provided is in compliance with the Commission's disclosure policy.
- (3) POLICY:** The plan for service provision submitted as part of an application for jurisdictional change shall include the following information: (1) an enumeration and description of the services to be extended to the affected territory; (2) the level and range of those services; (3) an indication of when those services can feasibly be extended to the affected territory; (4) an indication of any improvement or upgrading of structures, roads, sewer or water facilities, or other conditions the local agency would impose or require within the affected territory if the change of organization or reorganization is completed; and (5) information with respect to how those services will be financed.

In addition to the foregoing information, the following information will be required as part of each plan for service:

- (a)** a list of the existing services available to the affected area, and the agencies providing those services
 - (b)** a list of services available through the affected agency or agencies
 - (c)** a comparison of the existing and proposed service levels and the effects of the proposed change on service in adjacent areas
 - (d)** a description of all special local taxes, assessments, fees, and outstanding bonds that will potentially affect the proposal area
 - (e)** identification of any resource shortages or facility inadequacies presently experienced or anticipated by the affected agency
- (4) POLICY:** All proposals involving jurisdictional change will include a plan for services. Those proposals initiated by resolution of the affected agency shall include the plan for service with the application. When proposals are initiated by petition, the Commission's staff shall notify the affected agency and request a plan for service. In cases where the proposed jurisdictional change involves a reorganization, the plan for service shall address all of the affected agencies.
- (5) POLICY:** The following standards shall apply to the evaluation of plans for service:
- (a)** Each plan for service must be signed and dated by an official representative of the agency, certifying completeness and accuracy. In cases where the proposal includes annexation to more than one agency, the plan for service must be signed by a representative of

each annexing agency or each agency may submit its own separate plan for services.

- (b) The plans for service shall be made part of the file and shall be circulated to affected agencies and County departments for comment. The subject agency shall respond to any requests for additional or clarifying information.

- (6) **POLICY:** The Commission shall approve the extension of services by contract only when the agency in question can show it is not reasonable or possible to annex the site at the time the request is submitted.

B. COMMUNITY APPROACH

The Commission finds that a community approach to service provision is beneficial in that it facilitates the eventual consolidation of local agencies, it clarifies and simplifies service delivery, it assures the most complete ranges of services available to a developing area, and it helps define and empower a community. The Commission shall encourage a community approach to service provision by encouraging the coterminous development of local agency boundaries within the area.

- (1) **POLICY:** Spheres of influence for all local agencies serving a particular community shall be coterminous whenever possible.
- (2) **POLICY:** Service provision shall be viewed on a community basis. Annexation to a city shall generally be accompanied by simultaneous annexation to the special districts that serve that community. Likewise, when possible, annexation to a special district that serves a city shall include annexation to that adjacent city.

C. AGENCY PROLIFERATION

The Commission finds that great numbers of special districts add to various departmental workloads and increase the cost of government. It recognizes that layer upon layer of governmental agencies produce confusion and lead to duplication of services. It recognizes that in most cases the most efficient and effective agencies to provide needed levels of service are multipurpose local agencies, and that those local agencies most qualified to provide a full range of urban-type services are cities.

- (1) **POLICY:** The Commission may undertake studies of special districts for the purpose of examining the potential for efficiencies through reorganization. Districts most likely to be the subject of such studies include those that fall into one or more of the following categories:
 - (a) overlaying districts that provide the potential for service duplication
 - (b) inactive districts

- (c) overlaying limited purpose districts that could be consolidated into a single multipurpose district
 - (d) districts that include significant areas where no services are provided
 - (e) districts which appear to provide an inadequate level of service
 - (f) districts which are overlain by a city and may be merged into the city
- (2) **POLICY:** If the special district studies determine that some type of governmental reorganization is appropriate, the Commission may initiate a consolidation, a dissolution, a merger, or the formation of a subsidiary district.
- (3) **POLICY:** The Commission may identify possible opportunities to reduce the number of special districts through the establishment of coterminous spheres of influence and sphere of influence determinations that recommend ultimately dissolving, merging, or consolidating districts (zero spheres of influence). Such opportunities shall consist of those special districts that fall into the categories listed in Policy c(1).
- (4) **POLICY:** The initiation of consolidations, mergers, dissolutions, and the formation of subsidiary districts by the affected governing bodies and/or the affected landowners and voters shall be encouraged.
- (5) **POLICY:** The Commission shall utilize its authority to condition proposals in a manner that will discourage agency proliferation and encourage special district consolidation or dissolution where appropriate.
- (6) **POLICY:** The Commission encourages special districts and other affected agencies to identify and evaluate possible opportunities to consolidate, merge, or dissolve local agencies.
- (7) **POLICY:** If a proposal to the Commission includes the formation of a new government, the Commission shall determine whether existing agencies can feasibly provide the needed service or services in a more efficient and accountable manner. If a New single-purpose agency is deemed necessary, the Commission shall consider reorganization with other single-purpose agencies that provide related services.
- (8) **POLICY:** When considering the extensions of service to an area the Commission shall favor the provision of services by multipurpose agencies over limited or single purpose agencies. Generally, priority shall be given as follows:
- (a) annexation to an existing city
 - (b) annexation to an existing county service area
 - (c) annexation to an existing independent multipurpose district

- (d) annexation to an existing independent single purpose district**
- (e) formation of an independent multipurpose district**
- (f) formation of an independent single purpose district**

(9) POLICY: Every proposed new district formation, district consolidation, merger, or formation of a subsidiary district shall be accompanied by a feasibility study that contains, at a minimum, the following elements.

- (a) an explanation of the reasons for the proposed formation and a brief description of the characteristics of the study area**
- (b) a description of the local agencies presently serving the area, and their range and level of service, and a discussion of the potential impacts that the proposed formation would have on these districts**
- (c) a description of and rationale for the proposed boundaries**
- (d) a description of the proposed district services and service financing plan**
- (e) a five year budget projecting all expected revenues and expenditures**
- (f) an analysis of other governmental options for service**
- (g) a list of the pros and cons of the proposed formation**

(10) POLICY: An application to the Commission for district consolidation, district merger, or the formation of a subsidiary district shall include proof of at least one public hearing on the subject held within each district applying for consolidation or merger. Notice for the hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within each district affected. The notice shall be published at least fourteen days but no more than thirty days before the scheduled hearing and shall be no less than 1/8 of a page in size.

D. BOUNDARIES

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act encourages the logical formation and determination of local agency boundaries and requires LAFCOs to consider “the nonconformance of proposed boundaries with lines of assessment...” when reviewing a proposal for jurisdictional change.

The Commission finds that boundaries that follow lines of assessment are clearer, more understandable, and more readily identifiable. They facilitate service provision, assist in the determination of permissible land uses, simplify the assessment and property tax process, and encourage consistent mapping of jurisdictions. The Commission recognizes that there are times when the strict use of assessor parcels will result in an awkward proposal boundary. In such cases, it may be necessary to consider minor adjustments to the proposal boundaries or a change in the parcel lines.

One of the Commission’s most powerful tools is the ability to amend the boundaries of a proposal in order to create a boundary that the Commission feels is more equitable or effects better service provision. Related to this power is the ability of the Commission to expand a proposal to include additional jurisdictional

changes. For example, a proposal to annex to a full service city may need to be expanded to include a detachment from a local fire district to prevent a duplication of service.

- (1) POLICY: Sphere of influence revisions and jurisdictional changes involving assessor parcel splits shall be avoided whenever possible. Exceptions may be made where the applicant is able to prove that the split cannot reasonably be avoided without incurring undue hardship.**

- (2) POLICY: The Commission will generally honor an agreement between a city and the County, or a city and a city with respect to the inclusion or exclusion of roads adjacent to one or more of the boundaries of a proposed annexation. If no such agreement is in place, the entire width of any roadway which is adjacent to the property to be annexed should be included within the annexation when one or more of the following conditions apply:**
 - (a) the roadway will include significant new facilities (such as sewer lines, water lines, storm drains, or notable traffic control measures) that will be maintained by the annexing jurisdiction;**
 - (b) based upon existing and future potential land uses in the area, the primary users of that portion of the road would most likely be generated by the annexing entity; or**
 - (c) whenever the Commission, after considering the overall impacts, adjacent land uses, historic and perceptual boundary concerns, and other factors relevant to LAFCO policy, determines that annexation of the roadway would be appropriate.**

- (3) POLICY: The environmental documentation prepared for each project which proposes annexation of property to a city in which one or more of the boundaries between the city and the County or the city and another city are delineated by a road, shall include analyses which place the road within each of the jurisdictions. The environmental document or a supplemental document prepared by the applicant shall address the long-term maintenance costs associated with each of these potential scenarios.**

- (4) POLICY: Special districts shall be detached from an area when a city annexes that area and assumes the role of service provider in place of the special district.**

- (5) POLICY: Unless otherwise specified in the Commission's resolution, the area successfully detached from a local agency is also deemed removed from that agency's sphere of influence.**

E. MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEWS

When the Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act of 1985 was rewritten and became the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government

Reorganization Act of 2000 a significant new mandate was included. This mandate (Government Code Section 56430) specifies that “In order to prepare and 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.” While the new mandate lists the factors that must be addressed, it does not provide a plan or process for accomplishing this task. The Placer Commission has, therefore, adopted the following policies to provide some initial and interim organizational direction. (This section adopted 12/12/01.)

- (1) POLICY: LAFCO will encourage regional Municipal Service Reviews over project-specific reviews. Regional reviews are those that cover “logical” geographic areas defined by such things as a general or community plan or a drainage basin, et cetera.**

- (2) POLICY: If an agency or private party submits a request to initiate a proposal for a Municipal Service Review to LAFCO, staff will review the proposal with the applicant to discuss the potential parameters of the study. Following this, staff will make a recommendation to the Commission regarding the request. The Commission may or may not authorize the study and adopt parameters for it.**

- (3) POLICY: If a particular party is interested in initiating a project that will require a Municipal Service Review, they will be liable for the costs associated with doing the study.**

- (4) POLICY: LAFCO may choose to initiate certain studies on its own volition when there appears to be a need to study the organization and provision of services in a specified area.**

- (5) POLICY: When up-dating a general or community plan the County and cities should coordinate with LAFCO to see that a corresponding municipal services review is completed in conjunction with the plan.**

II. PLACER LAFCO ENCOURAGES THE PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND AND OPEN SPACE RESOURCES

While the Commission is prohibited from imposing any conditions “which would directly regulate land use density or intensity, property development, or subdivision requirements,” the Commission is required to consider land use and related data in their review. While rezoning is required, the Commission may not specify how a particular area should be zoned or developed.

The premature conversion of farmland and open space to other uses is discouraged by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act. In the pursuit of this goal, the Commission has authority to modify the proposal’s boundaries or to deny an

untimely proposal. Information regarding land use designations and existing and proposed land uses assists the Commission in its determinations as to the appropriateness of a proposal's timing and boundaries.

- (1) POLICY: The Commission encourages all agencies within the County to adopt and exercise development policies that promote orderly development and logical boundaries and protect productive agricultural lands and significant open space areas, including riparian areas.**

- (2) POLICY: Unless the subject area is substantially developed to its ultimate use, annexation to a city or special district will be linked to a proposal to develop and not be speculative in nature. Development plans, including a timetable, will be required as part of the LAFCO application for annexation.**

- (3) POLICY: Generally annexation of farmlands shall not be permitted when significant areas of non-productive farmland are already available. Development of vacant land within a city or district should be developed prior to fringe areas.**

- (4) POLICY: The Commission may set spheres of influence for unincorporated preserves for specified reasons such as to preserve the agricultural and open space areas or areas of possible future incorporation. Annexation of these areas by adjacent cities shall be discouraged. Annexation of these areas to special districts shall be approved only when the district's purposes are consistent with the sphere in question.**

III

ENCOURAGE LOGICAL PATTERNS OF GROWTH AND DISCOURAGE URBAN SPRAWL

One of the primary mandates of LAFCO is to encourage orderly growth and development, yet LAFCO is prohibited from directly regulating land use. With varying effect LAFCO can fulfill its mandate through the determination of jurisdictional boundaries and the extension of local agency services. The Commission recognizes that under existing circumstances, such goals will only be completely successful when they are embraced by all the area's local governments.

While the statutes encourage orderly growth and discourage urban sprawl, they do not define or set standards to quantify these concepts. The parameters for these concepts must be made at the local level where we find that one person's orderly growth is another's urban sprawl.

Spheres of influence play an important role in the process of encouraging orderly growth. Under law each local agency is required to have a sphere of influence. These spheres provide direction and growth for the planning of the affected local agency and all adjacent agencies. Spheres can be critically important tools in the goal to establish logical boundaries, yet their value is often underestimated. As a result they are not used as effectively as they might be. Spheres define the future boundaries of the entity. Once spheres of influence are established, the question of annexation within the sphere is primarily one of timing.

A. ORDERLY GROWTH

- (1) POLICY: The Commission encourages the urbanization of certain lands over others and hereby establishes a priority list for urbanization:**
 - (a) vacant or underdeveloped land within the existing boundaries of a city**
 - (b) vacant or underdeveloped land within the adopted sphere of influence of a city**
 - (c) vacant or underdeveloped land outside the adopted sphere of influence of a city**

- (2) POLICY: The commission will consider the following factors in determining logical growth patterns in reviewing proposals for annexation to a city or expansion of a city's sphere of influence:**
 - (a) adjacency with existing and planned growth pattern of the city**
 - (b) projected growth demand and relationship to remaining lands to be developed within the city and its existing sphere**
 - (c) ability of the city to provide and fund needed services (utilities, transportation, public safety, recreation, libraries) to the levels defined by the city's general plan**
 - (d) pending or anticipated development applications to the County for areas within a city's existing sphere**

- (5) POLICY: The Commission discourages urban level development in unincorporated areas adjacent to city boundaries.**

B. SPHERES OF INFLUENCE

- (1) POLICY: To allow for the evaluation of projected growth demand and its relationship to remaining lands to be developed within the city and the city's sphere, proposals for sphere of influence revisions (other than minor adjustments) shall require certain data for the consideration of the Commission. It is recognized that sphere reviews associated with periodic updates of the general plan will be more conceptual than those associated with specific projects. In any case, the data provided shall be as accurate, thorough, and pragmatic as possible. The data provided shall include the following:**

- (a) A market absorption study analyzing proposed uses in relation to similar uses within the city and the city's sphere. The study shall:

 - I. cover a 15 to 20 year planning horizon,
 - II. include all major land use categories proposed within sphere revision (residential, commercial, office and industrial),
 - III. identify project and citywide buildout capacities for the proposed land uses,
 - IV. provide an analysis of the competitive strength of the affected city and land uses within the regional market, and the proposed project land uses within the anticipated capture
 - V. contain a breakdown of projected absorption and supply margins over time by both land use and by geographic planning area within the city. At minimum, the analysis should distinguish projected absorption between the proposed sphere are and the existing (infill) portion of the city and the city's sphere are, and
 - (b) Analysis of alternative project sites located elsewhere within the city or its existing sphere. This analysis shall be included as an alternative in the environmental document prepared for the proposed sphere expansion. If such alternative sites are determined not to be feasible as defined by CEQA, the environmental document shall include a discussion of the reasons and relevant data used to make such determinations. LAFCO staff shall be afforded the opportunity to comment on the adequacy of the alternatives analysis prior to certification of the environmental document.
- (2) **POLICY:** Expansions of city spheres of influence shall be discouraged if there is feasible land appropriate for the proposed uses already within the sphere of influence.
- (3) **POLICY:** City Spheres of influence shall be reviewed when the general plan is up-dated or when there is a general plan amendment that would affect the city boundaries. In addition at LAFCO's request cities shall review their spheres no more frequently than every five years, advising LAFCO of their findings and submitting sphere amendment requests to LAFCO if circumstances warrant.
- (4) **POLICY:** If the Commission determines that a request for expansion of a city's sphere of influence would have the effect of exceeding the market demand for a particular use within the planning horizon, the Commission may approve the requested sphere expansion conditional upon detachment of other areas from the sphere.
- (5) **POLICY:** Special district spheres of influence will include only those areas that may benefit from the services provided by that district. This determination will be made based upon the relevant general and/or community plan for the area.

C. ANNEXATIONS

- (1) POLICY:** To allow for the evaluation of projected growth demand and its relationship to remaining lands to be developed within the city, proposals for annexations to a city or reorganizations including annexation to a city (except unincorporated islands and minor adjustments) shall be accompanied by the following:
- (a)** A market absorption study analyzing proposed uses in relation to similar uses within the city. The study shall:
 - I. cover a 15 to 20 year planning horizon,
 - II. include all major land use categories proposed within annexation (residential, commercial, office and industrial),
 - III. identify project and citywide buildout capacities for the proposed land uses,
 - IV. provide an analysis of the competitive strength of the affected city land uses within the regional market, and the proposed project land uses within the anticipated city capture of that regional market,
 - V. contain a breakdown of projected absorption and supply margins over time by both land use and by geographic planning area within the city. At a minimum, the analysis should distinguish projected absorption between the proposed annexation area and the existing (infill) portion of the city, and
 - VI. include a summary of key assumptions and methodologies used in generating the absorption projections.
 - (b)** Analysis of alternative project sites located elsewhere within the city or its existing sphere. This analysis shall be included as an alternative in the environmental document prepared for the proposed annexation or reorganization including annexation. If such alternative sites are determined not to be feasible as defined by CEQA, the environmental document shall include a discussion of the reasons and relevant data used to make determinations. LAFCO staff shall be afforded the opportunity to comment on the adequacy of the alternatives analysis prior to certification of the environmental document.
- (2) POLICY:** Unless special circumstances can be demonstrated, city annexations or reorganizations including city annexations shall be discouraged if there are feasible alternative sites for the annexation proposal already within the city.
- (3) POLICY:** Large development proposals that are proposed to be developed in phases may be annexed in phases, ensuring that growth occurs in a logical pattern.

- (4) All city annexations shall be pre-zoned. No subsequent change may be made to the general plan or zoning for the annexed territory that is not in conformance to the pre-zoning designations for a period of two years after the completion of the annexation.**

D. UNINCORPORATED ISLANDS

The creation and continued existence of unincorporated islands is expressly discouraged and/or prohibited. Unincorporated islands must continue to be serviced by the County and other local agencies serving unincorporated areas, but because these service areas are isolated from other service areas, they are difficult and expensive to serve.

Unincorporated islands, therefore, are not consistent with logical and efficient government.

- (1) POLICY: The Commission shall discourage the creation of islands or areas not in a city but substantially surrounded by a city or cities, or by a city or cities and a county boundary or a major body of water.**
- (2) POLICY: The Commission shall deny city annexations or reorganizations that include city annexations that create areas that are substantially or totally surrounded by a city. The Commission shall consider an area to be “substantially surrounded” when it is surrounded by a city or cities, or by a city or cities and a county boundary or a major body of water on at least 75% of its boundaries, unless one of the following conditions have been met:**
- (a) The Commission determines that denial of the proposal would be detrimental to the orderly development of the community and that the area that would be enclosed by the annexation cannot be reasonably annexed to another city or incorporated as a new city.**
 - (b) In the case of areas which are substantially surrounded, the applicant provides written results of a landowner (uninhabited or inhabited) or registered voter (inhabited) survey that shows that inclusion of the unincorporated area would successfully subvert the proposal.**
- (3) POLICY: The Commission shall discourage the annexation of a portion of an existing island to a city unless the applicant provides written proof through a survey that the proposed annexation is the largest possible portion of that island that may be successfully annexed.**

IV

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES

A. GENERAL

The following list of policies is generally administrative in nature and has been adopted for the purpose of refining and defining the Commission's process.

- (1) POLICY: If a proposed jurisdictional change between one or more agencies involves fiscal considerations beyond the adopted or standard arrangements, each affected agency shall study the effects of the proposal. If any affected agency feels that potential inequities exist, the agencies shall work together to reach and adopt a compromise.**
- (2) POLICY: Unless otherwise specified by Commission action, the effective date of a change of organization or reorganization shall be the date that the Certificate of Completion is issued.**
- (4) POLICY: All requests made pursuant to Government Code Section ~~56833.3~~ 56801 for State Controller review of an applicant's incorporation fiscal analysis must be submitted within thirty days of the Commission's first published notice of the proposal. The costs associated for all such requests will be borne by the party making the request.**
- (4) POLICY: Staff shall schedule protest hearings within the time constraints identified by the statutes but in conjunction with regularly scheduled LAFCO hearings unless otherwise directed by the Commission.**
- (6) POLICY: If an agency does not remit its required LAFCO payment to the Auditor within the timeframes established by statute, the County Auditor is authorized and requested to collect an equivalent amount from the property tax or any fee or eligible revenue owed to the agency along with any expenses incurred in the process of collecting the late payments or challenging nonpayment, unless otherwise directed by the Commission within the 60 day time limit.**
- (7) POLICY: Notice of all public hearings and Commission meetings shall be made available in electronic format on the LAFCO website.**

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Most LAFCO actions are subject to environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Commission has an established environmental procedure which follows the mandates found in CEQA. This procedure is outlined in the procedure section of this manual.

The State CEQA Guidelines encourage the review of a project in its entirety and at the earliest possible point in the planning process in order to assess the cumulative impacts of the proposal.

The Commission recognizes that an organization or reorganization most often represents only a step in a series required in a larger project. This project may include rezoning, the approval of land development plans, and possibly a general plan amendment. Ideally there should be a single environmental review that addresses all aspects of the project. In these cases the primary agency (usually a city) is in the position to review land use designation changes, service extension plans, land development plans, and organization or reorganization. In these cases, the Commission shall generally act as responsible agency.

- (1) POLICY: Whenever an agency is considering a project (such as rezoning, a general plan amendment, site development, or the installation of infrastructure) that requires annexation or some other jurisdictional reorganization, the environmental review for that project shall include consideration of the environmental impacts of annexation or jurisdictional reorganization, and LAFCO shall be treated as a responsible agency.**

C. RECONSIDERATION

Any party may file a written statement requesting amendments to or reconsideration of any resolution adopted by the Commission. The following policies shall govern reconsideration by the Commission:

- (1) POLICY: Requests for amendment to or reconsideration of a resolution of the Commission making determinations must include a statement as to what new or different facts that could not have been presented previously, or applicable new law, warrant the reconsideration. The requests shall state the specific modification to the resolution being requested.**
- (2) POLICY: Any request shall be submitted within thirty days of the Commission's decision and prior to the completion of the proceedings of the conducting authority. Any rehearing is subject to full public notice.**
- (3) POLICY: No request shall be deemed filed unless appropriate filing fees are submitted.**