



**Lou Ann Teixeira**  
*Executive Officer*

**MEMBERS**

**Helen Allen**  
*City Member*

**Federal Glover**  
*County Member*

**Martin McNair**  
*Public Member*

**Gayle B. Uilkema**  
*County Member*

**Dwight Meadows**  
*Special District Member*

**David A. Piepho**  
*Special District Member*

**Rob Schroder**  
*City Member*

**ALTERNATE MEMBERS**

**William Bristow**  
*Public Member*

**George H. Schmidt**  
*Special District Member*

**Mary N. Piepho**  
*County Member*

**Don Tatzin**  
*City Member*

August 13, 2008 (Agenda)

Contra Costa Local Agency Formation Commission  
651 Pine Street, Sixth Floor  
Martinez, CA 94553

**Green Valley Recreation & Park District Municipal Service Review**

Dear Commissions:

BACKGROUND

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) requires that not less than every five years LAFCO prepare municipal service reviews (MSRs) prior to or in conjunction with sphere of influence (SOI) updates.

In accordance with the MSRs, LAFCO must prepare written determinations on a range of issues, as presented below.

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; and
6. Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy.

In 2003-04, the Commission initiated the MSR/SOI update program. To date, the Commission has completed service reviews and SOI updates for over 60 special districts; baseline reviews are currently underway covering the 19 cities and a number of other special districts.

A team of consultants and LAFCO staff are preparing the service reviews and SOI updates. The approach involves a combination of countywide, sub-regional and individual agency reviews. The MSRs provide an assessment of the range and adequacy of municipal services provided in the County, and serve as an important tool for LAFCO in fulfilling its legislative mandate to coordinate the logical development of local government agencies and services.

## SUMMARY

On July 9, 2008, the Commission held a workshop, at which time LAFCO staff presented the Preliminary Draft MSR/SOI Update for the Green Valley Recreation & Park District (GVRPD). At the workshop, staff provided an overview of the District's services, along with a summary of key issues, government structure and SOI options. The Commission was asked to review the report, provide comment, and direct staff to circulate the Public Review Draft MSR report. In addition, public comment was accepted.

LAFCO staff made revisions to the MSR report based on comments received at the July LAFCO workshop and subsequent communications with District representatives. The more significant revisions included 1) additional discussion relating to the District's financial ability to provide services and funding options, 2) updated information regarding the District's recent SOI amendment, and 3) the addition of a government structure option (i.e., revert to a homeowners association) and related discussion. The report was circulated for a 21-day public review comment period and posted on the LAFCO website at [www.contracostalafco.org](http://www.contracostalafco.org). LAFCO received no additional comments.

The purpose of the hearing on August 13 is to present the Final Draft MSR report, receive additional comments; and request that the Commission accept the MSR report, adopt determinations and update the District's SOI (presented in a separate agenda item).

## DISCUSSION

The MSR report provides a review of District services and recommended MSR determinations, which are presented in the attachment resolution. In addition, the MSR provides SOI options and recommendations, which are presented as a separate LAFCO agenda item.

The MSR report identifies Government Structure Options (GSOs), including a discussion of potential advantages and disadvantages of these options. The MSR presents three potential GSOs for GVRPD, as follows:

- Maintain the status quo with annual report backs to LAFCO
- Consolidate with the Town of Danville
- Revert to a homeowners association

The recommended option is to maintain the status quo with annual report backs to LAFCO.

LAFCO may, but is not obligated to, initiate changes of organization or reorganization (i.e., consolidations, dissolutions, formations, mergers) based on the MSR findings. Any option involving a change or organization or reorganization typically requires additional study to determine the level of benefit in terms of service and anticipated costs.

In general, merger or consolidation of two or more agencies offers advantages such as potential service level improvements and administrative, election and overhead cost savings. Disadvantages include expenses associated with consolidation, negligible cost savings and political opposition.

With the exception of maintaining the status quo, further study would be needed to explore the other GSOs identified in the MSR report. Such analysis would typically include a fiscal impact report to determine costs/benefits of consolidation, an inventory of assets and liabilities, and other analyses, including detailed analysis of institutional impediments. It should be noted that the Town of Danville has expressed no interest in merging with the GVRPD. Further, the District has expressed no interest in either consolidating with the Town of Danville or reverting to a homeowners association. On the contrary, GVRPD has plans to expand its existing boundaries to enhance service capability.

### **Environmental Analysis**

The municipal service review is a study, intended to serve as an informational tool to help LAFCO, local agencies and the public better understand the public service structure in Contra Costa County.

The service review and determinations are Categorically Exempt under §15306, Class 6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Determine that the MSR project is Categorically Exempt pursuant to §15306, Class 6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines,
2. Consider comments presented prior to and during the public hearing and any revisions to the Green Valley Recreation & Park District MSR report,
3. Accept the report with any desired changes,
4. Adopt the MSR determinations by resolution attached hereto, and
5. Direct staff to prepare the Final MSR report and make available to all affected agencies and interested parties.

Sincerely,

LOU ANN TEXEIRA  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

c: Distribution

Attachment - Draft Resolution with MSR Determinations

**RESOLUTION OF THE CONTRA COSTA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION  
ADOPTING DETERMINATIONS FOR THE  
2008 GREEN VALLEY RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT MUNICIPAL SERVICES REVIEW**

**WHEREAS**, Government Code §56430 requires the Commission to conduct municipal service reviews (MSRs) in order to prepare and update spheres of influence (SOIs) pursuant to Government Code §56425;

**WHEREAS**, on July 9, 2008, the Commission conducted a workshop to review the Preliminary Draft *Green Valley Recreation & Park District MSR*, solicited comments, and directed staff to circulate the MSR for public review,

**WHEREAS**, following the workshop the Public Review Draft MSR was circulated for a 21-day public comment period;

**WHEREAS**, on August 13, 2008, the Commission conducted a public hearing to receive the Final Draft MSR;

**WHEREAS**, the Commission considered all comments, written and oral, received prior to and during the hearing on August 13, 2008; and

**WHEREAS**, the MSR report and determinations are Categorical Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to §15306 Class 6 of the CEQA Guidelines.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Contra Costa Local Agency Formation Commission does hereby resolve, determine and order as follows:

*The Green Valley Recreation & Park District MSR Determinations attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference are hereby adopted.*

\* \* \* \* \*

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 13<sup>th</sup> day of August 2008, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ROB SCHRODER, CHAIR, CONTRA COSTA LAFCO

*I hereby certify that this is a correct copy of a resolution passed and adopted by this Commission on the date stated above*

Dated: August 13, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lou Ann Texeira, Executive Officer

**EXHIBIT A**  
**GREEN VALLEY RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT**  
**MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW DETERMINATIONS**

1. ***Growth and Population Projections***

- The GVRPD serves households primarily from the Danville and Alamo areas.
- The population within the District boundaries is approximately 1,126. The territory within the District boundaries is built out, and projected growth within the existing boundaries is projected at less than 1% annually.
- Future growth will depend primarily on annexation of additional territory into the District boundaries and minimal infill development.

2. ***Present and Planned Capacity and Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies***

- The District's primary asset is a swimming pool, which is over 50 years old and in need of replacement.
- GVRPD has plans to replace the pool and expand its service boundary to enhance revenues and fund the needed improvements.

3. ***Financial Ability to Provide Services***

- The primary sources of revenue for the GVRPD include property tax and user fees. Due to funding, the District is limited in the services it can provide.
- The District should consider periodic review and update of its membership fees.
- In order to improve facilities and services, the District will need to enhance funding opportunities. The District proposes to expand its service boundary in order to enhance revenues.
- The District should also look for alternative sources of funding, including levying an assessment, sharing of resources and grant opportunities.
- GVRPD controls costs through various means including the use of volunteers and part-time seasonal employees to provide services; and utilizing the County Treasurer to manage its finances.
- The District Board should adopt an annual budget of estimated expenses and revenues.

4. ***Opportunities for Shared Facilities***

- The District does not currently share facilities. The District should look for ways to share resources and/or facilities with other agencies (e.g., Town of Danville, school district).

5. ***Accountability for Community Services Including Government Structure and Operational Options***

- The GVRPD is an independent District formed in 1949 under the Recreation & Park District Law, Public Resources §5780 et seq. The District is governed by a Board of Directors elected at large by voters within the District.

- The District boundaries are located wholly within the Town of Danville. The area served by the District is, for the most part, built out. Future growth and demand for service will be limited.
- Three government structure options were identified for the GVRPD:
  - 1) Maintain the status quo with annual report backs to LAFCO
  - 2) Consolidate with the Town of Danville
  - 3) Revert to a homeowners association

The advantages and disadvantages of these options are discussed in the MSR report. Options to consolidate with the Town of Danville and revert to a homeowners association would require additional study.

The Town of Danville is a separate public agency and has no plans to take over the GVRPD or its facility. A reorganization of the Town and the District is not considered a feasible option at this time. Further study would be needed to determine whether there would be real operational efficiencies, as well as the potential costs and benefits.

Further study to determine the costs and benefits associated with dissolving the district and transferring its assets and liabilities to a private homeowners association would be needed.

- The District maintains a website. The website does not currently include information regarding Board meetings (e.g., agenda, minutes, meeting notices, etc.). Board meetings should be open and accessible to the public. The District should hold regular public meetings, and update its website to include information regarding Board meetings.
- With regard to operations, the District is utilizing the County to manage its finances. The District should consider having an independent financial audit performed on a regular basis.

6. ***Effective and Efficient Service Delivery***

- The District is managed by the District's Board of Directors; there is no paid administrative staff.
- The District operates similar to a non-profit organization with volunteers and part-time employees.