

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

550 Main Street, Suite E. Placerville, CA 95667 (530) 295-2707 · lafco@edlafco.us · www.edlafco.us

May 7, 2019

The Honorable Kansen Chu California State Assembly State Capital Room 3126 Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: OPPOSE Assembly Bill 600 (as amended April 29, 2019)

Dear Assembly Member Chu:

The EI Dorado Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) joins the California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions (CALAFCO) to remain opposed to your bill, *Assembly Bill 600*. Like other LAFCOs, we are aware of and concerned about the disparity of local public services, especially for residents and properties located within disadvantaged unincorporated communities (DUCs). All Californians deserve adequate and safe drinking water and wastewater facilities and LAFCOs have been working diligently with our partners to accomplish that goal. We support your efforts to address these problems, which persist in many counties; however, *AB 600* in its current version does not represent a collective stakeholder dialogue with reasonable and systemic solutions to the problem.

The bill allows for an extension of service in lieu of annexation and we remain greatly concerned about extension of service without annexation. One of the primary statutory purposes of LAFCO is to ensure orderly growth. Extending services on an individual basis or by service category without annexation only serves to undermine the very purpose of jurisdictional boundaries and sphere of influence plans and conflicts with existing statute, Government Code Section 56133(b).

Another of LAFCOs' statutory purposes is to ensure the effective and efficient provision of municipal services. Ultimately, the annexation of a DUC does not ensure they will receive adequate, safe drinking water. The reality is there are engineering and financial issues that must be solved in order to ensure service and this bill does not address those ongoing issues. We want to ensure that local circumstances and conditions are taken into consideration and this bill offers a "one size fits all" approach that may not be effective in many instances.

The bill adds (8)(C) to Government Code Section 56375. As written, this section creates confusion and contradicts §56375(8)(A). We believe the intention is to prohibit LAFCO from approving the annexation of two or more contiguous disadvantaged communities within five years that are individually less than ten acres but cumulatively more than ten acres. If so, then this language conflicts with §56375(8)(A), which allows for commission policies to guide the commission in determining the size of the area to be annexed. Further, the term "paragraph" as used in this section creates uncertainty as to what section or subsection is actually being addressed.

Assembly Bill 600 (Chu) May 7, 2019 Page 2 of 2

We support workable and sustainable policy solutions to the disparities in service delivery to disadvantaged communities. However, a major obstacle remains the infrastructure and operational funding for these services. We believe that addressing the needs of disadvantaged communities through the planning process and finding tools to support the infrastructure deficiencies and implementation actions remain a very important part of the solution.

For all of the reasons noted above, the El Dorado LAFCO remains opposed to *AB 600*. Please contact me should you have any questions.

Respectfully,

José C. Henríquez Executive Officer

-Cost / CNA ique

Cc: Jimmy MacDonald, Consultant, Assembly Local Government Committee William Weber, Consultant, Assembly Republican Caucus Pamela Miller, Executive Director, CALAFCO