

Les Baugh
County Member

Irwin Fust
Special District Alternate



Patrick Jones
City Member

Dick Fyten
Public Member

Larry Farr
City Member Alternate

Pam Giacomini
County Member Alternate

David Kehoe
County Member

Vacant
Public Member Alternate

James Yarbrough
City Member

Brenda Haynes
Special District Member

Stephen Morgan
Special District Member

Jan Lopez
Executive Officer

January 19, 2014

Josh Miller
Duane Miller Engineering
P.O. Box 1307
Anderson, CA 96007

Kristen Maze
City of Anderson
1887 Howard Street
Anderson, CA 96007

RE: LAFCO #13-04 Deschutes Road Reorganization

Thank you for submitting this project for review before the Shasta Local Agency Formation Commission on December 18, 2013. Applicants are normally encouraged to meet with our staff early during the development of a project and its application process. We regret our recent transition period made this difficult to arrange during your early review process as Lead Agency. The level of detail in this letter

An executive officer is required to not only review applications and identify areas requiring further data or explanation when incomplete, but also to respond to the applicant "specifying those parts of the application which are incomplete and the manner in which they can be made complete."

I have reviewed the materials submitted for this project and have determined that additional information will need to be provided before the project can be considered complete. A meeting has been set for Tuesday, January 21st to go over the application and my recommendations.

APPLICATION STANDARDS & DOCUMENT REQUIREMENTS

Part 1 – Summary Listing Of Application Components

It is unclear who the "applicant" is for this project

1. If the city is the applicant, then a resolution initiating proceedings needs to be approved.

Ordinance 782 does not request LAFCO to initiate proceedings. It only acknowledges the territory is within the SOI of the City. The City still needs to adopt a Resolution of Application, addressing all the matters found within Item 1 (see page 2) notice and hold a public hearing, and adopt it. Be sure to include conditions of annexation and discussed later in the application form itself.

2. If the petitioner is the applicant, then it appears at this point that a number of processes of applying by petition has yet to be completed.

The petitioner needs to collect sufficient signatures to qualify for a petition directly to LAFCO and these petitions need to be verified by the County Elections Clerk before being determined as sufficient to initiate proceedings.

If support signatures are given to the city, then the city accepts them and attaches them to the resolution requesting initiation of proceedings. Sufficiency of signatures review by the Elections Clerk does not need to occur.

3. Type of Voter: Landowner voter? Registered voter?
4. Protest Issues. At this point, only 5% of the parcel owners (Roseburg) have requested this action. Generally, 25+% protest will require an election, while 51+% protest will terminate a proceeding. On the other hand, 80+% consent is almost as good as having 100% consent since this also avoids the expense of an election, although acknowledging some protest exists. To be successful in bringing a petition to a public hearing, petitioners should endeavor to gain as many consent signatures...at least 25% of the registered voters.
5. Signature requirements. Either a city representative or a chief petitioner signs the application. At this time, Shasta LAFCO policies do not permit a consultant to sign on their behalf for submitting an application.
6. CEQA: Please provide,
 - a. A copy of the list (w/addresses) to whom the Initial Study was circulated.
 - b. A copy of the Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for our files and the list (w/addresses) of all agencies and interested persons this Notice was circulated to.
7. City Hearings: please provide,

- a. A copy of all hearing notices, resolutions, and minutes regarding the annexation proposal

8. Property Tax Exchange:

Whether an agency or a chief petitioner submits an application, ultimately before the matter comes before the commission property tax exchange negotiations must take place between Shasta County and the agency or agencies involved, even if the agreement is for a zero exchange. If services are transferring from one agency to another (i.e., fire, water, sewer, etc.) the negotiations are very important to address in the financing discussion in the application.

9. Resolution Of Application needs to:
 - a. Include city services being provided to the annexation area, and new estimated costs to landowners that will as a result from the annexation, and show as an Exhibit ____
 - b. Refer to CEQA mitigations as conditions, and show as an Exhibit ____

- c. A statement requesting Shasta LAFCO to Initiate Proceedings for a boundary change pursuant to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Section 56000 et seq.).
- d. List all actions involved in this proposal: Annexation, detachment, reduction of sphere of influence.
- e. Include letters, comments, or agency resolutions that support or oppose of the proposed annexation.

10. Territory Being Annexed Data:

- a. List names, addresses, APNs, and acreage for each parcel within the proposed territory for notification purposes
- b. Provide list of names, addresses, and APNs for all parcels within 300 feet of the outer boundary of the proposed annexation.

Shasta LAFCO Application Data:

1. Nature of Proposal: Item 1, Page 1

- Type of application will be by (a) resolution or (b) petition. Petition will be by either (a) landowner or (b) registered voter.
- The annexation request involves more than one action and needs to be identified as a "Reorganization" involving annexation and detachments. Agencies involved are the City, CSA #1, and Anderson FPD.
- List all actions involved at the conclusion of the proposal:
 - Annexation of territory into the City of Anderson
 - Annexation of territory into the Anderson Fire Protection District
 - Detachment of territory and reduction of the SOI for County Service #1 Shasta County Fire
 - Affirm Cottonwood Fire Protection District are to retain lands currently within their existing boundary upon approval of this annexation.
 - Are there any other actions?

2. Sphere of Influence: Item 2, Page 1

- This needs to say yes.
- SOI change is involved for one agency. Please request removal of the territory from CSA #1 Shasta County Fire's SOI concurrent with detachment.

3. Public Agencies in Proposal Area: Item 4, Page 1

- Need to list all agencies that may be affected by the proposal, including CSA #1 Shasta County Fire
- School districts and individual school superintendents need to be notified. Please provide names and address for LAFCO notification. (More recent law change.)

4. Pre-Zoning: Item 11, Page 3

- c. 8.5" x 11" and 11" x 17" black and white reproducible map of the territory which show:
 - i. Current county general plan and zoning designations (color doesn't show up in copies)
 - ii. Approved general plan and pre-zoning designations (again, color doesn't copy well enough to read)

5. Chief Reason for Proposal: Item_12, Page 3

- "An agency resolution of application to LAFCO must include a summary recital of the chief reasons for the proposal."
- Need a more specific description of the services that will be provided, what alternatives are available, and why the alternatives are not as feasible as this proposal.
- Applicant landowner represents 18% of the total parcels in the territory, and may not be a registered voter living within the area.

6. Terms and Conditions: Item 13, Page 3

- Terms and conditions are applicable in this annexation request and will bind the parcels into the future:
 - Detachment from CSA #1; fee transfers to AFD
 - Annex to Anderson FPD
 - receive CSA #1 fire fee assessment
 - other service conditions and fees to be applied
 - Conditions and fees regarding current and future services from the city
 - Financing commitments (indebtedness, assessments, etc.)
 - Zones to be applied to territory
 - Mitigation measures from the CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration

7. Boundary Modifications: Item 14, Pages 4, 5

- Need a little more description of the logic behind this choice of boundary that says more, perhaps from the CEQA review? (i.e., historic industrial/commercial area, expected future growth, or some such).
- Here is a good place to add who approves of this proposal. Right now you have one landowner signed on out of 17 registered voters. This is a registered voter proposal and if it is protested, may go to an election and need to be approved by the registered voters within the territory.

8. Plan for Providing Services (GC 56653) Item 15, Pages 4-7

- Table(C, D, E, F):
 - Fire Protection needs to show
 - Anderson FPD Yes; state what fire fee will be, service available upon annexation
 - Cottonwood FPD as No effect
 - CSA #1 Yes; as \$20; detach (under D)
 - Streets/Traffic show
 - Shasta County; currently financed ?; Yes to transfer, financed?; available upon annexation

- Fire Protection discussion:
 - Expand to add Anderson FPD
 - Proximity to AFD stations
 - Special fire/emergency services needs for industrial and commercial lands.
 - How services will be financed
 - Explain Cottonwood FPD retaining existing lands
 - Explain detachment from CSA #1
 - Explain automatic and mutual aid agreements in existence
- Water discussion:
 - Have multiple zones been established for this service or is it one city-wide zone that is expanded concurrent or subsequently to annexation?
- Sewer discussion:
 - Have multiple zones been established for this service or is it one city-wide zone that is expanded concurrent or subsequently to annexation?

9. Water Service: Item 16, Page 7

- Requirement for agency water services analysis (G.C. 56668[k]):
- This area requires discussion of current “timely availability of water supplies” and also wants a discussion of future maximum build-out estimates of water use of the area being annexed and how that water will be provided based on the description within the application text.

10. Evaluation of Landowner Consent: Item 18, Page 9

- Regardless of whether a petition or agency resolution, we need to have all this information in order to notice county departments to confirm the affected parties’ data (assessor, auditor, elections, etc.)
- There are two protests about this project in the pre-zoning documents which need to be identified.

11. Certification, Indemnification, Signature: Item 21, Page 10

- As noted earlier, the application has to be either
 - Signed by a representative of the agency when by resolution
 - Signed by the chief petitioner when by petition

12. Additional Aspects:

The only other item that does not appear on the application forms but became law in 2012, is the identification of all Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUCs). A copy of the Technical Advisory from OPR has been provided to both the city and its engineers. In this instance, we simply need to identify where they are

- Within the city boundaries,
- Within the sphere of influence areas, and
- Within the territory proposed for annexation.

In future actions, the city will need to address specific issues identified for consideration as a result of the adoption of SB 244. Shasta County Planning is currently working on identifying these areas for the unincorporated portions of the county, and Shasta County cities will also need to do the same.

Most of the above information will not be difficult to provide. The application process is rather detailed, but it does cover the current requirements of law.

As you work on collection of the requested information, we will initiate notification of this application to the appropriate County departments and affected agencies. This is our second step toward issuance of a Certificate of Filing and the setting of a hearing date.

During this period, Anderson FPD will work to complete a property tax exchange agreement with Shasta County. Any support or guidance the city can provide with setting up a preliminary agreement will help the proposal move closer to a hearing. After the Certificate of Filing is issued, both Anderson FPD and the city can complete adoption of those agreements with the Board of Supervisors.

I look forward to working with you and assisting wherever possible on this project.

Cordially,



Jan Lopez
Executive Officer

Cc: Anderson FPD
Arne Hultgren, Roseburg Forest Products

SHASTA LAFCO APPLICATION
CHANGE OF ORGANIZATION OR REORGANIZATION

This application must be completed in full and submitted with any petition or resolution of application to LAFCO for a change of organization or reorganization made pursuant to Government Code Section 56000 et seq.

1. **Nature of Proposal:** Check one of the following. Insert city or district name. If the proposal involves more than one concurrent change (i.e., annexation to one agency, detachment from another), check the appropriate "reorganization" box.

- Annexation only** to a city or special district.
Affected city or district: City of Anderson
- Detachment only** from a city or special district.
Affected city or district: _____
- Reorganization by concurrent** annexation to city, detachment from district(s).
Affected city and district(s): _____
- Reorganization by concurrent** annexation to district, detachment from district.
Affected districts: _____
- Formation** of special district.
Type of district (i.e. CSD, CSA, FPD) : _____
- Dissolution** of special district.
Name of district: _____

2. **Sphere of Influence:** If the proposal is to annex to a city or district, is the area to be annexed within the sphere of influence of the affected city or district? **Yes** **No**. If response is "No", there must be a concurrent sphere of influence amendment action and Page 5 of this form is to be completed.

3. **Tax Exchange Agreement:** Is the proposal subject to a tax exchange agreement? **Yes** **No**. If response is "Yes", see Shasta LAFCO's "Application Standards & Document Requirements for compliance information.

4. **Public Agencies in Proposal Area:** List all public agencies - including school districts - whose current jurisdictional boundary or sphere of influence boundary falls within the proposal area. Also note the effect on the proposal on each agency.

<u>Public Agency</u>	<u>Effect of Proposal (i.e. annex, detach, no change)</u>
Shasta County	no change
Cottonwood Fire Prof. Dist.	annex
Anderson Fire Prof. Dist.	no change
LAFCo	no change
Shasta Mosquito Control Dist.	no change
Anderson-Cottonwood Irr. Dist.	no change
Cottonwood Union School District	no change
Cascade Union School District	no change
Anderson Cemetery District	no change

5. **Affected Territory is Legally (Check One):**

- Inhabited** (more than 12 registered voters) **Developed**
 Uninhabited (fewer than 12 registered voters) **Undeveloped**

6. **Characteristics of Affected Area: Insert totals and check data source.**

	Total #	Assessor/Auditor	Elections Dept.	Field Survey	Other Source: (Name)
Acres	385	Assessor			
Parcels	38	Auditor			
Inhabitants	17		X		
Registered Voters	17		X		
Dwelling Units	9	Assessor			
Commercial Units	13	Assessor			
Industrial Units	3	Assessor			
Assessed Value: Land	5,146,733	Auditor			
Assessed Value: Improvements	3,087,297.00	Auditor			
Total A.V.	8,234,030.00	Auditor			

7. **General Location of Proposal Area:** Summary statement of general location in relation to nearest major roads and intersections, nearest city or district boundary, and/or other locational landmarks.

The annexation/pre-zone area is located along the southeast side of the City of Anderson. The properties are situated east of the Interstate 5 freeway. The two arterial streets, Deschutes and Locust Road go through the area. The area also has active railroad tracks that parallel Locust Road.

8. **Present Land Use Characteristics:** Summary statement of current land use and development characteristics, as well as prevalent topographic/geographic characteristics that influence land use and development.

The area surrounding the proposed annexation area is agricultural 8+ acre vacant and industrial properties. North of the proposed annexation area is the City limit line, Anderson Creek and large lot rural residential property with frontage on Shady Lane. West of the area is the City limit line, which includes light industrial property, and heavy industrial property along Interstate 5. East of this area is bordered by Deschutes Road and rural residential property. The southernmost property is at Industry Road. Most of the annexation properties are developed or previously developed land with the exception of the northern most property that borders the City limits, approximately 58± acres adjacent to Anderson Creek (APN 201-950-023, 024,022). The proposed annexation area is relatively flat land with native and non-native vegetation (oak trees, grasses, etc). The property located in the north portion which is the only undeveloped parcel in the annexation area contains some floodway and floodplain along Anderson Creek, based on FEMA Firm Map 06089C1935G. The Union Pacific Railroad line diagonally crosses the annexation area in a northwest to southeast direction; Deschutes Road is the above grade overpass for the railroad tracks. The main canal for Anderson Cottonwood Irrigation District (ACID) parallels the railroad tracks for most of the length of this location.

9. **Proposed Development:** Summary statement of proposed development in the area, if any, and a statement of when development is expected to begin and/or be completed:

There is no proposed development associated with this application.

10. **General Plan and Zoning Designations:** List the current Shasta County General Plan land-use and zoning designations applied to the area, and the total acres under each designation. *Do not use abbreviations.* Attach maps showing the General Plan designations.

<u>General Plan Designation</u>	<u>No./Acres</u>	<u>Zoning Designation</u>	<u>No./Acres</u>
Industrial	164.65	General Industrial	144
Part-time Agriculture	35.35	Limited Ag	32
Rural Residential	58	Unclassified	67
		Commercial Light Industrial	20.85

11. **Pre-Zoning:** For proposals to *annex territory to a city*, §56375 requires that the annexation area be "pre-zoned". Please list zoning designations that will be applied by the city after annexation. *Do not use abbreviations.* Attach a map depicting the zoning designations and a copy of the ordinance adopting the designations.

<u>Zoning Designation</u>	<u>No. of Acres</u>
Heavy Industrial (M2)	258
Highway Commercial (C2)	59.47
Agricultural (AG)	26.35
Public Semi Public (PSP)	10

12. **Chief Reasons for Proposal:** An agency resolution of application to LAFCO must include a summary recital of the chief reasons for the proposal (such as the desire by landowners and/or developers to acquire agency services). In the space below, discuss the chief reasons for the proposal. Identify alternatives and explain why the alternatives are not as feasible as the proposal.

The applicant landowner would like to acquire all available services within the City of Anderson.

- N/A 13. **Terms and Conditions:** *For an application by a public agency*, the resolution of application may request terms and conditions on LAFCO's approval. In the section below, list and provide an expanded discussion of the terms and conditions requested in the resolution. If there are no terms and conditions, insert "None Requested".

14. **Boundary Modifications:** LAFCO is authorized to modify the boundary of a proposal to include or exclude territory. In the section below, explain how the proposed boundary was

determined, the alternatives considered, and what the impacts would be if LAFCO were to modify the boundary. Attach any maps that would support the proposed boundary or would visually depict the impacts of any boundary modification. *(This section is critical to LAFCO's analysis; please provide a complete response.)*

The boundary was determined based upon existing land uses and the availability of City services. The proximity to I-5 and the new off-ramp is also a factor in boundary.

15. **Plan for Providing Services (§56653):** Whenever a local agency or school district submits a resolution of application for a change of organization or reorganization, the local agency *shall* submit a plan for providing services within the affected territory. The applicant agency must also *complete the following table and attach a comprehensive narrative that includes the following information:*

- An enumeration and description of the services to be extended to the affected territory.
- The level and range of those services.
- An indication of when those services can feasibly be extended to the affected territory.
- 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.
- Information with respect to how those services will be financed.

(A) Service	(B) Current Provider <i>(e.g. County, Special District, Private, None)</i>	(C) Method to Finance Current Service <i>(Use Key Below)</i>	(D) To be Provided by this Proposal? <i>(Yes or No)</i>	(E) If Yes to (D), Method to Finance? <i>(Use Key Below)</i>	(F) If Yes to (D), Estimated Date Service Available
Law Enforcement	Sheriff		No		
Fire Protection	Anderson FPD Cottonwood FPD CSA 1		No		
Streets/Traffic	Shasta County		No		
Water	Individual Wells	O	No		
Sewer	None	O	No		
Power	PG&E		No		
Solid Waste	Waste Management		No		
Storm Drains	None		No		

Key: O=Owner; SC=Service Charges; AD=Assessment District; DA=Developer Agreement

Law Enforcement

The City has a total of 15 sworn County peace officers (Anderson Police Department) for the total City population of 9,946 (2010 US Census) persons in the incorporated area of the City. That is a ratio of one officer per 663 persons which meets the General Plan policy 4 to maintain 1.7 sworn officers per 1000 persons. The project will not result in additional residences although future development could be possible. The City is currently approximately 6.4 square miles with the proposed annexation this would increase by

approximately .5 square miles for a total of 6.8 square miles. The City of Anderson Police Department has reviewed this project and has not identified any significant impacts.

Fire Protection

The project is not located within high fire hazard severity zone. No significant additional level of fire protection is necessary.

The majority of the annexation/ pre-zoning area is in the Shasta County Fire Department jurisdiction with about 38 acres along the southern end within the Cottonwood Fire District. It is expected that the unincorporated area served by Calfire would be annexed into the Anderson Fire District. The Anderson and Cottonwood Fire Districts have mutual and automatic aid agreements. There is a portion of the annexation area that will fall within the Cottonwood Fire District, these parcel(s) would remain within the Cottonwood Fire District and be serviced appropriately.

The closest Calfire station that serves the area is near the Redding Airport and is 6.4 miles from the properties. The Anderson Fire station is 1.4 miles distance. The former Roseburg mill property has its own fire system with fire hydrants.

Streets/Traffic

The project would not cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The road system Deschutes Road, Locust and Barney Road are currently County maintained roads. The County would relinquish their responsibility of those roads at the time of annexation. The City is currently in the process of constructing an off-ramp at Interstate 5 and roundabout for traffic control. This entire process has been through environmental review and is projected for completion in September of 2013.

The project will result in a pre-zone of approximately 385 acres industrial and commercial zoned property, until development occurs it is difficult to anticipate daily trips. In addition, the Department of Public Works has indicated that this would not be a significant increase in traffic. The pre zone and annexation project would not generate enough traffic to significantly reduce the volume to capacity ratio of adjacent roadways to a reduced level of service. The project would allow for future development within the City limits that would be subject to CEQA review. This area has been studied significantly throughout the years and the most recent study is the technical memorandum by Omni Means for titled the Existing and Forecasted Daily Peak Hour Traffic Volumes and Resulting Traffic Operations Analysis.

The project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the Shasta Regional Transportation agency for designated roads or highway. The General Plan Circulation Element maintains a policy SP-8 which strives to maintain a LOS D as a minimum acceptable service during peak periods.

The major intersection that could be impacted by development on the proposed annexation area is at Deschutes Road/Locust Road/Factory Outlets Drive. The City will be completing a project at this intersection, which will add a northbound off-ramp, and a roundabout intersection. Per the approved Caltrans environmental document the intersection will operate at an acceptable level of service with development of the proposed annexed area for the foreseeable future. As development occurs the developer will be conditioned to mitigate any safety hazards and traffic impacts to maintain an acceptable level of service.

The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. At this time the project does not involve any development of the site. The pre-zone and annexation would allow future development that would be subject to CEQA review. The project would result in the division of non-residential land, which would not affect air traffic patterns.

The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses because the proposed extension of Gateway Drive is consistent with the Circulation element of the City of Anderson General Plan and Engineering design standards as established by Public Works. An extension of Gateway drive is proposed in the Circulation Element of the City of Anderson General Plan however this pre-zone and annexation would not require additional circulation at this time. The pre-zone and annexation would allow future development that would be subject to CEQA review.

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

The following roadways provide emergency access to the project: Deschutes Road (Arterial Street) provides east and west access to the properties. Locust (Arterial Street), Panorama Point, and Kimberly Roads provide southerly access routes.

The project has been reviewed by the City of Anderson Fire Protection District which has determined that there is adequate emergency access with the existing roadway in the annexation area.

The project would not result in inadequate parking capacity, at this time. Future development will require on-site parking pursuant to Chapter 17.46 of the Anderson Municipal Code Code.

The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

The project is consistent with the City of Anderson General Plan Circulation Element policies for transit and pedestrian bicycle modes, the 2007 City of Anderson Bikeway Plan.

The project area contains railroad track that runs through annexation area from I-5 and parallels Locust Road, adjacent to the Roseburg property. Deschutes Road is an existing overcrossing for the railroad with no other local roads that currently cross the tracks. Future development may require safety elements at the railroad tracks and shall be evaluated at the time of development for impacts which may require grade separations for major thoroughfares or improvements to existing grade crossings due to increase pedestrian or traffic volumes.

Water

Water service for the project is to be provided by the City of Anderson. Currently, wells serve the properties within the annexation/pre-zone area. The extension of water lines into the area will depend on the city's ability to pay for such improvements or by the property owners initiating the improvements. A future development may require the extension of public water lines into the area and the developer would pay the cost.

Sewer

The proposed project is consistent with the Master Sewer Plan for City of Anderson (March 2007). With the extension of sewer lines and potential increase of sewer fees the proposal will not exceed the capacity to treat sewage as described in the plan.

The Anderson Wastewater Treatment Plant has an existing average dry weather flow capacity (ADWF) of 2.0 million gallons per day (MGD) and a peak wet weather flow (PWWF) capacity of 8.0 MGD. The current summer ADWF is approximately 1.36 MGD which equates to 68 percent of capacity. The PWWF is estimated to be 5.9 MGD which is 74 percent of capacity. There is approximately 0.64 MGD capacity at the waste water treatment plant for dry weather flows and 2.1 MDG for wet weather flows. The plant has the capacity to be expanded to an ADWF of 2.5 MGD by modifying the existing treatment processes. It can be expanded beyond this capacity with more in-depth modifications and additions. When development is proposed in the annexation area the wastewater treatment plant capacity will be reviewed for significant environmental impacts to the system.

The area to be annexed does not currently have a wastewater collection system. The City of Anderson has approved a project to construct the South Anderson Sewer Interceptor Project. The project will construct a sewer trunk line extending along the existing southeast City limit from Pleasant Hills Drive to the City's wastewater treatment plant. The interceptor will provide sewage collection capabilities and capacity for the area to be annexed. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and adopted for the South Anderson Interceptor Sewer Project in 2005. Preliminary plans have been prepared and a zone of benefit has been established to collect funds for the project. The interceptor will range in size from 18- to 33-inches in diameter.

Solid Waste

Solid waste disposal will not be affected by this proposal. There will be no change of service provider or volume. Any future development will be address by the property owner and service provider at that time.

Storm Drains

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The drainage pattern will not be altered at this stage of the project because there is no development proposed. The current network of ditches which convey storm water to Anderson Creek will remain for existing developments; drainage will be disbursed to either the unimproved areas or landscape areas adjacent to buildings and parking areas. This will preserve the existing drainage pattern and not require alteration of the natural drainage courses. Future development will require building permits and as a condition of these permits drainage off the property is addressed. The project would not create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

16. **Water Service:** Pursuant to §56668(k), LAFCO must now consider, "Timely availability of water supplies adequate for projected needs . . ." Availability of water supply includes the fluid water itself (entitlements) and infrastructure (treatment capacity, storage capacity, regional transmission, and local distribution systems). Adequacy of water also means the ability of the agency to provide water to both existing and proposed development. In the space below, discuss water availability and adequacy in the context of the proposal set forth in this application.

The proposed area to be annexed lies within the City's Southern Pressure Zone which is primarily served by two wells and the 1.0 million gallon Anderson Height Reservoir. The pressure zone is connected to the City's Northern Pressure Zone. The Southern Pressure Zone total well capacity, with the Northern Pressure Zone contribution is approximately 2.95 MGD. The effective well capacity is approximately 1.7 MGD which is greater than the estimated maximum daily demand of 1.2 MGD. There is currently a 10-inch water line extending under Interstate 5 to the intersection of Locust Road and Barney Road. That is the extent of the City's water infrastructure in the vicinity of the annexation. At the time development is proposed the water systems will need to be reviewed and evaluated for.

Revised

N/A 17. Sphere of Influence Amendment as a Separate or Concurrent Action:

- A. **Compliance with §56425(b):** *For an application by a city* for amendment of a city sphere of influence, city and county representatives are required to meet on matters pertaining to the proposed sphere change. (See §56425(b) for specifics.) *This meeting is to be held at least 30 days prior to submitting an application to LAFCO.* To verify compliance with the statute, complete the following:

Date(s) of City/County Meeting(s): _____

City Attendees (Name/Position): _____

County Attendees (Name/Position): _____

City/County Agreement: City and County ___ **Did** ___ **Did not** enter into an agreement with respect to the proposed sphere of influence boundaries, and development standards and zoning requirements within the proposed sphere. (If an agreement *was* adopted, a copy is to be attached.)

- B. *For all applications that request amendment of a local agency sphere of influence, either as a single proposal or as a concurrent amendment associated with a proposed boundary change, the applicant is to attach a comprehensive narrative description and discussion of each of the following statutory factors:*

- (1) The present and planned land uses in the area to be included in the sphere, 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.

Maps and exhibits depicting the proposed sphere amendment boundary, and the relationship of the proposed sphere boundary to other adjacent sphere boundaries are also to be submitted. As well, it would be helpful to plot on the current sphere boundary map the annexations that have occurred over the past ten years so as to demonstrate agency growth.

If there are any questions with respect to the sphere of influence amendment requirements, applicants are encouraged to contact LAFCO staff *before* preparing the required documentation.

N/A 18. Evaluation of Landowner Consent: For applications submitted by a local agency, list each Assessor's Parcel included in the proposal, the number of acres per parcel, the current parcel owner(s), the parcel address, mailing address (if different), whether or not there is a dwelling unit or units on the parcel, number of resident registered voters, and check whether the landowner and/or registered voter has submitted a letter in support of the proposal, or opposed, or has not responded. *Attach copies of all support or opposition letters.* If necessary, continue the list on a separate sheet and attach it immediately following this page. (Example shown in *italics.*)

	Assessor's Parcel No.	No. Acres	Current Owner(s), Parcel Address, Mail Address	No. D.U. *	No. of Resident Registered Voters	S *	O *	NR *
	000-000-00	00	<i>Smith, John and Mary 000 Smith Lane P.O. Box (if applicable) City, CA 00000</i>	1	2	x		
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								

* DU = Dwelling Units; S= Support; O=Opposed; NR=No Response

N/A 19. 100% Consent Applications; Request Waiver of Public Hearing: Pursuant to §56663, proceedings before LAFCO may be conducted without a public hearing, and Conducting Authority proceedings may be waived, provided (a) *the applying agency's resolution of application requests a waiver,* and (b) provided the resolution is accompanied by *proof that all of the owners of land within the affected*

territory have given their written consent to the proposed change of organization or reorganization. The following is also to be completed and signed if the agency's resolution requests this waiver:

It is hereby certified that the signatures shown on the attached petitions and/or letters represent 100% of the owners of the territory included in the proposal presented in this application. It is further certified that these landowners consent to the proposal presented in this application.

Print Name: _____ Title: _____

Signature: _____ Agency: _____

20. Executive Officer's Report/Notice of Hearing: Print or type the name and addresses of three officers or persons in addition to the chief petitioners and/or clerk of each affected agency who are to receive copies of the Executive Officer's Report and the notice of the public hearing:

- 1. DVANE MILLER PO BOX 1307, ANDERSON, CA 96007
- 2. KRISTEN MAZE 1887 HOWARD ST, ANDERSON, CA 96007
- 3. _____

21. Certification, Indemnification, Signature:

- 1. In signing this document, it is hereby certified, that the statements made in this application and the attachments to this application are to the best of my knowledge complete and accurate.
- 2. The undersigned, as Applicant (agency and/or property owner), agrees to indemnify, save harmless, and reimburse LAFCO for all reasonable expenses and attorney fees in connection with the defense of LAFCO and for any damages, penalties, fines or other costs imposed upon or incurred by LAFCO should LAFCO be named as a party in any litigation or administrative proceeding in connection with the application, whether the application is maintained or withdrawn. Applicant further agrees that LAFCO shall have the right to appoint its own counsel to defend it and conduct its own defense in the matter it deems in its best interest, and that LAFCO's taking such actions shall not limit Applicant's obligations to indemnify and reimburse defense costs or relieve Applicant of such obligations.

Signature: Arne Hultgren Phone: 530-938-5754

Print/Type Name: ARNE HULTGREN Fax: _____

Title: CA. RESOURCE MANAGER e-mail: arneh@cfcc.com

Agency: Rosaling Forest Products Date: 14-NOV-2013