



Lou Ann Teixeira
Executive Officer

MEMBERS

Candace Andersen
County Member

Donald A. Blubaugh
Public Member

Tom Butt
City Member

Igor Skaredoff
Special District Member

Federal Glover
County Member

Michael R. McGill
Special District Member

Rob Schroder
City Member

ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Diane Burgis
County Member

Stanley Caldwell
Special District Member

Charles R. Lewis, IV
Public Member

Sean Wright
City Member

April 17, 2019
Agenda Item 8

April 17, 2019 (Agenda)

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

Second Round “City Services” Municipal Services Review Public Review Draft Report

Dear Members of the Commission:

BACKGROUND: The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) requires that every five years the Commission shall, as necessary, review and update each sphere of influence (SOI); and that in conjunction with the SOI update, the commission shall conduct a municipal service review (MSR).

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. The MSR serves as a basis for SOI updates and future boundary changes.

Contra Costa LAFCO continues to work on its 2nd round MSRs, having completed reviews of water and wastewater services (2014), reclamation services (2015), EMS/fire services (2016), and healthcare (2018).

SUMMARY: In May 2018, LAFCO initiated its 2nd round “city services” MSR covering all 19 cities and four of the six community services districts (CSDs).

Municipal services covered in the 2nd round “City Services” MSR include the following:

- Animal Control
- Broadband
- Building/Planning
- Law Enforcement
- Library
- Lighting
- Parks & Recreation
- Solid Waste
- Streets/Roads
- Stormwater
- Utilities (gas, electric community choice)

The 2nd round “City Services” MSR focuses on the following:

- ✚ Updating profile data including growth and population, jobs/housing, finances (expenses, revenues, debt, reserves, related fiscal indicators), and staffing
- ✚ Shared services (i.e., joint powers/joint use agreements, contracts between public agencies, public-private partnerships)
- ✚ Infill development/sprawl prevention/islands
- ✚ Agricultural/open space preservation

The MSR Process - Following a formal Request for Proposal and selection process, Lamphier-Gregory and Berkson Associates were hired to prepare the MSR report.

To date, the MSR process has entailed the following:

- ✚ May 10, 2018 - "City Services" MSR Kick-off presentation to Public Managers Association
- ✚ June 15, 2018 - Transmittal of MSR Questionnaire and Agency Profile Workbook (pre-populated by consultants) to local agencies
- ✚ August 9, 2018 – Follow-up Meeting with Public Managers Association
- ✚ January 14, 2019 – Transmittal of Administrative Draft chapter to each local agency for review
- ✚ March 27, 2019 – release of Public Review Draft MSR

The Public Review Draft MSR was released on March 27, 2019 and posted on the LAFCO website (<http://contracostalafco.org/agencies/municipal-service-reviews/>). Local agencies and interested parties were notified of the availability of the report and 30-day public comment period, which ends on April 25, 2019. Local agencies are encouraged to place the Public Review Draft MSR on their City Council/ Board of Directors agenda for public discussion and input.

To date, we have received comments from the cities of Pleasant Hill, Richmond, and Walnut Creek, the Town of Discovery Bay Community Services District, and from several residents, including letters from Kristen Altbaum and Roger Chelemedos (see attached).

On April 17th, LAFCO will hold the first of two public hearings on the "City Services" MSR. At this hearing, the MSR consultant will present a summary of the MSR report and major findings. Following the presentation, LAFCO staff will receive public comment and remarks and direction from the Commission. No final action on the Draft MSR report will be taken on April 17th.

The Commission will be asked to set a public hearing for June 12th, at which time the Commission will be asked to accept the Final MSR report, adopt the required MSR and SOI determinations, and update the SOIs for the 19 cities and four districts covered in the MSR report.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Receive the staff report and consultant's presentation,
2. Open the public hearing and receive comments,
3. Close the public hearing and provide comments and direction to the MSR consultant and LAFCO staff, and
4. Direct LAFCO staff to set a public hearing for June 12th, at which time the Commission will be asked to accept the Final MSR, make the required determinations, and update SOIs.

Sincerely,

LOU ANN TEXEIRA
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Exhibit: See <http://contracostalafco.org/agencies/municipal-service-reviews/>

Attachment 1 – Letter from Kristen Altbaum

Attachment 2 – Letter from Roger Chelemedos

c: Distribution

Sphere of Influence Change for unincorporated territory between Grayson and Withers in Lafayette, 94549 and within Lafayette/Acalanes school districts

This petition by residents is an adjunct document in support of the following letter written by Kristen Altbaum supporting changing our Sphere of Influence (SOI) from Pleasant Hill to Lafayette during the current Municipal Services Review period. This petition will be forwarded to Pleasant Hill and Lafayette City Managers. Given that LAFCO, a taxpayer funded agency, is responsible for helping facilitate logical boundaries, we residents are asking for support of this SOI change for our neighborhood:

March 27, 2019

LouAnn Texeira
Contra Costa County LAFCO
651 Pine Street, 6th Floor
Martinez, CA 94553

Dear Lou Ann,

Thank you very much for meeting with us and answering our questions!

In anticipation of LAFCO releasing a city services review which culminates in an SOI update, we support a SOI change for our area as described:

Unincorporated territory on Reliez Valley Road, or feeders off Reliez Valley Rd., south of the intersection of Grayson Rd./Reliez Valley Road, and all consistent with a Lafayette 94549 address and within the Acalanes/Lafayette school districts (map attached).

Our unincorporated territory, as described above, is currently illogically placed in the Pleasant Hill SOI, and further, illogically *combined within* the same island, as unincorporated Pleasant Hill parcels to the north east of us. These north east parcels comprise a completely separate community from ours, separated by significant topographical “barriers”. Grayson Creek separates Reliez Valley parcels in unincorporated Lafayette from unincorporated Pleasant Hill parcels on Mohawk, which are accessed by Grayson Road. This creek is within a very steep ravine and is surrounded by ivy and berry bushes that make traversing through it, to access our Pleasant Hill island neighbors, through yards, impossible. Further, unincorporated Lafayette parcels off Gloria Terrace are separated from unincorporated Pleasant Hill parcels to the north by a steep hill and subsequent ravine. Any attempts at co-mingling with our Pleasant Hill neighbors would have to be done by car, or biking/walking on arterials in many areas without sidewalks, versus through open space areas, yards, paths or residential streets.

Besides significant topographical barriers and Lafayette 94549 versus Pleasant Hill 94523 addresses, unincorporated Lafayette is separated by our unincorporated Pleasant Hill island neighbors by:

- A. Community identity: Our island neighbors identify themselves as “residents of Pleasant Hill”, whereas we identify ourselves as “residents of Lafayette”.
- B. Neighborhood unity: We are unified with our Lafayette City neighbors through attending the same parishes, coaching Lafayette sports, volunteering for Lafayette schools and patronizing local Lafayette businesses and restaurants. Our island neighbors are unified with Pleasant Hill City residents by these same standards.
- C. Schools: Our children attend Lafayette and Acalanes districts schools. Our island neighbors’ children attend Mt. Diablo district schools.
- D. Access roads and commute patterns: We access our homes via Withers/Reliez Valley Roads and make multiple trips per week in and through Lafayette. Our island neighbors drive in and through Pleasant Hill and access their homes via Grayson Road.

Pleasant Hill Planning Department Staff has confirmed that our island is not mentioned in Pleasant Hill’s general plan and no record has been found as to why we were ever part of Pleasant Hill’s SOI to begin with. Our original island boundaries were likely established prior to significant residential buildout, prior to 1960, and have been outdated and illogical for many years. They no longer make sense from a “community identity” and “neighborhood unity” standpoint. We are bordered on our southern edge by the City of Lafayette. Our island neighbors are bordered on their eastern and northern edges by the City of Pleasant Hill. This makes neither side of our island a stand alone island, detached from the community we/they identify with.

We respectfully ask that you split our island during the city services review period so that all territory south of the intersection of Grayson Rd/Reliez Valley Road on, or feeders to Reliez Valley Road be changed to a Lafayette SOI; and all territory which accesses Grayson Rd. continues to reside in the Pleasant Hill SOI. This SOI change mirrors the much more recently imposed and logical school districts boundaries. A majority of all neighbors, if not all, will agree with this determination.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kristen Altbaum (and neighbors within the Reliez Valley corridor)
(925) 285-8309

altbaum@icloud.com

.cc Niroop Srivatsa, June Catalano

sphere-of-influence-change-for-unincorporated

#	Name	Date	Comments
1	Kris Altman	2019-03-27 22:36:04	
2	Jack McCarthy	2019-03-27 22:46:13	Lafayette not pleasant hill
3	Rick Keely	2019-03-27 23:00:37	
4	Heidi Veeder Keely	2019-03-27 23:06:44	
5	Ron altbaum	2019-03-27 23:15:15	
6	Catherine McCarthy	2019-03-27 23:15:28	
7	Jocelyn Werner	2019-03-27 23:17:38	
8	Nanette Heffernan	2019-03-27 23:43:52	
9	Tom Heffernan	2019-03-27 23:44:21	
10	Nathan Mahlik	2019-03-27 23:51:50	
11	Roger Chelemedos	2019-03-28 00:10:52	
12	Yumi Chelemedos	2019-03-28 00:15:13	
13	Marina Kagan	2019-03-28 00:31:42	
14	Andrew Torson	2019-03-28 00:43:50	
15	D Lee Kirbach	2019-03-28 00:45:13	
16	Karen Yuen	2019-03-28 00:57:16	
17	Shira Abel	2019-03-28 01:23:26	
18	Marjorie Briner	2019-03-28 01:30:22	
19	Deborah ONeal	2019-03-28 01:31:39	
20	Thomas Barber	2019-03-28 01:50:26	I am a business owner in the area and respectfully request that our unincorporated area of Lafayette be pulled into the city limits. We Love Lafayette and that is the city we and our children most closely identify with, and I have have 4 children in the Lafayette school district.
21	sharon silveri	2019-03-28 02:02:00	
22	Sharyn Harrington	2019-03-28 02:34:07	If our zip code is 94549 it only makes sense that we fall under Lafayette
23	Pamela Chapman	2019-03-28 03:05:17	
24	Rahima Warren	2019-03-28 03:06:05	It makes sense to make this change.
25	Lane Altbaum	2019-03-28 03:27:52	
26	Debbie Warren	2019-03-28 03:46:11	
27	Fred Warren	2019-03-28 03:54:40	
28	Bruce Meyers	2019-03-28 03:57:33	
29	Maria Nelson	2019-03-28 03:59:21	
30	Linda Meyers	2019-03-28 04:00:04	
31	Don Smaglia	2019-03-28 04:13:49	

32	Beth Goldberg	2019-03-28 04:15:08	
33	Melissa Murphy	2019-03-28 04:34:03	
34	Matt Nelson	2019-03-28 04:56:42	
35	Darcy talbot	2019-03-28 06:43:40	
36	Patty Topkis	2019-03-28 07:39:49	
37	Hillary Gerlings	2019-03-28 13:53:05	
38	Theresa Chaparro	2019-03-28 14:56:18	
39	Albert Chaparro	2019-03-28 14:57:55	
40	Del Ponte family	2019-03-28 15:47:39	
41	Brian f topkis	2019-03-28 16:52:15	
42	Alicia Cervenka	2019-03-28 17:50:41	
43	Jean Schultz	2019-03-28 18:17:00	
44	Carol Kinney	2019-03-28 18:23:47	
45	Brad Altbaum	2019-03-28 19:01:50	
46	Chris Evans	2019-03-28 19:06:37	
47	Erin Park	2019-03-28 21:25:20	
48	Brianna Spraker	2019-03-28 23:12:05	
49	Todd Bielawski	2019-03-29 03:23:02	I support.
50	Kathleen Davis	2019-03-29 04:40:23	
51	Kent Davis	2019-03-29 04:43:18	
52	Kristy Hubbard	2019-04-01 03:44:19	
53	Steven Hubbard	2019-04-01 03:45:42	
54	David Rainero	2019-04-01 15:30:29	
55	Lara Mahlik	2019-04-01 16:34:53	
56	Rachel Dreyer	2019-04-03 16:43:12	
57	Kathy Hemmenway	2019-04-03 17:35:57	
58	Rachel Dreyer	2019-04-03 17:47:16	
59	Terrence Dreyer	2019-04-03 17:47:54	
60	Bernadette Fatehi	2019-04-03 23:34:38	
61	Renee Parnell	2019-04-03 23:39:37	
62	Brian Parnell	2019-04-03 23:50:05	
63	Lindy evans	2019-04-03 23:55:11	
64	Kelly wood	2019-04-04 00:01:48	
65	Sadi Adri	2019-04-04 12:06:04	
66	Kyle Parnell	2019-04-05 04:30:07	



Pleasant Hill



Pleasant Hill parcels access
Grayson



Sleep hill and subsequent ravine separates Lafayette from Pleasant Hill parcels

← Gloria Terrace →

Lafayette ↓

Lafayette parcels access Relief Valley Rd.

Ms. Texeira,

As per my earlier email, please find a letter signed by forty Lafayette City and County residents who are also in the Pleasant Hill Parks and Recreation District (the "district"). We are kindly requesting a review of the district boundaries, and ultimately the removal of all Lafayette citizens from the district.

Our letter calls out the fundamental inequity of today's circumstance, and revised districting as we suggest would align the school districts and recreation districts/locales for both Lafayette and Pleasant Hill. There is a separate letter you will receive asking to change Reliez Valley from the Pleasant Hill to Lafayette sphere-of-influence, which arguably goes hand-in-hand with our request, and we support whole-heartedly.

If you have any questions about our submission, please feel free to reach me at 925-330-5440.

Thank you and kind regards,

Roger Chelemedos

March 29, 2019

Contra Costa Local Agency Formation
Commission
651 Pine St, 6th Floor

Attn: Ms. Lou Ann Texeira

Dr. Commission Members and Staff

On behalf of the Lafayette residents of Reliez Valley, we kindly request a review of the district boundaries of the Pleasant Hill Parks and Recreation District a("the District or PHPRD") and ultimately the removal of all Lafayette residents (city and county) from the District.

As you know, the District was established in 1951, before incorporation of the cities of Pleasant Hill and Lafayette. Since then, much has changed. Very importantly, with the incorporation of Lafayette, and the change in school district for Reliez Valley residents from the Pleasant Hill to Lafayette schools (~30 years ago), the Lafayette Reliez Valley residents find themselves in a predicament...paying huge sums to the Pleasant Hill Parks and Recreation District for services and facilities they barely, if ever, use. This was significantly exacerbated by the passage of Measure E in 2009, which will cause many of Lafayette's residents to pay in excess of \$10,000 over the 30-year term of the Measure E bond, the proceeds of which were largely used to build Pleasant Hill's Senior Center, Pleasant Hill's Teen Center, the Pleasant Hill community center, significantly upgrade Pleasant Hill's Pleasant Oaks Park, and upgrade bathroom facilities at various parks primarily serving Pleasant Hill citizens. These facilities are lightly, if ever, used by Lafayette residents.

PHPRD is awesome, and we admire the District and its leaders, but we are served by the Lafayette Parks and Recreation Department and Lafayette Moraga Youth Association and have been for many years. It is simply unfair for our constituents to pay such large sums to PHPRD. We estimate that our Lafayette neighbors pay between \$50,000 and \$100,000 annually for the facilities that we do not use. And since we only represent a small fraction of the constituents of the district (~300 of 16,000 households, <2%), we are totally disenfranchised and kindly need help to separate from the District. It is our view, supported by activities and investments in the District, that the District's focus is squarely on central and eastern Pleasant Hill, as the use of the Measure E proceeds proves, and as further evidenced by the District's recent agreement to purchase a \$3 million , 5-acre parcel on Oak Park Boulevard, adjacent to Pleasant Hill Middle School, for future park development.

Separately, our residents are submitting to have the sphere of influence for our area reviewed and changed from Pleasant Hill to Lafayette. We support this effort

wholeheartedly, and also believe this is a change that should have been made many years ago, probably when the school district in this area was changed.

We understand that there is a financial downside to removing our constituents from the District. That said, there may be no better time than now to separate., and keeping us in the district just because provide money, but do not use the facilities, is fundamentally unfair. We note that the District has operated at a significant surplus for 5 years in a row, ending the most recent year with a \$400,000 surplus and an unheard of A+ credit rating from Standard Poor's.

We read the report by Burr Consulting from the last time a district review was undertaken. We noted that the consultant called out "In areas where PHRPD boundaries overlap city boundaries there would appear to be a duplication of services, as both PHRPD and the cities of Lafayette and Walnut Creek provide park and recreation services" and that different boundary options were considered, including the exclusion of Lafayette residents from the district. Based on the report, it appears that the primary reason for not separating Lafayette from the district is the adjacency of Brookwood Park to Lafayette. More than once, the report indicates that "residents in this area visit the park frequently due to the proximity". While the adjacency is undeniable, very few residents use the park. It is aging, with no investment made in over 15 years (with exception of the installation of 2 port-a-potties from Brookwood Park's portion of the Measure E funds), and, most importantly, it is poorly located. The park is at the corner of two very busy streets, Taylor Blvd and Withers Avenue. There are very few sidewalks in proximity to the park, so getting to the park is treacherous. From our observations over the past several years, the park is scantily utilized except for occasional dog walkers from the immediate (< 50 home) neighborhood. There are many options here, but none of them should fairly ask the citizens of Lafayette to pay \$50,000 -\$100,000 per year so a small number of dog walkers can use Brookwood Park. If separated, we would hope to work with the District to find a more equitable funding solution for ongoing maintenance at Brookwood Park.

Again, on behalf of the Lafayette city and county residents of Reliez Valley, we kindly and respectfully ask for separation from the Pleasant Hill Parks and Recreation District. We are simply not connected to the District in vision, strategy, recreational facilities and services and do not share the view that District should be concentrically focused on Pleasant Hill with us as a part of the District. While it might have made sense for our neighborhood to belong to the district in the past, that is simply not the case any longer, and has become, financially, heavily burdensome and fundamentally unfair.

Thank you for you consideration.

Respectfully, Lafayette City & County Residents and District Members,

Electronically signed by:

Shira Abel

Tom Barber

Roger Chelemedos

Yumi Chelemedos

Franca Del Ponte

Dave Dorian

Rachel Dreyer

Tom Dreyer

Brian Dunton

Shawna Dunton

Chris Evans

Lindy Evans

John Hemmenway

Kathy Hemmenway

Leonora Holmes

Neil Holmes

Hayes Hollar

Heidi Keely

Rick Keely

Rosemary Kirbach

Raj Krishna

Rupy Krishna

Lynda Lurie

Cathy McCarthy

Jack McCarthy

Maria Nelson

Matt Nelson

Dan O'Toole

Stephanie O'Toole

Erin Park

April Raffel

Robert Raffel

Ashley Stevens

Mike Stevens

Pete Stevens

Penny Stevens

Deborah Warren

Fred Warren

Jocelyn Werner

Peter Werner