



Lou Ann Texeira
Executive Officer

MEMBERS

Helen Allen
City Member
Federal Glover
County Member
Martin McNair
Public Member

Dwight Meadows
Special District Member
David A. Piepho
Special District Member

Rob Schroder
City Member

Gayle B. Uilkema
County Member

ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Sharon Burke
Public Member
George H. Schmidt
Special District Member
Mary N. Piepho
County Member
Don Tatzin
City Member

April 21, 2010 (Agenda)

April 21, 2010
 Agenda Item 11

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

Cemetery, Parks & Recreation Services Municipal Services Review

Dear Members of the Commission:

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 relating to various factors including growth and population; present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services including infrastructure needs or deficiencies; financial ability of agencies to provide services; status of and opportunities for shared facilities; and accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies.

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 efficient and logical development of local government agencies and services.

In 2006, the Commission approved an MSR/SOI work plan that provides for a phased approach to completing baseline MSRs/SOI updates for the 19 cities and remaining special districts using consultants and LAFCO staff. The approach involves a combination of service-specific (countywide), sub-regional, and agency-specific reviews.

To date, LAFCO has completed baseline countywide reviews covering healthcare, water/wastewater, fire/emergency, and reclamation services. In addition, the Commission has completed sub-regional MSRs covering all cities and community service districts, as well as several agency-specific MSRs.

SUMMARY

On February 10, 2010, LAFCO held a workshop, at which time the MSR consultants Jennifer Stephenson and Alex Hebert-Brown (Burr Consulting) presented an overview of the *Cemetery, Parks & Recreation MSR* covering the following local agencies: Alamo Lafayette Cemetery District (ALCD), Byron Brentwood

Knightsen Union Cemetery District (BBKUCD), Ambrose Recreation & Park District (ARPD), Pleasant Hill RPD (PHRPD), Rollingwood Wilart Park RPD (RWPRPD), and County Service Areas (CSAs) M-16, M-17, M-29, M-30, R-4, R-7, R-9, and R-10. The consultants provided an overview of the local agencies and their ability to provide services. The report includes the State-required determinations, along with SOI and governance structure options and recommendations. The Commission was asked to provide comment, and directed staff to circulate the Public Review Draft MSR report.

The project team made revisions to the MSR report based on comments received at the February workshop. The MSR report was then posted on the LAFCO website and circulated for a 28-day public review period. LAFCO received a number of comments during the public review period as summarized in Attachment 1. Revisions were made to the MSR report based on comments received. The Final Draft MSR report and SOI recommendations will be presented to the Commission on April 21, at which time the Commission will be asked to receive any final comments; accept the MSR report, adopt determinations, and update agency SOIs as presented in a separate agenda item. The MSR report is available on the LAFCO website at www.contracostalafco.org.

DISCUSSION

The *Cemetery, Parks & Recreation Services MSR* report provides a comprehensive review of services provided by local agencies under LAFCO's purview, including those agencies listed above. The MSR report focuses primarily on public agencies and their ability to provide municipal services.

Cemetery Services

Public cemetery services are provided by ALCD and BBKUCD. Private cemetery services are also provided by various religious organizations and private enterprises throughout the County. ALCD serves portions of the cities of Lafayette, Walnut Creek, San Ramon, the Town of Danville, and the unincorporated communities of Alamo, Blackhawk, Diablo, and a portion of the unincorporated community of Walden. ALCD's boundaries also include 21± acres (25 parcels) within the City of Orinda. BBKUCD serves the unincorporated communities of Byron, Knightsen, Discovery Bay, Bethel Island, the eastern portion of Morgan Territory, the City of Brentwood, the eastern portion of the City of Oakley, and the Delta islands of Jersey, Bradford, Webb, Quimby, Holland, Palm, Orwood, and Coney.

ALCD and BBKUCD are independent special districts responsible for operating, maintaining, improving, and expanding cemeteries within their district bounds. The MSR report finds that ALCD and BBKUCD appear to have sufficient capacity for the next 15-20 years, even accounting for population growth. Both districts have taken a proactive approach to expanding capacity by adding cremation niches at the cemetery facilities.

With regard to management and accountability, both districts generally exhibit the characteristics of well-managed local government agencies; however, significant planning needs face both districts. It is recommended that both districts develop and maintain a written capital improvement plan for cemetery facility improvements and expansion.

With regard to financing, both districts rely on property taxes (i.e., approximately 65% of total revenues) for funding. In addition, both districts charge endowment fees for burial plots and niches, as required by Health and Safety Code. However, both ALCD and BBKUCD report that their endowment care fees may be too low to cover long-term maintenance costs of existing plots. It is recommended that both districts conduct a formal review of the adequacy of the endowment care fund to determine if the fund balance will be enough to provide perpetual care to the cemetery facilities once they have reached capacity.

The MSR report identified boundary irregularities for both districts; these boundary issues are further discussed in the SOI staff report.

Park & Recreation Services

Park and recreation services are provided by various local, regional and other agencies. This MSR report reviews services provided by special districts, as listed above.

The MSR report indicates that service levels and demand vary significantly by agency, and that most of the districts fail to meet park acreage standards established by the land use authorities in the area (i.e., County, cities). It is suggested that all districts capitalize on facility sharing and open facilities to the public that are not presently available for general use, including establishing or increasing collaboration with the local school district, exploring community resources and other options for indoor offsite locations for recreation programs and activities, and partnering with non-profits such as the YMCA.

With regard to management and accountability, the MSR report notes that accountability to constituents within the CSAs and RWPRPD is constrained due to a lack of representation on advisory committees or the lack of a citizens advisory committee altogether. Further, there is generally a lack of outreach and information promoting the availability of recreation programming within the CSAs and RWPRPD. The MSR report contains a number of recommendations to help address these issues.

The MSR report indicates that the financial ability of agencies to provide park and recreation services varies significantly. Every district, with the exception of CSAs R-9 and R-10, receives some funding via property taxes and/or assessments. CSA R-9 has no regular financing source and assessments were denied twice by voters. Some of the districts (i.e., PHRPD and CSAs M-30 and R-4) report that finances were generally adequate to provide services; while others report inadequate financing, and some operate under severe budgeting constraints (i.e., ARPD and RWPRPD). The MSR report contains a number of recommendations to help address these issues.

Finally, the MSR report assesses a number of service area and boundary issues which are further discussed in the SOI staff report.

MSR DETERMINATIONS

The CKH Act requires LAFCO to review municipal services and prepare written a written statement of determinations with respect to a number of factors; the determinations relating to cemetery, parks and recreation services are presented in Attachment 2. In order to address the required factors, the MSR examines a number of issues as summarized below.

Growth and Population Projections

The MSR report provides information regarding growth and population projections and the impacts to municipal services.

With regard to cemetery services, natural population growth, in addition to population growth brought on by new residential construction, will increase demand for services in the future. Population growth within ALCD is projected to be low (less than 1% annual growth) over the next 10 years, consistent with other areas within central County. BBKUCD experienced significant growth from 2000 to 2008, and will continue to experience growth consistent with east County. Both ALCD and BBKUCD appear to have sufficient capacity for the next 15-20 years, even accounting for population growth.

Demand for park and recreation services varies based on a number of factors, including age and income level, but is primarily measured through population growth. As population increases, demand for these services will increase; however, the aging of the population is expected to partially offset the growth in residents.

Local demand will primarily depend on development. Areas with the most planned development, and hence, the greatest population increases, are CSA M-29 and ARPD. Population is expected to increase by 34% and 29%, respectively, for these two areas over the next 15 years. Relatively speaking, high growth is also anticipated within CSA M-30 due to new residential construction on currently vacant lots; however,

the overall population level within the CSA will still be relatively low (120± residents). CSA R-4, including the Town of Moraga, is anticipated to experience modest growth through 2025, with an annual growth rate of approximately 0.5% percent. Population growth for the majority of special districts providing park and recreation services is expected to be low (approximately 0.2% per year), given that many areas are currently built-out.

Adequacy of Public Services

The MSR provides a discussion of service demand and adequacy for each agency based on a number of factors, including jurisdictional boundaries, projected growth and opportunity for development, and available resources. There is significant variation in service demand, capacity and management practices among the local agencies.

Both ALCD and BBKUCD provide adequate services given financing levels. The MSR report notes that both districts could benefit by implementing multi-year capital improvement plans. In addition, the MSR report recommends that the districts conduct a formal review of the adequacy of the endowment care fund to determine if the fund balance will be enough to provide perpetual care to the cemetery facilities once they have reached capacity.

With regard to park and recreation services, the MSR report notes that additional park acres are needed within all districts, with the exception of CSA M-16, to meet existing Level of Service (LOS) standards, and additional acres will be needed to address population growth in the future.

Infrastructure

The MSR report provides information regarding agency infrastructure including facilities, vehicles and equipment. The present and planned capacity of public facilities and infrastructure needs ranges significantly by agency.

With regard to ALCD and BBKCD, no short-term capacity issues or infrastructure needs were identified. Both cemetery districts appear to have sufficient capacity for the next 15-20 years, even accounting for service demand at build-out. ALCD has reached capacity for in-ground burials at Alamo Cemetery, but continues to add capacity for cremation interments as the need arises. ALCD reported that adding niches is the only method of increasing capacity currently available to the district, due to the high cost of land within the district, and limited finances.

With regard to park and recreation services, every agency, with the exception of CSA M-16, has existing and future park acreage needs. ARPD, PHRPD, and CSAs M-29, R-4 and R-7 have significant existing and future acreage needs. CSAs M-17 and R-10 have relatively less parkland needs than other agencies. Existing facilities within CSAs M-16, M-29, M-30, R-9 and R-4 were noted as being in good or excellent condition and had minimal infrastructure needs or deficiencies. Facilities within CSA R-7 were identified as being in excellent condition, with improvements planned in the near future. RWPRPD's facility is in fair condition and needs moderate improvements.

ARPD, PHRPD, and CSAs M-17 and R-10 have significant park and recreation capital needs and deficiencies. All of the park and recreation facilities within CSA M-29 were constructed and opened between 2000 and 2009. There are limited needs and deficiencies presently; however, as the facilities age in the next 10-15 years, there will be a need for significant capital funding for facility rehabilitation. The City of San Ramon has begun maintenance and renovation planning to address these anticipated future capital needs.

Financing

The MSR report evaluates the financial ability of agencies to provide services. Most local agencies are experiencing a decline in revenues and an increase in costs.

Property taxes are the primary revenue source for ALCD and BBKUCD. Fees for service generate approximately 34% in BBKUCD and 32% of total revenues in ALCD. BBKUCD reported that its financial ability to provide services has improved in recent years due to the increased amount of residential development within the district. Both districts reported that the current level of financing is generally sufficient for routine maintenance and regular service provision; however, ALCD reported that some capital needs have not been addressed in recent years due to financing constraints. Both districts may encounter difficulty in obtaining and developing new cemetery land if adequate long-term planning is not conducted.

Property taxes and assessments are the primary funding stream for park and recreation services. Only CSAs R-9 and R-10 do not receive any funding from property taxes or assessments. Park and recreation districts faced significant financial pressure due to the suspension of Proposition 1A.

The MSR report notes that if districts charge fees for service, it is recommended that fees be reviewed and updated regularly. If districts charge a benefit assessment, and do not utilize a CPI adjustment, it is recommended that they do so.

Local Accountability and Governance

Several of the key factors LAFCO must address in its MSRs are opportunities for shared facilities, and accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies.

Neither ALCD nor BBKUCD is presently engaged in facility sharing, and no facility sharing opportunities were identified.

Park service providers practice extensive facility sharing in Contra Costa County. Most commonly, the districts collaborate with school districts to provide additional recreational areas and facilities to residents after school hours, which is the case for ARPD, PHRPD, and CSAs M-29, M-30, R-4, R-7A, and R-10.

The MSR report evaluated local accountability based on the measures of contested elections, constituent outreach efforts, transparency, and disclosure practices.

ALCD and BBKUCD demonstrated accountability during the MSR process. The two public cemetery districts have governing bodies which are appointed; thus voters do not elect the governing body members. In general, the cemetery districts conduct limited constituent outreach activities.

All of the park and recreation agencies demonstrated full accountability in disclosure of information and cooperation with LAFCO during the MSR process, with the exception of RWPRPD, which demonstrated partial cooperation. All agencies prepare and post meeting agendas and make minutes available as required. The level of public outreach ranged from significant by some (i.e., ARPD, PHRPD, CSA M-29, CSA R-7); limited outreach by some (i.e., CSAs M-30, R-4, R-9, R-10 and RWPRPD); and no outreach by others (i.e., CSAs M-16 and M-17). The MSR report includes recommendations for enhancing constituent interest and involvement.

The MSR report provides a number of major findings relating to the overall adequacy of public services as presented in the determinations. A number of governance alternatives, including consolidation, are identified in the report. These options are summarized in a separate SOI staff report and described more fully in the MSR report.

The Commission is responsible for guiding local agencies in the County to overcome challenges by recommending governance alternatives through its determinations on the required MSR factors and through its upcoming decisions relating to SOIs. After accepting the MSR report and adopting the determinations as presented in the attached resolution, the Commission will be asked to consider the SOI updates.

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 Categorical Exempt under §15306, Class 6 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Determine that the MSR project is Categorical Exempt pursuant to §15306, Class 6 of the CEQA Guidelines,
2. Consider comments presented prior to and during the public hearing and any revisions to the *Cemetery, Parks & Recreation MSR report*,
3. Accept the report with any desired changes,
4. Adopt the MSR determinations by resolution attached hereto (Attachment 2), and
5. Direct staff to prepare the Final MSR report and make available it to all affected agencies and interested parties.

Sincerely,

LOU ANN TEXEIRA
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

c: Distribution

Attachments:

1. Comment Log
2. Draft Resolution with MSR Determinations

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
1 ARPD, Tarry Smith March 2, 2010	p. 69	The City of Pittsburg has set aside by Council action \$600,000 dollars for the planning and construction of the Ambrose Park Project. To date we have spent in the neighborhood of \$120,000 on planning expenses. No park improvements have been made to date. The City has been involved in plan review and fiscal control of said Pittsburg funds to date.	Added content to document.
2	p. 65	ARPD participates in both CARPD and CPRS. Perceived benefits are insurance pools, training, sharing of knowledge of prior experience and legislative support.	Added content to document.
3 Contra Costa County Supervisor, District I March 22, 2010	p. 130	The Montalvin Manor Redevelopment Advisory Council has been providing informal feedback to Public Works Special Districts staff about M-17 issues. The RAC is composed of community members and one business seat from both District I and District II, and they meet monthly. Gabriel Lemus (Redevelopment Agency) staffs the RAC.	Added content to document.
4 Vicki Koc, Alamo Resident March 24, 2010	Exec. Sum.	Executive Summary Policy Option. I strongly concur that in built-out areas, like CSA R-7A, that collaboration with schools and partnering with non-profits should be a strong goal.	Noted.
5	p. 30	The table outlines that for R-7A that maintenance is provided by the county for two schools. This is in error and is later stated correctly in the text that the County provides maintenance at Alamo School and that the Town of Danville provided maintenance for Rancho Romero School.	Revised Table 3-8 (showing facility sharing practices). While the San Ramon Valley Unified School District is responsible for maintenance of the Rancho Romero School Park, the County (through CSA R-7) has partnered with SRVUSD to provide additional park facilities in the area. As part of the agreement, the CSA provides park maintenance services through the County at the Alamo Elementary School and pays for park improvements at Alamo Elementary and Rancho Romero School in exchange for public use of the facilities.
6	p. 38	MSR Determination #10. I strongly concur that CSA info be reported separately to improve clarity and transparency within the County annual audit.	Noted.
7	p. 38	MSR Determination #14. Reads "Areas with anticipated high growth rates are M-30...". This is misleading as stated by itself as it implies large growth numbers when what is projected is growth from 70 people to 120 people. Given the location and topography, and that these are custom homes on large lots, even that is debatable. Currently 70 people live in 26 homes.	Updated determination to reflect the fact that the high growth rate will yield only a minimal population increase.
8	p. 152	Paragraph 1. Sentence 5. Hap Magee Ranch Park does not lie solely 'within the Town of Danville'. It lies within the Town of Danville and the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County as was outlined on p. 149 to be 9.1 acres in Danville and 8.1 acres respectively. Please change the wording to accurately reflect p. 149 detail.	Updated to reflect the fact that Hap Magee Ranch Park is partially located within the Town of Danville.
9	p. 152	Paragraph 2. Sentence 2. A more accurate description of the location of GVRPD should not be in reference to the CSA R-7A but rather to its geographic location as within the Town of Danville and serving Danville residents.	No revision. The description of the location of GVRPD is in reference to CSA R-7 because it gives spatial context to consolidation as a governance alternative: consolidation is theoretically possible due to GVRPD's location immediately adjacent to CSA R-7.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
10	p. 153	Shared Facilities #12. Correction: "No further opportunities for facility sharing were identified." Please correct as there is a future possibility at Stone Valley Middle School.	Updated.
11	p. 153	#15. Accountability. It is noted that there is an opportunity for consolidation with GVRPD. I believe this would be problematic and not in the best interest of CSA R-7A. See comments below.	Noted.
12	p. 154	SOI Option 3: Expand to include Green Valley Pool District. This location is within the Town of Danville and serves its nearby Danville residents. To expand CSA R-7A to include this location leapfrogging over Danville territory and attach it to the unincorporated Alamo County recreation district is gerrymandering at its worst. It also totally ignores geography and that the GVRPD is clearly within the SOI of the Town of Danville.	No revision. While consolidation of CSA R-7 with GVRPD is not recommended, expanding the CSA R-7 SOI to include GVRPD would not involve "leapfrogging," "gerrymandering," or the ignoring of geography, as GVRPD is located immediately adjacent to CSA R-7.
13	p. 154	An additional option should be considered: Remove M-30 from the Town of Danville. M-30 has 26 homes of which approximately 20 are within the unincorporated area of Alamo and have Alamo addresses. Six I believe are within the Town of Danville and may have Alamo addresses. In addition the only road into this area passes directly by Hap Magee Ranch Park which is a joint park with land in both the Town of Danville and unincorporated County. This park is about half mile from the Alamo Springs development. In general the southern border of that road is Danville and the northern border is unincorporated Alamo. Therefore, remove M-30 from the Town of Danville and have it remain in Alamo to coincide with its geographic location.	No revision. No portion of CSA M-30 is within the Town of Danville, so the identified SOI option is not applicable. The CSA was created to serve the Alamo Spring subdivision, a portion of which is located in the Town of Danville; however, the CSA only includes those homes in Alamo Springs outside of the Town of Danville.
14 LAFCO Commissioner, Sharon Burke March 25, 2010	p. 147	Document states that the boundary area of R-7 is 20.6 square miles. The CFA for the incorporation of Alamo previously prepared by LAFCO states the entire area of all of Alamo is approximately 10 square miles, and R-7 does not include the Round Hill Country Club area of Alamo. It would seem the approximate square mileage should be somewhere around 8 square miles.	Correct area is 8.21 sq miles per County GIS, or approximately 5,254 acres. Revised area and population density in MSR.
15	p. 148	The bounds of CSA R-7 encompass the unincorporated community of Alamo - as previously mentioned, R-7 does not include the Round Hill area but this sentence appears to be inclusive of all of Alamo.	Updated text to include this information.
16	p. 149	There is no need for restrooms at Andrew Young Park. It is a small pocket park and visitors do not stay long and it is immediately adjacent to the commercial area which contains restaurant, service station and store bathrooms.	Updated text to include this information.
17	p. 149	Others have commented on the capital needs stated by the county for R-7 which are not accurate. Most of the listed capital improvements are already completed or not necessary. This resulted in Burr Consulting misstating the capital needs of the district.	Updated text to include this information.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
18	p. 4 and p. 152	Governance options - CSA R-7 property taxes paid by M-30 residents help fund Hap Magee Park, which is the closest park facility to M-30. As Alamo is a single community of interest with a recent incorporation drive, it does not make sense to detach M-30 from the rest of the Alamo Park and Recreation District, but to leave the community of interest intact. Governance option 2, the consolidation of the two CSAs into one CSA with a zone to leave the County-Danville agreement intact makes more sense.	While it is true that some of the property taxes paid by CSA M-30 residents to CSA R-7 fund Hap Magee Ranch Park, benefit assessments paid by CSA M-30 residents to the Town of Danville also fund Hap Magee Ranch Park, in addition to other enhanced services provided by the Town. While both governance alternatives are legitimate options, a consolidation of CSAs R-7 and M-30 would create a more complex agency with layers of zones and financing mechanisms, and may not necessarily improve efficiency.
19		Under governance options for R-7, I believe the consultant should have suggested that the district's SOI be expanded to include the Round Hill Country Club area. It is the only area of the Alamo community presently excluded from the district, and the district almost completely surrounds the Round Hill area, save only a small corner of open space that prevents a complete island being made of the area. Round Hill residents frequent district parks and attend district sponsored activities, although a fee is required for recreation programs attended by Round Hill residents. The district's main facility, Livorna Park, is located closer to Round Hill Country Club than to any other defined neighborhood in Alamo.	Updated text to include this information.
20	p. 153	As far as I know, there is no deteriorating infrastructure within the district. The district's facilities were all built within the last 15 years.	Updated text to include this information.
21	p. 153	As far as I know, there are no deferred maintenance costs in the district.	Updated text to include this information.
22	p. 149	I believe special mention should be made that the district does not now provide recreation programming for seniors, an identified need in the community of Alamo, which has a large population of seniors. Currently, seniors in Alamo attend senior programs in Danville or Walnut Creek, paying non-resident fees.	Updated text to include this information.
23	p. 150	The MSR states that the district does not provide enough parkland to the district residents consistent with General Plan goals. The district needs to make the acquisition of additional parkland a high priority. Although the community is largely built out, there are pockets of land that should be actively pursued by the district while real estate values are currently at a low. The district should make it a priority to use its available reserve funds to develop and acquire additional parkland for its residents or to develop school property such as Stone Valley Middle School into additional parkland.	Updated text to include this information.
24	p. 150	The MSR does not mention the approximately \$800,000 in grant funding available as a result of the passage of Proposition WW through the East Bay Regional Park District. This is a significant source available to the district.	Measure WW allocations by agency are shown in Table 3-10.
25	p. 150	One other commenter correctly identified Stone Valley Middle School as a possibility for district development. This has been an identified need in the district for some time.	Added footnote stating that many of the capital needs listed in the County Parks Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for CSA R-7 have already been completed, are not necessary, or were never discussed with the MAC.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
26 Nancy Dommes, Alamo Resident March 26, 2010	pp. 149- 150	Andrew H. Young Park - the report suggests <i>construct restrooms</i> - this has never been discussed or planned.	See response to comment #25. All plans for improvements listed on pp. 149-150 for Alamo area parks came from the County Parks CIP. The CIP was prepared in 2006-2007 by staff from the Department of Conservation and Development and the Public Works Department. The CIP was developed to identify countywide park needs in order to raise the Park Impact Fees to fund future park capital improvements. The CIP document went to the Board of Supervisor's Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC). The TWIC recommended the document for approval by the full Board of Supervisors. A public hearing was held on May 1, 2007 and the CIP was adopted by the Board of Supervisors.
27	pp. 149- 150	Alamo School - report also lists <i>construct restrooms, BBQs, play area equipment</i> - none of this has been discussed or planned.	See response to comment #26.
28	pp. 149- 150	Hap Magee Ranch Park - again, report lists <i>construct restrooms</i> - public restrooms were constructed years ago.	See response to comment #25.
29	pp. 149- 150	Livorna Park - listed is <i>construct restrooms, play and picnic areas, improve access</i> - there are no plans to construct additional restrooms, the play and picnic areas were renovated years ago, and access does not require improvement.	See response to comments #25 and #26.
30	pp. 149- 150	Rancho Romero - <i>picnic tables and BBQs</i> are already constructed. Items <u>not</u> included are install shading on ball field dugouts, and possible installation of shade structure on upper playground.	Updated text to include this information.
31	pp. 149- 150	Left completely off the list is: Monte Vista High School Pool - construct shade structure (which has been talked about but still not completed)	Updated text to include this information.
32	p. 148	On the recap of the FY 08-09 income/expenses, the administration expense seems low from what was provided to the R-7A committee.	The administration expense indicated in the report is what was provided by County Public Works for FY 08-09 in CSA R-7. This data was provided by the County on January 20, 2010.
33 Steve Mick, Alamo Resident March 26, 2010	p. 2	Disagrees with statement that "many of the CSAs are built-out and lack available land for new park facilities."	Noted.
34	p. 4	MSR fails to list all services provided to CSA M-30 residents by the Town of Danville.	Noted. Only park and recreation services were covered in the service duplication and boundary overlap discussion in the executive summary because those are the only services that are duplicated by CSA R-7. The Town of Danville provides additional services to the CSA M-30 area, which are included in a more lengthy discussion of service duplication and boundary overlap in the governmental structure and operational deficiencies section at the end of the parks chapter.
35	p. 7	Disagrees with SOI update recommendation to exclude the CSA M-30 boundary from the CSA R-7 SOI.	Noted.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
36	p. 22	Disagrees with statement that "many of the CSAs are built-out and lack available land for new park facilities," and "consequently, there will likely be little improvement to the LOS in M-17, R-7, R-9, and R-10 unless the CSAs can capitalize on facility sharing and open facilities to the public that are not presently available for general use."	Noted.
37	p. 28	Disagrees with facility conditions finding, that "facilities within CSA R-7 were identified by the County as being in excellent condition; however, significant improvements (including improved access, restrooms, upgraded irrigation and drainage, new picnic and BBQs, and play areas) are planned for all park facilities between 2009 and 2011. There are no plans for additional facilities in CSA R-7 at this time."	Updated text to include the opinion of Alamo MAC that many of the infrastructure needs identified in the CIP are not necessary or outdated.
38	p. 30	The table should reflect that maintenance costs of Hap Magee Ranch Park are shared equally with R-7A and CSA M-30	Revised to state that maintenance is funded jointly by the Town of Danville and the County.
39	p. 33	Figure 3-2 shows R-7 costs to be highest at about \$23,000. This does not seem correct - does this figure also include upgrades?	This figure is based on facilities maintenance only. As reported by the County, facilities maintenance in FY 08-09 for CSA R-7 was \$368,369. When divided by the acres of parkland maintained by the CSA (15.8 acres), the result is approximately \$23,300. (See comment #86.)
40	p. 37	Disagrees with finding that "While facilities within CSA R-7 were identified as being in excellent condition, significant improvements are planned in the near future."	See response to comment #37.
41	p. 193	This description [of CSA M-30] is lacking. The subdivision is quite small and it's not clear what park facilities would fit in the subdivision. Hap Magee Ranch Park is less than 0.4 miles from the subdivision. While Hap Magee Ranch Park is owned jointly by the county and the Town, it is administered by a joint powers agreement between the Town and R-7A. Maintenance costs are equally shared between the two."	The intent of this paragraph is to explain the duplication of services. Added content to clarify relevance.
42	p. 193	It's not clear what the implication of the statement, "The nearest County-owned facility financed by CSA R-7 funds is Andrew H. Young Park, which is approximately one mile from the border of CSA M-30" is. M-30 residents live quite close to Hap Magee Ranch Park, a premier park facility which is supported by tax revenue from R-7A and the Town of Danville and is partly owned by the County. The distance to Andrew H. Young Park is moot. As a matter of record, a facility that is actually closer than Andrew H. Young Park to the M-30 subdivision is Rancho Romero School Park."	CSA M-30 residents currently pay property tax to CSA R-7 for maintenance of Hap Magee Ranch Park, and a benefit assessment to the Town of Danville for maintenance of Hap Magee Ranch Park, among other enhanced services. The distance of Andrew H. Young Park from CSA M-30 is germane to the discussion, as it is solely funded by CSA R-7 funds, unlike Hap Magee Ranch Park, which is also funded from other sources (CSA M-30 and the Town of Danville). If CSA M-30 residents no longer paid property tax to CSA R-7, funding for maintenance of Andrew H. Young Park would also be decreased. Maintenance of the Rancho Romero School Park is provided by the San Ramon Valley USD, while only improvements are funded by CSA R-7.
43	p. 170	Typographical error in footnote #164: Change CSA R-7 to CSA R-10.	Revised.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
44 PHRPD, Bob Beggren March 29, 2010	p. 98	Paragraph #4, last sentence should also include: The District expects to sell the bonds in three series, starting in 2010, to fund construction of a new senior center, teen center, community center, upgrades to Pleasant Oaks Park, and replacing restrooms at park facilities.	Updated text to include this information.
45	p. 99	Page 99: Infrastructure: There are approximately 270 acres of parks and open space within PHRPD, including approximately 205 acres of parks directly maintained by the District (63 acres of which are developed)...	Updated developed parkland acreage in Table 3-4 and Table 3-7, and in accompanying text, to reflect six acres of Paso Nogal Park as developed.
46	p. 101	Page 101: Table 8-4: Maintained Park Acres 205	No revision to maintained park acres. Paso Nogal Park was already included in maintained parkland calculations.
47	p. 103	Page 103: Paragraph #3: "and many residents of the City of Lafayette likely use this park facility."	Revised.
48	p. 104	Page 104: 3) ...including approximately 205 acres of parks directly maintained by the District (63 acres of which are developed)	See response to comments #45-46.
49	p. 105	Page 105: 12) ...and Valley View Middle School.	Revised.
50	p. 106	Page 106: SOI Option #3 ...and residents of this area likely visit the park frequently due to the proximity.	Revised.
51	p. 106	Pleasant Hill Recreation & Park District is in agreement with the recommendation to adopt the SOI for the existing boundaries including the SOI of the City of PH (including 16 acres of the City currently located outside of PHRPD).	Noted.
52 BBKUCD, Mark White March 29, 2010	p. 5	On Page 5, it is stated that the BBK Union Cemetery District is charging slightly less than the amount required by law for Endowment Care. The law states that the grave size is to be determined by the number of square feet of grave area. That square footage is to be multiplied by \$4.50 per square foot. This District interpreted that to mean the exact grave size, which in this cemetery is 3 ft. x 8 ft. which equals 24 square feet. That multiplied by the price per square foot is \$108.00. This means the District is in fact charging \$52 above the amount prescribed by law.	No revision. The finding on page 5 is based on the calculations shown in Table 4-4. The grave areas (in square feet) shown in Table 4-4 were provided by the districts. BBKUCD reported that standard graves (lots in Sections D and E) measure 9' by 4' (36 sq. ft.), and Section F lots measure 11' by 4' (44 sq. ft.), as communicated to the consultant by e-mail on January 20, 2010. When multiplied by the minimum required endowment care fee of \$4.50 per square foot, the minimum required endowment care fee is \$162 for lots in Sections D and E, and \$198 for Section F lots. Hence, at \$160 and \$185, respectively, the district is charging slightly less than the minimum amount required by law.
53	p. 5	Ten years ago, this District did a survey on Endowment Care. The findings of the survey revealed that if this District were to charge an amount that would fill the Endowment Care Fund to a level that would sustain the Cemetery grounds without the help of property taxes, then BBKUCD would have to charge more for goods and services than the local Private Cemeteries and Non-profit Cemeteries currently do. In other words, taxpayers would pay "twice" as much for their burial needs.	Added related findings to MSR determinations under financial ability heading. Note that ALCD had a similar comment (# 106).

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
54	pp. 6-7	The MSR recommends that this District add the west side (old part) of Oakley to the District; or remove the east side (new part) of that same city. This District has been trying since 1988 to add the western portion of Oakley. However, there are two primary factors for this not happening. (1) Oakley does not wish to pay mitigation fees due to the fact it will shrink its property tax base; and (2) Union Cemetery District will not have a portion of the property taxes generated from old Oakley (due to Prop.13). Therefore, Union Cemetery District and the City of Oakley are at an impasse. As to removing new Oakley from this District, that is not very practical since Bethel Island is a part of the District and by removing new Oakley would form a big political hole in the north eastern portion of Union Cemetery District. As to a small portion of the City of Antioch being in the District, this report is the first time that has been revealed.	Removing the eastern portion of the City of Oakley from BBKUCD would not create a "hole" in the district, and neither would it make Bethel Island a noncontiguous area. As shown on Map TK-TK, Bethel Island (and other Delta islands) would still be contiguous to the remainder of the district boundary via Holland Tract, to the east of the City of Oakley.
55	p. 44	The report states that "Districts are also restricted from acquiring mausoleums constructed prior to 1937 or constructing new ones. The principal act requires districts to maintain cemeteries owned by the district." This is not the way the State Health & Safety Code reads. It states as follows: "A district may acquire maintain or repair a mausoleum for crypt entombment that was completed on or before May 1, 1937. A district may construct additions to the mausoleum." (H&S Code Section 9051(a). In other words, a district may not build any mausoleums after 1937, unless the district built or acquired one that was built prior to May 1, 1937. Exceptions are adding to a legally built or acquired mausoleum to maintain service.	Revised.
56	p. 54	Page 54, the report mentioned that both ALCD and BBKUCD are members of California Association of Public Cemeteries (CAPC); and California Special Districts Association (CSDA). BBKUCD is also a member of another state-wide organization, the Public Cemetery Alliance (PCA) which was not mentioned. It is through the PCA that BBKUCD is insured. PCA and Golden State Risk Management have collaborated to provide risk management services to many public cemetery districts in California.	Added text to reflect BBKUCD's membership in the Public Cemetery Alliance.
57	p. 55	The report says, "BBKUCD charges between \$3,343 and \$4,703 for regular in-ground burial services, depending on the location of the lot, and \$1,253 for a cremation niche, inclusive of all fees." To address the first statement; it is awkwardly worded in that this District has a sliding scale of fees, depending upon grave location or niche location. This is done so that even families with limited income can afford some kind of interment at the cemetery. Some families feel it is their duty to provide a more elaborate level of burial. These families can then be also accommodated, through higher levels of service.	Noted.
58	p. 55	The report says, "BBKUCD charges a non-resident fee of \$500 for an in-ground burial and \$85 for a niche interment." There is also a third tier of out of district fees charged. People choosing in-ground cremation burials, in designated spots, are charged \$75.00 for out of district service fees.	Updated text to include this information.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
59	p. 59	The MSR states that neither ALCD nor BBKUCD have long-range spending plans. This was not always the case at BBKUCD. Until 1992-93, this District had both a 5-year plan and a 10-year plan. The District was also developing a salary scale. However, income became very unstable during that fiscal year when the State of California made its first grab at the property taxes. Since then, there has been no method by which income can be thought of as "stable". Thus BBKUCD stopped making long-term plans due to the instability of the state budget and later, the unstable, overall economy.	Noted.
60	General	Not in the report – BBKUCD also offers pre-need sales of lots and services. That is the District will form a contract with a family or individual. The contract allows the District to collect money "up front" and the family or individual then "locks in" today's prices for tomorrow's interment. – thus beating inflation. The money is turned over to the Contra Costa County Treasurer's Office and is placed in an interest-bearing account. When the lots or services are needed for the burial of one of the persons on the contract, then the money is transferred from this escrow-like account to the District's General Fund for use.	Pre-need sales was mentioned as a service offered by BBKUCD on p. 230, under the "Nature and Extent" heading of the BBKUCD profile. A footnote was added to the document containing the additional information presented in this comment.
61 LAFCO Commissioner Sharon Burke March 30, 2010	p. 148	On page 148 of the MSR prepared by Burr Consulting, a budget is shown for R-7A. I feel two items are misleading. I do not think it is correct to include \$204,945 in Capital Outlays in the "Operating Expenditures". Basically, R-7 runs at a surplus every year over and above administration and maintenance costs and the surplus is added to the fund balance. Although correctly labeled as Capital Outlays, including capital expenditures in the Operating Expenditures gives the impression that expenditures are close to revenues when this is not accurate and a truer picture of the district would be presented by not including capital expenditures in the annual budget example shown.	Revised Table 10-12 to remove the word "operating" from total expenditures.
62		In addition, it is misleading to label one category "Recreation and Senior Services". The district currently does not provide any senior services and I am concerned that members of the public might see this and conclude that services are currently provided.	Added footnote to Table 10-12 indicating that senior services are not currently provided by the CSA.
63 Contra Costa County Supervisor, District III March 30, 2010	p. 152	There is strong opposition to the concept of consolidating Green Valley Recreation and Park District (GVRPD-Green Valley Pool), an isolated island of land completely surrounded by the Town of Danville, with the Alamo Parks and Recreation District R-7A District. I oppose this option as does the Alamo Municipal Advisory Council (AMAC). Given the geographic location of the GVRPD, it does not appear to be an appropriate match with Alamo but would be more aligned with the Town of Danville.	Added text to the document stating community opposition to consolidation with GVRPD. The boundaries of GVRPD are clearly within the Town of Danville; however, the GVRPD serves member families and individuals who reside both outside of the District's boundaries and outside of the Town of Danville's boundaries. Although consolidation of CSA R-7 with GVRPD is not recommended, it was identified as a possible option due to the fact that the agencies are located immediately adjacent to one another.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
64	p. 90	There is also reference to the GVRPD as having Alamo households, this is not the case.	The MSR does not reference the GVRPD as having Alamo households within the District. Instead, it references the fact that some families that use the pool are located outside of GVRPD, in the Town of Danville and the unincorporated community of Alamo.
65	p. 127	Map 10-3 does not appear to reflect the GVRPD.	Map 10-3 indicates the central county parks and recreation CSAs only, and therefore does not depict GVRPD.
66	p. 4	The option of consolidating CSA M-30 into R-7A is worth further discussion with both districts, the County and the Town of Danville.	Noted.
67	pp. 152-153, pp. 186-187, p. 188, and p. 195	There appears to be conflicting information in the MSR report about what services are eligible for funding and what services are actually being funded.	Based on the page numbers referenced, it is assumed that this comment is in reference to CSA M-30. For CSA M-30, services eligible for funding include parks and recreation, law enforcement, street maintenance, landscaping, and street lighting. Parks maintenance and landscaping services are provided by the Town of Danville's LLAD, while road maintenance (on the public roads leading to the CSA) is provided by the Town of Danville. Law enforcement in the CSA is provided to the Town of Danville and CSA M-30 by contract with the County Sheriff. Funds for street lighting in CSA M-30 are transferred to, and provided by, CSA L-100.
68	p. 30 and p. 42	There may be some editing errors between M-30 and R-7A in the report	Added clarifying content to descriptions of CSA R-7 and CSA M-30 throughout the report.
69	Map 3-1	Map 3-1 does not clearly designate M-30 vs. R-7A.	Maps have been revised in an attempt to make this clear. Map 10-3 also illustrates this area and is more zoomed in.
70	Misc.	Hap Magee Ranch Park is equally owned and maintained by both Contra Costa County and the Town of Danville. This is not reflected in several places of the report. The Town of Danville is the operator of the park but the County contributes an equal share of the maintenance costs.	Revised throughout the report.
71	p. 152	Hap Magee Ranch Park does not lie solely "within the Town of Danville." Its boundaries lie across both the Town of Danville (9.1 acres) and the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County (8.1 acres) as was outlined on p. 149. Once this is correctly reflected, there is likely to be different data for calculations that will affect other charts in the report.	Revisions made in text to clarify the location of Hap Magee Ranch Park and joint maintenance of facility between the County and the Town of Danville. Acreages were allocated properly in figures and tables (9.1 acres vs. 8.1 acres), thus no revisions to tables or figures were necessary.
72	p. 37, p. 149, pp. 150-152 and p. 192	There is not concurrence that the condition of all R-7A facilities is excellent. In fact, there are facilities that have reached their full life expectancy and will need to be replaced within the next few years. Further, there is current discussion in the Alamo community about planning for additional park facilities for R-7A. This is not referenced in the MSR.	Updated text to include the opinion that some park facilities have reached their full life expectancy. However, other comments suggest facilities are relatively new and few needs exist (see comments #17 and #20). Also, added text concerning additional park facilities in Alamo community.
73	p. 153	Determination (#7-8) for R-7A are not consistent with previous descriptions ("excellent" vs. "deteriorating" and "lack of funding").	Revised determinations based on comments regarding facility conditions and needs.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
74	p. 38	I agree as reflected that CSA information should be reported separately to improve clarity and transparency within the County annual audit (#10).	Noted.
75	p. 38	Determination #14 reads: "Areas with anticipated high growth rates are M-30..." This implies large growth numbers when what is projected is growth from 70 people to 120 people. Any projected growth should be reflected as "minimal" growth.	See response to comment #7.
76	p. 30	The table outlines that R-7A maintenance is provided by the county for two schools (page 30). This is in error and is later stated correctly in the text that the County provides maintenance at Alamo School and that the Town of Danville provides maintenance for Rancho Romero School. These corrections need to be made and consistency reflected.	See response to comment #5.
77	p. 193	CSA M-30 indicates the nearest owned County facility is Andrew H. Young Park. This is inaccurate as it is actually Hap Magee Ranch Park as referenced above. This inaccurate information appears to come from the previously referenced error that Danville fully maintains Hap Magee Ranch Park when it is actually a 50% split of both ownership and maintenance.	See response to comment #71.
78	p. 154	Under SOI options, there should be an option that provides for the consolidation of M-30 into R-7A (p. 154). The reference to consolidating with GVRPD may be an editing error. If this is the case, the new option would either replace Option 3 or become Option 4: "Consolidation of M-30 into R-7A and removal of M-30 from the Town of Danville." M-30 has 26 homes of which approximately 20 are within the unincorporated area of Alamo and have Alamo addresses, six are "adjacent to" the Town of Danville, and Hap Magee Ranch Park is about a half mile from the Alamo Springs development located in Alamo. In general, the southern border of La Gonda Way is Danville's boundary and the northern border is unincorporated Alamo, Contra Costa County. Therefore, M-30's SOI needs to be removed from the Town of Danville and remain in Alamo to coincide with its geographic location.	The option to consolidate CSA M-30 with CSA R-7 was included in the SOI options for CSA M-30, because no SOI change would be required for CSA R-7. SOI Option #3, consolidation with GVRPD, is a legitimate option and not an editing error. CSA M-30 does not have territory in the Town of Danville (see response to comment #13).
79	p. 154	Option 3: Expand to include Green Valley Pool District. This location is within the Town of Danville and serves its nearby Danville residents. If CSA R-7A was to expand to include GVRPD, it would require leapfrog over Danville territory to attach it to the unincorporated Contra Costa County (Alamo) recreation district. It would also ignore geography and that the GVRPD is clearly within the SOI of the Town of Danville and previous LAFCO discussion with representatives of the GVRPD to work with Danville to address the GVRPD's ongoing issues.	See response to comment #12.
80	p. 170	Footnote #164 indicates "a subsidiary district of the City of Hercules." This may be a typo.	Revised typographical error.
81 County Public Works, Julia Bueren March 30, 2010	p. 17	The second sentence, "All services provided by the CSA are supplied by contract providers..." Change the sentence to say, "Community Center coordination and recreation programming provided by the CSA are supplied by contract; maintenance of the community center building is provided by the County."	Revised.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
82	p. 19	Change the recreation attendance for CSA R-10 to reflect 500 participants in youth baseball.	Revised Table 3-2 (and accompanying text) and Table 10-20 to account for additional recreation participation.
83	p. 28	The second paragraph, second sentence, "Improvements include a new swimming complex, a new basketball court..." Change the sentence to start with "Proposed improvements include..."	Revised.
84	p. 30, Table 3-8	Two schools are listed as being maintained by the County. Change to show the following: Alamo Elementary School Park is maintained by the County and Rancho Romero School Park is maintained by the San Ramon Valley Unified School District.	Revised Table 3-8.
85	p. 33	Maintenance costs for County Service Area M-16 were \$9,576 for 2.4 acres which is \$3,990 per acre.	Updated Table 10-4, Table 10-5 and Figure 3-2, and accompanying text.
86	p. 148	Maintenance costs for County Service Area R-7 were reported as \$368,369 (shown on page 148 CSA R-7 expenditures), maintained park acres is 30.3 which is \$12,157 per acre. Figure 3-2 should be changed to reflect this.	No revision. While there are 30.3 acres of maintained parkland available to CSA R-7 residents, only 15.8 acres are funded by CSA R-7: Andrew H. Young Park (0.2 acres), Alamo Elementary School Park (3.1 acres), Livorna Park (4.4 acres), and 8.1 acres of Hap Magee Ranch Park. $\$368,369 / 15.8 = \sim\$23,000$.
87	p. 133	County Service Area M-16, FY 08-09 Financial Information: Replace with following amounts to clarify construction costs (capital outlays) for Big Oak Tree Park. Total Revenues: \$292,417 Total Expenditures: \$292,417 Carryover from previous year: \$14,704 Project Management: \$169,705 Property tax: \$25,901 Capital Outlays: \$113,136 Restricted Donations: \$15,700 Maintenance: \$9,576 Other General Fund ¹ : \$92,895 Intergovernmental Rev/Grants: \$143,217 (1) Other general fund sources include sources other than those listed separately.	Updated Table 10-4.
88	p. 148	The footnote for Other Expenditures for \$33,800 should be changed to (3) Other includes reimbursements to CSA M-17 for a transfer made in error.	Updated Table 10-12.
89	p. 152	Governance Alternatives, Paragraph 1: Change the sentence, "...Hap Magee Ranch Park, which lies within the Town of Danville..." to show that Hap Magee Ranch Park lies within both the Town of Danville and unincorporated Contra Costa County.	See response to comment #8.
90	p. 154	SOI Option 3: Public Works has concerns about the consolidation of CSA R-7 with GVRPD as a possible option to improve the operations of GVRPD. A consolidation would not be an enhancement to County Service Area R-7. There are not adequate financial resources to cover the additional costs for maintenance and capital improvements for the pool. Given the location of GVRPD, Public Works recommends that it would be more appropriate for GVRPD to be within the SOI of the Town of Danville.	Updated text to include this information.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
91	p. 158	"In FY 08-09, parks and recreation services in the CSA were financed entirely by park dedication fees." Change the sentence to say: "In FY 08-09, parks and recreation services in the CSA were financed by park dedication and developer in lieu fees," and under revenues, change the park dedication fees line to say "Park Dedication Fees/Developer In Lieu."	Revised Table 10-16.
92	p. 159	Park and Recreation Facilities, Valley View Elementary: Change "...a proposed school with children's play area, sports court, restrooms, architectural, and engineering costs" to "a proposed children's play area, sports court, restrooms, architectural and engineering costs at the school site."	Revised.
93	p. 170	Typographical error in footnote #164: Change CSA R-7 to CSA R-10.	Revised.
94 ALCD, Primo Facchini	General	The ALCD Board elected to use word "interment" rather than "burial." Please replace the word "burial" with "interment" in the MSR document.	Revised to use "interment" instead of "burial" where appropriate, as interment more broadly includes both in-ground burials and cremation niche placements.
95	p. 52	First par., remove the word "concrete"—the pathways are asphalt.	Revised.
96	p. 52	Figure 4-3 – Confirm that the photo of the niches is indeed at Lafayette Cemetery and not Alamo Cemetery.	Photo is indeed of niches at Lafayette Cemetery.
97	p. 53	Fourth par. – What is the basis for using the word "obligated"? Districts can't get the money to provide for this, and it puts a large burden on the district that doesn't have the funds. ALCD is concerned that the average reader will assume ALCD is not fulfilling its obligations.	The Legislature defined such districts' mission as providing cost-effective interments to their constituents (Health & Safety Code §9001(b)). Further the law requires these districts' boards to provide adequate cemetery space for the foreseeable future (Health & Safety Code §9061(c)(3)) due to their practice of allowing burials of non-residents (i.e., non-taxpayers). If public cemetery districts do not plan for, acquire and develop additional cemetery facilities as existing facilities reach capacity, they cannot fulfill their legislative intent because they would no longer be able to provide cost-effective interments to property tax-paying residents of the district.
98	p. 53	Last par – the illogical boundaries of ALCD have been a concern of the district for a long time.	Noted.
99	p. 54	Under Opportunities – The document is correct in stating that there are no opportunities for facility sharing.	Noted.
100	p. 54	Last par. - Contra Costa is a chapter of the California Special Districts Association	Revised.
101	p. 56	Under Maintenance Costs – Reference should be to Figure 4-5, not 4-4.	Revised.

**Log of Comments on the
Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services**

# Commenter	Page/ Section	Comment	Response
102	p. 57	Third par. – Why does the report refer to private cemeteries in this paragraph. Is that just for comparison’s sake, or was it actually a typo?	The reference to private cemeteries is not a typographical error. The 2008 Endowment Care Fund Survey conducted by the State Cemetery and Funeral Bureau of the Department of Consumer Affairs only surveyed private cemeteries. The lack of sufficient endowment care funding at private cemeteries prompted the minimum endowment fees required by the Health and Safety Code to be doubled for both private and public cemeteries.
103	p. 57	ALCD is concerned with statements in the document about “responsibility.” What authority is being cited? The District is concerned that the general reader will assume ALCD is not fulfilling its obligations. Acquiring new land is difficult due to limited funding and limited availability of land.	See response to comment #97. If the district is not able to acquire and develop new cemetery facilities as existing facilities reach capacity, it will no longer be able to fulfill its intended mission. While the district may lack the funds to acquire new land within the district, Health & Safety Code §9007 provides options for purchasing non-contiguous lands.
104	p. 59	Determination #3: The district is not able to conduct capital improvement planning due to a lack of funds.	Noted.
105	p. 59	Determination #4: Again, what is the citation for the “legal responsibility” statement?	See response to comment #97.
106	p. 59	Determination #5: The endowment care fund obligation was only established in 1985—there is no money to maintain older interment sites, and in fact the \$500 endowment care fee the district charges doesn’t even generate enough funds to take care of the newer sites.	See comment and response to comment #53. The authors share the district’s concerns that fees are inadequate, which is precisely why the MSR recommends that the cemetery districts conduct formal planning related to the sufficiency of the endowment care fund and remaining interment capacity: the less remaining capacity there is, the more urgent the need to establish sufficient endowment care fees.
107	p. 60	Determination #12: ALCD obviously can’t use taxpayers’ assets to share facilities with private cemeteries.	Noted.
108	p. 60	Determination #13: The district sometimes sends notices to churches, and they do as much outreach as possible, but do not have the funds to spend on outreach—too expensive to do special mailing, etc.	Added text to ALCD profile stating outreach efforts and limitations.
109	p. 60	Governmental Structure: ALCD has been concerned about the boundaries of the district for a long time.	Noted.
110	p. 60	Last par. -- Right now, ALCD is getting .0004 of the 1%; not enough to do more than the bare minimum, and ALCD is sure that no other district would be willing to give up any part of their share of the tax in any sort of property tax transfer agreement.	Noted.

**RESOLUTION OF THE CONTRA COSTA LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
ADOPTING DETERMINATIONS FOR THE
2010 CEMETERY, PARKS & RECREATION 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, the Commission previously authorized the *Cemetery, Parks & Recreation MSR* to be prepared; and

WHEREAS, on February 10, 2010, the Commission held a workshop to receive a preliminary overview of the *Cemetery, Parks & Recreation MSR*, received and provided comments, and directed staff to circulate the draft MSR for public review; and

WHEREAS, the *Cemetery, Parks & Recreation MSR* covers services provided by the following local agencies: Alamo Lafayette Cemetery District, Byron Brentwood Knightsen Union Cemetery District, Ambrose Recreation & Park District, Pleasant Hill RPD, Rollingwood Wilart Park RPD, and County Service Areas (CSAs) M-16, M-17, M-29, M-30, R-4, R-7, R-9, and R-10; and

WHEREAS, following the workshop the Public Review Draft MSR was circulated for a 28-day public comment period; and

WHEREAS, on April 21, 2010, the Commission conducted a public hearing to receive the Final Draft MSR; and

WHEREAS, the Commission considered all comments, written and oral, received prior to and during the hearing on April 21, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the MSR report and determinations are Categorically 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 Cemetery, Parks & Recreation Municipal Services Review determinations attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference are hereby adopted.

* * * * *

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 21st day of April 2010, by the following vote:

- AYES:
- NOES:
- ABSTENTIONS:
- ABSENT:

MARTIN MCNAIR, 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: April 21, 2010

Lou Ann Texeira, Executive Officer

EXHIBIT A
CEMETERY, PARKS & RECREATION
MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW DETERMINATIONS

I. Summary of Determinations and Key Issues – Cemetery Services

Growth and Population Projections

- The population of Alamo Lafayette Cemetery District (ALCD) is projected to increase by approximately 17,000 individuals (10%), over the next 10 years. At the existing burial/interment rate of four per 10,000 district residents, this would amount to an additional seven interment services per year by 2019.
- Build-out of the various planned and proposed developments within Byron Brentwood Knightsen Union Cemetery District (BBKUCD) will increase the population by as many as 34,321 individuals. At the existing burial/interment rate of 10 per 10,000 district residents, this would amount to an additional 34 interment services per year.

Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Infrastructure Needs

- No short-term capacity issues or infrastructure needs were identified for ALCD or BBKUCD, assuming that planned additions of niches are completed in ALCD. Both ALCD and BBKUCD appear to have sufficient capacity for the next 15-20 years, even accounting for service demand at build-out.
- ALCD has reached capacity for in-ground burials at Alamo Cemetery, but continues to add capacity for cremation interments as the need arises. ALCD reported that adding niches is the only method of increasing capacity currently available to the district, due to the high cost of land within the district, and limited finances.

Adequacy of Public Services

- Both cemetery districts provide adequate services given financing levels. Service adequacy could be improved for both districts by implementing a written multi-year capital improvement plan.
- It is important that both districts adequately plan for long-term facility needs, including acquiring and developing new cemetery facilities. In fairness to current and future taxpayers, public cemetery districts should continue providing cemetery services by obtaining and developing more land as existing facilities reach capacity.
- Both districts reported that endowment care fees may be inadequate. It is recommended that both districts conduct a formal review of the adequacy of the endowment care fund to determine if the fund balance will be enough to provide perpetual care to the cemetery facilities once they have reached capacity, and adopt appropriate fees.

Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Services

- Property taxes are the primary revenue source for the public cemetery districts in Contra Costa County, consisting of approximately 65% of all revenues. Fees for service generate approximately 32% of total revenues in ALCD, and 34% in BBKUCD.

- BBKUCD reported that its financial ability to provide services has improved in recent years due to the increased amount of residential development within the district.
- Both districts reported that their endowment care fees may be too low to cover long-term maintenance costs of existing plots. ALCD appears to lack the financial ability to continue expanding facilities, and may be unable to serve current and future taxpayers. ALCD reported that some capital needs have not been addressed in recent years due to financing constraints.

Status of, and Opportunities For, Shared Facilities

- Neither ALCD nor BBKUCD is presently engaged in facility sharing, and no facility sharing opportunities were identified due to the fact that the agencies are not contiguous.
- No opportunities for facility sharing with private cemetery providers were identified.

Accountability for Community Service Needs

- Cemetery service providers have a lower level of accountability in that governing bodies are appointed, voters do not have opportunities to choose among candidates for their governing body members, and providers generally conduct minimal constituent outreach activities; however, both ALCD and BBKUCD demonstrated accountability during the MSR process.

II. Agency-Specific Determinations – Cemetery Services

ALAMO LAFAYETTE CEMETERY DISTRICT (ALCD)

Growth and population projections

1. It is estimated that the residential population within ALCD is approximately 162,700. Recent growth has been low in the unincorporated areas and the cities of Lafayette, Danville and Walnut Creek, and relatively high in the City of San Ramon.
2. Recent population growth within ALCD has been most dramatic in the Dougherty Valley Specific Plan (DVSP) area of the City of San Ramon. The DVSP area is approximately 6,000 acres in the eastern portion of the City, consisting of 11,000 residential dwelling units, 54 acres of commercial and mixed-use space, and 3,200 acres of open space.
3. Population growth in the cities of Lafayette, Danville and Walnut Creek, and the unincorporated communities, is projected to be low (less than one percent annual growth) over the next 10 years, consistent with other areas of central Contra Costa County. Build-out of the DVSP area will ultimately yield a total of over 28,600 residents; however, approximately 70% of the residential units in the DVSP area had already been permitted as of the drafting of this report.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

4. No significant capacity issues were identified for ALCD, assuming that planned additions of niches are completed in a timely manner. The Lafayette Cemetery has approximately 500 full plots available for purchase, and the District plans to add 160 niches to the cemetery in FY 09-10. The Alamo Cemetery has reached capacity for full burials, and has approximately one to two years of existing capacity in niches; however, the District plans to add 370 niches at the cemetery in FY 09-10.

5. The District currently provides minimally adequate services given constrained financing; however, the District reported that it lacks the financial ability to expand or acquire new facilities, and thus may be unable to serve current and future taxpayers.
6. ALCD provides cemetery maintenance on a year-round basis, and spends approximately \$23,000 per acre on cemetery maintenance.
7. ALCD reported that a significant service challenge is determining residency of prospective customers due to the illogical boundaries of the District.
8. Infrastructure needs include rehabilitation of walking paths at both the Alamo and Lafayette cemeteries.
9. ALCD does not have a capital improvement plan. A written multi-year planning document could help the District plan capital expenditures, and would improve accountability.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

10. ALCD reported that the current level of financing is minimally sufficient for adequate service provision; however, the District does not appear to have the financial ability to provide long-term services. ALCD reported that it currently lacks the financial ability to expand or acquire new facilities.
11. The District indicated that it plans to participate in the Proposition 1A Securitization Program to mitigate the impact of the loss of property tax revenues borrowed by the State.
12. Some capital needs have not been addressed in recent years due to financing constraints.
13. ALCD indicated that their endowment care fees are too low to cover long-term maintenance of existing plots. It is recommended that ALCD conduct a formal review of the adequacy of the endowment care fund to determine if the fund balance will be enough to provide perpetual care to the cemetery facilities once they have reached capacity and adopt appropriate fees.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

14. ALCD does not practice significant facility sharing, and did not identify any potential facility sharing opportunities.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

15. ALCD reported that it determines residency for interment purposes by consulting a Board of Equalization map showing the Tax Rate Areas within the District; however, this map was found to be inconsistent with the LAFCO map in the area of the unincorporated community of Walden. It is recommended that ALCD collaborate with LAFCO staff and County GIS to verify the appropriate boundary.
16. Accountability is somewhat constrained by limited interest in serving on the governing body, as indicated by the recent extended vacancy on the Board.
17. ALCD demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.
18. ALCD does not conduct any significant community outreach or involvement activities.

BYRON BRENTWOOD KNIGHTSEN UNION CEMETERY DISTRICT (BBKUCD)

Growth and population projections

19. It is estimated that the residential population within the BBKUCD is approximately 75,000. The District experienced significant growth from 2000 to 2008 in the City of Brentwood, and anticipates growth within the City to continue in the long-term.
20. There are 5,046 residential units approved for new development in the City of Brentwood, and a portion of the potential 1,215-unit Ginocchio development is in the Brentwood planning area, west of the city limits.
21. The eastern portion of the City of Oakley has also experienced significant recent growth, and future growth is anticipated in the City of Oakley's East Cypress Corridor Specific Plan (ECCSP) area. The Oakley General Plan designates the ECCSP area for development of up to 5,763 residential dwelling units (including 544 existing residences), in addition to commercial, agricultural, recreation and public facilities.
22. Growth in the unincorporated areas includes Discovery Bay, Byron Airport, and Bethel Island. Development of the 1,100 acre Cecchini Ranch could eventually add 4,000 to 6,000 new residences east of Discovery Bay. Also, the Delta Coves project on Bethel Island may eventually add up to 495 new dwelling units within the BBKUCD.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

23. No capacity issues were identified for BBKUCD. The Union Cemetery had approximately 1,000 regular plots and 325 niches available for purchase as of November 2009, and plans to add an additional 400-500 new niches on existing cemetery land within the next few years as the need arises. The District also has capacity for an additional 1,000 plots in the undeveloped portion of the cemetery.
24. BBKUCD provides adequate service given constrained financing. The District provides cemetery maintenance on a year-round basis, and spends approximately \$27,100 per acre on cemetery maintenance.
25. BBKUCD looked into installing solar paneling at the cemetery to power the underground water pumps; however, the project was determined to be financially infeasible due to the high cost of permitting required by the County.
26. BBKUCD does not have a capital improvement plan; a written multi-year planning document could help the District plan capital expenditures, and would improve accountability.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

27. The District's financial ability to provide services has improved over the last five years, due to an increase in development and sale of new homes in eastern Contra Costa County. The amount of property tax revenue received by the District increased by 47% from FY 05-06 to FY 07-08.
28. BBKUCD reported that the current level of financing is generally sufficient for adequate service provision. The District indicated that it plans to participate in the Proposition 1A Securitization Program to mitigate the impact of the loss of property tax revenues borrowed by the State.
29. BBKUCD indicated that their endowment care fees may be too low to cover long-term maintenance of existing plots. It is recommended that BBKUCD conduct a formal review of the adequacy of the

endowment care fund to determine if the fund balance will be enough to provide perpetual care to the cemetery facility once it has reached capacity, and adopt appropriate fees.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

30. The District does not practice significant facility sharing, and did not identify any potential facility sharing opportunities.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

31. BBKUCD demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.
32. Accountability is also achieved by the District's various constituent outreach activities, including dissemination of meeting agendas to media contacts and interested parties, notifications and letters to the editor of local publications publicizing the cemetery as a place of historical significance, thanking volunteer groups or announcing changes. Further, BBKUCD maintains a website with information about District operations, services offered and contact information.

III. Summary of Determinations and Key Issues – Parks & Recreation Services

Growth and Population Projections

33. Demand for municipal park and recreation services is affected primarily by population growth. Demand is also affected by growth among population segments with higher park visitation rates such as younger and higher-income people.
34. Localized demand changes will primarily depend on development. Areas with anticipated high growth rates include County Service Area (CSA) M-29 and Ambrose Recreation & Park District (ARPD). While CSA M-30 may experience a high growth rate at build-out, overall population growth will only consist of approximately 50 residents. CSAs R-4, R-10 and M-16 anticipate modest growth through 2025. Growth in all other districts is anticipated to be minimal.

Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Infrastructure Needs

35. Of the 10 special districts providing park maintenance services, only CSA M-16 meets the Level of Service (LOS) standard established for the agency. CSA M-29 meets the LOS standard for community park acreage, but not for neighborhood park acreage. All other park providers do not meet established LOS standards.
36. Every agency, with the exception of CSA M-16, has existing and future park acreage needs. Pleasant Hill Recreation & Park District (PHRPD), CSAs M-29, R-4 and R-7A and ARPD have significant existing and future acreage needs. CSAs M-17 and R-10 have relatively less parkland needs than other agencies.
37. Existing facilities within CSAs M-16, M-29, M-30, R-9 and R-4 were identified as being in good or excellent condition and had minimal infrastructure needs or deficiencies. While facilities within CSA R-7 were identified as being in excellent condition, significant needed improvements were identified in the County Parks CIP. It is recommended that the County and Alamo MAC collaborate to jointly plan future capital improvements at CSA R-7A parks.

38. ARPD, PHRPD, and CSAs M-17 and R-10 have significant park and recreation capital needs and deficiencies. Rollingwood Wilart Park Recreation & Park District's (RWPPRD) facility is in fair condition and needs moderate improvements.
39. All of the park and recreation facilities within CSA M-29 were constructed and opened between 2000 and 2009. There are limited needs and deficiencies presently; however, as the facilities age in the next 10-15 years, there will be a need for significant capital funding for facility rehabilitation. The City of San Ramon has begun maintenance and renovation planning to address these anticipated future capital needs.

Adequacy of Public Services

40. Additional park acres are needed within all districts, with the exception of CSA M-16, to meet existing LOS standards, and additional acres will be needed to address population growth in the future.
41. Resident involvement in recreation activities may be indicative of agency outreach efforts. Program participation and rental usage is highest in PHRPD, RWPRPD and ARPD. Recreation demand is much lower within the CSAs.
42. There is generally a lack of websites promoting recreation programming within the CSAs. It is recommended that those agencies with recreation programming compile websites with all available classes and locations to promote the use of these services.
43. ARPD, PHRPD, and CSA M-29 are professionally managed and generally follow best management practices. These are the only districts that perform annual financial audits.
44. The County completes an annual audit for countywide finances; however, CSA information is not identifiable in these statements. It is recommended that CSA information be reported separately to improve clarity and transparency.
45. All of the districts 1) perform annual employee evaluations on at least an annual basis, with the exception of RWPRPD, 2) prepare timely annual budgets, 3) maintain current financial records, and 4) adopt long-term park capital improvement plans, also with the exception of RWPPRD.
46. It is recommended that all districts whose board members serve as staff consult with their legal counsel regarding the statutory authority for such dual service, and ask legal counsel to evaluate whether any prohibited conflicts of interest, incompatible activities or other legal problems might arise from this arrangement.

Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Services

47. Property taxes and assessments are the primary funding stream for park and recreation services. Of the 11 agencies comprehensively reviewed in this MSR, six receive more than 60% of their funding from property taxes and/or assessments. Only CSAs R-9 and R-10 do not receive any funding from property taxes or assessments.
48. Districts faced significant financial pressure due to the suspension of Proposition 1A, which loaned 8% of apportioned property tax revenue to the State; however, all PRDs and CSAs that receive property tax will be participating in the Proposition 1A Securitization Program for reimbursement of these funds.

49. In terms of park maintenance expenditures per acre, ARPD, CSA M-29 and CSA R-7 provided the highest service levels, and PHRPD and CSA M-17 provided slightly lower service levels. CSA M-30 and CSA R-10 provided the lowest service levels.
50. In terms of recreation expenditures per capita, PHRPD provides by far the highest service level. PHRPD expends nearly \$98 per district resident, compared to all other agencies providing recreation that expend less than \$8 per capita.
51. Within the agencies reviewed, park development impact fees are highest for CSA R-4 (Town of Moraga). Park impact fees charged by the County are lower than the average park impact fee charged statewide. Park development impact fees appear to be deficient in the City of Pleasant Hill, and may account for the deficit of parkland in the District.
52. Total revenues per capita exceed \$100 in ARPD, PHRPD, and CSAs M-16, M-29, M-30 and R-4. These agencies were generally the ones providing the highest service levels and with the best financial ability to provide services. Agencies with a funding level between \$40-70 per capita include CSA M-17 and CSA R-7, and agencies with funding at or below \$20 per capita include RWPRPD, CSA R-9 and CSA R-10.
53. CSAs that pass through their funds to cities within or adjacent to their bounds (i.e., CSAs M-29, M-30 and R-4) generally have higher service levels, because CSA funds are merely augmenting existing city funds for parks and recreation services. The cities reported that financing, while constrained, is generally sufficient to provide park and recreation services.
54. The financial ability of PHRPD to provide service will be enhanced in the coming years by Bond Measure E that was approved by district residents in August 2009. The \$28 million bond will fund various new facilities and upgrades within the District.
55. One financial limitation reported by the City of San Ramon is that the County has been slow to provide reimbursements from CSA M-29 for park expenditures in the City in recent years.
56. If districts charge fees for service, it is recommended that fees be reviewed/updated regularly. If districts charge a benefit assessment, and do not utilize a CPI adjustment, it is recommended that they do so.

Status of, and Opportunities For, Shared Facilities

57. Park service providers practice extensive facility sharing in Contra Costa County. Most commonly, the districts collaborate with school districts to provide additional recreational areas and facilities to residents after school hours, which is the case for ARPD, PHRPD, and CSAs M-29, M-30, R-4, R-7A, and R-10.
58. Of the park providers, only CSA M-16 and GVRPD have not in the past and do not presently practice facility sharing to some extent.
59. Opportunities for future facility sharing are generally limited to establishing or increasing collaboration with the local school district. In addition, ARPD plans to explore community resources and other options for indoor offsite locations for recreation programs and activities.

Accountability for Community Service Needs

60. Accountability is best ensured when there is sufficient constituent interest to maintain full governing boards or advisory committees, constituent outreach is conducted to promote accountability and ensure

that constituents are informed and not disenfranchised, and public agency operations and management are transparent to the public.

61. Generally, when there is a lack of constituent interest in an agency's activities, governing bodies are challenged to fill board and advisory committee positions. In the case of the park service providers, five districts have had extended board vacancies or lack an advisory committee altogether, including RWPRPD, and CSAs M-17, M-30, R-9 and R-10.
62. A possible opportunity for improved constituent interest and involvement may be to combine the advisory committees of CSAs R-9 and R-10 with the Alamo Municipal Advisory Council (MAC) for CSA R-7.
63. Accountability to constituents is constrained in CSAs M-29 and R-4, where the residents in the unincorporated areas being served by the cities are not eligible to sit on the city park commissions.
64. All agencies prepare and post meeting agendas and make minutes available as required. Those districts that perform significant outreach in addition to legally required activities include ARPD, PHRPD, CSA M-29, and CSA R-7. Limited outreach activities are performed by CSAs M-30, R-4, R-9, and R-10 and RWPRD. CSAs M-16 and M-17 do not perform any outreach activities. Websites with contact information are a recommended practice for all local agencies.
65. All of the agencies reviewed demonstrated full accountability in disclosure of information and cooperation with LAFCO during the MSR process, with the exception of RWPRPD, which demonstrated partial cooperation.

IV. Agency-Specific Determinations – Parks & Recreation Services

AMBROSE RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT (ARPD)

Growth and population projections

66. The estimated residential population within ARPD is approximately 23,000. Population is expected to increase at a rate similar to the City of Pittsburg, at an annual rate of approximately 1.6%. The estimated population of the District by 2025 is 29,611.
67. Various planned and proposed developments have been approved in the vicinity of ARPD, within the City of Pittsburg, and additional growth is anticipated within the City in the future. Planned and proposed subdivisions within the western portion of the City of Pittsburg include Alves Ranch (530 total units), Bailey Estates (249 units), Lawlor Estates (50 units), Vista del Mar (540 units), and the San Marco development (2,938 units). Bailey Estates and Lawlor Estates are located within ARPD, and build-out of these subdivisions is anticipated to add approximately 936 residents to the District. ARPD did not identify any growth concerns, and reported that growth within the City of Pittsburg thus far has not had a noticeable effect on service demand within ARPD.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

68. There are nearly 25 acres of neighborhood parkland owned and maintained by ARPD, which equates to 1.1 acres of neighborhood parkland per 1,000 district residents. Counting neighborhood parkland owned and maintained by the County within ARPD, and parkland adjacent to ARPD owned and maintained by the City of Pittsburg, there is approximately 48 acres of neighborhood parkland, amounting to 2.1 acres per 1,000 residents.

69. An additional 10 acres of neighborhood parkland is needed to achieve the County General Plan standard of 2.5 acres of neighborhood parkland per 1,000 residents.
70. Recreational programming provided by ARPD is inadequate. The District does not currently offer direct recreation programming; however, some recreation classes are offered by independent contractors at district facilities.
71. ARPD generally provides adequate park maintenance services, with the exception of Ambrose Park, which is slated for significant improvements.
72. Major infrastructure needs and deficiencies exist at Ambrose Park; and the District's short-term goal is to significantly improve the facility. Currently, the pool and related facilities, including tennis, bocce ball and basketball courts are all closed due to disrepair. ARPD has identified \$10-12 million in needed renovations for the park, with the first phase of improvements (\$1.7 million) set to begin in FY 09-10.
73. Service challenges faced by the District in recent years pertained to deteriorating infrastructure and a lack of financing for needed improvements.
74. ARPD has conducted capital improvement planning for Ambrose Park in conjunction with the City of Pittsburg, through the 2009 Ambrose Park Master Plan. The District has not prepared a written capital improvement plan for other park facilities.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

73. The District reported that the current level of financing is sufficient for minimally adequate service provision. Funds are not sufficient for the agency to directly provide recreation programming, and significant capital needs were not addressed in recent years due to fiscal constraints.
74. ARPD indicated that it plans to participate in the Proposition 1A Securitization Program to mitigate the impact of the loss of property tax revenues borrowed by the State.
75. The District may require increased revenues to finance additional services, and has identified the formation of an assessment district to fund new staff and recreation programs as a possible alternative.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

76. Current facility sharing practices include the use of school facilities for after school programs. The County shares facilities with ARPD by renting office space in the Ambrose Community Center. ARPD had previously maintained County-owned park facilities by joint agency agreement; however, this agreement was terminated by the County last year.
77. ARPD and the City of Pittsburg formed a partnership to plan and fund improvements at Ambrose Park.
78. The District is exploring the possibility of shared facilities with community resources, including the school district, for indoor offsite locations for recreation programs and activities. A lack of sufficient indoor facilities to create and run programs has been a limiting factor in recreation offerings for ARPD.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

79. ARPD demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.
80. The District's constituent outreach activities include advertising meetings and special events on its website, in the local newspaper, through postings at district facilities, in Bay Point MAC newsletters, and in mailings with utility bills.

PLEASANT HILL RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT (PHRPD)

Growth and population projections

81. There are approximately 16,000 households within PHRPD, with a population of about 40,000. The area has not experienced significant recent growth, as the District is almost entirely built-out. Population growth is expected to increase at a rate similar to the City of Pleasant Hill, at an annual rate of approximately 1%. The estimated population of the District by 2025 is 46,863.
82. The only proposed development within the District is on the 27-acre Mangini Ranch property; however, there has not been a recent proposal for the land, and development has not moved forward in recent years.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

83. There are 270± acres of parks and open space within PHRPD, including 120± acres of parks directly maintained by the District (63 acres of which are developed). Recreation facilities include three pools, two community centers, a senior center complex, a cultural center, and a historical site.
84. Generally, there is a lack of developed parkland within the District. The City of Pleasant Hill General Plan establishes a standard of three acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents. Within PHRPD there is approximately 1.6 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents. A total of 120 developed acres, or 57 additional developed acres, would be needed to meet the General Plan standard.
85. Counting all district-maintained parkland (both developed and undeveloped), there are approximately three acres of parkland per 1,000 district residents, including approximately 20 acres of neighborhood parkland (0.5 acres per 1,000 residents) and about 100 acres of community parkland (2.5 acres per 1,000 residents).
86. There is a significant amount of recreational programming offered within PHRPD. The estimated attendance for all recreation programs in FY 08-09 was approximately 1.4 million participant days, or roughly 35 participant days per resident.
87. Significant infrastructure needs within PHRPD will be addressed through Measure E bond funds. Bond funds will be used to construct a new senior center, a new teen center, a new community center, upgrades to Pleasant Oaks Park, and better restroom facilities at Rodgers-Smith Park, Pleasant Hill Park and Brookwood Park. All projects are anticipated to be completed by 2015.
88. PHRPD has conducted capital improvement planning through the 2003 recreation and parks master plan. The District's current planning efforts center around Bond Measure E. As of January 2010, the District was in the process of forming a seven-member bond oversight committee to review the capital improvement budget expenditure plan, and monitor expenditures to ensure that funds are spent in accordance with Measure E.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

89. The District reported that the current level of financing is generally sufficient for adequate service provision; however, budgets have become increasingly strained in recent years. The District indicated that it plans to participate in the Proposition 1A Securitization Program to mitigate the impact of the loss of property tax revenues borrowed by the State.
90. The financial ability of PHRPD to provide service was improved significantly with the passage of Bond Measure E in August 2009. The \$28 million general obligation bond was approved by nearly 76% of district residents.
91. The District reported that all fees are annually evaluated and updated as necessary.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

92. PHRPD shares two pool facilities with the Mt. Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD). PHRPD performs routine maintenance at both pool facilities, and MDUSD pays for utilities and other expenses related to operating the pools. PHRPD also maintains the baseball/softball fields at Pleasant Hill Elementary School, College Park High School and Valley View Middle School.
93. PHRPD owns a building for before and after school programs located at Gregory Gardens Elementary School, and shares a service center and maintenance yard facility with the City of Pleasant Hill.
94. No additional or future opportunities for shared facilities were identified.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

95. PHRPD demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.
96. Constituent outreach activities conducted by PHRPD include an email newsletter and a catalog of District programs, activities and events sent out three times a year, an email news bulletin with current information about the District, and a website that includes up-to-date listings of special events, activities and classes.
97. PHRPD has received numerous awards from the California Parks & Recreation Society (CARPD) and CSDA, including "California's Most Outstanding Recreation & Park District" in 1994 and 2003. In March 2010, PHRPD received the District of Distinction accreditation by the Special District Leadership Foundation.

ROLLINGWOOD WILART PARK RECREATION & PARK DISTRICT (RWPRPD)

Growth and population projections

98. The estimated residential population within PWPRPD is 2,382. Recent growth has been low due to the fact that the community is entirely built-out, and surrounded by the cities of San Pablo and Richmond. Population is expected to increase at a rate similar to the adjacent City of San Pablo, at an annual rate of approximately 0.2%. The District's population is expected to increase to 2,460 by 2025.
99. There are no planned or proposed developments located within the existing boundary of the District.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

100. RWPRPD provides minimally adequate maintenance and operation services to the Rollingwood Recreation Center.

101. The recreation center has a maximum capacity of 124 to 266 persons; the District has no plans to expand the recreation center to add capacity. RWPRPD does not directly provide recreation services or parkland.

102. The District estimates that yearly attendance at the Rollingwood Recreation Center is approximately 22,300, or roughly 9.7 attendees per District resident per year.

103. RWPRPD rents out the community center on Saturdays for private parties and functions. The District provided information regarding rental fees, security deposits, and use policies.

104. Community programs that utilize RWPRPD recreation Center include youth Latin and adult square dance classes, Narcotics Anonymous, TOPS meetings, Boy Scouts, and the neighboring Lutheran Church. Community programs approved by the board are allowed to use the recreation center at low or no cost.

105. RWPRPD infrastructure needs include improving accessibility of the restroom facilities and improving ventilation for the janitor's closet. Other needed improvements include fireproofing or replacing the curtains on the stage, resurfacing and painting of stall lines in the parking lot, and purchasing a sound system.

106. The District does not produce a written capital improvement plan for significant infrastructure needs.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

107. RWPRPD provides minimal operations and maintenance services to the Rollingwood Recreation Center, given financial and staffing constraints. The District has no full-time employees, and hires a building manager and janitor by contract. Funds are insufficient for the agency to provide full-time staffing or recreation programming. The building manager is also a board member, and routine maintenance at the facility is often performed directly by the board on a volunteer basis.

108. The most significant service challenge identified by the District is providing adequate services given limited finances and staffing. Rental revenues received by RWPRPD have decreased dramatically over the last year, due to a decreased number of facility rentals in the sagging economy.

109. Property tax revenue received by the District averaged \$30,000 per year from FY 06-07 to FY 08-09, consisting of 59% of total district revenues; while facility rental revenue averaged approximately \$19,200 per year over the same time span, consisting of approximately 36% of revenues. Total revenues decreased by nearly 17% from FY 06-07 to FY 08-09, including a 37% drop in facility rental revenue.

110. In FY 08-09, the District spent \$30,000 to replace the stove hood in the kitchen, which was a significant expenditure for the District.

111. RWPRPD has not raised facility rental fees since 2003. It is recommended that the District review and update all recreation and facility rental fees regularly.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

112. The District has shared facilities in the past with the City of San Pablo, but does currently practice significant facility sharing.

113. No current or future opportunities for facility sharing were identified by the District.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

114. Accountability to local voters is constrained by a lack of contested elections. There has only been one contested election in the District since 1979, and generating public interest in the District has proved difficult.

115. RWPRPD does not have a full five-member board. The District reported that it changed from a five-member board to a three-member board in 1999 due to the inability to fill two vacant board seats. Public accountability would be improved by having a full five-member governing body, as required by law, pursuant to Government Code Sections 1779-1780.

116. RWPRPD has not audited its financial statements in at least 10 years. The District identified having back-audits performed starting FY 09-10 as a goal to improve accountability.

117. The District conducts community outreach through the volunteer efforts of Narcotics Anonymous and the Boy Scouts.

118. RWPRPD demonstrated limited accountability in its disclosure of information and cooperation with LAFCO. The agency did not respond to LAFCO's initial written questionnaire in a timely manner, but did ultimately submit information at an in-person interview. The District did not provide follow-up comments or participate in the agency review process; numerous calls and emails to the District soliciting comment went unanswered.

CSA M-16

Growth and population projections

119. The 2009 residential population within CSA M-16 was 781. Recent growth has been low as the area is built-out. The projected population within the District by 2025 is 806.

120. Future growth will be limited to infill as the area is built-out.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

121. CSA M-16 appears to have sufficient park capacity to serve the residents within its boundaries presently and into the future, as the community is entirely built-out. As of 2009, there are approximately three acres of parkland per 1,000 residents provided by the CSA, which meets the recommended California benchmark standard and the County's General Plan parkland goal for neighborhood parks.

122. There are no school parks or parks operated by other providers within the District.

123. The most significant service challenge for the CSA M-16 is unfunded deferred maintenance and improvements at the existing park facilities totaling an estimated \$2.3 million.

124. Three of the District's four parks are in fair condition and have several infrastructure needs or deficiencies, including upgraded irrigation and drainage, installation of restrooms, additional BBQ areas, improved access, new basketball court flooring, new fencing, a drinking fountain, and a bike rack.

125. CSA M-16 has an up-to-date capital improvement plan; however, it appears to operate as a complete list of needs rather than a plan of when capital funding will become available for necessary improvements.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

126. The District reports that the current level of financing is not sufficient for adequate service provision, and that there are significant capital needs which have not been addressed due to fiscal constraints.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

127. The District does not practice significant facility sharing.

128. No opportunities for future facility sharing were identified.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

129. Accountability to local voters is achieved through a CSA advisory committee which acts as a sounding board for the community to voice local preferences to the County Board of Supervisors.

130. CSA M-16 demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.

CSA M-17

Growth and population projections

131. The 2009 residential population within the district was approximately 7,521. Recent growth has been low. The projected population within CSA M-17 by 2025 is 7,766.

132. There are no planned or proposed developments within the existing boundary and SOI of the District, as the area is built-out. Future development will be limited to in-fill.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

133. CSA M-17 facilities do not have sufficient capacity to meet existing and future demand, according to California and County adopted park-acreage standards and goals. As of 2009, there is 1.5± acres of parkland per 1,000 residents provided by the District, which fails to meet the California benchmark standard and the County General Plan neighborhood parkland goal.

134. In order to meet the County General Plan goal of 2.5 acres of neighborhood parkland per 1,000 residents, the District would need an additional 7.8 acres of parkland. If parks operated by neighboring agencies and within 0.5 miles of CSA M-17 are included in the capacity analysis, the General Plan parkland service goal would be exceeded within the CSA.

135. Three additional park facilities, other than those provided by the CSA, are within 0.5 miles of the CSA in the neighboring cities of Richmond and Pinole and unincorporated Contra Costa County.

136. Existing recreational programming is offered through the YMCA and appears to be adequate with a wide variety of programs. In order to advertise the classes available to the public, CSA M-17 should consider a website for the recreation facility and programs offered.
137. The most significant service challenge for CSA M-17 is unfunded deferred maintenance and improvements at the existing park facilities totaling an estimated \$4.4 million.
138. Infrastructure needs and planned improvements for the two District facilities include improvements to drainage and irrigation for the soccer field, construction of new pathways, new restrooms, and basketball and tennis courts, installation garbage cans, a water fountain, picnic tables, BBQs and benches, improvement of landscaping, new flooring at the community center, and improvements to road access.
139. CSA M-17 has an up-to-date capital improvement plan; however, it appears to operate as a complete list of needs rather than a plan of when capital funding will become available for necessary improvements.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

140. The District reports that the current level of financing is not sufficient for adequate service provision. There are significant capital needs which have not been addressed because of financing constraints.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

141. CSA M-17 practices facility sharing by offering recreation programming through a contract with the YMCA at the District's community center.
142. Opening school parks to the public through an agreement with the West Contra Costa Unified School District is an opportunity for future facility sharing that could enhance CSA M-17's service level.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

143. Accountability to local voters is limited as the CSA M-17 advisory committee was disbanded in 1990. It is recommended that the County consider reforming the advisory committee, so that it may act as a sounding board for the community to voice local preferences to the County.
144. The CSA demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.

CSA M-29

Growth and population projections

145. The 2009 population within CSA M-29 was about 21,598 residents. The area has experienced significant recent growth. Between 2002 and 2009, the estimated population of the District has grown by over 500%, from 3,366 to 21,598.
146. It is anticipated that the area will continue to experience a strong rate of growth until the Dougherty Valley Specific Plan area is built-out. The area at build-out will have about 11,000 dwelling units with an estimated new residential population of 29,040. As of the end of 2009, the development was approximately 74% complete.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

147. As of 2009, there were about 3.5 acres of city-owned and school neighborhood parkland per 1,000 residents in CSA M-29, and 3 acres of city-owned and school community parkland per 1,000 residents.
148. While the total acreage of existing park facilities and community parks exceed City parkland standards, CSA M-29 lacks sufficient neighborhood parkland to meet the City standard of 4.5 neighborhood park acres per 1,000 residents. In order to meet the City's neighborhood parkland standard, CSA M-29 would need an additional 22.5 acres of neighborhood parkland.
149. At build-out of the area, the specific plan outlines plans for at least 6.4 acres and up to 9.8 acres of parkland (including school facilities) per 1,000 residents.
150. The District facilities have all been built since 2000 and are in excellent condition. No major needs or deficiencies were identified for the park and recreation facilities.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

151. The City of San Ramon reported that the current financing level is generally not adequate to provide services to CSA M-29, as the number of units sold and paying assessments to the District have not kept up with the cost of providing services, as a result of the recent economic decline. As a result, the City has had to use general funds to finance services in the area.
152. Financial challenges faced by the City have been magnified, as the County has been slow to reimburse the City for funds that were paid in advance to provide services to the area. It is recommended that the County and City work to ensure timely reimbursement.
153. Significant capital financing will be required as park facilities age and require rehabilitation. The City has begun planning for these capital financing needs.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

154. The City presently practices facility sharing and collaboration with the San Ramon Valley Unified School District (SRVUSD) at every school site in San Ramon.
155. No additional opportunities for facility sharing within the CSA's boundaries were identified by the City.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

156. Accountability to local voters is constrained as the CSA does not have an advisory committee to act as a sounding board for the community to voice local preferences to the County or the City. In addition, CSA residents are not eligible to sit on the City's Park and Community Services Commission.
157. The City should consider allowing CSA M-29 residents to sit on the Park and Community Services Commission to enhance accountability.
158. The CSA and City demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.

CSA M-30

Growth and population projections

159. The 2009 residential population within CSA M-30 was about 70. Recent growth has been high as the subdivision began construction in 1999. Of the 26 existing dwelling units within the CSA, 19 units were constructed between 1999 and 2001, and the remaining seven were constructed between 2003 and 2008.
160. There are 15 vacant parcels within CSA M-30 that could support single family residential development in the future. Build-out of the District will yield a total population of approximately 120.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

161. With regard to service levels within CSA M-30, the only park facility within 0.5 miles of the District is Hap Magee Ranch Park. The park provides adequate parkland capacity for the District's 70 residents, according to the Town of Danville parkland standards.
162. It is recommended that the Town of Danville clarify in its recreation guide its policy regarding CSA M-30 residents being eligible for Town recreation programming resident fees.
163. The Town of Danville has planned approximately \$0.6 million in park capital improvements by 2014, to improve Town parks serving residents of CSA M-30.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

164. The Town reports that the current level of financing is sufficient for adequate service provision.
165. The County has been slow to reimburse the Town for funds that were paid in advance to provide services to the area. It is recommended that the County and City work to ensure timely reimbursement.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

166. The Town has a joint development, maintenance, and management agreement with the County for Hap Magee Ranch Park and a joint use agreement with the SRVUSD for use of recreation facilities.
167. No further opportunities for facility sharing were identified.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

168. Accountability to local voters is constrained as CSA M-30 does not have an advisory committee to act as a sounding board for the community to voice local preferences to the County or the Town. In addition, CSA M-30 residents are not eligible to sit on the Town's Park and Leisure Services Commission.
169. The Town should consider allowing CSA residents to sit on its Park and Leisure Services Commission to enhance accountability.
170. CSA M-30 and the Town of Danville demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.

CSA R-4

Growth and population projections

171. The estimated residential population within CSA R-4 is about 16,341, including 16,204 residents of the Town of Moraga and an estimated 137 residents in the unincorporated portion of the District.
172. Growth within the incorporated area of CSA R-4 is expected to be moderate with a projected growth rate of 10% within the Town between 2009 and 2025. Planned and proposed residential development within the Town total over 650 dwelling units. The projected population within CSA R-4 by 2025 is 17,699.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

173. The Town, and consequently CSA R-4, is slightly deficient in the amount of developed parkland and neighborhood parkland available to its residents. There were approximately 4.5 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents within CSA R-4, and 3.5 acres of developed parkland per 1,000 residents if the school facilities are excluded. The Town's General Plan identifies a goal of five acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, which means the Town must acquire an additional 7.8 acres of developed parkland (including school facilities) to meet the General Plan standard.
174. In terms of neighborhood parkland, the Town has about 25 acres if school facilities are included, yielding 1.5 acres per 1,000 residents. The Town reported that two acres per 1,000 residents is the target standard for neighborhood parkland, meaning the Town needs at least an additional 7.4 acres of neighborhood parkland to meet the target neighborhood parkland standard.
175. Recreation attendance in FY 08-09 was reported by the District to be approximately 17,650 participant days, or roughly 1.1 participant days per resident.
176. The Town provides park and recreation services to the District. CSA R-4 serves as a financing mechanism to provide park and recreation services to the unincorporated areas adjacent to the Town.
177. Infrastructure needs for CSA R-4 include improvements to the building facilities at Hacienda de las Flores park, and improvements to recreation facilities at Joaquin Moraga Intermediate School.
178. The Town conducts park-related planning through its Parks and Recreation Master Plan (adopted in 2007), a Park Development Impact Fee Study (2008), and the Town General Plan (2002). Park and recreation goals and objectives are also evaluated annually in the budget. The Town does not prepare a capital improvement plan specific to park and recreation improvements; however, capital improvement needs and costs have been outlined in the Parks Master Plan.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

179. The Town reports that the current level of financing for the park and recreation department is sufficient; however, the Town faces challenges financing maintenance of a large open space area.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

180. CSA R-4 shares facilities with the Town at the Hacienda de las Flores park, which is used by the Town as its main office. The Town also shares facilities the Moraga School District, by contributing funds to the school district for use of fields during non-school hours and weekends; however, this funding is being phased out over the next five years. The Town reported that it occasionally plans special events in conjunction with East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). The Town recently ended a three-year

cooperative relationship with the City of Lafayette, sharing recreation programs, in the hopes of providing enhanced recreation services.

181.No new opportunities for facility sharing were identified.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

182.Public accountability for park and recreation programs is achieved by through the Town's Parks and Recreation Commission. The Commission reports to the Town Council, and is comprised of seven public members. Accountability for CSA R-4 residents in unincorporated areas is limited because only residents of the Town of Moraga may sit on the Commission.

183.CSA R-4 and the Town of Moraga demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.

CSA R-7 (Zone A)

Growth and population projections

184.The estimated 2009 residential population within CSA R-7A was 13,395. Population growth between 2000 and 2008 was about 15%. The projected population within the District by 2025 is 13,880.

185.Future growth will be limited to lot splits for second residential units and infill which is projected to average approximately 25 units annually.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

186.As of 2009, there were approximately 2.2 acres of total parkland per 1,000 residents provided by CSA R-7A, or one acre of neighborhood parkland per 1,000 residents.

187.CSA R-7A facilities do not have sufficient capacity to meet existing and future demand, according to California and County adopted park-acreage standards and goals. In order to meet the County General Plan goal, CSA R-7A would need an additional 24 acres of total parkland, of which, at least 20 acres would need to consist of neighborhood parkland.

188.While the area within CSA R-7A lacks sufficient neighborhood park acreage, there are several regional and community parks provided by other agencies within 0.5 miles of the District, including Oak Hill Community Park in the Town of Danville, the Diablo Foothills Regional Park owned by EBRPD, Rudgear Park in the City of Walnut Creek, and EBRPD open space.

189.Recreation programming is limited to annual special events. For additional recreation programming, CSA R-7A residents must join programs in the neighboring cities of Danville and Walnut Creek and pay non-resident fees.

190.Various infrastructure needs for CSA R-7A parks were identified in the County Parks CIP. The Alamo MAC reported that infrastructure is in good condition, as facilities were all built within the last 15 years, and few capital needs exist. It is recommended that the County and Alamo MAC collaborate to jointly plan future capital improvements to CSA R-7A parks.

191.CSA R-7A has an up-to-date capital improvement plan; however, it appears to operate as a complete list of needs rather than a plan of when capital funding will become available for necessary improvements.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

192. The District reports that the current level of financing is not sufficient for adequate service provision. There are significant capital needs which have not been addressed because of financing constraints.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

193. CSA R-7A practices extensive facility sharing through financing and maintenance agreements with SRVUSD and the Town of Danville. These agreements provide access to four additional park and recreation facilities for CSA R-7A residents.

194. No further opportunities for facility sharing were identified by the County. The Alamo MAC identified future facility sharing possibilities at Stone Valley Middle School.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

195. Accountability to local voters is achieved through the Alamo MAC which acts as a sounding board for the community to voice local preferences to the County regarding park and recreation services in CSA R-7A.

196. The District demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.

197. Opportunities for consolidation include consolidation with CSA M-30 or Green Valley Recreation & Park District.

198. CSA R-7 Zone B is presently inactive and should be considered for dissolution by the County Board of Supervisors, and the area detached from the CSA R-7 by LAFCO.

CSA R-9

Growth and population projections

199. As of 2009, there was a population of approximately 24,570 within CSA R-9. The area has experienced minimal recent growth. The projected population within the District by 2025 is 25,368.

201. There are no major planned or proposed developments located within the existing boundary and SOI of the District. Future growth is anticipated to be limited to in-fill and minor subdivision projects.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

200. CSA R-9 facilities do not have sufficient capacity to meet existing and future demand, according to California and County adopted park-acreage standards and goals. As of 2009, the reading garden provides minimal park acreage for the residents of CSA R-9. If school facilities are included as part of the District's park facilities, there would be approximately 1.2 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

201. In order to meet the County General Plan goal, CSA R-9 would need an additional 32 acres of neighborhood parkland in addition to the existing school facilities.

202. Park facilities within 0.5 miles of CSA R-9 include Lamoine Valley View Park and Rain Cloud Park in the City of Richmond; Kennedy Grove Regional Recreation Area and Wildcat Canyon Regional Park owned and operated by EBRPD; and Pinole Valley High School facilities, Pinole Valley Park and Sarah Drive Park in the City of Pinole.

203. The most significant service challenge for CSA R-9 is the lack of a regular financing source. With the exception of park dedication fees from developers, the District has no other fixed revenue sources. CSA R-9 has floated an assessment measure to the land owners twice in 1985 and 1998 to gain additional revenues; however, the measure failed on both occasions.

204. Infrastructure needs for CSA R-9 include a new community park which will cost an estimated \$5 million. In order to expand access to school parks outside of school hours, the County identified \$6.9 million in needed repairs and improvements to four schools within the District.

205. The CSA has an up-to-date capital improvement plan; however, it appears to operate as a complete list of needs rather than a plan of when capital funding will become available for necessary improvements.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

206. CSA R-9 reports that the current level of financing is not sufficient for adequate service provision. There are significant capital needs which have not been addressed because of financing constraints.

207. CSA R-9 needs a fixed revenue source to provide adequate services levels. The present revenue, which is limited to park dedication fees, is minimal and only allows for occasional capital outlays.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

208. CSA R-9 practices facility sharing with the Children's Reading Garden, which is a joint project with the County library, community members and the District 1 Supervisor's office.

209. An opportunity to share facilities with other agencies may include financing of Richmond Unified School District park facilities to promote public use of the school parks outside of school hours.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

210. Accountability is constrained by limited interest in serving on the CSA R-9 advisory committee. The advisory committee acts as a sounding board for the community to voice local preferences to the County.

211. CSA R-9 demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.

212. As CSA R-9 has no regular source of financing, lacks public interest to fill advisory committee positions, provides minimal services at a less than adequate service level, a governance alternative for CSA R-9 may be dissolution.

213. It is recommended that the County Board of Supervisors consider combining the advisory functions of the CSA under the El Sobrante MAC.

CSA R-10

Growth and population projections

214. The 2009 estimated residential population within CSA R-10 was 6,862. Recent growth has been limited. The projected population within the District by 2025 is 7,136.

215. Growth in the future is anticipated to be minimal with some in-fill and small subdivision projects. This growth is not anticipated to impact service demand in the future.

Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies

216. CSA R-10 facilities do not have sufficient capacity to meet existing and future demand, according to California and County adopted park-acreage standards and goals. As of 2009, the District offered approximately two acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.
217. An additional 3.7 acres of neighborhood parkland are needed to achieve the County standard of 2.5 acres of neighborhood parkland per 1,000 residents.
218. Park facilities provided by other agencies within 0.5 miles of CSA R-10 include Foxboro Park (3.6 acres) in the City of Hercules.
219. CSA R-10 provides limited recreational programming primarily through private instructors. In order to advertise the classes available to the public, the District should consider a website for the recreation facility and programs offered.
220. The recreation building and ball field were identified by the County as being in fair condition. Planned improvements to the facility total \$3.8 million and include new restrooms, improvement of the flooring and lighting in the recreation center, lights in the outfield, improved access, landscaping, and new fencing, drinking fountains, trash cans and picnic areas.
221. Service challenges are due to deteriorating infrastructure and a lack of financing for needed improvements.
222. CSA R-10 has an up-to-date capital improvement plan; however, it appears to operate as a complete list of needs rather than a plan of when capital funding will become available for necessary improvements.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

223. The District reports that the current level of financing is not sufficient for adequate service provision. There are significant capital needs which have not been addressed due to fiscal constraints.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

224. CSA R-10 practices extensive sharing of the park and recreation facilities serving the area. The Rodeo Creek Trail is jointly owned with the Flood Control District and maintained by the County Lighting and Landscaping District Zone 38. The recreation center and ball field are owned by the John Swett Unified School District, maintained and operated by CSA financing, and recreation programming and additional maintenance is provided by the Rodeo Baseball Association.
225. No further opportunities for facility sharing were identified.

Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies

226. Accountability is constrained by limited interest in serving on the CSA R-10 advisory committee. The advisory committee acts as a sounding board for the community to voice local preferences to the County.
228. The CSA demonstrated accountability and transparency by disclosing financial and service related information in response to LAFCO requests.