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Municipal Service Review Process

The Municipal Service Review (MSR) process is a comprehensive assessment of the ability of government agencies to effectively and efficiently provide services to residents and users. The form and content of the MSR is governed by requirements of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) and the State of California’s LAFCO MSR Guidelines (Guidelines), published in August 2003. This MSR considers the operations and management of irrigation, drainage and reclamation service providers within Butte County.

The process began in June of 2006 with a two-part questionnaire sent to each irrigation, drainage and reclamation service provider included in this MSR, seeking information, planning and budgetary documents, and records related to the provision of those services. After reviewing the information collected, the consultant conducted follow-up consultation through site visits, telephone and e-mail to identify remaining information needs, discuss operational and technical issues, and resolve discrepancies in materials received. The questionnaire has been included as Appendix A.

Once all necessary information was collected, analysis was conducted for each of the service providers. This analysis, which considered all of the topics required by the CKH Act, is presented in Sections 2, 3, and 4 of this document. Once the analysis was complete, determinations were made regarding the ability of the service providers to effectively and efficiently provide service. These determinations correspond to the topic areas set forth in the CKH Act. The determinations represent the conclusions of Butte LAFCO regarding each of the service providers, based on the information provided and statements made by the service providers.

This MSR was released for review by the irrigation, drainage and reclamation service providers, as well as the general public, for a period of at least 30 days in January 2007. Comments received on the Draft MSR are provided in Section 5 of this document, along with responses to each of the comments made. Following public review, the MSR was considered and adopted by Butte LAFCO in April 2007.
**Topic Areas of Analysis**

The MSR contains analysis and conclusions, referred to in this document as determinations, regarding nine topic areas set forth in the CKH Act. These areas of analysis contain the essential operational and management aspects of each service provider, and together constitute a complete review of the ability of the providers to meet the service demands of the residents within their boundaries. The nine topic areas have been combined into the following five topic headings for analysis in this MSR:

1. Growth and Infrastructure
2. Financing and Rate Restructuring
3. Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing
4. Government Structure and Local Accountability
5. Management Efficiencies

An explanation of the specific operational and management aspects of each service provider considered in each of these topic areas is provided in the Introduction.

**Summary**

The Municipal Service Review (MSR) for Irrigation, Drainage and Reclamation Service Providers considers services provided by independent special districts within Butte County. The six irrigation districts are providing agricultural irrigation water and some domestic water distribution. However, this MSR focuses entirely on their agricultural irrigation water services and does not analyze the domestic water services. The 14 drainage and reclamation districts covered in this MSR are providing irrigation and stormwater drainage and maintenance services throughout the County. The drainage and reclamation districts range in size and complexity from large areas with multiple landowners to small districts with only a few landowners. Some provide irrigation and stormwater drainage services while others provide only stormwater drainage services.
Although Butte County’s land use pattern is predominantly rural and there are policies in place to ensure that it does not lose its agricultural heritage, it has been affected by the growth and development occurring throughout the Sacramento region. The characteristics of the districts’ service areas are highly varied, including densely developed urban areas, areas that are experiencing growth and development, and lightly populated rural areas.

The service providers included in this MSR are identified in the Introduction and analyzed in Sections 2, 3 and 4.
1.0 INTRODUCTION
Role and Responsibility of LAFCO

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) are local agencies that were established by state legislation in 1963 for each county in California to ensure that changes in local agency organization occur in an orderly fashion. It is LAFCOs responsibility to encourage the logical, efficient, and most appropriate formation of local municipalities, service areas, and special districts, and to preserve agricultural and open spaces.

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) requires every LAFCO to prepare a Municipal Service Review (MSR) for each of its cities and special districts. MSRs are required prior to and in conjunction with the update of a Sphere of Influence (SOI). This review is intended to provide Butte LAFCO with the necessary and relevant information related to irrigation, drainage and reclamation service providers within the County, specifically regarding the appropriateness of each service provider’s existing and proposed boundaries and SOI.

Purpose of the Municipal Service Review

MSRs are intended to provide LAFCO with a comprehensive analysis of service provision by each of the special districts and other service providers within the legislative authority of the LAFCO. This analysis focuses on irrigation, drainage and reclamation service providers, giving Butte LAFCO the information and analysis necessary to update boundaries and spheres of influence. The MSR makes determinations in each of nine mandated areas of evaluation, providing the basis for the LAFCO to review proposed amendments to a service provider’s boundaries or SOI.

A Sphere of Influence (SOI) is defined in Section 56425 of the Government Code as “a plan for the probable physical boundary and service area of a local agency or municipality as determined by the Commission.” Butte LAFCO is required to adopt a SOI for each city and district in its jurisdiction. When reviewing and determining spheres of influence for these service providers, the LAFCO will consider and make recommendations based on the following information:
• The present and planned land uses in the area
• The present and probable need for irrigation, drainage, and reclamation services in the area
• The present ability of each service provider to provide necessary services
• The fiscal, management, and structural health of each provider
• The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the Commission determines that they are relevant to the service provider.

**Methodology and Approach to this MSR**

This MSR has been prepared to analyze the 20 irrigation, drainage, and reclamation service providers within Butte County. The 20 service providers to be reviewed include the following:

Irrigation Service Providers

2.1 South Feather Water and Power Agency
2.2 Durham Mutual Water Company
2.3 Biggs-West Gridley Water District
2.4 Butte Water District
2.5 Western Canal Water District
2.6 Richvale Irrigation District

Drainage Service Providers

3.1 Drainage District No. 1
3.2 Drainage District No. 2
3.3 Drainage District No. 100
3.4 Drainage District No. 200
3.5 Butte Creek Drainage District
3.6 County Service Area No. 4 – Sierra Del Oro Drainage
3.7 County Service Area No. 23 – Pleasant Valley Drainage
3.8 County Service Area No. 24 – Chico Mud Creek Drainage
3.9 County Service Area No. 25 – Shasta Union Drainage
3.10 County Service Area No. 87 – Keefer Road/Rock Creek Drainage

Reclamation Service Providers

4.1 Rock Creek Reclamation District
4.2 Sacramento River Reclamation District
4.3 Reclamation District No. 833

Figures 1-1 and 1-2 contain maps of the location of these service providers within the County.

LAFCO has boundary authority over special districts and cities, but does not have authority over private entities. In accordance with Government Code 56425, LAFCO must conduct service reviews prior to or in conjunction with the mandated 5-year schedule for updating Spheres of Influence (SOIs) for the agencies within its jurisdiction. This MSR is solely for public irrigation, drainage, and reclamation service providers in Butte County. LAFCO previously prepared a separate MSR to address domestic water and wastewater providers. LAFCO will prepare additional MSRs in the future to address the remaining types of districts.
Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Location of Drainage and Reclamation Service Providers
BUTTE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Butte County Boundary
City Limits
Communities
County Service Area:
No. 4 - Sierra Del Oro Drainage
No. 23 - Pleasant Valley Drainage
No. 24 - Chico Mud Creek Drainage
No. 25 - Shasta Union Drainage
No. 26 - Thermalito Drainage
No. 87 - Keefer Rd/Rock Creek Drainage
Reclamation District No. 833
Rock Creek Reclamation District
Sacramento River Reclamation District
Butte Creek Drainage District
Drainage District No. 1
Drainage District No. 2
Drainage District No. 100
Drainage District No. 200

Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
This MSR evaluates the structure and operation of each of the irrigation, drainage, and reclamation service providers and discusses possible areas for streamlining, improvement, and coordination. Key sources for this study include agency-specific information gathered through research, surveys, and site visits, as well as the MSR Guidelines prepared by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR). The organization of the review is based on nine topic areas recommended in the MSR Guidelines from OPR as set forth in the CKH Act. The MSR report must include an analysis of the issues and written determination for each of the following:

- Growth and population projects for the affected area;
- Infrastructure needs or deficiencies;
- Financing constraints and opportunities;
- Cost avoidance opportunities;
- Opportunities for rate restructuring;
- Opportunities for shared facilities;
- Government structures options, including advantages and disadvantages of the consolidation or reorganization of service providers;
- Evaluation of management efficiencies; and
- Local accountability and governance.

The review is organized by service provider, with each provider being the subject of one chapter. Within each chapter, there are sections corresponding to the nine criteria required by the CKH Act. For greater efficiency and readability, some of these topics have been combined into the following five topic headings for analysis in this MSR:

1. Growth and Infrastructure
2. Financing and Rate Restructuring
3. Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing
4. Government Structure and Local Accountability
5. Management Efficiencies
An explanation of the specific operational and management aspects of each service provider considered in each of these topic areas is provided below.

1. **Growth and Infrastructure**
   This section evaluates existing and projected population estimates and examines the ability of each provider to accommodate future growth and demand projections. Also discussed is the adequacy and quality of the service providers’ infrastructure, including whether sufficient infrastructure and capital are in place (or planned for) to accommodate planned future growth and expansions.

2. **Financing and Rate Restructuring**
   This section provides an analysis of the financial structure and health of each service provider, including the consideration of rates and service operations, as well as other factors affecting the financial health and stability of each provider. Other factors considered include those that affect the financing of needed infrastructure improvements and compliance with existing requirements relative to financial reporting and management.

3. **Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing**
   Practices and opportunities that may help to reduce or eliminate unnecessary costs are examined in this section, along with cost avoidance measures that are already being utilized. Occurrences of facilities sharing are listed and assessed for efficiency, and potential sharing opportunities to facilitate more efficient delivery of services are discussed.

4. **Government Structure and Local Accountability**
   This section addresses the adequacy and appropriateness of existing boundaries and spheres of influence, and evaluates the ability of each service provider to meet its demands under its existing government structure. Also included in this section is an evaluation of compliance by each provider with public meeting and records laws.
5. **Management Efficiencies**

This section assesses the management structure and overall managerial practices of each service provider. This analysis includes a review of the organizational structure, and the allocation of duties and responsibilities among elected or appointed officials, management, and staff.

Information and written determinations regarding each of the above issue areas are provided in this document for public review and comment, as well as for consideration by Butte LAFCO in assessing potential changes to a SOI or other reorganization.

**Questionnaire**

To obtain information related to the above identified topics, the consultant team (Kleinschmidt) developed a questionnaire. An administrative draft questionnaire was developed and sent to Butte LAFCO staff for review. Comments from LAFCO staff were incorporated into a formal seven-page questionnaire designed to solicit relevant information from each of the districts. The questionnaire contained two phases and addressed the topics identified above. The questionnaire was mailed to the districts on June 22, 2006. Fifteen of the 20 districts included in the MSR responded and the information was used to draft the corresponding sections in this document. A copy of the blank questionnaire is shown in Appendix A. Individual district responses to the questionnaire are included in Appendix D.

**Meeting with Districts**

On June 1, 2006, invitations were mailed to each of the districts to attend a meeting to discuss the process for developing this MSR. Butte LAFCO staff and the consultant team (Kleinschmidt) hosted the meeting on June 21, 2006, at the City of Oroville Council Chambers at 1735 Montgomery Street, Oroville. One district attended the meeting, Richvale Irrigation District. The PowerPoint presentation shown during the meeting is included in Appendix B.
In the days following the meeting, members of the consultant team and Butte LAFCO staff called each district to urge them to respond to the questionnaire and answer their questions about the process. Additionally, in-person meetings and telephone calls were held to clarify information that was provided by those districts that responded.

**GIS**

After detailed research, Butte LAFCO delineated each service provider’s boundaries and Sphere of Influences (SOIs) based on district assessment information provided by the County of Butte Assessor’s Office. The GIS Analyst prepared a map of each district depicting the boundaries, SOIs, and any parcels being assessed district fees that were located outside of district boundaries. The draft maps were mailed to the appropriate districts for review and verification of boundaries and SOIs. Comments received from the districts were used to correct the data and update the maps (Appendix D).

**Butte County Growth and Population Regional Setting**

Historically, population growth in Butte County has been minimal, with the exception of Chico, the largest city in the County. Recently, however, the County has encountered a growth spurt, and is primed to continue this growth into the foreseeable future. Figure 1-3 below illustrates the current population distribution throughout the County in terms of the irrigation, drainage, and reclamation service providers.
The population growth in the region can be projected using several methods. The growth rates projected by Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) have been selected as the basis for the population projections in this MSR as they model the expected growth in the County better than other methods and are uniformly used by other agencies for General Plan purposes. Table 1-1 below contains the expected growth rates for Butte County for the period 2006–2030, including the cities within the County, the unincorporated areas of the County, and the County as a whole.
Table 1-1. Annual Growth Rates for Period 2006–2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroville</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gridley</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte County Total</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Butte Regional Growth Projects 2006–2030. Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG).

Because the boundaries for the irrigation, drainage, and reclamation districts do not coincide with city and county boundaries which were the spatial basis for the BCAG population data, it was necessary to translate the BCAG data to correspond with boundaries of individual districts. Several different methodologies were tested for calculating existing and projected populations. Based on our comparisons, we determined that the best method to estimate the number of people currently living within each district was a per-parcel methodology based on the average number of people per parcel. This per-parcel methodology was selected for a number of reasons, including the following: 1) the number of parcels was easily calculated from existing GIS data; 2) irrigation water is often distributed on a per-parcel basis; and 3) based on our comparisons it provided the most reliable estimate.

The total number of parcels in Butte County and each of the Cities is shown in Table 1-2 below. We divided the total number of people in each jurisdiction by the total number of parcels to determine the average number of people per parcel. Using GIS we calculated the number of parcels within each district and also determined how many of those parcels were within a city or within the unincorporated areas. We then multiplied the number of parcels by the average number of people per parcel to derive an estimate of the total number of people within the district.
It should be noted that BCAG’s 1.1 percent growth rate projected for the unincorporated areas of Butte County is likely high for some of the more rural districts in this report. BCAG growth projections average the higher growth areas surrounding the cities and in the foothills with the very slow growth in the agricultural areas to estimate an average growth rate for all the unincorporated areas of the County. However, the consulting team has utilized BCAG projections throughout the document in order to maintain consistency of population estimates.

### Table 1-2. 2006 Regional Population Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Total # of Parcels</th>
<th>2006 Regional Population Estimate *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biggs</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>1,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>23,344</td>
<td>79,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gridley</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>5,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oroville</td>
<td>5,847</td>
<td>13,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise</td>
<td>11,503</td>
<td>26,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>47,117</td>
<td>90,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total County</strong></td>
<td><strong>90,946</strong></td>
<td><strong>217,209</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Department of Finance

### Butte County Irrigation Regional Setting

The Butte County Agricultural Commissioner’s Office estimated the County’s agricultural production value in 2002 was over $300 million. Rice and almond crops contributed significantly to the total value. The *Butte County Water Inventory and Analysis* (2001) characterizes current agricultural demand in the County in average and dry water years. The report estimates water demand using DWR’s 1997 land-use data, Agricultural Commissioner Reports, and discussions with land owners and water purveyors regarding irrigated crop acreage and irrigation requirements.

The Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation prepared an *Agricultural Water Demand Forecast* (2003) as part of their *Integrated Watershed and Resource Conservation Plan* (2004). The report indicates that the total agricultural demand in the County
is about 1 million acre-feet in a normal water year and 1.1 million acre-feet in a drought year, or about 70 percent and 73 percent of total County water demand, respectively. Butte County has about 230,500 acres of irrigated crop land in a fully cropped, normal year. Rice accounts for about 110,000 acres, or 48 percent of total irrigated acreage. Rice requires approximately 5.5 acre-feet applied water per acre. Other major crops in the County include grain, orchards, and pasture. Orchard crops require an average of 3.6 acre-feet applied water per acre. Butte County has an adequate supply of surface water and groundwater to meet current agricultural demands (Agricultural Water Demand Forecast Technical Memorandum, 2003).

Future agricultural water demand will vary from current demand because of changes in economic, land use, and hydrologic conditions. Recent trends show agricultural land conversion for urban and environmental uses, resulting in less irrigated crop land in production. Cities with potential agricultural land conversions in Butte County include Chico, Oroville, Gridley and Biggs. In addition to urban development, local governments and land trusts in Butte County are purchasing permanent agricultural conservation easements.

**Butte County Drainage and Reclamation Regional Setting**

Butte County encompasses 1,640 square miles and has a 2006 population of 217,209, based on Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) estimates. Butte County is the most populated county north of Sacramento. The Feather and Sacramento Rivers receive water from the creeks and streams that flow southerly through Butte County on their way to the Delta and San Francisco Bay. These rivers support extensive recreational use and fisheries, including salmon and steelhead migration. These rivers are also a major source of domestic and agricultural water for the State of California. A number of drainage districts and Butte County Public Works operate and maintain storm drainage systems that consist of hundreds of miles of open drainage ditches, pipe, and several detention basins. There are seven watersheds within the boundaries for Butte County. They are the Pine Creek Watershed, Big Chico Creek Watershed, Little Chico Creek Watershed, Cherokee Watershed, Feather River/Lower Honcut Creek Watershed, Lake Oroville/Upper Feather River Watershed, and the Butte Creek Watershed.
The drainage districts covered in this MSR are primarily located in the Central Valley portion of Butte County. One drainage district, CSA No. 4, is located in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, north of the Town of Paradise. Topography in the western portion of Butte County is relatively flat and slopes slightly towards the Sacramento River west of the County boundary. Flooding in such low-lying areas is an inherent problem that is a continuing threat as impervious surfacing from new development increases. Drainage districts throughout the County must cope with increasing stormwater runoff and aging infrastructure. While county and City regulations require new development to construct stormwater infrastructure and facilities to mitigate the increase in impervious surfacing, the system as a whole has a finite drainage capacity. Further impacting the capacity of local drainage district infrastructure are flood control efforts by the Department of Reclamation and the Department of Water Resources. During periods of high flows on the Sacramento River, these State agencies ease flood levels by releasing flows into the Butte Sink area and other floodwater detention areas along the Sacramento River. Such activities create a backflow of waters up tributaries that are used by local districts for drainage of low-lying areas within Butte County.

Drainage services in much of southern and western Butte County are provided by a variety of independent drainage districts. Because of the relatively flat topography, proximity to rivers, and history of flooding, it has been difficult to resolve drainage issues. Given this area’s location near the major metropolitan area of Sacramento and relatively easy access to Interstate I-5, economic and social pressure for increased urban development can be anticipated. Changing land uses from agriculture to urban and suburban uses to provide residential housing and other economic opportunities in this area of poor drainage is a challenge. Potential barriers to safely allowing urban development include the lack of a comprehensive drainage plan for the area, lack of a fair funding mechanism, and lack of drainage facilities to support urban (rather than agricultural) land uses.

**Water Quality**

Irrigation, drainage, and reclamation districts are responsible for complying with federal and state water quality regulations. These regulations can be divided into four categories:
1.0 INTRODUCTION

- NPDES Phase II in designated urbanized areas
- Agriculture drainage (Ag Waiver Program)
- Aquatic Pesticide Program
- Water Quality Certification Program

Generally, water quality regulations are managed by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board through their “Regional Board Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, 4th Edition 1998” (Basin Plan). This Basin Plan identifies existing beneficial uses of the Feather River as municipal and domestic supply, agricultural irrigation; contact recreation, canoeing and rafting; non-contact recreation; warm and cold freshwater habitat; warm and cold water migration; warm and cold water spawning and wildlife habitat.

1. NPDES

The 1987 Water Quality Act (WQA) added Section 402(p) to the Clean Water Act (CWA), requiring that U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issue National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for various categories of stormwater discharges. Details about EPA’s administration of this program can be found at: www.epa.gov/region9/water/npdes/stormwater.html

Within California, the NPDES permit program, including stormwater permitting, has been assigned to the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). Details regarding SWRCB’s Municipal Permitting Program can be found at: www.swrcb.ca.gov/stormwtr/municipal.html.

The 1972 amendments to the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) prohibited the discharge of pollutants from point sources to waters of the United States, unless the discharge was authorized by a permit issued under the NPDES permitting program. The 1987 amendments to the CWA added Section 402(p), which defined storm water discharges from certain municipal and industrial activities as point sources that required a NPDES permit. The amendments directed the EPA to adopt regulations
establishing permitting requirements for municipal and industrial storm water discharges. The Phase I amendments also required storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer systems (known as MS4 systems) serving populations greater than 100,000 to obtain coverage under a national surface water permit program. The EPA then developed the Phase II Storm Water Program to include small MS4 systems in urban areas and operators of small construction sites.

In California, the federal NPDES permitting program is implemented through the Porter-Cologne Act, a part of the California Water Code, by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards). The EPA promulgated the NPDES Phase II regulations on December 8, 1999. Municipalities to be addressed in Phase II are defined as any municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4s) not already covered by the Phase I program and defined by the Bureau of Census as an “Urbanized Area,” or on a case-by-case basis on small MS4s located outside of “Urbanized Areas” that the NPDES permitting authority designates.

Runoff from storm water is a discharge if it ultimately may reach a water of the State. Drainage received by those irrigation, drainage, and reclamation districts discussed in the MSR flows downstream and has the potential eventually to reach the Feather and/or Sacramento Rivers. The districts that are located within the designated “urbanized area” are required to comply with the NPDES Phase II requirements. In Butte County, the “urbanized areas” include only geographic areas located near the cities of Chico and Oroville, including the nearby unincorporated areas. This could potentially include areas within the boundaries of South Feather Water and Power Agency, CSA 26, CSA 25, CSA 24, CSA 23, and CSA 4. However, a detailed map of the designated “urbanized area” was not readily available. The RWQCB advises that this compliance is easier to achieve if local dischargers work together. The districts are encouraged to help implement the Storm Water Management Programs (SWMP) that have been approved for local municipalities as described below:
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Chico’s Storm Water Management Program, which was accepted by the State in December 2004 and is due to be updated in 2008, can be viewed at: www.waterboards.ca.gov/stormwtr/docs/chico_swmp.pdf. Butte County’s SWMP, accepted by the State in January 2004 and due to be updated in 2008, can be viewed at: www.waterboards.ca.gov/stormwtr/docs/butte_co_swmp.pdf.

2. Agricultural Drainage

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (found in California Water Code, Division 7) is very broad in scope. The California Water Code regulates any person discharging waste or proposing to discharge waste within any region that could affect the quality of the waters of the State. The term “waste” is very broadly defined and the term “waters of the state” includes all surface water and groundwater within the State, such as natural streams, irrigation ditches or canals ponds, agriculturally-dominated waterways and constructed agricultural drains. Commonly, agricultural irrigation districts provide raw water (i.e., not treated) to farmers for use on crops. After the crops are irrigated, the used water sometimes runs off and returns to the water canal or drain, which can sometimes lead to a mixing of used (drainage) water and supply water traveling to downstream farmers. Eventually, the used (drainage) water flows downstream and discharges into local tributaries and rivers, at which point it is commonly referred to as “spill” water. It is the spill water that is regulated by the RWQCB. Direct discharge may include, for example, discharges directly from piping, tiled rain ditches, or sheet flow to surface waters of the State. Indirect discharge may include discharge from one parcel to another parcel and then to surface waters of the State. The Central Valley Water Board has adopted the irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver to provide a new way for dischargers to comply with the California Water Code.

Resolution No. R5-2003-0105 and the Irrigated Lands Conditional Waiver Program are designed to encourage the development of Coalition Groups. A Coalition Group is any group or entity receiving Regional Water Board approval for its plan to address water quality impacts from irrigated lands. Property owners, farmers, and irrigation
districts can join a Coalition Group to work together to address water quality issues on a regional or sub-watershed basis, and to ensure that resources will be used most effectively.

The next phase of the Agricultural Waiver program is for the RWQCB to develop a 10-year implementation program as required by Resolution No. R5-2003-0105.

3. **Aquatic Pesticide Program**

Local irrigation, drainage, and reclamation districts manage and maintain a variety of infrastructure, including open agricultural ditches and canals, closed pipes, natural and managed watercourses, detention basins, and other infrastructure. Sometimes, algae, invasive weeds, or native vegetation can grow within this infrastructure and create maintenance difficulties for the districts such as blocking flows, reducing capacity in flood control channels, and creating obstacles and hazards. The districts may manage the vegetation using a variety of methods, including removing the vegetation by hand, using other mechanical means (bulldozers, etc.) to remove the vegetation, or chemical treatment. If herbicides or pesticides are proposed for use within a water conveyance, detention basin, or other aquatic area, a permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board is required. The permit is called a NPDES General Permit (Water Quality Order 2004-0009-DWQ, Statewide General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit for the Discharge of Aquatic Pesticides for Aquatic Weed Control in Waters of the United States General Permit No. CAG990005). A few exceptions are allowed as described in NPDES Policy Section 5.3 Exceptions. Details can be found at the following web site:

www.swrcb.ca.gov/npdes/docs/aquatic/permit.pdf

To obtain coverage under this General Permit, a discharger must submit a completed Notice of Intent, a vicinity map, and an annual fee to the Central Valley RWQCB.
4. Water Quality Certification Program

Activities such as dredging, filling, pipeline construction, levee reconstruction, wetland habitat improvement, pier installation, boat harbor dredging, gravel mining, flood control excavation, minor stream crossings, and other construction-related activities that are located in a wetland or “waters of the U.S.” require a permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Water Quality Certification (WQC) program is administered Pursuant to §401 of the Clean Water Act and applies to any applicant for a federal license or permit for activities that may result in any discharge into waters of the U.S. shall provide the federal permitting agency (i.e., Army Corps of Engineers) with a certification from the respective State. The WQC Program started as a relatively narrow response to the requirements of CWA §401. It has evolved into being the State’s de facto wetland protection regulation program.

If a local irrigation, drainage, or reclamation district proposes to conduct activities such as those described above within or near waters of the U.S., then approval from the appropriate regulatory agencies should be sought.

In summary, local irrigation, drainage, and reclamation districts are responsible for complying with federal and state water quality regulations as described in the preceding paragraphs.

General Observations

During the course of preparing this MSR, the consultant team observed that many of the districts would benefit from an improved process for preparing GIS maps of boundaries, infrastructure, facilities and other important physical features. Generally, the responsibility for providing accurate data and maps lies with each district. However, many of the districts are small in size and have correspondingly small budgets and limited computer capability. In the long-run, improved spatial data and maps would be very beneficial to each district. To improve the process for preparing GIS maps, the districts may consider reaching an agreement/contract with other entities to provide these services. Potential GIS service providers may include Butte
LAFCO, Butte County, non-profit organizations, or private consultants. There is no universal approach for the provision of GIS services for each district and the different districts may vary in the amount and timing of GIS information needed.

Many of the districts will face a future challenge of aging infrastructure. It is anticipated that districts will meet this challenge through a variety of mechanisms including regular maintenance, repairs, inspections, and replacement as needed. When districts appear before LAFCO with requests to expand or annex Sphere of Influence areas, we recommend that LAFCO ask the pertinent district(s) to describe how they will cope with aging infrastructure issues.

While preparing this MSR the consultants observed that many of the districts are unclear about LAFCO’s role and mission. Informal outreach by LAFCO staff to the districts may assist LAFCO by improving communication and clarifying regulations. It is suggested that LAFCO host an informal, annual gathering to provide the opportunity for an open forum in which district representatives can ask questions and bring forth suggestions.

Through the preparation of this MSR it was noted that there are a number of districts that have overlapping services and boundaries. Additionally, there are a number of districts that have insufficient staff or resources to provide internal administration and/or maintenance duties. Below is a matrix summarizing the inter-relationship between the districts and the services they provide (Table 1-3).
### Table 1-3. Matrix summary of district services, administration and management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provided</th>
<th>District Management*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>Drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Feather Power and Water Agency</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Mutual Water Company</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biggs-West Gridley Water District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte Water District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canal Water District (WCWD)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richvale Irrigation District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District No. 1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District No. 2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District No. 100</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District No. 200</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte Creek Drainage District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 87</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Reclamation District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento River Reclamation District</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation District No. 833 (RD833)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates how internal management services are provided. An X indicates that the duty is provided internally by district staff. Those districts that did not respond to the requests for information are indicated with a Not Available (N/A).
General Determinations

A number of general determinations regarding the service districts were made during the preparation of this MSR, which are listed in the table below.

Summary of General Determinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irrigation Regional Setting</th>
<th>Butte County has an adequate supply of surface water and groundwater to meet the County’s current agricultural demands.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Future agricultural water demand will vary from current demand because of changes in economic, land use, and hydrologic conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Many of the districts will face a future challenge of aging infrastructure. It is anticipated that districts will meet this challenge through a variety of mechanisms including regular maintenance, repairs, inspections, and replacement as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Topography in the western portion of Butte County is relatively flat and slopes slightly towards the Sacramento River west of the County boundary. Flooding in such low-lying areas is an inherent problem that is a continuing threat as impervious surfacing from new development increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Further impacting the capacity of local drainage district infrastructure are flood control efforts by the Department of Reclamation and Department of Water Resources, which at times creates a backflow of waters up tributaries that are used by local districts for drainage of low-lying areas within Butte County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A substantive, comprehensive, and regional drainage plan is needed to support anticipated urban growth in the southern and western portions of Butte County. Such a drainage plan should include mitigation fees or other funding mechanism to provide the needed facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7 | Water Quality Compliance with water quality regulations is managed by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board through their “Regional Board Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, 4th Edition 1998” (Basin Plan). Irrigation, drainage, and reclamation districts are responsible for complying with federal and state water quality regulations, including the following four programs:  
  - NPDES Phase II in designated urbanized areas  
  - Agriculture drainage (Ag Waiver Program)  
  - Aquatic Pesticide Program  
  - Water Quality Certification Program |
| 8 | General Observations Many of the districts are small in size and have correspondingly small budgets and limited computer capability. In the long-run, improved spatial data and maps would be very beneficial to each district. To improve the project for preparing GIS maps, the districts may consider reaching an agreement/contract with other entities to provide these services. |
| 9 | Informal outreach by LAFCO staff to the districts may assist LAFCO by improving communication and clarifying regulations. |
PROFILE – SOUTH FEATHER WATER AND POWER AGENCY

Provider Name: South Feather Water and Power Agency
Contact Person: Michael Glaze, General Manager
Address: 2310 Oro-Quincy Highway, Oroville, CA 95966
Phone: (530) 533-4578

Service Area Information

Land Area: 31,000 acres
Number of Parcels: 9,273
Population: 18,278

Date of Formation: November 17, 1919
Enabling Legislation: California Water Code, Irrigation District Law, Division 11, §20500 et seq.

Governing Body: Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dee Hunter</td>
<td>Division 1</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Meyer</td>
<td>Division 2</td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Moreland</td>
<td>Division 3</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Edwards</td>
<td>Division 4</td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Cecchi</td>
<td>Division 5</td>
<td>Dec 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Domestic and Irrigation Water Services, Hydro Generation
Synopsis of Provider: The South Feather Water and Power Agency provides domestic and irrigation water to portions of southeastern Butte County, including the eastern portion of the City of Oroville and the unincorporated areas south and east of the City. The majority of the Agency’s water is used for agricultural irrigation. However, there is a general trend in increased domestic water demand.
PROFILE – DURHAM MUTUAL WATER COMPANY

Provider Name: Durham Mutual Water Company
Contact Person: Jonathon Mulder
Address: 1807 Durham Dayton Highway, Durham, CA 95938
Phone: (530) 342-9324

Service Area Information

Land Area: unknown
Number of Parcels: unknown
Population: unknown

Date of Formation: unknown
Enabling Legislation: unknown

Governing Body: unknown

Provided Services: Durham Mutual Water Company is a private water district and is not subject to LAFCO regulations and MSR requirements.

Synopsis of Provider: The service provider did not respond to a request for information.
PROFILE – BIGGS-WEST GRIDLEY WATER DISTRICT

Provider Name: Biggs-West Gridley Water District
Contact Person: Bernoy Bradford, Manager
Address: 1713 West Biggs-Gridley Road, Gridley, CA 95948
Phone: (530) 846-3317

Service Area Information

Land Area: approximately 32,000 acres
Number of Parcels: 909
Population: 1,749

Date of Formation: 1942
Enabling Legislation: California Water Codes, Division 13, Part 2

Governing Body: Board of Directors

Current Directors | Office | Term Expires
--- | --- | ---
Ralph “Dick” Cassady | President | 2007
Dick Storm | Vice President | 2009
Gary Justeson | Member | 2009
Phillip Haynes | Member | 2009
Thomas Coleman | Member | 2007

Provided Services: Agricultural irrigation
Synopsis of Provider: Biggs-West Gridley Water District is an agricultural water supplier that provides surface water from the Feather River. It also provides water to the 8,500 acres of the Gray Lodge Wildlife Area in its service area, as well as to the remainder of the refuge.

The service provider did not respond to a request for information.
PROFILE – BUTTE WATER DISTRICT

Provider Name: Butte Water District
Contact Person: Mark Orme, Manager
Address: 735 Virginia Street, Gridley, CA 95948
Phone: (530) 846-3100

Service Area Information

Land Area: 18,030 acres
Number of Parcels: 2,194
Population: 4,217

Date of Formation: July 1956
Enabling Legislation: California Water Code, Division 13, §20200 et seq.

Governing Body: Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Waller, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Giovannetti, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Bozzo, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Pantaleoni, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Correa, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Agricultural irrigation

Synopsis of Provider: Butte Water District provides irrigation services to parcels that are primarily intensive agricultural in nature. The District is located directly south of the Thermalito Afterbay and is bordered by the Feather River to the east.
PROFILE – WESTERN CANAL WATER DISTRICT

Provider Name: Western Canal Water District  
Contact Person: Ted Trimble, General Manager  
Address: PO Box 190, Richvale, CA 95974  
Phone: (530) 342-5083

Service Area Information

Land Area: 62,974 acres  
Number of Parcels: 673  
Population: 1,292

Date of Formation: December 1984  
Enabling Legislation: California Water Code, Division 13, §20200 et seq.

Governing Body: Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Larrabee, President</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Anderson, Vice President</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer Lundberg, Director</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Tennis, Director</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milt LaMalfa, Director</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Agricultural and environmental irrigation
Synopsis of Provider: Western Canal Water District provides irrigation services to parcels in intensive agricultural production. The District is located to the north and west of the unincorporated community of Richvale and extends into Glenn County, although no services are currently provided to that County. The District also serves approximately 856 acres within Butte County, which fall outside of the boundaries of the District.
PROFILE – RICHLVALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Provider Name: Richvale Irrigation District
Contact Person: Brad Mattson, Manager
Address: 1193 Richvale Highway, Richvale, CA (Mail: PO Box 147, Richvale, CA 95974)
Phone: (530) 882-4243

Service Area Information

Land Area: 34,150 acres
Number of Parcels: 517
Population: 993

Date of Formation: July 7, 1930
Enabling Legislation: California Water Code, Division 11, §20500 et seq.

Governing Body: Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gene Harris, President</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Meyer, Director</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Job, Director</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Mattson, Treasurer/Assessor</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Agricultural irrigation

Synopsis of Provider: The Richvale Irrigation District provides irrigation water services to the rural areas surrounding Richvale, the predominant land use of which is intensive agricultural. The small agricultural community of Richvale, although contained within the District boundaries, is not served by the District.
PROFILE – DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 1

Provider Name: Drainage District No. 1
Contact Person: Jeff Spence, District Engineer
Address: PO Box 876, Gridley, CA 95948
Phone: (530) 671-1008

Service Area Information

Land Area: 6,249 acres
Number of Parcels: 845
Population: 1,624

Date of Formation: District bylaws recorded in 1908
Enabling Legislation: Drainage District Act of 1885, Uncodified Acts, Act 2200

Governing Body: Board of Trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trustees</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darin Pantaleoni</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Campbell</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Stowe</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Irrigation and stormwater drainage

Synopsis of Provider: The service provider did not respond to a request for information.
PROFILE – DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 2

Provider Name: Drainage District No. 2
Contact Person: Ted Trimble, General Manager
Address: PO Box 190, Richvale, CA 95974
Phone: (530) 342-5083

Service Area Information

Land Area: 7,587 acres
Number of Parcels: 51
Population: 98

Date of Formation: February 3, 1920
Enabling Legislation: Section 5 of Act 985 of the Legislation of the State of California, entitled “An Act to Promote Drainage”

Governing Body: Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Sheppard</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Thengvall</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Lundberg</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Irrigation and stormwater drainage

Synopsis of Provider: Drainage District No. 2 is located south and west of the community of Nelson. It provides maintenance on primary drainage ditches and approximately eight miles of Little Dry Creek for the purpose of conveyance of irrigation and stormwater drainage.
PROFILE – DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 100

Provider Name: Drainage District No. 100
Contact Person: John Marta, Assistant Secretary
Address: PO Box 386, Richvale, CA, 95974
Phone: (530) 882-4212

Service Area Information

Land Area: 27,013 acres
Number of Parcels: 486
Population: 933

Date of Formation: August 30, 1915
Enabling Legislation: California Water Act of 1913

Governing Body: Board of Trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Lundburg</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Thengvall</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Arens</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Irrigation and stormwater drainage

Synopsis of Provider: Drainage District No. 100 provides drainage of irrigation flows and stormwater flows for the unincorporated areas of Butte County surrounding the residential farming communities of Richvale and Nelson.
PROFILE – DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 200

Provider Name: Drainage District No. 200
Contact Person: Paul Minasian, Legal Counsel
Address: PO Box 1679, Oroville, CA 95965
Phone: (530) 533-2885

Service Area Information

Land Area: 5,528 acres
Number of Parcels: 91
Population: 175

Date of Formation: unknown
Enabling Legislation: Drainage District Act of 1903, Uncodified Acts 2200

Governing Body: Board of Trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trustees</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milton LaMalfa, Trustee/President</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Irrigation and stormwater drainage

Synopsis of Provider: The service provider did not respond to a request for information.
PROFILE – BUTTE CREEK DRAINAGE DISTRICT

Provider Name: Butte Creek Drainage District
Contact Person: Ted Trimble, General Manager
Address: PO Box 190, Richvale, CA 95974
Phone: (530) 342-5083

Service Area Information

Land Area: 47,852 acres
Number of Parcels: 321
Population: 616

Date of Formation: November 27, 1920
Enabling Legislation: “An Act to Promote Drainage” Section 5 of Act 985

Governing Body: Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Larrabee</td>
<td>November 1, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Tennis</td>
<td>November 1, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Harris</td>
<td>November 1, 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Irrigation and stormwater drainage

Synopsis of Provider: Butte Creek Drainage District provides maintenance and drainage services of irrigation and stormwater flows to areas of southwestern Butte County and southeastern Glenn County, including the small agricultural community of Nelson. Its primary purpose is to provide maintenance of the main drainage ditches, Smith Bridge and the Moulton Cut in the Butte Sink area.
PROFILE – CSA NO. 4 – SIERRA DEL ORO DRAINAGE

Provider Name: Sierra Del Oro Drainage (CSA No. 4)
Contact Person: Tom Blixt, Senior Administrative Analyst
Address: 7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA  95965
Phone: (530) 538-7266

Service Area Information

Land Area: 2,615 acres
Number of Parcels: 4,473
Population: 8,588

Date of Formation: July 23, 1963
Enabling Legislation: County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2 Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1)

Governing Body: Butte County Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Street lighting, water quality testing, and maintenance of stormwater drainage facilities
Synopsis of Provider: Sierra Del Oro Drainage (CSA No. 4) provides maintenance of stormwater drainage facilities to residential property owners in the Paradise Pines area north of the Town of Paradise. Its primary purpose is to provide maintenance of roadside drainage ditches and swales.
PROFILE – CSA NO. 23 – PLEASANT VALLEY DRAINAGE

Provider Name: Pleasant Valley Drainage (CSA No. 23)
Contact Person: Tom Blixt, Senior Administrative Analyst
Address: 7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA  95965
Phone: (530) 538-7266

Service Area Information

Land Area: 663 acres
Number of Parcels: 2,015
Population: 6,403

Date of Formation: December 28, 1965
Enabling Legislation: County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1)

Governing Body: Butte County Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services: Maintenance of stormwater drainage facilities
Synopsis of Provider: Pleasant Valley Drainage (CSA No. 23) is a storm drainage maintenance and assessment district. While most of the area within CSA No. 23 lies in the City of Chico, the remainder is County jurisdiction that is currently in the process of being annexed into the City, at which time CSA No. 23 will be fully within the City limits.
# PROFILE – CSA NO. 24 – CHICO MUD CREEK DRAINAGE

**Provider Name:** Chico Mud Creek Drainage (CSA No. 24)

**Contact Person:** Tom Blixt, Senior Administrative Analyst

**Address:** 7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA, 95965

**Phone:** (530) 538-7266

## Service Area Information

**Land Area:** 14,533 acres

**Number of Parcels:** 14,214

**Population:** 43,931

**Date of Formation:** December 28, 1965

**Enabling Legislation:** County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1)

**Governing Body:** Butte County Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provided Services:** Maintenance of stormwater drainage facilities
Synopsis of Provider: Chico Mud Creek Drainage (CSA No. 24) maintains drainage and flood protection infrastructure for provision of stormwater flows, primarily maintenance of project levees and the Lindo Channel Diversion Structure. CSA No. 24 lies in the northwestern portion of Butte County and includes the northern portion of the City of Chico.
PROFILE – CSA NO. 25 – SHASTA UNION DRAINAGE

**Provider Name:** Shasta Union Drainage (CSA No. 25)

**Contact Person:** Tom Blixt, Senior Administrative Analyst

**Address:** 7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA  95965

**Phone:** (530) 538-7266

**Service Area Information**

**Land Area:** 2,465 acres  
**Number of Parcels:** 3,400  
**Population:** 10,247

**Date of Formation:** December 28, 1965

**Enabling Legislation:** County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1)

**Governing Body:** Butte County Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Provided Services:** Maintenance of stormwater drainage facilities
Synopsis of Provider: Shasta Union Drainage (CSA No. 25) provides storm drainage maintenance services. Existing land use within the CSA boundaries is primarily urban with a few agricultural parcels. Land use jurisdiction of the areas within the CSA are shared, with some of the development occurring in the City of Chico and some in the unincorporated area of the County. Upon completion of current annexations, approximately 65 percent of CSA No. 25 will be within the City of Chico’s boundaries.
PROFILE – CSA NO. 87 – KEEFER ROAD AND ROCK CREEK DRAINAGE

Provider Name:  Keefer Road and Rock Creek Drainage (CSA No. 87)
Contact Person:  Tom Blixt, Senior Administrative Analyst
Address:  7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA  95965
Phone:  (530) 538-7266

Service Area Information

Land Area:  3,315 acres
Number of Parcels:  1,023
Population:  1,970

Date of Formation:  August 9, 1983
Enabling Legislation:  County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1).  Board of Supervisors Resolution Nos. 83-130 and 91-61; Local Area Formation Commission of Butte County Resolution Nos. 82-28 and 91-35; California Government Code Section 61000

Governing Body:  Butte County Board of Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided Services:  An inactive drainage district
Synopsis of Provider: Keefer Road and Rock Creek Drainage (CSA No. 87) was most recently utilized as a planning tool and funding mechanism for the planning and environmental review process for the North Chico Specific Plan. It lies primarily within the unincorporated area of Butte County, adjacent to the northwest boundary of the City of Chico. Although the CSA was originally formed to serve as a stormwater drainage assessment and maintenance entity, it no longer functions as such; nor does it currently provide any other services.
PROFILE – ROCK CREEK RECLAMATION DISTRICT

Provider Name: Rock Creek Reclamation District
Contact Person: Paul Behr, Trustee
Address: 5556 Wilson Landing Road, Chico, CA 95973
Phone: (530) 345-3412

Service Area Information

Land Area: 4,644 acres
Number of Parcels: 76
Population: 146

Date of Formation: unknown
Enabling Legislation: The District was formed pursuant to Resolution No. 85-167 and Section 50000 et. seq. of the California Water Code.

Governing Body: Board of Trustees

Current Trustees | Term Expires
--- | ---
Paul Behr | Unknown
Bob Vanella, Trustee | December 2007
Robert Hennigan, Trustee | December 2007
Bruce McGowan | Unknown
Unknown

Provided Services: Flood control and drainage

Synopsis of Provider: Rock Creek Reclamation District provides flood control services to agricultural and single-family residential parcels in the area surrounding the community of Nord in northern Butte County.
PROFILE – SACRAMENTO RIVER RECLAMATION DISTRICT

Provider Name: Sacramento River Reclamation District
Contact Person: Paul R. Minasian, Legal Counsel
Address: PO Box 1679, Oroville, CA 95965
Phone: (530) 533-2885

Service Area Information

Land Area: 20,725 acres
Number of Parcels: 139
Population: 267

Date of Formation: November 8, 1999
Enabling Legislation: Water Code Section 50000, et seq

Governing Body: Board of Trustees

Current Trustees
Shirley Lewis, President/Trustee
Richard Wright, Trustee
Peter D. Peterson, Trustee
Jim Paiva, Trustee
Roy Roney, Trustee
Donald O’Dell, Trustee
Mark Peterson, Trustee

Provided Services: Address the needs of landowners relating to Sacramento River flooding.
Synopsis of Provider: Sacramento River Reclamation District provides flood control coordination services to agricultural and single-family residential parcels on the east side of the Sacramento River, north of Big Chico Creek. The primary purpose of the District is to coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide for the maintenance of existing land features including existing levees given flooding and erosion threats. Additionally, the District serves as a vehicle for obtaining flood control monies from State and federal sources as it becomes available.
PROFILE – RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833

Provider Name: Reclamation District No. 833
Contact Person: Charles O. Nuchols, Manager
Address: PO Box 247, Gridley, CA 95948
Phone: (530) 846-3303

Service Area Information

Land Area: 38,025 acres
Number of Parcels: 4,099
Population: 9,468

Date of Formation: 1921
Enabling Legislation: State Reclamation Act

Governing Body: Board of Trustees

Current Trustees Term Expires
Charles H. Johnson, Jr., President December 2007
William B. Fiedler, Trustee December 2007
Dane Andes, Trustee November 2009

Provided Services: Flood control and drainage

Synopsis of Provider: Maintain primary drainages for conveyance of irrigation water and stormwater from approximately 38,000 acres surrounding the incorporated cities of Biggs and Gridley in southwestern Butte County. The District also owns and operates a 720-acre property in the Butte Sink located in Sutter County for drain-water management, duck hunting, and farming.
2.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY IRRIGATION SERVICE PROVIDER
2.1 SOUTH FEATHER WATER AND POWER AGENCY

Agency Characteristics

The South Feather Water and Power Agency (SFWPA/Agency), formerly known as the Oroville-Wyandotte Irrigation District, provides domestic and irrigation water to portions of southeastern Butte County (Figure 2-1). The Agency was established in 1919 and occupies approximately 32,000 acres, including the eastern portion of the City of Oroville and the unincorporated areas south and east of the City. While the majority of the Agency’s water is used for agricultural irrigation purposes, it also provides water for domestic water and hydropower. SFWPA has begun the process of re-licensing its hydropower project through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), which is scheduled for completion in 2009. The Agency anticipates submitting a re-license application to FERC in March 2007. The current license will expire April 1, 2009. The SFWPA is located in the Feather River/Lower Honcut Watershed.

Agency Size: Approximately 31,000 acres
Parcels within District: 9,273
Estimated Population within District: 18,278
Office Location: 2310 Oro-Quincy Highway, Oroville, CA 95966
Services: Domestic and Irrigation Water Services, Hydro Generation
Employees: 60 full-time, 1 temporary
Date of Formation: November 1919
Enabling Legislation: California Water Code, Division 11, §20500 et seq
Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected (5, 10, 15, 20 Year Time Frame)

The Agency currently provides domestic and agricultural water services to approximately 18,278 people, with the majority of the population residing within and immediately surrounding the City of Oroville (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). Figure 2-2 offers population projections to 2030. The Butte County Association of Governments 2006–2030 growth projections for the City of Oroville are 4.6 percent and the unincorporated areas of Butte County are 1.1 percent.

Figure 2-2. South Feather Water and Power Agency Estimated Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>18,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>19,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>22,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>23,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>25,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The area served by SFWPA is located south of Lake Oroville and southeast of the Feather River. Most of the area is in the unincorporated areas of Butte County and includes the small
2.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY IRRIGATION SERVICE PROVIDER

communities of Palermo, Kelly Ridge, Wyandotte, and Bangor. Land use in the unincorporated areas is primarily agricultural, with citrus and olives being some of the most common crops. Although only approximately five percent of the Agency jurisdiction lies within the City of Oroville, the unincorporated lands surrounding the City of Oroville to the east are largely urbanized. Land uses in the City are regulated by the City’s General Plan. The predominant land uses in this portion of the City and surrounding unincorporated lands include single-family residences, mobile home parks and schools.

Though 73 percent of the Agency’s distributed water currently goes to agricultural irrigation customers, domestic water services are expected to increase substantially over the next 20 years as agricultural land is converted to urban uses. Agricultural irrigation customers comprise only approximately 550 of the 7,200 water diversions, the remaining being domestic water users, which include homes, schools, and businesses. Approximately 9,500 acres within the Agency’s boundaries produce agricultural crops, which consume approximately 15,153 acre-feet per year (AFY) of raw water. No increase in demand for agricultural water is anticipated (Figure 2-3).

**Figure 2-3. SFWPA Water Demand Projections 2005–2025**

![Water Demand Projections Diagram](chart.png)

Source: SFWPA Urban Water Management Plan 2006
The Agency’s service area is bordered on the west by Oroville and to the north by Lake Oroville and the Thermalito Diversion Canal. The topography to the east somewhat restricts residential growth in that direction. Because of these constraints, most of the residential growth that is expected to be serviced by the Agency will likely occur in the areas immediately surrounding the City of Oroville and south. Given that domestic water uses tend to utilize less water on a per-acre basis compared to agricultural uses, it is assumed that the SFWPA has adequate supplies to meet projected future needs.

There has been some discrepancy between the Agency and LAFCO in regards to the location of the Agency’s boundaries and Sphere of Influence. The two entities are currently working to update and resolve the difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Determination SFWPA-1 (Growth):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-1</strong> The population in the area served by SFWPA will continue to grow at a rate of approximately 4.6 percent annually in the City of Oroville area and 1.1 percent in the unincorporated areas of Butte County per BCAG’s 2006–2030 growth rate projections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-2</strong> The Agency and LAFCO will continue to work together to resolve the boundary discrepancies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/Detention

The SFWPA’s 2004 report entitled “Water System Conveyance Evaluation” provides details and analysis of the Agency’s water conveyance system. The Agency’s water supply is provided primarily from the upper watershed of the South Fork of the Feather River and the upper portion of the Slate Creek watershed. This water is diverted through a series of dams, canals, and tunnels before it reaches Miner’s Ranch Reservoir, the system’s terminal reservoir. Since the mid-1990s, the agency has been implementing its Capital Improvement Plan to replace aging
water transportation infrastructure. As a result of the proactive nature of the Agency’s maintenance program, the number of leaks in the domestic water distribution system has been dramatically reduced.

The approximately 110 miles of canals, ditches, and pipelines that provide irrigation water to the Agency’s agricultural customers are currently undergoing prioritization and rehabilitation. Historically, ditches may have lost as much as 90 percent of the water in the system before reaching a paying customer. The Agency is taking a programmatic approach to identify sections of the irrigation distribution system that experience the greatest seepage and subsequently implement prioritized canal lining projects. Some sections of the canals have already been lined with gunite to remedy more severe leakage problems.

The Agency indicates that additional storage will be needed in the future as the Agency’s domestic water customer base grows. Surplus property was recently sold by the Agency, and a portion of the proceeds were placed into a reserve account restricted for the purpose of purchasing property upon which to build future storage facilities. The location and size of future storage will be determined through a soon-to-be-completed distribution model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination SFWPA-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1 There will likely be a need for additional water storage facilities in the future as the Agency’s domestic water customer base grows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Capacity

The Agency’s water is diverted through a series of dams, canals, and tunnels, where it is finally delivered to the Miner’s Ranch Reservoir, which serves as the terminal reservoir for the system. The Agency has pre-1914 and appropriated water rights on the South Fork of the Feather River and its tributaries that exceed the actual yield of said watershed.
South Feather Water and Power Agency’s average annual consumption is approximately 28,000 AF (acre-feet), with one-quarter (7,000 AF) of that being delivered to residential users and the rest (21,000 AF) going to agricultural users. SFWPA expects the annual demand for agricultural irrigation water services to remain constant for the next 10 to 20 years, and then it is anticipated the demand will gradually decrease over the next 20 to 30 years as illustrated in Figure 2-3. Conversely, the demand for domestic water services is expected to increase significantly in the future as agricultural land is converted to urban uses.

The Agency has water rights that exceed the annual yield of the watershed (see Table 2-1). The State Water Resources Control Board currently has a petition pending that will limit the domestic consumption in the Agency’s service area to 51,000 acre-feet (AF) annually. However, this petition will not affect agricultural irrigation water services. Although the yield from the watershed declines in dry years, these water rights do not change.

The Agency has water storage available for both raw and treated water. The Agency has five raw-water storage reservoirs with a combined capacity of 171,500 acre-feet. Agency-owned raw-water reservoirs include the following reservoirs: Little Grass Valley, Miners Ranch, Ponderosa, Lost Creek, and Sly Creek. Additionally, four treated water storage tanks have a combined capacity of 5.2 MG (million gallons). The Agency operates a water treatment plant.
with a capacity of 14.5 MGD. The SFWPA’s 2006 report entitled “Urban Water Management Plan” (Draft) provides details regarding the Agency’s water supply, water demands, and capacity to meet projected demands.

It should be noted that California Water Service Company (a private water district serving the City of Oroville) has extended its service area into a small portion of the northeast corner of the SFWPA service area, and provides domestic water service there.

**Determination SFWPA-3 (Capacity):**

| 3-1 | There will likely be a need for additional domestic water storage capacity in the future as the Agency’s domestic customer base grows and demand increases. |

C. Facilities

The Agency’s facilities include a number of canals, ditches, reservoirs, water treatment plants, and various offices and warehouses.

The Agency’s offices are located in the City of Oroville on Oro-Quincy Highway. They are currently undergoing a comprehensive renovation and expansion to upgrade the facilities to meet current health and safety standards and to provide much-needed room for staff and administrative functions.

The SFWPA’s 2004 report entitled “Water System Conveyance Evaluation” provides details and analysis of the Agency’s water conveyance system and facilities. SFWPA maintains over 112 miles of irrigation canals, ditches, and pipelines that originally were intended for mining purposes. Historically, the irrigation ditches were earthen-lined, and as much as 90 percent of the water was lost during transport due to leaks, seepage, and evapotranspiration. The Agency is in the process of identifying sections of the irrigation distribution system that experience the greatest seepage and subsequently implement prioritized canal lining projects. Some sections of the canals have already been lined with gunite to remedy more severe leakage problems.
**FINANCING AND RATE RestructURING**

Annual audit reports and financial statements from FYs 2001–03 for the Agency were reviewed in accordance with LAFCO’s 2003 MSR Guidelines to determine fiscal viability, suitability of current funding practices, and potential fiscal impacts resulting from new legislation.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations, unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. The Agency is subject to annual State Controller audits in July of every fiscal year; however, the Agency has not been submitting its annual budgets to the County Auditor. As a result of a recent opinion letter from the Agency’s legal counsel, the Agency indicated that it would begin doing so, starting with the 2005 budget.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment- and property-related fees, and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. In accordance with Proposition 218 requirements, the Agency increased rates by $4.10 per account each month (the “State Budget Bailout Charge”) in order to offset the loss of revenue resulting from a legislated Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund shift.

The FY 2002–03 annual audit noted no material weaknesses in financial reporting or operations. A material weakness is a condition in which one or more of the internal control components does not ensure accuracy in financial statements or provide adequate internal oversight.

The Agency audits and budgets present information related to both the overall fiscal viability of SFWPA as a whole, and separately analyze the Water and Power Divisions. In FY 2002–03, assets of the Agency exceeded liabilities by $32,955,854; of this amount $3,714,351
(unrestricted net assets) may be used to meet the Agency’s ongoing operational needs. Water Division operating revenues increased by four percent ($168,928) from FY ending 2002; Power Division operating revenues declined by 12 percent ($969,135). Water Division operating expenses increased by 9.8 percent ($403,982); Power Division operating expenses increased by 16.8 percent ($949,355). Total long-term debt increased by $2,607,503 and was reduced by $2,369,470 in principal repayments.

In FY 2002–03, Water Division expenses totaled $4,863,904, which included salaries and wages, bond interest payable, contractor bonds payable, deferred revenues, serial bonds payable, installment payment agreements, and contracts payable. Program revenues included charges for services ($4,352,218), operating grants and contributions ($695,617), and capital grants and contributions ($50,336). Revenues exceeded expenditures by $234,267. Water Division assets consist of current assets (cash, accounts receivable, inventory, and prepaid expenses); non-current assets (restricted cash, investments, and interest receivable); capital assets (land, construction, and FERC re-licensing); loans receivable and deferred expenses. Total assets equaled $31,550,782, 66 percent of which were capital assets.

**Figure 2-4. Financial Summary for South Feather Water and Power Agency.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>Total Net Assets (not provided)</th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$5,558,308</td>
<td>$3,724,124</td>
<td>$3,963,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>$4,966,222</td>
<td>$3,963,373</td>
<td>$3,724,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$5,789,837</td>
<td>$4,275,366</td>
<td>$4,966,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Liabilities include current liabilities such as accounts payable, salaries payable, bond interest payable; and long-term liabilities such as serial bonds payable, installments payable, and
contracts payable. FY 2002–03 liabilities totaled $9,311,909. Net assets for the Water Division totaled $22,238,873.

The Agency charges $0.64 per unit (100 cubic feet) for the first 100 units of water, and $0.25 for every unit thereafter, together with a fixed $15.00/month service charge. Rates charged by the Agency are significantly cheaper in comparison with rates charged by California Water Service Company (serving Oroville).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination SFWPA-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1 Revenues exceed expenditures; current rates charged for services are appropriate, and are significantly less than the rates charged by California Water Service Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2 The Agency has been in noncompliance with Government Code Section 53901 but has agreed to come into compliance starting with the 2005 budgets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The information in this section of the report was excerpted from the Butte LAFCO MSR for Domestic Water and Wastewater Services, February 2006.

The Agency is a member of the Association of California Water Agencies Joint Powers Insurance Authority, which provides SFWPA’s property, liability, auto, worker’s compensation, and employee crime policies. The Agency also invests funds with the Local Agency Investment Fund, which is a California State Treasury fund through which local governments may pool investments.

The Agency has developed agreements with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to facilitate development, acquisition, construction, and operation of several hydroelectric powerhouses operated by SFWPA. In one agreement, the Agency constructed and operated a series of dams, reservoirs, and powerhouses called the South Fork Power Project. According to the South Fork Power Purchase Contract, all electric power generated by the facilities must be
sold to PG&E, which has agreed to pay all debt service on the revenue bonds used to finance the project, plus a stipend of $12,500 each month. The contract for sale of electricity to PG&E expires in 2010.

Historically, the Agency has applied for grants and issued revenue bonds to finance construction and replacement of infrastructure. In 2001, the Agency applied for and received a grant from the Department of Water Resources for partial funding for a canal-lining project. In 2003, the Agency issued certificates of participation in the amount of $2,695,000 to finance a solar photovoltaic electricity generation system for the Miner’s Ranch Treatment Plant.

Other cost avoidance measures include agreements with Yuba County Water District in which the District will begin maintaining 10.5 miles of SFWPA ditch after 2010; replacing leaking infrastructure, thus saving on repair costs; and installing solar panels, which help pay for the operation of the treatment plant. Additionally, Agency crews participate in new service installations (other than subdivisions); their staff time costs are compensated by the customer. There appear to be limited opportunities for facilities sharing.

**Determination SFWPA-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):**

| 6-1 The Agency utilizes a sufficient range of cost avoidance practices in its operations. No facilities or equipment sharing arrangements exist; this situation has not resulted in increased costs or a reduction in the level of service provided to customers. |

**GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The information in this section of the report was excerpted from the Butte LAFCO MSR for Domestic Water and Wastewater Services, February 2006.

The Agency was originally established in 1919 as an Irrigation District under Irrigation District Law, Division 11, of the Water Code (Section 20500 et seq.) of the State of California (available at www.leginfo.gov).
The Agency is governed by an elected five-member Board of Directors, which serves as the decision-making authority for SFWPA. Each director must be a voter within the Agency boundaries and a resident of the division they represent at the time of their nomination and throughout their term; directors are elected by voters who are residents of the District.

As of January 2007, the Board of Directors is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dee Hunter</td>
<td>Division 1</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Meyer</td>
<td>Division 2</td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Moreland</td>
<td>Division 3</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Edwards</td>
<td>Division 4</td>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Cecchi</td>
<td>Division 5</td>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board members receive a fixed monthly fee of $500, which has not seen an increase in the past 15 years. Board meetings are held on the fourth Tuesday of every month at 2:00 p.m. in the Agency office conference room at 2310 Oroville-Quincy Highway in Oroville. Meeting schedules and agendas for open meetings are posted on the Agency’s web site at least 72 hours prior to each meeting, and Board meeting announcements are also provided to the local newspaper. Contact information for each Board member is provided on SFWPA’s web site. On average, four members of the public attend the monthly meetings. The General Manager is responsible for ensuring Agency compliance with the Brown Act with support from the Agency’s legal counsel.

The Agency’s Environmental and Safety Compliance Officer is responsible for ensuring compliance with rules and regulations regarding environmental and safety issues. The Agency’s Water Division Manager is responsible for rules and regulations regarding water distribution. The Agency feels that its current boundaries and sphere of influence are appropriate for the services it provides.
SFWPA has noted that to best accommodate future needs, their Sphere of Influence boundary should be co-terminus with their “place-of-use” boundary as designated by the State Water Resources Control Board regarding the approved area for distribution of water per existing water rights. SFWPA currently serves water to six customers outside its boundaries via surplus water agreements that are considered for renewal annually. This practice is very common for irrigation districts throughout northern California. During a drought, the Agency has flexibility based on water availability, to decide if/how to distribute surplus water.

**Determination SFWPA-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

7-1 The Agency’s Sphere of Influence boundary should be co-terminus with their “place-of-use” boundary as designated by the State Water Resources Control Board regarding the approved area for distribution of water per existing water rights.

7-2 The Agency maintains accountability and compliance in its governance, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements. There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in Agency activities, and information regarding the Agency is readily available to members of the public.

**MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES**

The information contained in the following section was excerpted from the Butte LAFCO MSR for Domestic Water and Wastewater Services, February 2006.

The Board of Directors is responsible for appointing a General Manager to oversee the Finance Division, the Water Division, and the Power Division. The Water Division is administered by the Water Division Manager who oversees 32 employees. The ratio of managers to workers is appropriate; the Agency is not top-heavy in managers. The Agency has various policies and procedures related to personnel, provision of services, customer relations, operations and maintenance, relationships with other agencies, and the like. The Agency is subject to yearly audits and has accomplished all recommendations from recent audits and management letters. In 2005, the Agency received a management commendation from the Butte County Grand Jury.
The Agency appears to be meeting its mission statement, which is as follows: “The mission statement of the SFWPA is both to deliver a dependable supply of safe, quality drinking water to its customers, and a dependable supply of water for agricultural users, in an economical, efficient and publicly responsible manner. Hydroelectric generation facilities shall be utilized to optimize revenue from power generation, consistent with providing adequate and dependable water supplies to customers. SFWPA is also committed to providing its employees a safe work environment and encouraging personal growth and attainment of goals.”

With good financial and operational health, there do not appear to be any necessary governmental structure changes to ensure an efficient, long-term continuation of service provision by the Agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination SFWPA-8 (Management Efficiencies):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-1  The overall management structure of the Agency is sufficient to account for necessary services and to maintain operations in an efficient and effective manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Determinations for South Feather Water and Power Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFWPA-1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>The population in the area served by SFWPA will continue to grow at a rate of approximately 4.6 percent annually in the City of Oroville area and 1.1 percent in the unincorporated areas of Butte County per BCAG’s growth rate projections.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>The Agency and LAFCO will continue to work together to resolve the boundary discrepancies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFWPA-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>There will likely be a need for additional water storage facilities in the future as the Agency’s customer base grows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFWPA-3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>There will likely be a need for additional domestic water storage capacity in the future as the Agency’s customer base grows and demand increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFWPA-4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>The Agency has a proactive maintenance program and has well-maintained infrastructure that is adequate to meet the existing and anticipated demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFWPA-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>Revenues exceed expenditures; current rates charged for services are appropriate and are significantly less than the rates charged by California Water Service Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>The Agency has been in noncompliance with Government Code Section 53901 but has agreed to come into compliance starting with the 2005 budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFWPA-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>The Agency utilizes a sufficient range of cost avoidance practices in its operations. No facilities or equipment sharing arrangements exist; this situation has not resulted in increased costs or a reduction in the level of service provided to customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFWPA-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>The Agency’s Sphere of Influence boundary should be co-terminus with their “place-of-use” boundary as designated by the State Water Resources Control Board regarding the approved area for distribution of water per existing water rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>The Agency maintains accountability and compliance in its governance, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements. There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in Agency activities, and information regarding the Agency is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFWPA-8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>The overall management structure of the Agency is sufficient to account for necessary services and to maintain operations in an efficient and effective manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 DURHAM MUTUAL WATER COMPANY

District Characteristics

Durham Mutual Water Company (DMWC) is a private water company that is regulated by the California Department of Corporations. Private water companies are not subject to LAFCO requirements and their participation the MSR process is not mandated. DMWC did not respond to a request for information in this MSR process. However, in the interest of sharing information with the public, we have listed Durham Mutual Water Company and provided the information that is available in the public record.

DMWC was created by area residents. The Company provides surface water for agricultural uses from Butte Creek. (See Figure 2-5 for a map of DMWC’s boundaries.) The District is part of the Butte Creek adjudication, and has first priority rights to 44.7 cubic feet per second (cfs). The water is diverted at Durham Mutual Dam, and is then conveyed to customers in the service area (Water Inventory and Analysis Report, 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within District:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
2.3 BIGGS-WEST GRIDLEY WATER DISTRICT

District Characteristics

A survey/questionnaire was mailed to this District on June 22, 2006, and later e-mailed at the District’s request on July 12, 2006. The consultant team made follow-up telephone calls requesting the District’s response to the questionnaire on July 12th and 24th. A response from the District was received February 20, 2007, and follow-up information was received in March 2007. Information included in this section has been assembled from research of various documents identified in the Bibliography. A map has been prepared by LAFCO based on the most current information available in their files.

The Biggs-West Gridley Water District is located east of the cities of Biggs and Gridley (Figure 2-6). Formed in 1942, the District has grown to occupy approximately 32,000 acres. Approximately 85 percent of the District’s acreage is irrigated for agriculture and managed wetland uses. Additionally, the District serves approximately 8,500 acres of the Gray Lodge Wildlife Area, of which 2,600 acres are within their service area. Three other areas outside the District recapture irrigation drainage water for irrigation purposes that totals approximately 800 acre-feet of water (Water and Inventory Analysis, 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>32,000 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within District:</td>
<td>1,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>1713 West Biggs-Gridley Road, Gridley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Irrigation water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected (5, 10, 15, 20 Year Time Frame)

Biggs-West Gridley Water District (BWGWD) provides irrigation services to the residential, agricultural, and open space property owners of approximately 909 parcels. BWGWD’s service area encompasses an area located to the west of Highway 99 and the Cities of Biggs and Gridley; to the southeast of Cherokee Canal; and north of the Sutter County line as shown in Figure 2-6. The BWGWD District boundaries and the Sphere of Influence boundaries are congruent (i.e., the same, no sphere beyond current boundaries). The District has an estimated population of 1,749 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). The majority of parcels are primarily agricultural with associated rural residences. The BWGWD has no plans for expansion and does not anticipate future population growth. The District does not prepare any service demand projections for upcoming years.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 2-7), corresponding to Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) projections for 2006–2030 of 1.1 percent per year for the unincorporated areas. Based on these trends, we project population growth to the year 2030 within the District to be as shown in the graph below:
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The boundaries of the BWGWD encompass a total of 32,000 acres located in the southwestern portion of Butte County. There are approximately 909 customers within the District boundaries who purchase water for crop irrigation. The primary agricultural crops grown within the District are alfalfa, rice, and miscellaneous annual crops and orchards. It should be noted that less “permanent” crop acreages fluctuate annually in response to a number of factors, including changes in the commodity market, individual landowners, etc. Rural residences, rural roads, and open space are other land uses found within the District boundaries. The Gray Lodge State Wildlife Area, also located within the District, provides wildlife habitat and recreational opportunities, including bird watching, hunting, and fishing. Land use in this area is regulated by the Butte County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

BWGWD lies within the Cherokee watershed and the Cherokee Canal forms the District’s northwest boundary. Other canals located within the District include the Belding Canal, Snake River Canal, and the Ashley Lateral. Eventually, water within this district flows downstream to RD 833 canals and then into the Sacramento River. Water quality in this watershed is regulated by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.
The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Map classifies the western portion of BWGWD as “A”—No base flood elevations determined.

**Determination BWGWD-1 (Growth):**

1-1 The population within the District may grow at an average rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually, which is consistent with the BCAG’s projected rate of growth for the unincorporated area of Butte County.

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/Detention

The Biggs-West Gridley Water District holds senior water rights to approximately 160,000 acre feet of Feather River water, which is diverted through the Thermalito Afterbay. Water then enters the BWGWD canal network though the Sutter Butte Canal. Exit flows from the District enter the reclamation drains of RD833, and then eventually make their way to the Sacramento River. (Note: The boundaries of BWGWD and RD833 overlay spatially, but each District provides a different service.)

BWGWD supports operation and maintenance (O&M) of the Sutter Butte Canal through its participation in the Joint Water Districts Board, which includes representatives of each of the four districts that receive water from the Sutter Butte Canal. The September 16, 1970, Joint Operating Agreement forms the basis of the relationships among the four participating districts, which include Biggs-West Gridley Water District, Richvale Irrigation District, Butte Water District, and the Sutter Extension Water District as shown in Figure 2-11. The Joint Water Districts Board is working to reduce seepage from the Sutter Butte Canal and improve efficiency of water use.

The BWGWD was formed in the 1940s to provide irrigation water and it now delivers this water to customers through an extensive system of canals and laterals. The majority of the laterals within the district are maintained by private landowners. Most of the primary laterals and canals
are privately owned with maintenance easements held by the District. A diagram of the District’s canals, laterals, and drains is available in LAFCO’s files.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination BWGWD-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1  BWGWD maintains the primary drain lateral and canals through maintenance easements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Capacity**

BWGWD is a member of a Joint Powers Agreement known as the Joint Water District and is allocated 29 percent of the 555,000 acre-feet of water annually acquired by the Joint Water District pursuant to pre-1914 water rights. The District’s allocation amounts to approximately 160,000 acre feet. Additionally, the 1969 agreement with the State acknowledges BWGWD’s ability to pump groundwater, and the District has a groundwater management plan.

Over the past 10 years, annual demand for water has averaged approximately 160,000 acre-feet during the summer irrigation season and 45,000 acre-feet during the winter. Peak summer flows are approximately 750 cfs and peak winter flows are approximately 300 cfs. The District currently utilizes about all of its water allocation. Excess water can be transferred between districts within the Joint Water District, but cannot be transferred out of the district. Out-of-District transfers are only allowed by idling in-district crops to free up water and must be approved by the Board of Directors and Department of Water Resources (DWR). The design capacity of the existing water system is approximately 750 cfs. Planned improvements to the system capacity may increase the design capacity to 850 cfs at some time in the future.

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation is conducting a study to determine the feasibility of providing additional water resources for protection of wildlife in the Gray Lodge Wildlife Area (see web site at: www.usbr.gov/mp/watershare/documents/2004RefugeCriteria.pdf). Aside from this study, there are no proposed or planned changes in system capacity, and water supplies are determined to be adequate to serve projected demand within the District boundaries Primary constraint to water delivery will be the limitations of District facilities and availability of water in drought years.
2.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY IRRIGATION SERVICE PROVIDER

**Determination BWGWD-3 (Capacity):**

3-1 Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.

C. Facilities

BWGWD owns real property, an office building, and equipment. The District’s real property consists of its shop building and office, located at 1713 West Biggs Gridley Road, and several pump sites. The District also owns its water delivery system, which includes canals, weirs, flumes, and gates, but does not appear to own the property underlying its water delivery system. Equipment includes vehicles, pumps, and maintenance equipment. Vehicles include several Ford pick-up trucks, an excavator, a tractor, and a backhoe. These fixed assets, net of accumulated depreciation, are reflected in the District’s financial statements.

**Determination BWGWD-4 (Facilities):**

4-1 The District owns real property, office and storage buildings, and maintenance equipment. These fixed assets are reflected in the District’s financial statements.

FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING

The District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. Financial statements with independent auditor’s reports were provided for fiscal years ending December 31, 2004, and December 31, 2005.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. It is assumed that since the implementation of Proposition 218 any impacts have been adjusted for in the District’s finances. A statewide diversion fee currently being proposed by the SWRCB could have a significant impact to District customers if passed into legislation.
In the Fiscal Year ending December 31, 2005, the District maintained $2,619,431 in total net assets. Major sources of funding included irrigation water sales and standby fees. Operating revenues totaled $674,059 and other revenues totaled an additional $88,513 in 2005. Major expenditures included employer wages and fringe benefits; maintenance costs; legal, accounting, and bookkeeping costs; dues and Water Board expenses; insurance costs, depreciation of capital assets; and other miscellaneous expenses. Operating expenses totaled $732,801. The total operating income for FY ending December 31, 2005, showed a net income of $29,771. Factoring in other sources of operating and non-operating income, the District witnessed a total change in net assets (FY 2004–2005) of $29,771.

![Financial Summary for Biggs-West Gridley Water District](image)

*Note: Data for FY 2006 was not available.*

The District maintained a substantial cash and reserve fund in 2005 totaling $928,013. This reserve should be sufficient to cover unanticipated expenses during the upcoming fiscal years. The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan, does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and has no outstanding public debt. Emergency funds are held in the Local Agency Investment Fund.
(LAIF), as described on the following web site: www.treasurer.ca.gov/pmia-laif/laif-program.asp. Information regarding FY 2006 was not yet available and it is anticipated that their financial audit for FY 2006 will be completed in October 2007.

The District’s irrigation water rate varies according to the type of crop. Different crops utilize different amounts of water. A water rate sheet is available in LAFCO’s files. While the District has approximately 425 customers, it is willing to sell water to customers outside District boundaries. However, data was not provided in an appropriate format to determine the proportion of out-of-District customers.

**Determination BWGWD-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

5-1 Typically, the BWGWD operates in a fiscally sound manner.

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The District is not exposed to excessive liabilities or risks; however, typical risks of losses could include the following: theft of, damage to, and destruction of assets; errors and omissions; injuries to employees; and natural disasters. The District transfers risks that may arise from these and other events through the purchase of medical insurance, dental insurance, and a pooled insurance program (ACWA/JPIA Insurance).

The District is a member of a Joint Powers Agreement known as the Joint Water District and is made up of Richvale Irrigation District, Butte Water District, Biggs-West Gridley Water District, and Sutter Extension Water District (Figure 2-11). As a member of the Joint Water District, BWGWD shares common maintenance, facilities, and equipment. The purpose of the Joint Water District Board is for protection of water rights, and maintenance and improvements of joint conveyance system and facilities. There are no other mutual or automatic aid agreements in place.
GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The BWGWD is run by a five-member Board of Directors that serves as the decision-making authority. Each director is elected to a four-year term by the landowners in the District and must have landholdings within the District boundaries.

The current five members are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ralph “Dick” Cassady</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Storm</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Justeson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Haynes</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Coleman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the Board receive a $50 stipend per meeting and participate in the District’s health insurance program. Meetings are held on the third Wednesday of the month. Meetings are posted, and anyone interested is welcome to attend. The District’s legal counsel is responsible for ensuring compliance with the Brown Act. The District Manager serves as Secretary to the Board and is responsible for managing the District’s seven employees. The Board of Directors is responsible for appointing a Treasurer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination BWGWD-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1 The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governance, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES

The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors that appoints a District Manager to oversee a total staff of seven employees. The ratio of managers to workers is appropriate; the District is not top-heavy in managers.

The management structure of the District is relatively simple and is well-suited to the type of operations undertaken by the District; the linear management structure ensures reportability and accountability. Alternative structures or reorganizations of the staff would not necessarily result in more efficient operations. The existing structure is considered appropriate for the District.

**Determination BWGWD-8 (Management Efficiencies):**

8-1 The overall management structure of the District is sufficient to account for necessary services and to maintain operations in an efficient and effective manner.

**Summary of Determinations for Biggs-West Gridley Water District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BWGWD-1 (Growth)</td>
<td>1-1 The population within the District may grow at an average rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually which is consistent with the BCAG’s projected rate of growth for the unincorporated area of Butte County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWGWD-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1 BWGWD maintains the primary drain lateral and canals through maintenance easements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWGWD-3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1 Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWGWD-4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1 District owns real property, office and storage buildings, and maintenance equipment. These fixed assess are reflected in the District’s financial statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWGWD-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1 Typically, the BWGWD operates in a fiscally sound manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWGWD-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWGWD-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWGWD-8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 BUTTE WATER DISTRICT

District Characteristics

The Butte Water District (BWDt) is located directly south of the Thermalito Afterbay and borders the Feather River on the east side (Figure 2-9). Established in 1956, the District consists of a total of 18,030 agricultural acres in the unincorporated area of Butte County. The District is comprised primarily of agricultural lands, 55 percent of which are in permanent crops such as orchards. The District supplies water to approximately 550 customers for agricultural irrigation. Recent increases in development activity around the cities of Biggs and Gridley indicate a potential conversion of agriculture to residential and commercial land uses. The District is located within the Feather River/Lower Honcut and Cherokee Watersheds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>District Size:</strong></th>
<th>18,030 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcels within District:</strong></td>
<td>2,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Population within District:</strong></td>
<td>4,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Location:</strong></td>
<td>735 Virginia Street, Gridley, CA 95948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services:</strong></td>
<td>Agricultural irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees:</strong></td>
<td>8 full-time staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Formation:</strong></td>
<td>July 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling Legislation:</strong></td>
<td>California Water Code, Division 13, §20200 et seq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Butte LAFCO
Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected (5, 10, 15, 20 Year Time Frame)

Butte Water District (BWD) provides irrigation services to approximately 2,194 low-density parcels under the ownership of approximately 550 individuals or organizations. The District’s service area is bordered by the Feather River on the east side and includes the “Area of Concern” between the cities of Biggs and Gridley. The District has an estimated population of approximately 4,217 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). The majority of parcels are primarily agricultural in nature with associated rural residences, and no significant additional growth is anticipated for the District. Recent increases in development activity around the cities of Biggs and Gridley indicate a potential conversion of agriculture to residential and commercial use. The District does not prepare any service demand projections for upcoming years.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 2-10) assuming an annual growth rate of 5.2, 5.1, and 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the Cities of Biggs and Gridley and the unincorporated portions of the County, respectively, as determined by the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) for 2006–2030.
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The boundaries of the Butte Water District encompass a total of 18,030 acres. There are approximately 550 customers within the District boundaries that purchase water for crop irrigation. The primary agricultural crop within the District is orchards which comprises about 55 percent of the irrigable acres. Other crops and land uses in the District include rice, pasture, alfalfa, grains, kiwis, melons, and low-density residential use. It should be noted that less “permanent” crop acreages fluctuate annually in response to a number of factors, including changes in the commodity market, individual landowners, etc.

The Butte Water District includes the “Area of Concern” between the cities of Biggs and Gridley as well as areas south of Gridley. Recent development activity in the Biggs/Gridley area indicates a trend of agricultural land conversion for urban uses, resulting in less irrigated crop land in production. BCAG projects Biggs and Gridley as having the fastest average annual growth rates in Butte County at 5.2 and 5.1 percent, respectively.
**Determination BWD-1 (Growth):**

1-1 It is anticipated that the population within the Butte Water District will increase at a rate of approximately 5.2, 5.1, and 1.1 percent, respectively, over the next 20 years consistent with BCAG’s growth projections for the Cities of Biggs and Gridley and the unincorporated areas of Butte County.

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/Detention

The Butte Water District has rights to approximately 133,200 acre-feet of Feather River water, which is diverted through the Thermalito Afterbay. Water then enters the Butte Water District canal network through the Sutter Butte Canal. Exit flows from the District enter the reclamation drains, Sutter Bypass, and Butte Creek.

The Butte Water District provides irrigation water to customers through an extensive system of canals and laterals. The majority of the laterals within the District are maintained by private landowners. Most of the primary laterals and canals are privately owned with maintenance easements held by the District. No maps identifying the sections owned were provided.

**Determination BWD-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**

2-1 The Butte Water District maintains the primary drain lateral and main canal through maintenance easements.

2-2 It would be beneficial for the District to prepare a map of the infrastructure it is responsible for maintaining and the portions of the main canal under District ownership.

B. Capacity

The Butte Water District is a member of a Joint Powers Agreement known as the Joint Water District and is allocated 24 percent of 555,000 acre-feet of water annually acquired by the Joint Water District pursuant to pre-1914 water rights. The District’s allocation amounts to
approximately 133,200 AF. The Joint Water District consists of Butte Water District (BWD), Biggs-West Gridley Water District (BWGWD), Richvale Irrigation District (RID), and Sutter Extension Water District (SEWD) (Figure 2-11).

Annual demand for water averages 100,000 acre-feet during the summer irrigation season and 10,000 acre-feet during the winter. The District currently utilizes approximately 70–80 percent of its allocation. Excess water can be transferred between districts within the Joint Water District, but cannot be transferred out of the district. Out-of-district transfers are only allowed by idling in-District crops to free up water and must be approved by the Board of Directors and Department of Water Resources (DWR). The system capacity is approximately 500 cubic feet per second (cfs) and is metered only at the point of diversion from the Joint Water District canals.

There are no proposed or planned changes in system capacity, and water supplies are determined to be adequate to serve projected demand within the District boundaries. Primary constraints to water delivery will be the limitations of District facilities and availability of water in drought years.

The District indicates that it has excess water to serve other agencies, districts, and service areas, in addition to members of the Joint Water District. Additionally, the District is looking into providing water service for municipal and industrial uses.

The District noted future challenges in water quality, and commercial and residential development encroachment as concerns that will need to be addressed. Additionally, the District expressed concerns over safety where canals run through towns. As developers build housing projects, there is more development adjacent to canals, which can lead to safety concerns. The District would like to see developers made responsible for relocating canals underground as development occurs.
Figure 2-11

Source: Butte LAFCO

NOTE: The Joint Water District also includes Sutter Extension Water District (not shown)

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Determination BWD-3 (Capacity):

3-1 Due to the generally stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.

3-2 It is recommended that the District work with local municipalities, the County of Butte, and LAFCO to address public safety concerns regarding increased development in the Biggs and Gridley area.

C. Facilities

The District owns four parcels on which its headquarters and maintenance facilities are located, including the following Assessor Parcel Numbers: 021-132-040, 009-082-006, 009-122-003, and 009-122-009. The District also indicates that it owns maintenance equipment for its operations but did not provide an inventory of what is owned or leased.

Determination BWD-4 (Facilities):

4-1 The District owns or leases a number of parcels on which their headquarters and maintenance facilities are located. The District also indicates that it owns maintenance equipment. It is recommended that the managers of Butte Water District provide LAFCO an inventory of equipment and indicate whether it is owned or leased.

FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING

District financial documents were not provided to the consultant and therefore public information concerning the District’s financial status is limited. Because no financial documents were provided, the consultant was unable to prepare a financial summary graph as was included in other District sections.

The District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards.
2.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY IRRIGATION SERVICE PROVIDER

Annual budget and financial information for Butte Water District was not provided by the District. In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, Butte Water District is required to file a copy of its annual budget with the Butte County Auditor unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year (FY). The District is subject to yearly County audit.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Rates are based on the types of crops in cultivation and are set according to annual budgets. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms.

**Determination BWD-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

5-1 The financial status of the District could not be determined because managers of the District did not provide budgetary or other financial information regarding this District. It is recommended that the managers of Butte Water District provide LAFCO with the budgetary and insurance information as soon as possible.

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The District is exposed to various risks of losses; theft of, damage to, and destruction of assets; errors and omissions; injuries to employees; and natural disasters. The District transfers risks that may arise from these and other events through the purchase of medical insurance, dental insurance, and a pooled insurance program (ACWA/JPIA Insurance).

The District is a member of a Joint Powers Agreement known as the Joint Water District and is made up of Butte Water District, Biggs-West Gridley Water District, Richvale Irrigation District, and Sutter Extension Water District (Figure 2-11). The purpose of the Joint Water District Board is for protection of water rights and maintenance and improvements of joint conveyance system and facilities. As a member of the Joint Water District, Butte Water District shares common maintenance, facilities, and equipment.
There are no other mutual or automatic aid agreements in place. The date of the last Sphere of Influence review was in September 2006. The District believes it is currently adequately defined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination BWD-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1  The District appears to be well-staffed and organized and participates in a Joint Powers Authority for sharing of costs associated with maintenance, facilities, and equipment. No additional cost avoidance measures were identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The District is run by a five-member Board of Directors that serves as the decision-making authority. Each director is elected to a four-year term by the landowners in the District. Directors must be landowners within the District or legal representatives thereof. Members of the Board receive compensation of $100 per month and $50 per additional meeting. Regular meetings of the Board of Directors are held on the second Wednesday of each month. These meetings are posted in advance and announced in the local newspaper and appear to be in compliance with the Brown Act. The current Board of Directors is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Waller, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Giovannetti, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Bozzo, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Pantaleoni, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Correa, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board of Directors is responsible for appointing a District Manager. The District Manager is exclusively responsible for managing the distribution system and work of the District. He/she directs the District’s other employees, including an Assistant Manager, Office Manager/Bookkeeper, maintenance worker and ditchtenders, in the oversight of office operations and maintenance duties.
Determination BWD-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):

7-1 The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.

7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.

7-3 Modifications to the District’s boundaries and SOI are not proposed at this time.

MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES

The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors. The Board appoints a District Manager to oversee a staff of seven other full-time employees and one or two seasonal workers. The ratio of managers to workers is appropriate; the District is not top-heavy in managers.

The management structure of the District is relatively simple and is well-suited to the type of operations undertaken by the District; the linear management structure ensures reportability and accountability. Alternative structures or reorganization of the staff would not necessarily result in more efficient operations at this time. The existing structure is considered appropriate for the District.

Determination BWD-8 (Management Efficiencies):

8-1 The Butte Water District management structure appears to be sufficient and appropriate.

Summary of Determinations for Butte Water District

| BWD-1 (Growth) | 1-1 | It is anticipated that the population within the Butte Water District will increase at a rate of approximately 5.2, 5.1, and 1.1 percent, respectively, over the next 20 years consistent with BCAG’s growth projections for the Cities of Biggs and Gridley and the unincorporated areas of Butte County. |
| BWD-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities) | 2-1 | The Butte Water District maintains the primary drain lateral and main canal through maintenance easements. |
| | 2-2 | It would be beneficial for the District to prepare a map of the infrastructure it is responsible for maintaining and the portions of the main canal under District ownership. |
| BWD-3 (Capacity) | 3-1 | Due to the generally stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity. |
| | 3-2 | It is recommended that the District work with local municipalities, the County of Butte, and LAFCO to address public safety concerns regarding increased development in the Biggs and Gridley area. |
| BWD-4 (Facilities) | 4-1 | The District owns or leases a number of parcels on which their headquarters and maintenance facilities are located. The District also indicates that it owns maintenance equipment. It is recommended that the managers of Butte Water District provide LAFCO an inventory of equipment and indicate whether it is owned or leased. |
| BWD-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring) | 5-1 | The financial status of the District could not be determined because managers of the District did not provide budgetary or other financial information regarding this District. It is recommended that the managers of Butte Water District provide LAFCO with the budgetary and insurance information as soon as possible. |
| BWD-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing) | 6-1 | The District appears to be well-staffed and organized and participates in a Joint Powers Authority for sharing of costs associated with maintenance, facilities and equipment. No additional cost avoidance measures were identified. |
## 2.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY IRRIGATION SERVICE PROVIDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BWD-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</th>
<th>7-1</th>
<th>The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-3</td>
<td>Modifications to the District’s boundaries and SOI are not proposed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWD-8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>The Butte Water District management structure appears to be sufficient and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 WESTERN CANAL WATER DISTRICT

District Characteristics

The Western Canal Water District (WCWD) is located directly west of the Thermalito Afterbay and to the north and west of the unincorporated community of Richvale, extending into Glenn County and proceeding southerly along Butte Creek almost to the Colusa County-Glenn County border (Figure 2-12). Although a portion of the District’s Sphere of Influence extends into Colusa County, no services are currently provided in that County.

Established in 1984, the District incorporates a total of 62,974 acres, of which 58,140 acres are irrigable acres. Approximately 39,000 irrigable acres are located in Butte County and the remaining acreage is located in Glenn County. The District is comprised primarily of agricultural lands, 90 percent of which are farmed in rice. The District has 258 canal turnouts supplying water to 150 customers for agricultural irrigation, rice straw decomposition, waterfowl and wildlife, and other agricultural uses within its boundaries. The District is located within the Butte Creek and Cherokee Watersheds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>62,974 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within District:</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>2003 Nelson Rd., Nelson, CA 95958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Agricultural and environmental irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>10 full-time, 1 or 2 part-time as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>December 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>California Water Code, Division 13, §20200 et seq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Canal Water District
BUTTE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Source: Butte LAFCO
Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected (5, 10, 15, 20 Year Time Frame)

Western Canal Water District provides irrigation services to approximately 673 low-density parcels under the ownership of approximately 150 individuals or organizations. The District’s service area surrounds and encompasses the area south of the agricultural community of Nelson, north of Biggs and Gridley west of State Highway 99. The District has an estimated current population of approximately 1,292 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). The majority of the parcels are primarily agricultural in nature with associated rural residences, and no significant additional growth is anticipated for the District. Consequently, the District does not prepare any service demand projections for upcoming years.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (see Figure 2-13) assuming an annual growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) for 2006–2030. District staff noted that the 1.1 percent growth rate is likely high for the District. BCAG growth projections average the higher growth areas surrounding the cities and in the foothills with the very slow growth in the agricultural areas to estimate an average growth rate for all the unincorporated areas of Butte County. However, for consistency purposes, the consulting team has utilized BCAG projections throughout the document and further explained the methodology used for population estimates and projections in the Introduction.
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The boundaries of the Western Canal Water District encompass a total of 58,140 irrigable acres. Of this, 39,304 acres lie within Butte County and 18,836 acres are in Glenn County. The District also serves approximately 500 acres located in the Llano Seco Unit of the Upper Butte Basin Wildlife Area of Butte County, which is outside of the District’s boundary and its SOI, and 356 acres in Glenn County, which also fall outside of the boundaries of the District but are within its SOI. The remaining acreage is owned by the Department of Fish and Game and is located in the Llano Seco Wildlife Area. Lands within the District boundaries are used mainly for intensive agriculture production. The District also maintains several duck ponds in the Butte Sink area.

There are approximately 258 customers within the District boundaries that purchase water for crop irrigation, primarily for rice production. The District identifies customers as any landowner, grower, refuge manager, duck club operator, or other person or entity who orders water. The primary agricultural crop within the District is rice with about 90 percent of the irrigable acres (estimated in 2004 to be approximately 52,300 acres). Other crops and land uses in the District include orchards, pasture, grains, habitat, and low-density residential use. It should be noted that crop acreages fluctuate annually in response to a number of factors,
including changes in the commodity market, individual landowners, etc. There is limited potential for increase in agricultural irrigation services as the District currently utilizes approximately 95 percent of its water rights.

The Western Canal Water District does not anticipate any significant changes in land use in the future. The majority of the District is located within a floodplain, which may limit residential growth. Additionally, the District does not anticipate a significant change in crop cultivation from rice because of the heavy soil type within the District. The soil is not conducive to most other types of crops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination WCWD-1 (Growth):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1  The District should make application to LAFCO to formally annex all territory being served by the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2  It is anticipated that the population within the Western Canal Water District will continue to increase at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent over the next 20 years consistent with BCAG’s growth projections for the unincorporated areas of Butte County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/Detention

The Western Canal Water District has rights to approximately 295,000 acre-feet of Feather River water, which is delivered via Lake Oroville. The water is diverted by the State Department of Water Resources at the Thermalito Diversion Dam and conducted through the State’s Thermalito facilities into the Thermalito Afterbay. Water then enters the Western Canal Water District canal network through the Western Canal at the northwest corner of the Thermalito Afterbay. Additionally, a portion of the District’s water allocation is via direct diversion from Butte Creek. The District also leases a water holding slough to facilitate water conveyance to portions of their service area.
The Western Canal Water District provides irrigation water to customers through an extensive system of canals and laterals. The District maintains approximately 31 miles of main canal. The majority of the laterals within the District are maintained by private landowners. Most of the primary laterals and canals are privately owned with maintenance easements held by the District. The District noted that aging infrastructure could become a concern over time.

There are a number of very short and sporadically located sections of the main canal that are owned by the District. There are currently no maps identifying the sections owned.

**Determination WCWD-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**

| 2-1 | The Western Canal Water District maintains the primary drain lateral and main canal through maintenance easements. |
| 2-2 | It would be beneficial for the District to prepare a map of the infrastructure it is responsible for maintaining and the portions of the main canal under District ownership. |
| 2-3 | During preparation of this MSR, Western Canal Water District noted that aging infrastructure may be a future concern. WCWD combats this by performing regular maintenance, repairs, inspections, and replacement. If these measures become ineffective, then the District’s aging infrastructure represents a concern to the long-term efficient delivery of services. Therefore, it is recommended that an infrastructure analysis, a replacement/improvement plan, and an implementation timeline be developed as a part of a future sphere of influence update. |

**B. Capacity**

Water supply is from direct diversion, pre-1914 appropriative rights from the Feather River and from delivery by PG&E through facilities of the State Water Project at the Thermalito Afterbay and by direct diversion from Butte Creek. The District has total water rights allowing for the diversion of 295,000 acre-feet annually. In accordance with the “Agreement on the Diversion of Water from the Feather River” of January 17, 1986, water supply may be decreased during years of drought. Water supply may be reduced no more than 75,000 acre-feet in any one year and no more than a total of 150,000 acre-feet in any series of seven consecutive years. The District does
not have any water purchase agreements. District facilities can accommodate 1200 cfs in the Western Main Canal and 50 cfs in the Western Lateral.

In order to allow for maintenance of the District’s infrastructure, it is the District’s policy not to provide water service from mid-January through March, a time period during which there is no demand for irrigation service.

Annual demand for water averages 280,000 acre-feet/year with peak demand occurring during the growing season. Approximately 75 percent of demand is for irrigation (April through October), and 25 percent is for environmental uses (November through January). The District also, incidentally, provides water in the non-irrigation season for the flooding of duck clubs in the Butte Sink area. It may, when given authorization by the Board of Directors, provide water for the flooding of duck ponds within district boundaries, so long as such flooding does not interfere with agricultural operations. Any excess capacity not utilized by the District is left in Lake Oroville and used by and at the discretion of the Department of Water Resources. Excess water can also be transferred between districts within the Feather River District (i.e., Richvale Irrigation District, Butte Water District, etc.), but cannot be transferred out of the district. Out-of-district transfers are only allowed by individual landowners electing to idle in-District crops, or groundwater substitution pumping, to free up water and must be approved by the Board of Directors and the DWR.

There are no proposed or planned changes in system capacity, and water supplies are determined to be adequate to serve projected demand within the District boundaries. Primary constraints to water delivery will be the capability of district facilities and availability of water in drought years. Aging infrastructure may be problematic in the future. Additionally, infrastructure capacity is occasionally limited during spring flood-up periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination WCWD-3 (Capacity):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1  Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2  Infrastructure capacity is occasionally limited during spring flood-up periods. No additional capacity problems have been reported to the District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Facilities

The District owns approximately 3.5 acres in the agricultural community of Nelson, where its headquarters is located. On the headquarters site are an office building, shop, and four wheeler shed. The District has equipment of varying ages, including a new tractor and loader in excellent condition, a loader approximately 10 years old and in fair condition, and a 7-year-old backhoe in good condition.

**Determination WCWD-4 (Facilities):**

4-1 The District’s facilities consist of an office and maintenance buildings on approximately 3.5 acres within the community of Nelson. The District also owns various maintenance equipment in varying ages and condition. No need for additional facilities or equipment were identified.

**FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING**

The District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. Financial statements with independent auditor’s reports were provided for fiscal years ending in 2004 and 2005, and proposed/approved budgets for 2005 and 2006.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Rates are based on volume as measured in acre feet and are set annually by the Board of Directors. Standby rates are based on acreage and are also regulated by Proposition 218. Customers served outside of District boundaries are subject to double fees and no standby fees. Additionally, there must be surplus water available to serve these customers. Water charges for 2006 were set at $3.00 per acre-foot for irrigation and waterfowl. Standby charges were $5.00 per irrigable acre.

Because WCWD is an independent enterprise District, its revenue is obtained solely from the water service it provides its customers and not from any property tax. The County Auditor’s office has not requested a copy of WCWD’s financial statements. However, in accordance with
Government Code Section 53901, WCWD may be asked to file a copy of its annual budget by the Butte County Auditor at some time in the future.

In Fiscal Year (FY) ending in 2005, the District maintained $15,583,483 in total assets, of which $2,239,309 were current assets and $1,859,168 and $11,485,006 were locked into investments and capital assets respectively. The District maintained $93,220 in total liabilities. Major sources of funding included irrigation and winter water sales and standby fees. Operating revenues totaled $1,044,448. Major sources of expenditure included employee wages and fringe benefits; maintenance costs; depreciation of capital assets; legal, accounting, and bookkeeping costs; dues and subscriptions; insurance costs; electricity; pensions; and other miscellaneous expenses. Operating expenses totaled $1,353,987. The total operating income (loss) for FY 2004–2005 totaled -$309,539. Factoring in other sources of operating and non-operating income, the District witnessed a total change in net assets (FY 2004–2005) of -$61,822, ending the fiscal year with total net assets of $15,490,263.

*Figure 2-14. Financial Summary for Western Canal Water District*

![Financial Summary for FY 2004 through 2006](image-url)
Determination WCWD-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):

5-1 Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner. Although the District’s expenditures exceeded its revenues during 2004–2006, it appears that the District remains financially secure through its total net assets.

COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING

The District is exposed to various risks of losses; theft of, damage to, and destruction of assets; errors and omissions; injuries to employees; and natural disasters. The District transfers risks that may arise from these and other events through the purchase of medical insurance, dental insurance, and a pooled insurance program (ACWA/JPIA Insurance). District bylaws were most recently updated in May of 2005 and are designed to limit liability.

The District is not a partner to any joint agreements and has not identified any areas that may be more efficiently served by others. There are no mutual or automatic aid agreements in place and no joint power authorities’ agreements. The date of the last review of the Sphere of Influence is unknown, but the District believes it is currently adequately defined.

The Western Canal Water District currently provides administrative services to two other districts under contract: Butte Creek Drainage District and Drainage District No. 2 (Figure 2-15). Both Districts have insufficient staff and finances to perform their own administrative duties.

Determination WCWD-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):

6-1 The District appears to be well-staffed and organized. No cost avoidance measures or facilities sharing opportunities were identified.
Figure 2-15

Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The District is run by a five-member Board of Directors that serves as the decision-making authority. Each director is elected to a four-year term by the landowners in the district. Elections are held in November of odd-numbered years. Directors must be landowners within the district or legal representatives thereof. Members of the Board are reimbursed in accordance with Section 20200, et seq. of Division 10 of the Water Code of the State of California. Regular meetings of the Board of Directors are held on the third Tuesday of each month at 9:00 a.m. These meetings appear to be in compliance with the Brown Act.

The current Board of Directors is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Larrabee, President</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Anderson, Vice President</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer Lundberg, Director</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Tennis, Director</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milt LaMalfa, Director</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board of Directors is responsible for appointing a District Manager. The District Manager is exclusively responsible for managing the distribution system and work of the District. He/she directs the District’s other employees, including, among others, an Office Manager/Bookkeeper to oversee office operations and finances, an Operations Manager to serve as water master and supervise field crews, and an Office Clerk to manage customer service and light office duties.

The District provides service to approximately 500 acres in the Llano Seco Wildlife Area for DFG that are located outside the District’s boundaries and SOI. It also provides service to 356 acres that are located outside the service area boundaries, but within the District’s SOI. The District does not propose modifications to its boundaries or SOI at this time because the infrastructure is privately owned and it has been difficult for the district to obtain maintenance easements for the canals and other infrastructure that serves these areas.
**Determination WCWD-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

7-1 The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.

7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.

7-3 Modifications to the District's boundaries and SOI are not proposed at this time.

**MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES**

The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors. The Board appoints a District Manager to oversee a staff of nine other full-time employees and one or two seasonal workers. The ratio of managers to workers is appropriate; the District is not top-heavy in managers.

The management structure of the District is relatively simple and is well-suited to the type of operations undertaken by the District; the linear management structure ensures reportability and accountability. Alternative structures or reorganization of the staff would not necessarily result in more efficient operations at this time. The existing structure is considered appropriate for the District.

Several mapping errors and/or inconsistencies were noted during research and information collection. Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN) 029-010-010 and 029-170-009 are mapped as having overlapping irrigation coverage on both the Western Canal Water District and Richvale Irrigation District boundary maps. However, both parcels are served by Western Canal Water District.

**Determination WCWD-8 (Management Efficiencies):**

8-1 The Western Canal Water District management structure appears to be sufficient and appropriate. No inefficiencies were noted.

8-2 Overlapping boundary mapping for Western Canal Water District and Richvale Irrigation District over APNs 029-010-010 and 029-170-009 should be remedied. Both parcels are served irrigation water by Western Canal Water District.
## Summary of Determinations for Western Canal Water District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WCWD-1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>The District should make application to LAFCO to formally annex all territory being served by the District.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>It is anticipated that the population within the Western Canal Water District will continue to increase at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent over the next 20 years consistent with BCAG’s growth projections for the unincorporated areas of Butte County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WCWD-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</th>
<th>2-1</th>
<th>The Western Canal Water District maintains the primary drain lateral and main canal through maintenance easements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>It would be beneficial for the District to prepare a map of the infrastructure it is responsible for maintaining and the portions of the main canal under District ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>During preparation of this MSR, Western Canal Water District noted that aging infrastructure may be a future concern. WCWD combats this by performing regular maintenance, repairs, inspections, and replacement. If these measures become ineffective, then the District's aging infrastructure represents a concern to the long-term efficient delivery of services. Therefore, it is recommended that an infrastructure analysis, a replacement/improvement plan, and an implementation timeline be developed as a part of a future sphere of influence update.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WCWD-3 (Capacity)</th>
<th>3-1</th>
<th>Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Infrastructure capacity is occasionally limited during spring flood-up periods. No additional capacity problems have been reported to the District.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WCWD-4 (Facilities)

| 4-1 | The District’s facilities consist of an office and maintenance buildings on approximately 3.5 acres within the community of Nelson. The District also owns various maintenance equipment in varying ages and condition. No need for additional facilities or equipment was identified. |

### WCWD-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)

| 5-1 | Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner. Although in 2005 the District’s expenditures exceeded its revenues, it appears that the District remains financially secure through its total net assets. |

### WCWD-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)

| 6-1 | The District appears to be well-staffed and organized. No cost avoidance measures or facilities sharing opportunities were identified. |

### WCWD-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)

| 7-1 | The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements. |

| 7-2 | There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public. |

| 7-3 | Modifications to the District’s boundaries and SOI are not proposed at this time. |

### WCWD-8 (Management Efficiencies)

| 8-1 | The Western Canal Water District management structure appears to be sufficient and appropriate. No inefficiencies were noted. |

| 8-2 | Overlapping boundary mapping for Western Canal Water District and Richvale Irrigation District over APNs 029-010-010 and 029-170-009 should be remedied. Both parcels are served irrigation water by Western Canal Water District. |
2.6 RICHVALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

District Characteristics

Richvale Irrigation District (RID/District) occupies approximately 34,150 acres in and around the agricultural community of Richvale, west of Highway 99 and the City of Oroville (Figure 2-15). Established in 1930, the District currently provides irrigation services through approximately 80 miles of open canals. RID does not provide any domestic water services. The District is comprised primarily of agricultural lands, 99 percent of which are farmed in rice. The District supplies water to 125 customers for agricultural irrigation, rice straw decomposition, waterfowl and wildlife, and other agricultural uses within its boundaries. The District is located within the Butte Creek Watershed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>Approximately 34,150 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within District:</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>1193 Richvale Highway, Richvale, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Agricultural and environmental irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>July 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>California Water Code, Division 11, §20500 et seq.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
A. Population: Existing and Projected (5, 10, 15, 20 Year Time Frame)

The Richvale Irrigation District (RID) provides agricultural irrigation water services to 517 agricultural and rural residential parcels within the approximately 34,150 acres that make up the District. The predominant land use is intensive agricultural. The small agricultural community of Richvale is contained within the District boundaries and consists of low-density residential uses. The estimated population within the district is 993 people (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). It is currently estimated that approximately half of the total potential customers within the District are being served. RID does not provide domestic water services.

Projected population growth in the District is anticipated to reach 1,261 by 2030 (Figure 2-17). Projections assume a growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments for 2006–2030. Population growth is limited by the County’s land-use designations within the District, the existing sewer capability, and the infrastructure capacity of Richvale. All but a very limited number of parcels are zoned Agriculture with at least a 40-acre minimum density.
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

Most of the approximately 34,150 acres within the district boundaries are held in agricultural use. The community of Richvale is approximately 150 acres in size and, although located within the District boundaries, is not served by the District. Historically, all but 37 acres of the approximately 34,000 acres of farmland within the District boundaries are planted in rice (approximately 33,963). Annual demand for irrigation water is dependent upon the total acres of rice being planted, which can fluctuate from year to year. Rice utilizes approximately 5.5 acre-feet applied water per acre. The remaining acreage served by the District is in irrigated pasture.

The Richvale Irrigation District has no expansion capability for two reasons. First, the District’s boundaries are limited by the Western Canal Water District (WCWD) to the north and Biggs-West Gridley Water District to the south. Second, the District’s water supply is finite and restricted under contract, rendering expansion opportunities unlikely. Also, due to Irrigation Code limits, RID may not develop significant domestic water services. Therefore, even if the population of Richvale were to increase in size, RID would be unable to provide domestic water. The District is not expected to grow in size, population, or extent of services provided. The District’s Sphere of Influence was last updated in 1989 and no need for expansion was identified.
The District does not anticipate any significant changes in land use in the future. The majority of the District is located within a floodplain, which will limit residential growth. Additionally, the District does not anticipate a significant change in crop cultivation from rice due to the heavy soil type within the District. The soil is not conducive to most other types of crops.

**Determination RID-1 (Growth):**

1-1 *It is anticipated that the population within the Richvale Irrigation District will continue to increase at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent over the next 20 years consistent with BCAG’s growth projections for the unincorporated areas of Butte County.*

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/detention

The District’s water is supplied from the Feather River via Lake Oroville and the Thermalito Afterbay. In addition, RID has a riparian water right on Little Dry Creek for 18,300 acre-feet that is limited to use from April through September (Butte County Water Inventory and Analysis, 2001).

The District provides irrigation water to customers through an extensive system of canals and laterals. The District maintains approximately 80 miles of open canal. The majority of the laterals within the District are maintained by private landowners. Most of the primary laterals and canals are District owned and maintained. Aging infrastructure may be problematic in the future. Additionally, infrastructure capacity is occasionally limited during spring flood periods. The system flow capacity is 750 cfs.

**Determination RID-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**

2-1 *The Richvale Irrigation District maintains approximately 80 miles of open canal. During preparation of this MSR, RID noted that aging infrastructure may be a future concern. RID combats this by performing regular maintenance, repairs, inspections, and replacement. If these measures become ineffective, then the District’s aging infrastructure represents a concern to the*
long-term efficient delivery of services. Therefore, it is recommended that an infrastructure analysis, a replacement/improvement plan, and an implementation timeline be developed as a part of a future sphere of influence update.

B. Capacity

The Richvale Irrigation District is a member of a Joint Powers Agreement known as the Joint Water District and is allocated 27 percent of 555,000 acre-feet of water annually acquired by the Joint Water District pursuant to pre-1914 water rights. The District’s allocation amounts to approximately 149,850 AF. The Joint Water District consists of RID, Biggs-West Gridley Water District (BWGWD), Butte Water District (BWD), and Sutter Extension Water District (SEWD) (Figure 2-11). In addition, Richvale Irrigation District has a riparian water right on Little Dry Creek for 18,300 acre-feet that is limited to use from April through September (Butte County Water Inventory and Analysis, 2001).

The District’s Feather River water rights amount to approximately 149,850 acre-feet annually. Annual water supply is essentially controlled by the Feather River flows into Lake Oroville and the capacity of the water distribution system. Water enters the District’s distribution system through the Thermalito Afterbay beginning in April of each year. The irrigation season is typically April through October; however, the District may continue water distribution from November to January for rice straw decomposition, to benefit wildlife habitat in the Butte Basin, and to comply with restrictions on rice straw burning (Butte County Water Inventory and Analysis, 2001). The system capacity is approximately 750 cubic feet per second (cfs), with 500 cfs at the Richvale Main and 250 cfs at the Minderman Weir.

In accordance with the “Agreement on the Diversion of Water from the Feather River” of May 27, 1969, water supply may be decreased during years of drought. Water supply may be reduced no more than 50 percent in any given year and no more than a total of 100 percent in any series of seven consecutive years.
There are no proposed or planned changes in system capacity, and water supplies are determined to be adequate to serve projected demand within the District boundaries. Primary constraints to water delivery will be the limitations of District facilities and availability of water in drought years. The District noted future challenges in water supply, drought, levee repairs, environmental issues, and aging infrastructure as concerns that will need to be addressed. The District is currently in the process of preparing a long-range planning and implementation document with acquisition of Proposition 50 funds.

**Determination RID-3 (Capacity):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-1</th>
<th>Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity. No capacity problems have been reported to the District.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>The District noted future challenges in water supply, drought, levee repairs, environmental issues, and aging infrastructure as concerns that will need to be addressed. It is recommended that the District continue in their endeavors to prepare a long-range planning and implementation plan to address their future challenges and concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Facilities

The District owns approximately five acres in the community of Richvale, on which its offices and maintenance buildings are located. Some of the canals and laterals within the system are owned by RID, while others are held through easements across private property. There is no comprehensive list of which canals and laterals are owned and which are held through easements.

The District owns construction equipment used in the operation and maintenance of its facilities, including the following: John Deere 6420, John Deere 160LC excavator, John Deere 410G backhoe, Cat D-4G dozer, numerous trucks and pickups, and various support equipment. All equipment is in good condition.
**Determination RID-4 (Facilities):**

| 4-1 | The District’s facilities consist of office and maintenance buildings on approximately five acres within the community of Richvale. The District also owns various maintenance equipment in varying ages and condition. No needs for additional facilities or equipment were identified. |
| 4-2 | A comprehensive inventory of canals and laterals and their ownership/easement status may facilitate management of the District’s facilities. |

---

**FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING**

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, RID files a copy of its annual budget with the Butte County Auditor unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year (FY). The district is subject to yearly County audit.

The District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. Financial statements with independent auditor’s reports were provided for fiscal years ending in 2004 and 2005, and proposed/approved budgets for 2005 and 2006.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. It is assumed that since the implementation of Proposition 218 any impacts have been adjusted for in the District’s finances. A statewide diversion fee currently being proposed by the SWRCB could have a significant impact to District customers if passed into legislation.

In FY 2005, the District maintained $5,272,983 in total net assets and $64,037 in total liabilities. Major sources of funding included irrigation water sales and standby fees. Operating revenues totaled $757,471. Major sources of expenditure included employer wages and fringe benefits; maintenance costs; legal, accounting, and bookkeeping costs; dues and Water Board expenses; insurance costs, depreciation of capital assets; and other miscellaneous expenses. Operating expenses totaled $1,002,705. The total operating income for FY 2005 showed a loss of $245,234.
Factoring in other sources of operating and non-operating income, the District witnessed a total change in net assets between FY 2004 and FY 2005 of -$29,368. Similarly, the District experienced a total change in net assets of -$24,316 from FY 2005 to FY 2006. Assets are being utilized to cover the difference between revenues and expenditures.

**Figure 2-18. Financial Summary for Richvale Irrigation District**

The District maintains a substantial cash reserve in excess of $2 million. This reserve should be more than sufficient to cover the annual net loss in system operations. The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan, does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and has no outstanding public debt. The District noted that it has outstanding litigation costs of approximately $80,000.

Water rates for the 2006 calendar year were established at $8.00/acre for all conditions except for the spring rice water period when fees were $16.00/acre. A fee of $6.75/acre is charged for all irrigable areas, including acreage irrigated from privately owned wells, to help defray the cost of maintaining the system.
2.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY IRRIGATION SERVICE PROVIDER

**Determination RID-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

5-1 Since FY 2004, expenditures have exceeded revenues. Rates should be re-evaluated as necessary to ensure that they cover the costs of providing related services.

---

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The District is exposed to various risks of losses including the following: theft of, damage to, and destruction of assets; errors and omissions; injuries to employees; and natural disasters. The District transfers risks that may arise from these and other events through the purchase of medical insurance, dental insurance, and a pooled insurance program (ACWA/JPIA Insurance).

The District is a member of a Joint Powers Agreement known as the Joint Water District and is made up of Richvale Irrigation District, Butte Water District, Biggs-West Gridley Water District, and Sutter Extension Water District (Figure 2-11). As a member of the Joint Water District, Richvale Irrigation District shares common maintenance, facilities, and equipment. The purpose of the Joint Water District Board is for protection of water rights and maintenance and improvements of joint conveyance system and facilities. There are no other mutual or automatic aid agreements in place.

It has been suggested that it may be beneficial for the Richvale Irrigation District to absorb Drainage Districts 100 and 200 (DD100 and DD200). Both drainage districts are located almost entirely within the boundaries of the Richvale Irrigation District and have limited resources of their own (Figure 2-19). There appear to be mutually beneficial opportunities for consolidation of maintenance and administrative duties. For example, there are instances in which DD100 and RID operate and maintain ditches on opposite sides of the same road. Additionally, RID currently provides maintenance services for DD200 for an annual fee of $5,000.
### Determination RID-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6-1</th>
<th>The District appears to be well-staffed and organized, and participates in appropriate joint agreements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Consolidation of Richvale Irrigation District, Drainage District No. 100, and Drainage District No. 200 is recommended to more efficiently provide facilities and maintenance resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-19

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The Richvale Irrigation District is run by a three-member Board of Directors that serves as the decision making authority. Each director is elected to a four-year term by the landowners in the District and must have landholdings within the District boundaries.

The current Board of Directors is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gene Harris, President</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walt Meyer, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyle Job, Director</td>
<td>not provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board of Directors is responsible for appointing a Treasurer/Assessor who provides direction to the District Manager, who in turn serves as Secretary to the Board and is responsible for managing the District’s other six employees. Members of the Board and the Treasurer/Assessor receive a $100 stipend per meeting. Meetings are held on the third Thursday of the month at 1:30 p.m. During Spring work and harvest, meetings are moved to the third Wednesday of the month at 7:30 p.m. Meetings are posted, and anyone interested is welcome to attend. The District’s legal counsel is responsible for ensuring compliance with the Brown Act.

**Determination RID-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

7-1 The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.

7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.
The District is governed by a three-member Board of Directors. The Board appoints a District Manager to oversee a staff of six other employees. The ratio of managers to workers is appropriate; the District is not top-heavy in managers.

The management structure of the Richvale Irrigation District is relatively simple and is well-suited to the type of operations undertaken by the District; the linear management structure ensures reportability and accountability. Alternative structures or reorganizations of the staff would not necessarily result in more efficient operations. The existing structure is considered appropriate for the District.

Several service boundary inconsistencies were noted during research and information collection. Assessor Parcel Numbers (APN) 029-010-010 and 029-170-009 are mapped as having overlapping irrigation coverage on both the Western Canal Water District and Richvale Irrigation District boundary maps. However, both parcels are served by Western Canal Water District. Additionally, four parcels located between RID and WCWD boundaries are currently not within either boundaries and yet are being served by RID.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination RID-8 (Management Efficiencies):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-1  The overall management structure of the District is sufficient to account for necessary services and to maintain operations in an efficient and effective manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-2 Overlapping boundary mapping for Western Canal Water District and Richvale Irrigation District over APNs 029-010-010 and 029-170-009 should be remedied. Both parcels are served irrigation water by Western Canal Water District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-3 Four parcels outside of and between the two district boundaries are being served by RID and include APNs 029-030-021, 029-030-022, 029-030-008, and 029-220-048. Inclusion of these parcels in RID’s boundaries may facilitate management of their services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Determinations for Richvale Irrigation District

| RID-1 (Growth) | 1-1 | It is anticipated that the population within the Richvale Irrigation District will continue to increase at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent over the next 20 years consistent with BCAG’s growth projections for the unincorporated areas of Butte County. |
| RID-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities) | 2-1 | The Richvale Irrigation District maintains approximately 80 miles of open canal. |
| | 2-2 | During preparation of this MSR, RID noted that aging infrastructure may be a future concern. RID combats this by performing regular maintenance, repairs, inspections, and replacement. If these measures become ineffective, then the District’s aging infrastructure represents a concern to the long-term efficient delivery of services. Therefore, it is recommended that an infrastructure analysis, a replacement/ improvement plan, and an implementation timeline be developed as a part of a future sphere of influence update. |
| RID-3 (Capacity) | 3-1 | Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity. No capacity problems have been reported to the District. |
| | 3-2 | The District noted future challenges in water supply, drought, levee repairs, environmental issues, and aging infrastructure as concerns that will need to be addressed. It is recommended that the District continue in their endeavors to prepare a long-range planning and implementation plan to address their future challenges and concerns. |
**RID-4 (Facilities)**

| 4-1 | The District’s facilities consist of office and maintenance buildings on approximately five acres within the community of Richvale. The District also owns various maintenance equipment in varying ages and condition. No needs for additional facilities or equipment were identified. |
| 4-2 | A comprehensive inventory of canals and laterals and their ownership/easement status may facilitate management of the District’s facilities. |

**RID-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)**

| 5-1 | Since FY 2004, expenditures have exceeded revenues. Rates should be re-evaluated as necessary to ensure that they cover the costs of providing related services. |

**RID-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)**

| 6-1 | The District appears to be well-staffed and organized, and participates in appropriate joint agreements. |
| 6-2 | Consolidation of Richvale Irrigation District, Drainage District No. 100, and Drainage District No. 200 is recommended to more efficiently provide facilities and maintenance resources. |

**RID-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)**

| 7-1 | The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements. |
| 7-2 | There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public. |

**RID-8 (Management Efficiencies)**

<p>| 8-1 | The overall management structure of the District is sufficient to account for necessary services and to maintain operations in an efficient and effective manner. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overlapping boundary mapping for Western Canal Water District and Richvale Irrigation District over APNs 029-010-010 and 029-170-009 should be remedied. Both parcels are served irrigation water by Western Canal Water District.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>Four parcels outside of and between the two District boundaries are being served by RID and include APNs 029-030-021, 029-030-022, 029-030-008, and 029-220-048. Inclusion of these parcels in RID’s boundaries may facilitate management of their services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER
3.1 DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 1

District Characteristics

Drainage District No. 1 (DD1) is located east and south of the City of Gridley and directly west of the Feather River (Figure 3-1). The District collects runoff from agricultural irrigation water and natural storms in an area of approximately 6,249 acres. It is uncertain when the District, which is located in the Feather River Watershed, was originally established.

Response to the MSR survey/questionnaire was received by staff on March 26, 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>6,249 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within District:</td>
<td>1,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>649 Township Road, Gridley, CA 95948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Maintain primary drainage ditches for the purpose of conveyance of stormwater drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>It is thought that the District was originally formed in 1905; however, the District’s bylaws were recorded in 1908.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>Drainage District Act of 1885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drainage District No. 1

BUTTE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

Drainage District No. 1, located southeast of the City of Gridley, contains approximately 845 low-density parcels. Of these, 808 residential and agricultural parcels pay taxes and receive drainage services. The remaining parcels are owned by the State of California or other local agencies and do not pay tax. The District has an estimated current population of 1,624 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). Land use in Drainage District No. 1 is primarily agricultural and the District does not prepare any service demand projections for upcoming years.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 3-2) assuming an annual growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County, and assuming an annual growth rate of 5.1 percent for those parcels within the City of Gridley, as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments for 2006–2030.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The land use within the District boundaries is primarily intensive agriculture with very low-density, single-family residences. Those parcels located within the unincorporated area are zoned Agriculture by the Butte County Zoning Ordinance. The City of Gridley boundaries and Sphere of Influence extend into the western portion of the District, and the City has land-use authority over these parcels. The City’s 2005 Zoning map designates many of the parcels within the District as AR-5 (1 unit per 5 acres), R-1 (4 units per acre), C-2 (General Commercial), and Public/Quasi Public. The City recently initiated a 2007 Sphere of Influence Amendment and General Plan Update, including a “Public Outreach and Visioning” process. The outcome of this process has not yet been determined.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 17 percent impervious cover.
Drainage District No. 1 adopted a resolution on August 25, 1995, indicating that increases in impervious cover resulting from urbanization in the Gridley area cause increases in peak flows into the District’s main drain and cause a back-up into District drains in times of heavy storms. The resolution also notes that complaints from landowners regarding this increased flooding have been received in the past. The resolution requests that proponents of new development prepare drainage studies and CEQA review, and ensure that no increase above historic peak flows impact the District. This general process is consistent with the policies of Butte County and the City of Gridley, although information regarding the effectiveness of policy implementation was not readily available.

New connections (i.e., culverts) require approval from the District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination DD1-1 (Growth):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1 The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent in the unincorporated areas and 5.1 percent in the incorporated areas annually for the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/Detention

The District does not own or lease any facilities or property. The District is responsible for maintaining drainage ditches that cross privately owned land and it receives access to these ditches (and underlying property) via easements. The District provides no maintenance of private laterals, which are the responsibility of individual landowners utilizing the main drain ditches. A map of the ditches the District is responsible for maintaining is available in LAFCO’s files. The map was prepared in March 2000 by the District’s consulting engineers, Laughlin and Spence. The District contracts its maintenance duties out to various outside vendors.
Water quality is monitored by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with stormwater pollution.

**Determination DD1-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**

| 2-1 | The District contracts with private vendors to provide maintenance of the primary drainage ditches. The District does not own or lease any facilities or property. |

B. Capacity

When originally designed, Drainage District No. 1 was estimated to have capacity to accommodate one-half inch of rainfall per 24-hour time period. However, this estimate has not been updated and the validity is uncertain. This District did note that during heavy river flows, the District is required to pump water into the Feather River and the pump has a capacity of about 30,000 gpm. Nearby reclamation district canals were sized to handle one-half inch of rainfall runoff per 24-hour time period, which equates to 15 cfs per square mile. The District Engineer indicates that it is possible that DD No. 1 canals were similarly designed. The drainage facilities managed by the District currently accommodate irrigation and stormwater drainage from its 6,249 acres. The Butte County Flood Mitigation Plan noted that a few roads within the District did experience flooding during the 1993 storm events and this is understandable given that the majority of the District is relatively flat and is located near the Feather River.

The District noted that most property owners within its boundaries understand that their agricultural property temporarily stores floodwater during peak events. However, concerns arise when flood waters affect building areas and associated structures, septic systems, and wells. The drainage infrastructure was not originally designed to provide flood control for urban development. The District believes that new urban or residential development may create difficulties.

Enlargement of the pump station located at the Feather River has been discussed, but definitive plans for construction have not been developed.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

**Determination DD1-3 (Capacity):**

3-1 The physical capacity of the District to accommodate drainage or alterations to peak flows is uncertain. Flooding of roads within the District and complaints of flooding from landowners have been documented.

C. Facilities

The District does not own or lease any lands or major facilities. For maintenance purposes it receives access to drainage ditches via easements. The District owns a major pump station at the Feather River discharge, which is capable of discharging 30,000 gpm, and several smaller pump stations exist within the District.

**Determination DD2-4 (Facilities):**

4-1 The District does not own or lease any land or major facilities. The District does own pumping equipment.

---

**FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING**

Drainage District No. 1 follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. Financial audits for Fiscal Year (FY) 2003–2004 and FY 2004–2005 were reviewed.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The District currently has no fee schedule. Rates are based on property assessment of $7.50 per acre with a minimum of $50 per parcel. Collection of assessments is managed by the Butte County Tax Collector as the fiduciary agent.
In FY 2005–2006, the District maintained $285,890 in total net assets. Primary sources of revenue included property taxes, interest, and charges for current services. Operating revenues and expenses totaled $85,805. The total operating revenue for FY 2005–2006 showed a slight gain of $1,151 over the previous fiscal year.

**Figure 3-3. Financial Summary for Drainage District No. 1**

The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan, does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and does not have any outstanding debt. The District has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. The District does have an insurance policy.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations, unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year.

**Determination DD1-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

5-1 The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.

5-2 Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner. In recent years the District’s revenues have exceeded expenditures. The District retains cash and other assets to cover future emergencies or unexpected expenses.
COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING

Drainage District No. 1 is not exposed to excessive liabilities or risks. Maintenance is provided by outside vendors, which are selected after a competitive process with multiple quotes sought. The District believes that use of consultants and other vendors minimizes its overhead and operation costs. The District has not used grant opportunities as a cost avoidance measure. The District has limited costs, which are primarily related to the provision of maintenance services and the need for insurance.

Determination DD1-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):

6-1 Drainage District No. 1 appears to have no need for cost avoidance measures in its operations nor does it have facility or equipment sharing opportunities.

GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The District is an autonomous Special District of the State of California formed under the Drainage District Act of 1885, Uncodified Acts, Act 2200 consistent with the District’s by-laws recorded in March 1908. The bylaws provide for a three-member Board of Trustees, elected by the District landholders. There is some uncertainty regarding the date of the last election of District Board members and the date their term might expire.

The current board consists of three members as follows:

Member
Darin Pantaleoni
Clare Campbell
Jake Stowe

The original by-laws for Drainage District No. 1 suggest that the Board hold quarterly meetings. Recently, however, meetings have been held more frequently, on a bi-monthly basis. Meeting notices are posted at City Hall and the District welcomes any member of the public to attend.
meetings and provide public input on agenda items. District meetings appear to be held in compliance with the Brown Act.

**Determination DD1-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-3</td>
<td>It is recommended that the District provide more information to LAFCO regarding the schedule for elections for Board offices and the dates that Board member terms expire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES**

Drainage District No. 1 operates under direct management of the Board of Trustees. The District has no employees.

**Determination DD1-8 (Management Efficiencies):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Drainage District No. 1 operates under direct management of the Board of Trustees. The District has no employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Determinations for Drainage District No. 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD1-1 (Growth)</td>
<td>1-1 The population within the District is expected to grow at an annual rate of approximately 1.1 percent in the unincorporated areas and 5.1 percent in the incorporated areas for the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD1-2 (Conveyors/ Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1 The District contracts with private vendors to provide maintenance of the primary drainage ditches. The District does not own or lease any facilities or property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD1-3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD1-4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DD1-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring) | 5-1 | The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.  
5-2 Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner. In recent years the District’s revenues have exceeded expenditures. The District retains cash and other assets to cover future emergencies or unexpected expenses. |
| DD1-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing) | 6-1 | Drainage District No. 1 appears to have no need for cost avoidance measures in its operations, nor does it have facility or equipment sharing opportunities. |
| DD1-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability) | 7-1 | The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.  
7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.  
7-3 It is recommended that the District provide more information to LAFCO regarding the schedule for elections for Board offices and the dates that Board member terms expire. |
| DD1-8 (Management Efficiencies) | 8-1 | Drainage District No. 1 operates under the direct management of the Board of Trustees. The District has no employees. |
3.2 DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 2

District Characteristics

Drainage District No. 2 (DD2) is located south and west of the community of Nelson (Figure 3-4). The District was originally formed to make improvements to approximately eight miles of Little Dry Creek, which flows through the District’s boundaries. Additionally, the District maintains a lateral canal connecting Little Dry Creek to Butte Creek. The District provides drainage services to 51 residential and agricultural parcels for irrigation and stormwater flows. The District was established in February of 1920.

The majority of the District has been identified as a 100-year flood zone on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Additionally, mapping performed by the State of California Office of Emergency Services (OES) includes large portions of the District in a number of dam failure inundation areas, including Oroville Dam, Thermalito Afterbay and Thermalito Forebay. The District is located in the Butte Creek Watershed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>7,587 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within District:</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>PO Box 190, Richvale, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Maintain primary drainage ditches and approximately eight miles of Little Dry Creek for the purpose of conveyance of irrigation and stormwater drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>February 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>Section 5 of Act 985 of the Legislation of the State of California, entitled “An Act to Promote Drainage”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drainage District No. 2

BUTTE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

Drainage District No. 2 provides drainage services to the residential and agricultural property owners of approximately 51 low-density parcels northwest of the City of Biggs. The District has an estimated current population of approximately 98 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). Land use in the District is primarily agricultural in nature and no significant additional growth is anticipated within the District. Consequently, the District does not prepare any service demand projections for upcoming years.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 3-5) assuming an annual growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments for 2006–2030.

Figure 3-5. Drainage District No. 2 Estimated Population Growth
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The land use within the District boundaries is primarily intensive agriculture with very low-density, single-family residences. All 51 parcels within this District are zoned Agriculture with a 40-acre minimum, nine of which are held in voluntary agricultural land conservation under rolling 10-year contracts associated with the Williamson Act (www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/index.htm). There is the potential for division of the larger parcels. However, division of agricultural parcels in this area is unlikely due to economic and land use trends associated with the intensity of agriculture within the District and the significant acreage under Williamson Act contracts.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 14 percent impervious cover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination DD2-1 (Growth):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1 The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure

A. Conveyors/Detention

The District does not own or lease any detention facilities; however, it provides maintenance on approximately eight miles of Little Dry Creek and a section of a lateral between Little Dry Creek and Butte Creek for drainage purposes. Little Dry Creek is a naturally occurring tributary to Butte Creek. The Creek has been modified to accommodate irrigation and stormwater flows.
The District provides no maintenance of private laterals, which are the responsibility of individual landowners utilizing the main drain ditches. It is not clear whether Drainage District No. 2 has responsibility for maintaining other drainage laterals within this area. The District contracts its maintenance duties out to various outside vendors.

Water quality is monitored by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with stormwater pollution.

### Determination DD2-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):

| 2-1 | The District contracts with private vendors to provide maintenance of the primary drainage ditches, including that portion of Little Dry Creek that flows through their service area. It is not clear whether the District is responsible for maintaining other drainage laterals within this area. It would be beneficial for the District to prepare a map of the infrastructure it is responsible for maintaining. The District does not own or lease any detention facilities. |

### B. Capacity

Although Drainage District No. 2’s drainage capacity has not been quantified, the District noted that no capacity problems have been reported. The drainage facilities managed by the District currently accommodate irrigation and stormwater drainage from its 7,587 acres. Because the majority of the District is located within a 100-year flood zone as mapped by FEMA, large storm events may potentially cause widespread flooding.

### Determination DD2-3 (Capacity):

| 3-1 | Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity. No capacity problems have been reported to the District. |
C. Facilities

The District does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment. Little Dry Creek is not owned by the district. Rather, easements held across private property provide the District access to the creek for maintenance and operation purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination DD2-4 (Facilities):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1 The District does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING

The District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. A summary of estimated revenue and expenditures was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2004–2005 and proposed/approved budget for FY 2005–2006.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The District currently has no fee schedule. Rates are based on property assessment only, which is managed by the Butte County Tax Collector as their fiduciary agent.

In FY 2005–06, the District maintained $10,997 in total net assets. Primary sources of revenue included property taxes, interest, and charges for current services. Operating revenues and expenses totaled $4,157. The total operating revenue for FY 2005–06 showed a loss of $197, however, there were sufficient funds in the District’s fund balance to offset the loss. Although there are no emergency funding strategies or reserve policies in place, there remain sufficient carryover funds from year to year for the operating expenses required for this District’s operational costs (Figure 3-6).
The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan, does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and does not have any outstanding debt. The District has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. The District is a member of the Special Districts Insurance Program.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations, unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. District officials have complied with this requirement through submittal of annual budgets to the County Auditor.

**Determination DD2-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

5-1 The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.

5-2 Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner. Although in recent years it appears that the District’s expenditures have matched its revenues, there remains a small balance for emergencies or unexpected expenses.
COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING

Drainage District No. 2 has an informal agreement that allows Western Canal Water District (WCWD) to utilize Little Dry Creek to convey WCWD’s irrigation water downstream to local farmers during the summer season. In exchange for this conveyance, WCWD provides up to $1,000 of in-kind service for the purpose of maintaining Little Dry Creek for drainage.

To save money, the Trustees of DD2 have waived any compensation for meeting attendance, etc.

The entirety of Drainage District No. 2 (DD2) lies within the boundaries of Butte Creek Drainage District, a much larger district that surrounds DD2 on three sides (Figure 3-7). The two Districts were formed under the same enabling statute and provide the same services. It may be that the consolidation of the Districts could provide more efficient and seamless management of the drainage resources in the area. Both Districts are currently operationally administered by Western Canal Water District’s Manager (Figure 2-15). Neither District has sufficient staff or resources to perform its own administrative and maintenance duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination DD2-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1 Because Drainage District No. 2 is located entirely within Butte Creek Drainage District’s boundaries and they provide the same services, district consolidation may provide a more efficient and seamless management of the drainage facilities and services in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship Between Drainage Districts

Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The District is an autonomous Special District of the State of California formed under the Drainage District Act of 1885, Uncodified Acts, Act 2200 consistent with the District’s by-laws recorded in March 1920. The bylaws provide for a three-member Board of Directors, elected by the District landholders. For many years, the District has not had sufficient turnout of landholders at its board meetings to hold such an election. The board members serving at the present time were each appointed by prior board members to fill the positions until such an election was held.

The current board consists of three members as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Sheppard</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Thengvall</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Lundberg</td>
<td>May 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drainage District No. 2 holds annual meetings. Meeting agendas are prepared by the Western Canal Water District Manager. District meetings comply with the Brown Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination DD2-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1 The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-3 It is recommended that the District develop a plan to hold regular elections for Board offices. Additionally, it may be beneficial to increase the frequency of Board meetings from annual to semi-annual in order to facilitate District management and provide increased opportunity for public involvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES

Drainage District No. 2 contracts with Western Canal Water District to administer the operations of the District in accordance with policies adopted by the Board of Directors. The contract is currently in the process of being formalized.

**Determination DD2-8 (Management Efficiencies):**

8-1 Because Drainage District No. 2 contracts out all administrative duties, consolidation with other districts may be beneficial for management efficiency.

8-2 The District should continue to follow through with formalizing the contract with Western Canal Water District for administrative services.

**Summary of Determinations for Drainage District No. 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD2-1 (Growth)</td>
<td>The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD2-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>The District contracts with private vendors to provide maintenance of the primary drainage ditches, including that portion of Little Dry Creek that flows through their service area. It is not clear whether the District is responsible for maintaining other drainage laterals within this area. It would be beneficial for the District to prepare a map of the infrastructure it is responsible for maintaining. The District does not own or lease any detention facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD2-3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity. No capacity problems have been reported to the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD2-4 (Facilities)</strong></td>
<td>4-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD2-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</strong></td>
<td>5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD2-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</strong></td>
<td>6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD2-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</strong></td>
<td>7-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD2-8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 100

District Characteristics

Drainage District No. 100 (DD100) was originally established on August 30, 1915, under the California Water Act of 1913 for the purpose of providing irrigation and stormwater drainage services to the fledgling rice industry surrounding the small agricultural communities of Richvale and Nelson (Figure 3-8). The District provides drainage of irrigation and stormwater flows to approximately 486 agricultural and rural residential parcels.

The majority of Drainage District No. 100 has been identified as a 100-year flood zone by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Additionally, mapping performed by the State of California Office of Emergency Services (OES) includes almost the entirety of the District in several dam failure inundation zones including Oroville Dam, Thermalito Afterbay and Thermalito Forebay. Drainage District No. 100 is located in the Butte Creek watershed.

| District Size: | 27,013 acres |
| Parcels within District: | 486 |
| Estimated Population within District: | 933 |
| Office Location: | 301 School Street, Richvale, CA (mailing address: PO Box 386, Richvale, CA, 95974) |
| Services: | Maintain drainage ditches for conveyance of irrigation and stormwater flows from private drain laterals |
| Employees: | One full-time, one part-time |
| Date of Formation: | August 30, 1915 |
| Enabling Legislation: | CA Water Act of 1913 |
Drainage District No. 100

BUTTE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Source: Butte LAFCO
Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

Drainage District No. 100 provides drainage services to the residential and agricultural property owners of approximately 486 parcels surrounding Richvale and the agricultural community of Nelson. The District has an estimated population of approximately 933 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). The majority of the parcels are primarily agricultural in nature and no significant additional growth is anticipated for the District. Consequently, the District does not prepare any service demand projections for upcoming years.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 3-9) assuming a growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments 2006–2030 growth projections.

Figure 3-9. Drainage District No. 100 Estimated Population Growth
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The area within the District boundaries is primarily intensive agriculture (mainly rice fields) with very low-density, single-family residences. The majority of the parcels within this District are zoned Agriculture with a 40-acre minimum, and approximately 114 acres are zoned Agriculture with a 5-acre minimum. Eighty-six of the agricultural parcels are held in voluntary agricultural land conservation under rolling 10-year contracts associated with the Williamson Act (www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/index.htm). There is the potential for division of the larger parcels. However, division of agricultural parcels in this area is unlikely due to economic and land-use trends associated with the intensity of agriculture within the District and the significant acreage under Williamson Act contracts.

The District also encompasses the communities of Nelson and Richvale, which are primarily low-density residential farming communities. The zoning and General Plan designations of the area indicates that there is limited potential for significant development in or surrounding either of these communities.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 21 percent impervious cover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination DD100-1 (Growth):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1  The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Infrastructure

A. Conveyors/Detention

Infrastructure within the District consists of a network of drainage and irrigation canals. Drainage channels were constructed to convey agricultural return water from surrounding fields. Eventually, the drainage water flows to Butte Creek via several alternate routes/laterals. Given the overlapping ownership of the lateral canals, LAFCO would benefit from having a list and/or a map of drainage canals that this District is responsible for maintaining.

The District does not own or lease any detention facilities. However, it provides maintenance of ditches for stormwater and irrigation drainage purposes and a total of 13 bridges that are owned by the District. The District provides no maintenance of laterals, which are the responsibility of individual landowners.

All in-District maintenance duties are performed by Drainage District No. 100 staff. The District’s irrigation and stormwater ultimately drains into Butte Creek, which is located outside of the District boundaries. Butte Creek provides drainage conveyance for a number of districts in the area. In order to assist in the maintenance of Butte Creek, the District is part of a multi-party maintenance agreement with Reclamation District No. 833, Drainage District No. 200, Butte Slough Irrigation District, and Butte Creek Drainage District (Figure 3-10). The maintenance agreement was established on June 2, 1936, and quantifies a shared compensation between Drainage District No. 100 and Butte Creek Drainage District for the annual cost of maintenance along Butte Creek and Moulton Cut. The cost-share proportion is based on the total acreage of the agreement parties. Reclamation District No. 833’s portion is the combined acreage of it and Drainage District No. 200’s acreage. It is the District’s understanding that maintenance of Butte Creek is performed or coordinated by Reclamation District No. 833 on an annual basis or as needed. However, there appears to be some miscommunication or misunderstanding as to who undertakes actual maintenance duties.
Drainage District No. 100 lies within the Butte Creek watershed, directly west of the Cherokee Canal. Water quality is monitored by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with stormwater pollution.

**Determination DD100-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**

2-1 Drainage District No. 100 employees provide all in-District maintenance duties.

2-2 Given the overlapping ownership of the lateral canals, LAFCO would benefit from having a list or a map of drainage canals that this District is responsible for maintaining.

2-3 The District is part of a multi-party Maintenance Agreement with Reclamation District No. 833, Drainage District No. 200, Butte Slough Irrigation District, and Butte Creek Drainage District for shared maintenance of Butte Creek and Moulton Cut. It is recommended that the details of how the maintenance agreement is fulfilled be made clear to all districts involved, in addition to Butte LAFCO.

2-4 The District does not own or lease any detention facilities.

**B. Capacity**

Drainage District No. 100’s drainage capacity has not been quantified. The drainage facilities managed by the District currently accommodate irrigation and stormwater drainage from 27,013 acres. The District indicates that no capacity problems have been reported. However, it should be noted that because the majority of the District is located within a 100-year flood zone as mapped by FEMA and the State of California OES, large storm events will likely cause widespread flooding regardless of the District’s drainage capacities.

**Determination DD100-3 (Capacity):**

3-1 Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.
C. Facilities

Drainage District No. 100 owns approximately two acres within the town of Richvale, which is utilized for offices, maintenance buildings, and equipment storage. The District provided an inventory of its equipment, including the following: two backhoes, one mower, one pickup, and two trucks, all of which are in good condition. The District does not own any ditches or detention facilities. However, it does own and maintain 13 bridges located throughout the District.

**Determination DD100-4 (Facilities):**

4-1 The District owns approximately two acres within the town of Richvale, for the purpose of offices, maintenance buildings, and equipment storage. No need for additional facilities were identified.

**FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING**

The District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. A summary of estimated revenue and expenditures was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2003–2004 and the proposed/approved budget for FY 2004–2005.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The District charges a rate of $4.50 per acre on all properties greater than one acre in size and located within the District boundaries.

In FY 2004–2005, the District maintained $153,622 in total net assets. Major sources of revenue included property taxes, interest, and charges for current services. Operating revenues totaled $193,000. Operating expenses totaled $233,000, which exceeded revenues. The total operating
income for FY 2004–2005 remained that of FY 2003–2004. There are no emergency funding strategies or reserve policies in place (Figure 3-11).

**Figure 3-11. Financial Summary for Drainage District No. 100**

![Financial Summary for Drainage District No. 100](image)

The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan, does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and does not have any outstanding debt. The District has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. The District is a member of the Special Districts Insurance Program.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations, unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. District officials have complied with this requirement through submittal of annual budgets to the County Auditor.

**Determination DD100-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

5-1 Since FY 2003–2004, expenditures have exceeded revenues. Rates should continue to be re-evaluated as necessary to ensure that they cover the costs of providing related services.
COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING

Drainage District No. 100 overlaps with Butte Creek Drainage District boundaries in the northern portion of the District (Figure 3-7). Because the two Districts provide essentially the same services, it would be preferable to reorganize the boundaries in the overlap area such that it is covered by only one of the two districts.

**Determination DD100-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):**

6-1 The overlap area between Drainage District 100 and Butte Creek Drainage District in the northern part of the District should be reorganized such that the area is covered by only one of the two districts.

GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The District is an autonomous Special District of the State of California formed under the Water Act of 1913. The District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees that are elected by the District landholders.

The Trustees serve four-year terms and are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Lundburg</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Thengvall</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Arens</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the Board of Trustees are appointed by election and receive compensation in the sum of $50 per meeting. Drainage District No. 100 holds monthly meetings, and meeting agendas are prepared by the District Manager. All meetings appear to be in compliance with the Brown Act.
### Determination DD100-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES

The Board of Trustees appoints a full-time manager to administer the day-to-day operations of the District and to oversee a staff of one seasonal employee. The management structure of the District is relatively simple and is well-suited to the type of operations undertaken by the District. No inefficiencies in management of the District were noted.

### Determination DD100-8 (Management Efficiencies):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>The overall management structure of the District is sufficient to account for necessary services and to maintain operations in an efficient and effective manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Determinations for Drainage District No. 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD100-1 (Growth)</td>
<td>The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD100-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>Drainage District No. 100 employees provide all in-District maintenance duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Given the overlapping ownership of the lateral canals, LAFCO would benefit from having a list or a map of drainage canals that this District is responsible for maintaining.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>The District is part of a multi-party Maintenance Agreement with Reclamation District No. 833, Drainage District No. 200, Butte Slough Irrigation District, and Butte Creek Drainage District for shared maintenance of Butte Creek and Moulton Cut. It is recommended that the details of how the maintenance agreement is fulfilled be made clear to all districts involved, in addition to Butte LAFCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>The District does not own or lease any detention facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD100-3 (Capacity)</strong></td>
<td>3-1 Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD100-4 (Facilities)</strong></td>
<td>4-1 The District owns approximately two acres within the town of Richvale, for the purpose of offices, maintenance buildings, and equipment storage. No need for additional facilities were identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD100-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</strong></td>
<td>5-1 Since FY 2003–2004, expenditures have exceeded revenues. Rates should continue to be re-evaluated as necessary to ensure that they cover the costs of providing related services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD100-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</strong></td>
<td>6-1 The overlap area between Drainage District 100 and Butte Creek Drainage District in the northern part of the District should be reorganized such that the area is covered by only one of the two districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DD100-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</strong></td>
<td>7-1 The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD100-8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 200

District Characteristics

A survey/questionnaire was mailed to this District on June 22, 2006. The consultant team made follow-up telephone calls requesting the District’s response to the questionnaire on July 12th. A second questionnaire was emailed to the District’s legal counsel on July 12th. A response from the District was not received. Consequently, very limited information about the District is available to include in this MSR. Information included in this section has been assembled from research of various documents identified in the Bibliography. A map has been prepared by LAFCO based on the most current information available in their files (Figure 3-12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>5,528 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within District:</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
3.5 BUTTE CREEK DRAINAGE DISTRICT

District Characteristics

Butte Creek Drainage District (BCDD) is located south of the community of Durham and west of Highway 99 (Figure 3-13). The District was originally formed to deepen, enlarge, or clean out the channel of Butte Creek and other channels necessary to provide adequate drainage of irrigation and stormwater flows for the properties within its boundaries. The District is responsible for maintenance of the Smith Bridge and the Moulton Cut in the Butte Sink area to provide water to waterfowl hunters in exchange for accepting drainage water. The District provides services to approximately 276 agricultural and 45 single-family residential parcels for a total of approximately 47,852 acres. The District was established November 27, 1920.

The majority of Butte Creek Drainage District has been identified as a 100-year flood zone by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Additionally, mapping performed by the State of California Office of Emergency Services (OES) includes almost the entirety of the District in a number of dam failure inundation areas, including Oroville Dam, Paradise Lake, and Magalia Reservoir. The District is located within the Butte Creek and Little Chico Creek Watersheds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size: 47,852 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District: 321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within District: 616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location: PO Box 190, Richvale, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services: Maintain Butte Creek and associated primary drainages for conveyance of irrigation water and stormwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation: November 27, 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation: “An Act to Promote Drainage” Section 5 of Act 985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

The District provides drainage services to the agricultural and residential property owners of approximately 47,852 acres in the Richvale area of southwestern Butte County and southeastern Glenn County and includes the small agricultural community of Nelson. The District has an estimated current population of approximately 616 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction).

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 3-14) assuming an annual growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments for 2006–2030.

Figure 3-14. Butte Creek Drainage District Estimated Population Growth

![Butte Creek Drainage District Estimated Population Growth](image-url)
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The area within the District boundaries is primarily intensive agriculture with very low-density, single-family residences. The majority of parcels within this District are zoned Agriculture with a 40-acre minimum (approximately 47,795 acres) by the Butte County and Glenn County General Plans. The majority of parcels are primarily agricultural in nature, 78 of which are held in voluntary agricultural land conservation under rolling 10-year contracts associated with the Williamson Act (www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/index.htm). Given the 40-acre minimum parcel size, there is the potential for division of the larger parcels. However, division of agricultural parcels in this area is unlikely due to economic and land-use trends associated with the intensity of agriculture within the District and the significant acreage under Williamson Act contracts. Additionally, there is a small amount, approximately 57 acres, of land designated for single-family residences in the small agricultural community of Nelson. Nelson is located on the Midway between Durham and Richvale.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 20 percent impervious cover.

### Determination BCDD-I (Growth):

1-I The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.
Infrastructure

A. Conveyors/Detention

The District does not own or operate any detention facilities. Its primary purpose is to provide maintenance for the main drainage ditches, a portion of Butte Creek, Smith Bridge and the Moulton Cut in the Butte Sink area. The District provides no maintenance of laterals, which are the responsibility of individual landowners utilizing the main drainage ditches. Water quality is monitored by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with stormwater pollution.

All maintenance duties for Butte Creek Drainage District are performed by Reclamation District No. 833 under contract. Additionally, the District is part of a multi-party maintenance agreement with Reclamation District No. 833, Butte Slough Irrigation District, and Drainage Districts Nos. 100 and 200 for maintenance of Butte Creek and Moulton Cut (Figure 3-10). The agreement was established on June 2, 1936, and quantifies a shared 50 percent compensation between Drainage District No. 100 and Butte Creek Drainage District. Butte Creek provides drainage conveyance for a number of districts in the area. It is the District’s understanding that maintenance of Butte Creek is performed by Reclamation District No. 833 on an annual basis or as needed. However, there appears to be some miscommunication or misunderstanding as to who undertakes the actual maintenance duties of the agreement.
### Determination BCDD-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):

2-1 Butte Creek Drainage District contracts with Reclamation District No. 833 for all maintenance duties.

2-2 The District is part of a multi-party maintenance agreement with Drainage Districts Nos. 100 and 200, Butte Slough Irrigation District, and Reclamation District No. 833 to provide maintenance of Butte Creek and Moulton Cut. The District is also responsible for maintenance of Smith Bridge in the Butte Sink area. It is recommended that the details of how the multi-party maintenance agreement is fulfilled be made clear to all districts involved, in addition to Butte LAFCO.

2-3 The District does not own or operate any detention facilities.

### A. Capacity

The District’s drainage capacity has not been quantified. The drainage facilities managed by the District currently accommodate irrigation and stormwater drainage from 47,852 acres. The District indicates that no capacity problems have been reported. However, it should be noted that because the majority of the District is located within a 100-year flood zone area as mapped by FEMA, large storm events have the potential to cause widespread flooding.

### Determination BCDD-3 (Capacity):

3-1 Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.

### B. Facilities

The District does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment. Butte Creek and associated drainages are not owned by the District. Rather, easements held across private property allows the District access to the creek for maintenance and operation purposes.

### Determination BCDD-4 (Facilities):

4-1 The District does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.
FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING

The District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. A summary of estimated revenue and expenditures was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2004–2005 and proposed/approved budget for FY 2005–2006.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The District currently has no fee schedule. Rates are based on property assessments, which are managed by the Butte County Tax Collector as their fiduciary agent.

It should be noted that Butte Creek Drainage District is a bi-county district. Approximately 70 percent of its revenue is from parcels within Butte County and the remaining 30 percent is derived from parcels within Glenn County. Butte County Treasury holds money for the District and serves as the county of record for filing with the State Controller (LGFA).

In FY 2005–06, the District maintained $145,619 in total net assets. Major sources of revenue included property taxes and interest. Operating revenues totaled $10,990. Operating expenses totaled $8,500. The total operating income for FY 2005–06 showed a gain of $2,490. Although there are no emergency funding strategies or reserve policies in place, there remain sufficient carryover funds from year to year for the operating expenses required for this District’s operational costs (Figure 3-15).
The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan, does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and has no outstanding debt. The District has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. The District is a member of the Special Districts Insurance Program.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the county in which it conducts its principal operations unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. District officials have complied with this requirement through submittal of annual budgets to the County Auditor.

**Determination BCDD-5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

5-1 The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.

5-2 Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner. Although in recent years it appears that the District’s expenditures have been close to their revenues, there remains a balance available for emergencies or unexpected expenses.
COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING

The District has an informal agreement with Western Canal Water District (WCWD) to utilize WCWD administrative services at no cost to the District (Figure 2-11). District Trustees receive compensation in the sum of $50 per meeting.

Butte Creek Drainage District includes the entirety of Drainage District No. 2 within its boundaries. Additionally, a portion of the District overlaps with Drainage District No. 100 in an area east of the community of Nelson (Figure 3-7). The three Districts were formed under the same enabling statute and provide the same services. It has been suggested that the services of Drainage District No. 2 and Butte Creek Drainage District be consolidated to provide a more efficient and cost-effective management of the drainage resources between the two Districts. Both Districts are currently operationally administered by Western Canal Water District’s Manager (Figure 2-15). Neither District has sufficient staff or resources to perform its own administrative and maintenance duties. Additionally, the service area that is shared by Butte Creek Drainage District and Drainage District No. 100 should be reorganized such that there is no duplication of services in the same location (Figure 3-7).

**Determination BCDD-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Because Drainage District No. 2 is located entirely within Butte Creek Drainage District’s boundaries and they provide the same services, consolidation of the two Districts may provide a more efficient and cost-effective management of the drainage resources between the two districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>The overlap of district boundaries between Butte Creek Drainage District and Drainage District No. 100 should be reorganized such that there is no duplication of services in the same location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The District is an autonomous Special District of the State of California formed under the Drainage District Act of 1885, Uncodified Acts, Act 2200. Consistent with its 1920 Charter, the
District is governed by a three-member Board of Directors who are elected by the District landholders. The Board members serve in four-year terms, or until successors are elected. For many years, the District has not had sufficient turnout of landholders at its board meetings to hold such an election. The board members serving at the present time were all appointed by prior board members to fill the positions until such an election was held.

Currently, Butte Creek Drainage District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eric Larrabee</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Tennis</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Harris</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Butte Creek Drainage District holds semi-annual meetings. Meeting agendas are prepared by the Western Canal Water District Manager as part of their agreement for administrative services. All meetings comply with the Brown Act through posting of public notices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination BCDD-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1 In its day-to-day operations, the District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-3 In the long run, the District should develop a plan to hold regular elections for Board offices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES

Butte Creek Drainage District operates under an informal agreement with Western Canal Water District to administer the operations of the District in accordance with policies adopted by the Board of Directors. There is no exchange of fee or services for this function.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

**Determination BCDD-8 (Management Efficiencies):**

8-1 Butte Creek Drainage District has an informal agreement with Western Canal Water District to administer the operations of the District in accordance with policies adopted by the Board of Directors. This agreement should be formalized and a copy provided to LAFCO.

8-2 Because the District contracts out both administrative and maintenance duties, consolidation with other districts may be beneficial for management efficiency.

**Summary of Determinations for Butte Creek Drainage District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCDD-1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCDD-2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>Butte Creek Drainage District contracts with Reclamation District No. 833 for all maintenance duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>The District is part of a multi-party maintenance agreement with Drainage Districts Nos. 100 and 200, Butte Slough Irrigation District, and Reclamation District No. 833 to provide maintenance of Butte Creek and Moulton Cut. The District is also responsible for maintenance of Smith Bridge in the Butte Sink area. It is recommended that the details of how the multi-party maintenance agreement is fulfilled be made clear to all districts involved, in addition to Butte LAFCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>The District does not own or operate any detention facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCDD-3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, the District does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCDD-4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>The District does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCDD-5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner. Although in recent years it appears that the District’s expenditures have been close to its revenues, there remains a balance available for emergencies or unexpected expenses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCDD-6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</th>
<th>6-1</th>
<th>Because Drainage District No. 2 is located entirely within Butte Creek Drainage District’s boundaries and they provide the same services, consolidation of the two Districts may provide a more efficient and cost-effective management of the drainage resources between the two districts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>The overlap of district boundaries between Butte Creek Drainage District and Drainage District No. 100 should be reorganized such that there is no duplication of services in the same location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCDD-7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</th>
<th>7-1</th>
<th>In its day-to-day operations, the District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-3</td>
<td>In the long run, the District should develop a plan to hold regular elections for Board offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCDD-8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Butte Creek Drainage District has an informal agreement with Western Canal Water District to administer the operations of the District in accordance with policies adopted by the Board of Directors. This agreement should be formalized and a copy provided to LAFCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>Because the District contracts out both administrative and maintenance duties, consolidation with other districts may be beneficial for management efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 CSA NO. 4 – SIERRA DEL ORO DRAINAGE

**CSA Characteristics**

County Service Area No. 4 (CSA No. 4), commonly referred to as Sierra Del Oro Drainage, was established on July 23, 1963, under the County Service Area Law. It was formed to provide street lighting, water quality testing, and stormwater drainage services to 4,473 single-family residential parcel owners. For the purpose of this MSR, only the drainage services will be reviewed.

The CSA is located in the unincorporated Paradise Pines Area north of the Town of Paradise (Figure 3-16). Paradise Lake and Magalia Reservoir occur outside of the CSA to the east. Although the southeastern corner of the CSA is within the Magalia Reservoir Inundation Area along Little Butte Creek, there are no residential parcels within this area. None of the residential parcels within the CSA are identified as a flood zone by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CSA Size:</strong></th>
<th>Approximately 2,615 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcels within CSA:</strong></td>
<td>4,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Population within CSA:</strong></td>
<td>8,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Location:</strong></td>
<td>7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA  95965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services:</strong></td>
<td>Street lighting, water quality testing, and stormwater drainage services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees:</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Formation:</strong></td>
<td>July 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling Legislation:</strong></td>
<td>County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2 Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3-16

Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

The CSA provides stormwater drainage services to the residential property owners of approximately 4,473 parcels. The CSA has an estimated population of 8,588 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). CSAs were created to serve a specified number of parcels and are not likely to expand.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the CSA has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 3-17) assuming an annual growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated area and the nearby Town of Paradise as determined by the Butte County Association of Governments for 2006–2030.

Figure 3-17. CSA No. 4 – Sierra Del Oro Drainage Estimated Population Growth
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The CSA lies within the Butte Creek Watershed in the Sierra Nevada foothills near the Town of Paradise. Winter and spring storms bring precipitation to the area, and the resulting stormwater flows into Middle Butte Creek via surface flow and constructed pipes, channels, and drop inlets. Middle Butte Creek is a tributary of Butte Creek. Middle Butte Creek and its unnamed tributary flow southerly through the center of the CSA. The headwaters of Firhaven Creek flows southerly through the small northeastern portion of the CSA, and Little Butte Creek flows southerly near the southeastern boundary of the CSA. Slaughterhouse Ravine flows southerly through the southwestern portion of the CSA. The headwaters of two unnamed tributaries of Butte Creek flow southerly through the southern portion of the CSA. Although the Upper Centerville Canal is located due west of CSA No. 4, only 1,000 feet of the canal flow through the upper northwestern corner. Eventually, Butte Creek drains into the Sacramento River.

Current land use within the CSA is primarily single-family residential. Significant population growth within the CSA is not anticipated. This CSA is designed to meet the stormwater drainage needs of only its existing service area, so additional capacity is not available to accommodate additional growth.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 13 percent impervious cover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination CSA No. 4–1 (Growth):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1  This CSA is not expected to grow beyond its original boundaries, due to constraints associated with the design of its drainage system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/Detention

The CSA does not own or lease any detention facilities. Its primary purpose is to provide maintenance for roadside drainage ditches and swales. County road crews maintain any roadside ditches that may become clogged with debris on an annual and as-needed basis. CSA No. 4 is located in the Butte Creek watershed. Water quality is monitored by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Determination CSA No. 4–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**

2-1 This CSA does not own or lease any stormwater drainage or detention facilities. Furthermore, no inclusion or expansion of such facilities is anticipated.

B. Capacity

The CSA’s drainage capacity has not been quantified. The roadside ditches and swales managed by this CSA currently accommodate stormwater drainage from 2,615 acres. There are no levees nor is there a history of known flooding within this CSA.

**Determination CSA No. 4–3 (Capacity):**

3-1 No increases in capacity are anticipated for this CSA.

C. Facilities

The CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.

**Determination CSA No. 4–4 (Facilities):**

4-1 This CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING

The CSA follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards and has not been audited. A summary of estimated revenue, other financing sources, and residual equity transfers was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2001–2002 and FY 2002–2003 and the proposed/approved budget for FY 2003–2004.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the CSA at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The CSA has no fee schedule. Rates are based on assessment only which are managed by the Butte County Tax Collector as their fiduciary agent.
Accumulated reserves for CSAs are shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 15 sheet, provided in Appendix G. As shown in Figure 3-18, in Fiscal Years 2001–2002, 2002–2003, and 2003–2004, the reserves/designations for CSA No. 4 increased gradually each year from $238,868, to $278,425, and to $341,034, respectively. Appendix G also provides updated information for FY 2005–2006 and proposed numbers for FY 2006–2007. The reserves are held to help the County with major unanticipated future expense, such as levee failure. Expenditures varied throughout the three fiscal years we studied. Expenditures generally consist of charges for interfund services from other County departments, such as the Auditor, roads, and General Services.

The CSA’s “available” fund balance is carried over from the previous year as shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 16. It does not equate to an actual fund balance (i.e., Schedule 15). For FY 2001–2002 the available fund balance was $241,685. For FY 2002–2003 fund balance was $44,557, and for FY 2003–2004 the available fund balance was $50,453.

Because of the complexity of the County’s budget process and the various reporting schedules, the data presented in Figure 3-18 may not “add-up” at first glance. Our preliminary review of the CSA’s budget indicates that revenues generally cover the costs of expenses in a typical fiscal
year. A detailed review of the CSA budget is beyond the scope of this study. Additional budget and administrative information can be obtained from the Butte County Department of Public Works. It should also be noted that the information presented in this report is based on data received from the Department of Public Works, and the CSA Administrator has advised that all final County budget information resides with the County Auditor’s office.

The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan (although one may not be necessary since no improvements are planned). The CSA does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and has no outstanding debt. The CSA has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. County staff who provide maintenance of CSAs are covered under the County’s general insurance.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. CSA officials noted that annual budgets are submitted to the County Auditor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination CSA No. 4–5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1 The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2 Historically, the CSA has operated in a fiscally sound manner. Revenues have consistently exceeded expenditures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The CSA is not exposed to any significant risks or liabilities. Grant opportunities are not used to defray costs. CSA No. 4 has minimal costs, primarily services and supplies. It has no employees, facilities, or infrastructure. This CSA is cooperatively managed along with other CSAs by the Butte County Department of Public Works. The Board of Supervisors acts as the governing body. This management under the county umbrella is efficient.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

---

**Determination CSA No. 4–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):**

The CSA appears to operate efficiently. Additional cost avoidance measures for operations or facilities sharing opportunities are not warranted at this time.

---

**GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The Butte County Board of Supervisors serves as the decision-making authority of the CSA. The County of Butte is divided into five supervisory districts. The districts vary in size to provide for an equal distribution of the County’s population, rather than by geographical size. District division based on population is designed to give all citizens of the County equal representation on the County Board. “Whenever the United States Census shows that the population of any supervisory district exceeds or lacks more than twenty-three percent as compared with the population in another district or districts, then the Board shall change the boundaries of such district or districts so that the population of each district shall be as nearly equal as possible” (Butte County Charter Article II, Section 6). District lines can change, and consideration of this process takes place following Census years.

Each district elects a Supervisor to represent that district on the County Board of Supervisors. The term of office for a Supervisor is four years, and there is no limit on the number of terms a member may serve. Supervisors must be residents of the district they represent at the time they are elected, and they must remain residents of that district while in office. At the beginning of each year the Board elects a new Chair and Vice Chair.

The current five members are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues relating to CSA No. 4 are addressed during regular Board meetings. The Board generally meets the second and fourth Tuesday of each month. Meetings start at 9:00 a.m. and are held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Administration Building, 25 County Center Drive, Oroville. The agenda for each Board meeting is posted in front of the County Administration Building at least 72 hours prior to each meeting. Agendas are usually posted at that location and on the County Clerk of the Board web site by 4:00 p.m. on the Wednesday prior to the Tuesday meeting. Agendas are also available by mail and e-mail subscription. Past minutes are also posted on the County web site. The County Counsel, who sits on all regularly scheduled meetings, is responsible for ensuring Board compliance with the Brown Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination CSA No. 4–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1 The CSA maintains accountability and compliance in its governance, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in CSA activities through attendance of County Board of Supervisor’s meetings, during which time issues regarding CSAs are discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES**

The Butte County Department of Public Works Land Development Manager oversees the administration of the CSA. County road crews provide maintenance of drainage systems as needed. There are no other employees hired specifically by the CSA. The County has had no actions filed against it from any regulatory agencies within the last 10 years.

Information with regard to the various aspects of each CSA as required for this report was not readily accessible. Methods of communicating between CSA administration and the road crews who provide the day-to-day operations is not clear. Ideally, managers of a storm drain system would be able to demonstrate a conceptual understanding of the nature of storms, hydrology, infrastructure design capacity and functional capacity. Also, a list of related storm drainage infrastructure would be beneficial.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

### Determination CSA No. 4–8 (Management Efficiencies):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Due to the small size of the CSA, it can maintain its operations in an efficient and effective manner without permanent employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>As information concerning the CSA is not readily available, the County should consider reorganizing the management structure for CSAs to promote a more responsive and efficient management process and to provide additional technical expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>The County has had no actions taken against it from regulatory agencies in regard to the CSAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Determinations for CSA No. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSA No. 4–1 (Population and Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>This CSA is not expected to grow beyond its original boundaries due to constraints associated with the design of its drainage system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>This CSA does not own or lease any stormwater drainage or detention facilities. Furthermore, no inclusion or expansion of such facilities is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4–3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>No increases in capacity are anticipated for this CSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4–4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>This CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4–5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Historically, the CSA has operated in a fiscally sound manner. Revenues have consistently exceeded expenditures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>The CSA appears to operate efficiently. Additional cost avoidance measures for operations or facilities sharing opportunities are not warranted at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>The CSA maintains accountability and compliance in its governance, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in CSA activities through attendance of County Board of Supervisor’s meetings, during which time issues regarding CSAs are discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4–8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Due to the small size of the CSA, it can maintain its operations in an efficient and effective manner without permanent employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>As information concerning the CSA is not readily available, the County should consider reorganizing the management structure for CSAs to promote a more responsive and efficient management process and to provide additional technical expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>The County has had no actions taken against it from regulatory agencies in regard to the CSAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 CSA NO. 23 – PLEASANT VALLEY DRAINAGE

CSA Characteristics

Pleasant Valley Drainage (CSA No. 23) was established on December 28, 1965, to provide stormwater drainage maintenance services to 2,015 primarily residential parcels. The majority of the parcels are urban, with most of the development occurring in the City of Chico and some in the unincorporated area of Butte County (Figure 3-19). Annexations are currently in process that will result in the entirety of CSA No. 23 being within the City boundaries. The CSA is located in the Big Chico Creek Watershed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSA Size:</th>
<th>663 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within CSA:</td>
<td>2,015 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within CSA:</td>
<td>6,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA 95965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Stormwater drainage maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>December 28, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

The CSA provides storm drainage services to the primarily residential property owners of 2,015 parcels. The CSA has an estimated population of approximately 6,403 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). CSAs were created to serve a specified number of parcels and are not likely to expand.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the CSA has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 3-20) assuming an annual growth rate of 2.5 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the City of Chico as determined by the Butte County Association of Governments for 2006–2030.

Figure 3-20. CSA No. 23 – Pleasant Valley Drainage Estimated Population Growth
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

CSA No. 23 lies within the Big Chico Creek watershed, specifically south of Sycamore Creek and north of Lindo Channel. Winter and Spring storms bring precipitation to the area. The precipitation is collected in a series of structures and drains into Sycamore Creek and Lindo Channel. Eventually the stormwater makes its way to Big Chico Creek and the Sacramento River. Most of the area within CSA No. 23 is in the City of Chico and land use is regulated by the City of Chico General Plan and zoning ordinance. CSA No. 23 will be fully within the City limits following current and future annexation activities. Existing land use within the CSA boundaries is primarily urban residential with some minimal areas or parcels designated for open space. Based on BCAG’s 2006–2030 population projections, growth in the City of Chico is expected to occur at a rate of approximately 2.5 percent annually. However, County and City staff indicate that the area within the CSA appears to be mostly built out at this time. The CSA is designed to meet the stormwater needs of its existing service area only, so it does not have additional capacity available to accommodate growth beyond the buildout of the service area it was designed for. As new development occurs, developers are required to construct stormwater drainage facilities and establish their own maintenance agreements as part of their development projects.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 50 percent impervious cover.

The spatial distribution of the CSA boundaries includes several islands of land that are not served by the CSA. Additional consultation with City and County staff is needed to determine whether these areas currently receive drainage services.
**Determination CSA No. 23–1 (Growth):**

The CSA is not expected to experience growth beyond the buildout of the original design of its drainage systems. BCAG growth projections estimate a 2.5 percent growth rate in the City of Chico.

---

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/detention

The CSA is solely a storm drainage maintenance and assessment district and does not own any conveyance or detention facilities. Developers are required to construct their own detention facilities and/or drainage delivery infrastructure as part of their development agreements. The current drainage system consists of underground piping, open channels and drop inlets that drain into Lindo Channel to the south and Sycamore Creek, a tributary of Mud Creek, to the north. The remaining County lands within CSA No. 23 are currently in the process of being annexed into the City. The mechanism for transfer of existing AB8 funding for maintenance of the CSA to the City has yet to be determined, and is a prerequisite for the City assuming maintenance responsibility and dissolution of this CSA. Currently, maintenance within the CSA is provided by street jurisdiction and system type. For example, the City maintains piped systems for those sections that flow under or along City-owned streets. The County maintains all open ditches and levees. It is anticipated that upon annexation, the City will assume maintenance responsibility of the piped portion of the system while the County will retain maintenance of open ditches and levees. This maintenance is important because it prevents localized flooding.

Sycamore and Mud Creeks are an essential part of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) project to divert floodwaters from Big Chico Creek via a series of weirs located on culverts leading to tributaries of Sycamore Creek. Lindo Channel is an ephemeral stream that has been modified for flood control purposes. Overflow from Big Chico Creek and the City is conveyed through Lindo Channel to a reconvergence point west of the City. The USACE has advised urban planners to use caution when determining the level of flood protection provided in portions
of Sycamore and Mud Creeks. The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with storm water pollution. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Board regulates water quality in CSA No. 23.

**Determination CSA No. 23–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not own or lease any stormwater drainage or detention facilities. Furthermore, no inclusion or expansion of such facilities is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>The remaining County lands within CSA No. 23 are currently in the process of being annexed into the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>A mechanism for transfer of existing AB8 funding for maintenance of the CSA is necessary for the City to assume maintenance responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Capacity

Although the capacity of the system has not been quantified by CSA administrators, they indicate that because CSAs are designed to accommodate a specific number and type of parcels and land uses there is no unutilized capacity in the system. Furthermore, the administrators indicate that they are not anticipating a need for expansion.

**Determination CSA No. 23–3 (Capacity):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>County staff indicate the CSA to be capable of supporting the expected design buildout of lands within the CSA boundaries, although no capacity analysis is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Future changes to the impervious coverage within the CSA should be evaluated as more information is made available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Facilities

The CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.

**Determination CSA No. 23–4 (Facilities):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING

The CSA follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards and has not been audited. A summary of estimated revenue, other financing sources, and residual equity transfers was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2002–2003 and FY 2003–2004 and the proposed/approved budget for FY 2004–2005.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the CSA at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The CSA has no fee schedule. Rates are based exclusively on property assessment.

Figure 3-21. Financial Summary for CSA No. 23

![Financial Summary for CSA No. 23]

In FY 2004–2005, the CSA’s major sources of revenue included property taxes, RDA compensation from the City of Chico, and interest. Operating revenues totaled $15,749. Operating expenses were abnormally low, totaling $1,701, and consisted primarily of interfund services to the Road Fund. It should be noted that proposed expenditures for FY 2006–2007 are $16,392, which is more consistent with past average expenditures. See Appendix G for details.
Accumulated reserves for CSAs are shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 15 sheet, provided in Appendix G. As shown in Figure 3-21, in Fiscal Years 2002–2003, 2003–2004, and 2004–2005, the reserves/designations for CSA No. 23 increased gradually each year from $50,268, to $58,877, and to $59,471, respectively. Appendix G also provides updated information for FY 2005–2006 and proposed numbers for FY 2006–2007. The reserves are held to help the County with major unanticipated future expense, such as levee failure. Expenditures varied throughout the three fiscal years we studied. Expenditures generally consist of charges for interfund services from other County departments such as the Auditor, roads, and General Services.

The CSA’s “available” fund balance is carried over from the previous year as shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 16. It does not equate to an actual fund balance (i.e., Schedule 15). For FY 2002–2003 the available fund balance was $17,148. For FY 2003–2004 fund balance was $6,376, and for FY 2004–2005 the available fund balance was $59,471.

Because of the complexity of the County’s budget process and the various reporting schedules, the data presented in Figure 3-21 may not “add-up” at first glance. Our preliminary review of the CSA’s budget indicates that revenues generally cover the costs of expenses in a typical fiscal year. A detailed review of the CSA budget is beyond the scope of this study. Additional budget and administrative information can be obtained from the Butte County Department of Public Works. It should also be noted that the information presented in this report is based on data received from the Department of Public Works, and the CSA Administrator has advised that all final County budget information resides with the County Auditor’s office.

The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan; however, since no improvements are currently planned, a Capital Improvement Plan may not be necessary. The CSA does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and has not have any outstanding debt. The CSA has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. County staff who provide maintenance of CSAs are covered under the County’s general insurance.
In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations, unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. CSA No. 23 complies with this requirement through submittal of annual budgets to the County Auditor.

**Determination CSA No. 23–5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Upon transferal of the CSA to the City, there may be an opportunity for rate restructuring; however, the fiscal details of the transfer are yet to be determined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The CSA has made efforts to reduce operating costs. Efforts include competitive bidding, interagency purchasing or other agreements, and sharing of operational staff.

**Determination CSA No. 23–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sharing of equipment between CSAs Nos. 23, 24, and 25 has been proposed by the County as a methods to streamline expenses in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The Butte County Board of Supervisors serves as the decision-making authority of the District. The County of Butte is divided into five supervisorial districts. The districts vary in size to provide for an equal distribution of the County’s population, not geographical size. District division based on population is designed to give all citizens of the County equal representation on the County Board. “Whenever the United States Census shows that the population of any supervisorial district exceeds or lacks more than twenty-three percent as compared with the population in another district or districts, then the Board shall change the boundaries of such district or districts so that the population of each district shall be so nearly equal as possible”
(Butte County Charter Article II, Section 6). District lines can change, and consideration of this process takes place following Census years.

Each district elects a Supervisor to represent that district on the County Board of Supervisors. The term of office for a Supervisor is 4 years, and there is no limit on the number of terms a member may serve. Supervisors must be residents of the district they represent at the time they are elected, and they must remain residents of that district while in office. At the beginning of each year the Board elects a new Chair and Vice Chair.

The current five members are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues relating to CSA No. 23 are addressed during regular Board meetings. The Board generally meets the second and fourth Tuesday of each month. Meetings start at 9:00 a.m. and are held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Administration Building, 25 County Center Drive, Oroville. Meeting agendas are posted on the Clerk of the Board web site.

### Determination CSA No. 23–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):

| 7-1 | The CSA maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements. |
| 7-2 | There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in CSA activities through attendance of County Board of Supervisor’s meetings, during which time issues regarding CSAs are discussed. |
CSAs are managed by the Butte County Public Works Department, Land Development Section. The Land Development Manager and his staff oversee the administration of CSA No. 23. County road maintenance crews provide maintenance of drainage systems as needed. Administration of this CSA, in terms of budget and accounting, appears to be efficient. However, technical information for CSA No. 23 is not readily available. Coordination between CSA administration and the County road crews is not clear. A comprehensive understanding of the physical nature of the storm drainage system and its relation to the social, legal, and budgetary institutions was not demonstrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination CSA No. 23–8 (Management Efficiencies):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-1 Due to the small size of the CSA, it can maintain its operations in an efficient and effective manner without permanent employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-2 As information concerning the CSA is not readily available, the County should consider reorganizing the management structure for CSAs to promote a more responsive and efficient management process and to provide additional technical expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-3 Comprehensive management of the storm drain system for CSA No. 23 is complex and could be improved by adding technical expertise to more carefully assess the relationship between local hydrology, infrastructure, social, budgetary, and legal institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-4 The County has had no actions taken against it from regulatory agencies in regard to the CSAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Determinations for CSA No. 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSA No. 23–1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>The CSA is not expected to experience growth beyond the buildout of the original design of its drainage systems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not own or lease any stormwater drainage or detention facilities. Furthermore, no inclusion or expansion of such facilities is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>The remaining County lands within CSA No. 23 are currently in the process of being annexed into the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>A mechanism for transfer of existing AB8 funding for maintenance of the CSA is necessary for the City to assume maintenance responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23–3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>County staff indicate the CSA to be capable of supporting the expected design buildout of lands within the CSA boundaries, although no capacity analysis is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>Future changes to the impervious coverage within the CSA should be evaluated as more information is made available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23–4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities or equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23–5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Upon transferal of the CSA to the City, there may be an opportunity for rate restructuring; however, the fiscal details of the transfer are yet to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sharing of equipment between CSAs Nos. 23, 24, and 25 has been proposed by the County as a method to streamline expenses in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td><em>The CSA maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td><em>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in CSA activities through attendance of County Board of Supervisor’s meetings, during which time issues regarding CSAs are discussed.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23–8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td><em>Due to the small size of the CSA, it can maintain its operations in an efficient and effective manner without permanent employees.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td><em>As information concerning the CSA is not readily available, the County should consider reorganizing the management structure for CSAs to promote a more responsive and efficient management process and to provide additional technical expertise.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-3</td>
<td><em>Comprehensive management of the storm drain system for CSA No. 23 is complex and could be improved by adding technical expertise to more carefully assess the relationship between local hydrology, infrastructure, social, budgetary, and legal institutions.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-4</td>
<td><em>The County has had no actions taken against it from regulatory agencies in regard to the CSAs.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 CSA NO. 24 – CHICO MUD CREEK DRAINAGE

CSA Characteristics

County Service Area No. 24, commonly referred to as Chico Mud Creek Drainage, was originally established in December 1965, under the County Service Area Law. It was formed for the purpose of providing stormwater drainage services, primarily maintenance of project levees and the Lindo Channel Diversion Structure. The CSA provides drainage of stormwater flows to approximately 14,214 residential, agricultural, and open space parcels, located in the City of Chico and nearby unincorporated areas (Figure 3-22).

CSA 24 contains parcels that are identified as a flood zone by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Details are provided in the Land-Use section of this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSA Size:</th>
<th>14,533 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within CSA:</td>
<td>14,214 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within CSA:</td>
<td>43,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA 95965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Maintain drainage and flood protection infrastructure for provision of stormwater flows, primarily maintenance of project levees and the Lindo Channel Diversion Structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>None. The CSA does not, itself, have any employees. Rather, the CSA is supported by the Land Development Division of the Butte County Department of Public Works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>December 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSA No. 24 - Chico Mud Creek Drainage

BUTTE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

CSA No. 24 provides drainage and flood protection infrastructure services to property owners of approximately 14,214 parcels. CSA No. 24 encompasses an area that includes the western portion of the City of Chico and adjacent unincorporated area as shown in Figure 3-22. The CSA boundaries and the Sphere of Influence boundaries are congruent (i.e., the same, no sphere beyond current boundaries). The CSA currently has an estimated population of approximately 43,931 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction).

The CSA has no plans for expansion and does not anticipate future growth. However, the City of Chico is experiencing population growth at a rate of 2.5 percent annually. BCAG indicates that the unincorporated areas generally experience a population growth rate of 1.1 percent per year. Based on these trends, we project population growth to the year 2025 within the CSA to be as shown in Figure 3-23 below:
Figure 3-23. CSA No. 24 – Chico Mud Creek Drainage Estimated Population Growth

B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

CSA No. 24 is located in the northwestern portion of Butte County, north of the junction of Highways 32 and 99. The City of Chico occupies the southern part of the CSA.

Land use within this CSA is diverse. The CSA includes the northern portion of the City of Chico and within the City’s boundaries land-use changes are governed by the City of Chico General Plan. Additionally, the City of Chico Redevelopment Plan focuses its efforts to encourage economic growth in specific areas within the CSA boundaries. Within the City, the predominant land uses are single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial, and open space. Additional land-uses include airport related uses, business professional, recreation, industrial, and mobile home parks. The Chico Municipal Airport lies to the north of the CSA. Land-use changes in the unincorporated areas are governed by the Butte County General Plan. Land use in the unincorporated area includes rural residential parcels, public uses, open space, and agriculture.

CSA No. 24 lies within the Big Chico Creek watershed. Mud Creek, Sycamore Creek, Lindo Channel, and Big Chico Creek flow westerly through the northern, central, and southern
portions, respectively, of the CSA. Mud Creek and the Lindo Channel merge with Big Chico Creek downstream of the CSA. Eventually, Big Chico Creek drains into the Sacramento River.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 46 percent impervious cover.

CSA No. 24 is mapped as a flood zone by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Maps (Figure 3-24). The FEMA flood map for this area identifies several classifications of potential funding. This CSA includes parcels representing each of these classifications. Most of the CSA is classified as within Flood Zone “A”—Special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flood, no base flood elevations determined. The southwestern portion of the CSA, located along Big Chico Creek is designated as “AE”—Special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flood, base flood elevations determined. The portion of Big Chico Creek located east of Hwy 32 is designated as “AE-F” – Floodway area, base flood elevations determined. The area surrounding the Little Chico Creek floodplain in the southern part of the CSA is designated as “AO” with flood depths of 1 to 3 feet (usually sheet flow on sloping terrain); average depths determined. This flood zone is a special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flood. A small portion of the CSA, near the City of Chico and within the Little Chico Creek watershed is designated as “X” on the FEMA map, indicating that areas of 500-year flood; areas of 100-year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood.
FEMA Flood Hazard Zones:

A = No base flood elevations determined. Special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flood.

AE = Base flood elevations determined. Special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flood.

AE-F = Base flood elevations determined. Floodway area. Special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flood.

AH = Flood depths of 1 to 3 feet (usually areas of ponding); base flood elevations determined. Special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flood.

AO = Flood depths of 1 to 3 feet (usually sheet flow on sloping terrain); average depths determined. For areas of alluvial fan flooding, velocities also determined. Special flood hazard area inundated by 100-year flood.

X (500) = Areas of 500-year flood; areas of 100-year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile; and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood.

Source: Butte LAFCO
### Determination CSA No. 24–1 (Growth):

| 1-1  | The population within the CSA may grow at an average rate of approximately 2.5 percent annually for those parcels in the City of Chico and 1.1 percent annual for those parcels within the unincorporated area. |

---

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/detention

Infrastructure that the CSA maintains includes project levees, the Lindo Channel Diversion Structure, and storm drainage pipes located under County-maintained roads. The CSA’s responsibilities are limited to maintenance, it does not own the levees or other detention facilities. All maintenance duties are performed by staff from the Butte County Department of Public Works. Because many of the storm drains and related infrastructure lie under or near County roads, it is efficient for the County road maintenance crews to continue performing maintenance duties for this storm drainage infrastructure. Storm drainage pipes located under city-maintained roads are maintained by the City of Chico. Major channels within the area are maintained by the Department of Water Resources. The CSA is not party to any shared maintenance agreements. The drainage water (from stormwater and/or irrigation) ultimately flows to Big Chico Creek via several natural stream tributaries and other channels. Infrastructure maintenance may benefit from development of a map that depicts the infrastructure the CSA is responsible for maintaining.

The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with stormwater pollution. Additionally, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board regulates water quality.
### Determination CSA No. 24–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):

2-1 CSA No. 24 maintains project levees, the Lindo Channel Diversion Structure, and storm drainage infrastructure located along or under County-maintained roads. The Butte County Department of Public Works, Land Development Division provides administrative oversight. The County road crews maintain CSA infrastructure.

### B. Capacity

Although the capacity of the system has not been quantified by CSA administrators, they indicate that because CSAs are designed to accommodate a specific number and type of parcels and land uses there is no unutilized capacity in the system. However, the Lindo Channel Diversion Structure was designed to accommodate flows up to 6,000 cfs. The drainage and flood protection infrastructure managed by the CSA currently accommodate irrigation and stormwater drainage from 14,533 acres with an overall existing 46 percent average impervious cover. However, flooding has occurred in this region in the past and the area is identified on the FEMA flood map.

### Determination CSA No. 24–3 (Capacity):

3-1 Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, and due to the City’s requirements that new development be responsible for their storm drainage impacts, the CSA does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.

### A. Facilities

According to the CSA’s County managers, CSA No. 24 does not own any land or facilities. The District owns the following equipment: one 1992 Ford F-350 truck, one mower attachment, one sprayer, and a few chain saws. This equipment is occasionally rented to other CSAs or to the Public Works road operations as a cost-sharing measure.

### Determination CSA No. 24–4 (Facilities):

4-1 The CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities or equipment.
FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING


Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the CSA at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The CSA charges a per acre rate on all properties located within the District boundaries. However, this rate could not be determined because financial information regarding CSA No. 24 was not provided by the County staff. The District has no fee schedule. Rates are based on assessment only which are managed by the Butte County Tax Collector as their fiduciary agent.

In FY 2004–2005, CSA No. 24’s major sources of revenue included property taxes, compensation from the City of Chico, and interest. Operating revenues totaled $158,712. Operating expenses totaled $93,818 and consisted primarily of interfund services for the Road Fund. The total operating income for FY 2005–2006 showed a decrease of $25,987 to $132,725 and operating expenses of $165,875, an increase of $35,029.
Accumulated reserves for CSAs are shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 15 sheet, provided in Appendix G. As shown in Figure 3-25, in Fiscal Years 2003–2004, 2004–2005, and 2005–2006, the reserves/designations for CSA No. 24 increased gradually from $534,271 to $585,541. Appendix G also provides proposed (not actual) numbers for FY 2006–2007. The reserves are held to help the County with major unanticipated future expense, such as levee failure.

Expenditures varied throughout the three fiscal years we studied. Expenditures generally consist of charges for interfund services from other County departments such as the Auditor, roads, and General Services.

The CSA’s “available” fund balance is carried over from the previous year as shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 16. It does not equate to an actual fund balance (i.e., Schedule 15). For FY 2003–2004 the available fund balance was $68,626. For 2004–2005 fund balance was $19,525, and for FY 2005–2006 the available fund balance was $84,420.

Because of the complexity of the County’s budget process and the various reporting schedules, the data presented in Figure 3-25 may not “add-up” at first glance. Our preliminary review of the CSA’s budget indicates that the ratio between revenues and expenditures is highly variable between various fiscal years, depending on the needs of the CSA. However, the large
accumulated reserves that are carried over provide a financial buffer to the variable annual expenditures. A detailed review of the CSA budget is beyond the scope of this study. Additional budget and administrative information can be obtained from the Butte County Department of Public Works. It should also be noted that the information presented in this report is based on data received from the Department of Public Works, and the CSA Administrator has advised that all final County budget information resides with the County Auditor’s office.

The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan; however, since no improvements are currently planned, a Capital Improvement Plan may not be necessary. The CSA does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and does not have any outstanding debt. The District has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. County staff who provide maintenance of CSAs are covered under the County’s general insurance.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations, unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. CSA officials have complied with this requirement through submittal of annual budgets to the County Auditor.

**Determination CSA No. 24–5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>The CSA operates in a fiscally sound manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The CSA is not exposed to excessive liabilities or risks. County staff who provide maintenance of CSAs are covered under the County’s general insurance. The CSA has not used grant opportunities as a cost avoidance measure. CSA No. 24 has minimal costs, primarily services and supplies. It has no employees, facilities, or infrastructure. This CSA is cooperatively
managed, along with other CSAs, by the Butte County Department of Public Works. The Board of Supervisors acts as the governing body. This management, under the County umbrella, is generally efficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination CSA No. 24–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1 The CSA appears to have no need for cost avoidance measures in its operations or facilities sharing opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The Butte County Board of Supervisors serves as the decision-making authority of the CSA. The County of Butte is divided into five supervisory districts. The districts vary in size to provide for an equal distribution of the County’s population, rather than by geographical size. District division based on population is designed to give all citizens of the County equal representation on the County Board. “Whenever the United States Census shows that the population of any supervisory district exceeds or lacks more than twenty-three percent as compared with the population in another district or districts, then the Board shall change the boundaries of such district or districts so that the population of each district shall be as nearly equal as possible” (Butte County Charter Article II, Section 6). District lines can change, and consideration of this process takes place following Census years.

Each district elects a Supervisor to represent that district on the County Board of Supervisors. The term of office for a Supervisor is four years, and there is no limit on the number of terms a member may serve. Supervisors must be residents of the district they represent at the time they are elected, and they must remain residents of that district while in office. At the beginning of each year the Board elects a new Chair and Vice Chair.

The current five members are as follows:
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues relating to CSA No. 24 are addressed during its regular Board meetings. The Board generally meets the second and fourth Tuesday of each month. Meetings start at 9:00 a.m. and are held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Administration Building, 25 County Center Drive, Oroville. The agenda for each Board meeting is posted in front of the County Administration Building at least 72 hours prior to each meeting. Agendas are usually posted at that location and on the County Clerk of the Board web site by 4:00 p.m. on the Wednesday prior to the Tuesday meeting. Agendas are also available by mail and e-mail subscription. Past minutes are also posted on the County web site. The County Counsel, who sits on all regularly scheduled meetings, is responsible for ensuring Board compliance with the Brown Act.

**Determination CSA No. 24–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

7-1 The CSA maintains accountability and compliance in its governance, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.

7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in CSA activities through attendance of County Board of Supervisor’s meetings, during which time issues regarding CSAs are discussed.

**MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES**

The Butte County Department of Public Works, Land Development Manager oversees the administration of the CSA. County road maintenance crews provide maintenance of drainage systems as needed. There are no other employees hired specifically by the CSA.
With regard to the CSAs, the County has had no actions filed against it from any regulatory agencies within the last 10 years. Administration of the CSA, in terms of budgeting and accounting, appears to be efficient. However, technical information for CSA No. 24 is not readily available. Under ideal circumstances managers of a storm drainage system would be able to demonstrate the following:

- A comprehensive understanding of the watershed and its associated hydrology and geomorphology.
- An understanding of the relationship between storm precipitation and infrastructure design capacity and functional capacity.
- A list of all related storm drainage infrastructure that is readily accessible.
- Ability to readily relate the physical nature of storm drain system (as described above) to the social, legal, and budgetary aspects of the people and institutions within the watershed. This ability to translate physical storm drain related items to the social, legal, and budgetary systems would promote good working relationships among the people and institutions that rely on the storm drainage system for flood protection.
- Understanding of water quality issues.

Additional work by the County is needed to achieve this goal of comprehensive storm-drain management. It is recognized that achieving this goal is especially challenging because CSA No. 24’s storm drainage system is complex, given that the City, the County, and DWR all have storm drainage infrastructure in this watershed. The laws governing flooding, water quality, and the environment have become more complex during the past few years. Technical knowledge of the region’s hydrology, geomorphology, and other physical attributes has expanded as new information becomes available. Supplementary technical expertise may need to be added to assist CSA managers. Looking towards the future management of this CSA, some reorganization is warranted.
### Determination CSA No. 24–8 (Management Efficiencies):

8-1 The storm-drainage system for CSA No. 24 is complex, given that the City, the County, and DWR each have storm drainage infrastructure in this watershed. Management of this storm drain system could be improved by adding technical expertise of individuals who can demonstrate the ability to relate the physical nature of the storm drain infrastructure to the local hydrology, social, legal, and budgetary institutions.

8-2 As information concerning the CSA is not readily available, consideration should be given to reorganization of the overall management structure within the County Public Works Department with respect to CSAs.

8-3 The County has had no actions taken against it from regulatory agencies in regard to CSAs.

### Summary of Determinations for CSA No. 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSA No. 24-1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>The population within the CSA may grow at an average rate of approximately 2.5 percent annually for those parcels in the City of Chico and 1.1 percent annual for those parcels within the unincorporated area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>CSA No. 24 maintains project levees, the Lindo Channel Diversion Structure, and storm drainage infrastructure located along or under County-maintained roads. The Butte County Department of Public Works, Land Development Division provides administrative oversight. The County road crews maintain CSA infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24–3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>Due to the stable trend in agricultural land uses, and due to the City’s and County’s requirements that new development be responsible for their storm drainage impacts, the CSA does not anticipate the need for any potential increases in capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24–4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not own any land or facilities. No need for additional facilities was identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24–5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>The CSA operates in a fiscally sound manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>The CSA appears to have no need for cost avoidance measures in its operations or facilities sharing opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>The CSA maintains accountability and compliance in its governance, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in CSA activities through attendance of County Board of Supervisor’s meetings, during which time issues regarding CSAs are discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24–8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>The storm-drainage system for CSA No. 24 is complex, given that the City, the County, and DWR each have storm drainage infrastructure in this watershed. Management of this storm drain system could be improved by adding technical expertise of individuals who can demonstrate the ability to relate the physical nature of the storm drain infrastructure to the local hydrology, social, legal, and budgetary institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>As information concerning the CSA is not readily available, consideration should be given to reorganization of the overall management structure within the County Public Works Department with respect to CSAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>The County has had no actions taken against it from regulatory agencies in regard to CSAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9 CSA NO. 25 – SHASTA UNION DRAINAGE

CSA Characteristics

Shasta Union Drainage (CSA No. 25) was established on December 28, 1965, to provide storm drainage services to 3,400 agricultural, residential, and commercial parcels. The majority of the parcels are urban in nature, with some of the development occurring in the City of Chico and some in the unincorporated area of the County. Upon completion of annexations currently in process, approximately 65 percent of the CSA will be within the City of Chico’s boundaries (Figure 3-26).

The northwest boundary of the CSA is defined by Mud Creek and the northeast boundary by Sycamore Creek. A narrow 100-year floodplain follows each creek and is located within the CSA boundaries. CSA No. 25 is in the Big Chico Creek watershed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSA Size: 2,465 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within CSA: 3,400 parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population within CSA: 10,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location: 7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA 95965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services: Stormwater drain maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation: December 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation: County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Butte LAFCO
Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

The CSA provides storm drainage services to the residential and agricultural property owners of 3,400 parcels. The CSA has an estimated population of approximately 10,247 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction), 8,576 of which are within the City of Chico. CSAs are designed to serve a specified number of parcels and are not likely to expand.

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 3-27) assuming an annual growth rate of 2.5 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the City of Chico as determined by the Butte County Association of Governments for 2006–2030.

Figure 3-27. CSA No. 25 – Shasta Union Drainage Estimated Population Growth

![Graph showing projected population growth from 2006 to 2030 for CSA No. 25](image-url)
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

The CSA lies within the Big Chico Creek watershed. Winter and Spring storms bring precipitation to the area and the resulting storm water flows into Mud Creek via surface flow and constructed pipes, channels, and drop inlets. Mud Creek is a tributary to Big Chico Creek. Eventually the collected storm water makes its way to the Sacramento River.

Upon completion of current annexations, approximately 65 percent of CSA No. 25 will be within the City of Chico’s boundaries. Existing land use within the CSA boundaries is primarily urban residential, commercial, and a few agricultural parcels. Based on BCAG’s 2006–2030 population projections, growth in the City of Chico is expected to occur at a rate of approximately 2.5 percent annually. The CSA is designed to meet the stormwater needs of its existing service area with existing development density only. Additional capacity, to accommodate growth beyond the buildout of the service area, cannot be provided due to design capacity (infrastructure) constraints. Any new development that may occur is required to construct stormwater drainage facilities and establish their own maintenance agreements as part of their development agreements.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 49 percent impervious cover.

**Determination CSA No. 25 – 1 (Growth):**

- **1-1** The CSA is not expected to experience growth beyond the buildout of the original design of their drainage systems.
- **1-2** BCAG growth projections estimate a 2.5 percent growth rate in the City of Chico.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

Infrastructure

A. Conveyors/detention

The CSA is solely a storm drainage maintenance and assessment district and does not own any conveyors or detention facilities. Many of the subdivisions and commercial developments within this district developed their own detention facilities and/or drainage delivery infrastructure as part of their land-use permitting requirements. Development infrastructure remains privately owned and maintenance is provided through private maintenance agreements.

Drainage systems under and alongside City or County roadways are jointly maintained and consist of underground piping, open channels, and drop inlets that drain into Mud Creek, Sycamore Creek, and Lindo Channel. Currently, maintenance within the CSA is provided by street jurisdiction and system type. For example, the City maintains piped systems for those sections that flow under or along City-owned streets. The County maintains all open ditches and levees.

Sycamore and Mud Creeks are an essential part of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ (USACE) project to divert floodwaters from Big Chico Creek via a series of weirs located on culverts leading to tributaries of Sycamore Creek. Lindo Channel is an ephemeral stream that has been modified for flood control purposes. Overflow from Big Chico Creek and the City is conveyed through Lindo Channel to a reconvergence point west of the City. The USACE has advised urban planners to use caution when determining the level of flood protection provided in portions of Sycamore and Mud Creeks. The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with stormwater pollution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination CSA No. 25–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1 The CSA does not own or lease any stormwater drainage or detention facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furthermore, no inclusion or expansion of such facilities is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Capacity

The capacity of infrastructure within CSA No. 25 has not been quantified.

**Determination CSA No. 25–3 (Capacity):**

3-1 County staff indicate the CSA to be capable of supporting the expected design buildout of lands within the CSA boundaries, although no capacity analysis is available. It would be beneficial to accurately quantify the drainage capacity of the CSA based on future changes to the impervious coverage within the CSA.

C. Facilities

The CSA does not own or lease any lands or major facilities. The CSA owns one piece of equipment: a 2006 Ford F-550 truck in excellent condition.

**Determination CSA No. 25 – 4 (Facilities):**

4-1 The CSA does not own any facilities and does not anticipate a need for future facilities.

---

**FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING**

The CSA follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards and has not been audited. A summary of estimated revenue, other financing sources, and residual equity transfers was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2002–2003 and FY 2003–2004 and the proposed/approved budget for FY 2004–2005.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the CSA at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The CSA has no Proposition 218 opportunities and has no fee schedule. Rates are based on assessment only.
In FY 2004–2005, CSA No. 25’s major sources of revenue included property taxes, compensation from the City of Chico, and interest. Total revenues were $108,142. Appropriations totaled $48,760 and consisted primarily of interfund services for the Road Fund, Auditor, and General Services. Appropriations were also used to purchase equipment.

Accumulated reserves for CSAs are shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 15 sheet, provided in Appendix G. As shown in Figure 3-28, in Fiscal Years 2002–2003, 2003–2004, and 2004–2005, the reserves/designations for CSA No. 25 increased from $743,731 to $858,822. Appendix G also provides proposed (not actual) numbers for FY 2006–2007. The reserves are held to help the County with major unanticipated future expense, such as levee failure. Expenditures varied throughout the three fiscal years that were studied. Expenditures generally consist of charges for interfund services from other County departments such as the Auditor, roads, and General Services.

The CSA’s “available” fund balance is carried over from the previous year as shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 16. It does not equate to an actual fund balance (i.e., Schedule 15).
For FY 2002–2003 the available fund balance was $94,999. For FY 2003–2004 fund balance was $45,656 and for FY 2004–2005 the available fund balance was $95,385.

Because of the complexity of the County’s budget process and the various reporting schedules, the data presented in Figure 3-28 may not “add-up” at first glance. Our preliminary review of the CSA’s budget indicates that revenues typically exceed expenditures. A detailed review of the CSA budget is beyond the scope of this study. Additional budget and administrative information can be obtained from the Butte County Department of Public Works. It should also be noted that the information presented in this report is based on data received from the Department of Public Works, and the CSA Administrator has advised that all final County budget information resides with the County Auditor’s office.

The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan; however, since no improvements are planned, a Capital Improvement Plan may not be necessary. The CSA also does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and does not have any outstanding debt. The CSA has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. County staff who provide maintenance of CSAs are covered under the County’s general insurance.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations, unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. The CSA complies with this requirement through submittal of annual budgets to the County Auditor.

**Determination CSA No. 25–5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-1</th>
<th>The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>No opportunities for rate restructuring were identified by CSA administrators. Should administration of the CSA transfer to the City, there may be an opportunity for rate restructuring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING

The CSA does not own any facilities. It does provide routine maintenance activities on drainage systems serving the 3,268 agricultural, residential, and commercial parcels within the CSA’s boundaries.

**Determination CSA No. 25–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):**

6-1 Sharing of equipment between CSAs 23, 24, and 25 has been proposed by the County as a methods to streamline expenses in the future.

6-2 Upon completion of current annexations, approximately 65 percent of the CSA will be within the City of Chico’s boundaries. It is recommended that the County and City consider sharing of maintenance duties and equipment to minimize costs.

GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The Butte County Board of Supervisors serves as the decision-making authority of the CSA. The County of Butte is divided into five supervisorial districts. The districts vary in size to provide for an equal distribution of the County’s population, rather than by geographical size. District division based on population is designed to give all citizens of the County equal representation on the County Board. “Whenever the United States Census shows that the population of any supervisorial district exceeds or lacks more than twenty-three percent as compared with the population in another district or districts, then the Board shall change the boundaries of such district or districts so that the population of each district shall be so nearly equal as possible” (Butte County Charter Article II, Section 6). District boundary lines can change and consideration of this process takes place following Census years.

Each district elects a Supervisor to represent that district on the County Board of Supervisors. The term of office for a Supervisor is four years, and there is no limit on the number of terms a member may serve. Supervisors must be residents of the district they represent at the time they are elected, and they must remain residents of that district while in office. At the beginning of each year the Board elects a new Chair and Vice Chair.
The current five members are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSA No. 25 holds its meetings during regular Board meetings. The Board generally meets the second and fourth Tuesday of each month. Meetings start at 9:00 a.m. and are held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Administration Building, 25 County Center Drive, Oroville. Meeting agendas are posted on the Clerk of the Board web site.

**Determination CSA No. 25–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

7-1 The CSA maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.

7-2 There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in CSA activities through attendance of County Board of Supervisor’s meetings, during which time issues regarding CSAs are discussed.

**MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES**

CSAs are managed by the Butte County Public Works Department, Land Development Section. The Land Development Manager and his staff administers the operations of CSA No. 25. County road maintenance crews provide maintenance of drainage systems as needed. Administration of this CSA in terms of budget and accounting appears to be efficient. However, technical information for CSA No. 25 is not readily available. Information with regard to the various management or staffing aspects of this CSA as required for this report was not readily accessible. Methods for coordination between CSA administrators and County road crews on a day-to-day basis is not clear.
### Determination CSA No. 25–8 (Management Efficiencies):

8-1 Due to the small size of the CSA, it can maintain its operations in an efficient and effective manner without permanent employees.

8-2 As information concerning the CSA is not readily available, the County should consider reorganizing the management structure for CSAs to promote a more responsive and efficient management process and to provide additional technical expertise.

8-3 Comprehensive management of the storm drain system for CSA No. 25 is complex and could be improved by adding technical expertise to more carefully assess the relationship between local hydrology, infrastructure, social, budgetary, and legal institutions.

8-4 The County has had no actions taken against it from regulatory agencies in regard to the CSAs.

### Summary of Determinations for CSA No. 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSA No. 25–1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>The CSA is not expected to experience growth beyond the buildout of the original design of their drainage systems.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>BCAG growth projections estimate a 2.5 percent growth rate in the City of Chico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not own or lease any stormwater drainage or detention facilities. Furthermore, no inclusion or expansion of such facilities is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>County staff indicate the CSA to be capable of supporting the expected design buildout of lands within the CSA boundaries, although no capacity analysis is available. It would be beneficial to accurately quantify the drainage capacity of the CSA based on future changes to the impervious coverage within the CSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not own any facilities and does not anticipate a need for future facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan. No opportunities for rate restructuring were identified by CSA administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Should administration of the CSA transfer to the City, there may be an opportunity for rate restructuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sharing of equipment between CSAs 23, 24, and 25 has been proposed by the County as a method to streamline expenses in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Upon completion of current annexations, approximately 65 percent of the CSA will be within the City of Chico’s boundaries. It is recommended that the County and City consider sharing of maintenance duties and equipment to minimize costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>The CSA maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in CSA activities through attendance of County Board of Supervisor’s meetings, during which time issues regarding CSAs are discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>Due to the small size of the CSA, it can maintain its operations in an efficient and effective manner without permanent employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25–8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>As information concerning the CSA is not readily available, the County should consider reorganizing the management structure for CSAs to promote a more responsive and efficient management process and to provide additional technical expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-3</td>
<td>Comprehensive management of the storm drain system for CSA No. 25 is complex and could be improved by adding technical expertise to more carefully assess the relationship between local hydrology, infrastructure, social, budgetary, and legal institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>The County has had no actions taken against it from regulatory agencies in regard to the CSAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.10 CSA NO. 87 – KEEFER ROAD AND ROCK CREEK DRAINAGE

CSA Characteristics

CSA No. 87, also known as Keefer Road and Rock Creek Drainage, was originally formed in 1983 to provide storm drainage and road maintenance services to 1,023 residential and agricultural parcel owners in the unincorporated areas north of the City of Chico (Figure 3-29). The CSA had become inactive until their powers were expanded to include a one-time collection of fees to fund the Northwest Chico Specific Plan in 1995.

The areas surrounding Rock Creek on the north end of the CSA, a swathe through the middle, and the areas adjacent to Mud Creek in the southern portion of the CSA are identified as flood prone areas by the Federal Emergency Management Agency 100-year Flood Insurance Rate Maps. CSA No. 87 is located in the Big Chico Creek watershed.

| CSA Size: | Approximately 3,315 acres |
| Parcels in CSA: | 1,023 parcels |
| Estimated Population within CSA: | 1,970 |
| Office Location: | 7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA 95965 |
| Services: | An inactive drainage district that was most recently utilized as a planning tool and funding mechanism for the planning and environmental review process for the Northwest Chico Specific Plan. |
| Employees: | None |
| Date of Formation: | August 1983 |
| Enabling Legislation: | Board of Supervisors Resolution No’s 83-130 and 91-61; Local Area Formation Commission of Butte County Resolution No’s 82-28 and 91-35; California Government Code Section 61000 |
CSA No. 87 - Keefer Road and Rock Creek Drainage

BUTTE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

CSA No. 87 is an inactive drainage district in the area north of Chico and consists of 1,023 parcels within the unincorporated areas of Butte County and four parcels within the City of Chico. Also, the Chico Municipal Airport is located adjacent to the CSA on the east side. CSAs are generally designed to serve a specific number of parcels upon creation. The CSA has an current estimated population of 1,970 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction). In 1995, the North Chico Specific Plan was adopted by the Butte County Board of Supervisors, which included new land use designations and densities. The Specific Plan increased the potential buildout of the area by approximately 2,800 residential units of varying densities. Due to the increase in potential density created by the Specific Plan, the Plan recommends a number of funding options, one of which is revision of CSA No. 87 to cover the increase in service needs (North Chico Specific Plan, 1995).

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the CSA has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 3-30) assuming an annual growth rate of approximately 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated areas of Butte County as determined by the Butte County Association of Governments for 2006–2030.
Figure 3-30. CSA No. 87 – Keefer Road/Rock Creek Drainage
Estimated Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

This CSA is primarily within the unincorporated area of Butte County and adjacent to the northwest boundary of the City of Chico. The Butte County Board of Supervisors approved the North Chico Specific Plan in 1995. This Specific Plan allows for development of residential, industrial, commercial, business and professional and public areas. This CSA was originally designed to meet the needs of its existing service area only and a specified level of development. This CSA does not have additional capacity to accommodate new development in its current form. Based on BCAG’s 2006–2030 population projections, growth in the unincorporated areas of Butte County is expected to occur at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually.

In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 33 percent impervious cover.
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

**Determination CSA No. 87–1 (Growth):**

1-1 The CSA is currently inactive.

1-2 The adoption of the North Chico Specific Plan by the County Board of Supervisors approved a potential increase in residential, commercial and industrial density within the CSA area. The Specific Plan stipulates that new drainage systems shall be installed by developers as part of tentative map and development improvement requirements.

1-3 Based on BCAG’s 2006–2030 population projections, growth in the unincorporated areas of Butte County is expected to occur at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually.

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/detention

Rock Creek forms the northern boundary of the CSA. Keefer Slough, a natural drainage, runs through the northern portion of the CSA. Localized flooding along Rock Creek and Keefer Slough has been experienced in the past. Specifically during large storm events, Keefer Slough sometimes overflows and causes sheet flow flooding over State Highway 99. The local residents, Butte County, Department of Water Resources, and the United States Army Corps of Engineers have initiated the Rock Creek-Keefer Slough Flood Control Project to partially address flooding issues in downstream reaches. The north and south forks of Mud Creek flow westerly across the central portion of this CSA. The CSA does not own, lease, or operate any drainage conveyance systems or detention facilities.

CSA No. 87 is currently inactive as a drainage service provider. Existing drainage ditches along County roads are maintained by Butte County Public Works, and it seems that the County provides this service for free to existing property owners within the boundaries of CSA No. 87. Infrastructure established as part of more recent development is maintained under maintenance agreements established by the developers. The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with storm water pollution.

**Determination CSA No. 87–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**
3.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDER

2-1 The CSA is currently an inactive CSA and does not own, lease or operate any stormwater drainage or detention facilities.

B. Capacity

CSA No. 87 is currently an inactive drainage service provider. CSAs were originally designed to accommodate a finite amount of development and a specified number of parcels. Managers of CSA No. 87 feel that it has sufficient capacity to serve the existing levels of development within the area; however, this has not been quantified. Since a significant portion of the CSA is located in a FEMA-identified 100-year floodplain, provision of any additional capacity would need to be carefully evaluated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination CSA No. 87–3 (Capacity):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1 The CSA was originally proposed to accommodate the drainage needs of the existing area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-2 Existing infrastructure capacity could not be determined due to limited information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Facilities

The CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities, or equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination CSA No. 87–4 (Facilities):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1 The CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities or equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING

The CSA follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards and has not been audited. A summary of estimated revenue, other financing sources, and residual equity transfers was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year 2002–2003 through FY 2004–2005 and the proposed/approved budget for FY 2005–2006.
Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The CSA has no fee schedule. Fees were established as a one-time assessment. The CSA is an inactive drainage district and does not collect regular assessments.

In FY 2005–2006, the CSA’s sources of revenue consisted solely of interest, and operating revenues totaled $0.00. Operating expenses totaled $550.00 and consisted primarily of interfund services to the County Auditor and debt repayment fees. The total operating income for FY 2005–2006 showed a loss of $323.

*Figure 3-31. Financial Summary for CSA No. 87*

Accumulated reserves for CSAs are shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 15 sheet, provided in Appendix G. As shown in Figure 3-31, for Fiscal Years 2003–2004, 2004–2005, and 2005–2006, the reserves/designations for CSA No. 87 remained steady at $8,778 for each year. The reserves are held to help the County with major unanticipated future expense, such as levee failure. Expenditures varied throughout the three fiscal years we studied. Expenditures
generally consist of charges for interfund services from other County departments such as the Auditor, roads, and General Services.

The CSA’s “available” fund balance is carried over from the previous year as shown on the County’s Budget Schedule 16. It does not equate to an actual fund balance (i.e., Schedule 15). For FY 2003–2004 the available fund balance was $8,333. For FY 2004–2005 fund balance was $321, and for FY 2005–2006 the available fund balance was $550.

Because of the complexity of the County’s budget process and the various reporting schedules, the data presented in Figure 3-31 may not “add-up” at first glance. Our preliminary review of the CSA’s budget indicate that revenues generally cover the costs of expenses in a typical fiscal year; however, for FY 2005–2006 expenses exceeded revenues prompting the recommendation that the County evaluate the rate structure for CSA No. 87. A detailed review of the CSA budget is beyond the scope of this study. Additional budget and administrative information can be obtained from the Butte County Department of Public Works. It should also be noted that the information presented in this report is based on data received from the Department of Public Works, and the CSA Administrator has advised that all final County budget information resides with the County Auditor’s office.

The CSA does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan, does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF), and has no outstanding debt. The CSA has not been party to any legal actions affecting its financial status and has no outstanding litigation. County staff who provide maintenance of CSAs are covered under the County’s general insurance.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. CSA officials noted that annual budgets are submitted to the County Auditor.
Determination CSA No. 87–5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):

5-1 The CSA is an inactive drainage service provider and does not currently collect assessments. In FY 2005–2006 this resulted in a situation in which expenses exceeded revenues. The County should evaluate the rate structure for CSA No. 87.

COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING

The CSA is currently an inactive drainage service provider. Its most recent use was that of a funding mechanism for the planning and environmental review process for the North Chico Specific Plan, adopted in 1995 by the Butte County Board of Supervisors. Further, the CSA was identified in the Specific Plan as a potential funding mechanism for capital facilities formation and maintenance.

Determination CSA No. 87–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):

6-1 Because CSA No. 87 has been inactive as a drainage service provider for the past 10 years, it is recommended that the County evaluate the role of this CSA.

GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The Butte County Board of Supervisors serves as the decision-making authority of the District. The County of Butte is divided into five supervisorial districts. The districts vary in size to provide for an equal distribution of the County’s population, not geographical size. District division based on population is designed to give all citizens of the County equal representation on the County Board. “Whenever the United States Census shows that the population of any supervisorial district exceeds or lacks more than twenty-three percent as compared with the population in another district or districts, then the Board shall change the boundaries of such district or districts so that the population of each district shall be so nearly equal as possible” (Butte County Charter Article II, Section 6). District lines can change, and consideration of this process takes place following Census years.
Each district elects a Supervisor to represent that district on the County Board of Supervisors. The term of office for a Supervisor is four years, and there is no limit on the number of terms a member may serve. Supervisors must be residents of the district they represent at the time they are elected, and they must remain residents of that district while in office. At the beginning of each year the Board elects a new Chair and Vice Chair.

The current five members are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Connelly</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dolan</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Kirk</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Josiassen</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim K. Yamaguchi</td>
<td>District 5</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issues relating to CSA No. 87 are addressed during regular Board of Supervisor meetings. The Board generally meets the second and fourth Tuesday of each month. Meetings start at 9:00 a.m. and are held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Administration Building, 25 County Center Drive, Oroville. Meeting agendas are posted on the Clerk of the Board web site.

**Determination CSA No. 87–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

7-1 The CSA is currently an inactive drainage service provider.

**MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES**

Butte County Public Works Department Land Development Section administers CSA No. 87. The Land Development Manager and his staff are the administers. County road crews provide maintenance of drainage systems as needed. Information with regard to the various management or staffing aspects for this CSA as required for this report was not readily accessible. The CSA is currently inactive.
### Determination CSA No. 87–8 (Management Efficiencies):

8-1 Because CSA No. 87 has been inactive for the past 10 years, it is recommended that the County evaluate the necessity of keeping CSA No. 87 intact as a drainage service provider. Should the County wish to retain the CSA as a drainage service provider it may be beneficial to reorganize the County’s overall management structure of the CSA to facilitate a more responsive and efficient management process.

### Summary of Determinations for CSA No. 87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSA No. 87–1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>The CSA is currently inactive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>The adoption of the North Chico Specific Plan by the County Board of Supervisors approved a potential increase in residential, commercial and industrial density within the CSA area. The Specific Plan stipulates that new drainage systems shall be installed by developers as part of tentative map and development improvement requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Based on BCAG’s 2006–2030 population projections, growth in the unincorporated areas of Butte County is expected to occur at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 87–2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>The CSA is currently an inactive CSA and does not own, lease or operate any stormwater drainage or detention facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 87–3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>The CSA was originally proposed to accommodate the drainage needs of the existing area. Existing infrastructure capacity could not be determined due to the limited information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 87–4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>The CSA does not own or lease any lands, major facilities or equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CSA No. 87–5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)

| 5-1 | The CSA is an inactive drainage service provider and does not currently collect assessments. In FY 2005–2006 this resulted in a situation in which expenses exceeded revenues. The County should evaluate the rate structure for CSA No. 87. |

### CSA No. 87–6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)

| 6-1 | Because CSA No. 87 has been inactive as a drainage service provider for the past 10 years, it is recommended that the County evaluate the role of this CSA. |

### CSA No. 87–7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)

| 7-1 | The CSA is an inactive drainage service provider. |

### CSA No. 87–8 (Management Efficiencies)

| 8-1 | CSA No. 87 has been inactive for the past 10 years. Should the County wish to retain the CSA as a drainage service provider, it may be beneficial to reorganize the County’s overall management and financing structure of the CSA to facilitate a more responsive and efficient management process. |
4.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY RECLAMATION SERVICE PROVIDER
4.1 ROCK CREEK RECLAMATION DISTRICT

District Characteristics

Rock Creek Reclamation District (RCRD) was initially formed in 1985 under the State Reclamation Act. The District provides flood control services to approximately 4,644 acres of agricultural and single-family residential parcel owners in an area surrounding Nord in northern Butte County (Figure 4-1). The District consists of large agricultural properties and low-density residential uses.

Pine Creek forms a portion of the western boundary above Highway 32. Additionally, Rock Creek flows through the District and joins Mud and Big Chico Creeks in the southern portion of the District. The majority of the Rock Creek Reclamation District has been identified as a 100-year flood zone on Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps. The District is also located in dam failure inundation areas for Shasta and Whiskeytown Dams. The District is located in the Big Chico Creek and Pine Creek Watersheds.

| District Size: 4,644 acres |
| Parcels within District: 76 |
| Estimated Population Within District: 146 |
| Office Location: 5556 Wilson Landing Road, Chico, CA |
| Services: Maintain primary levees and drains for conveyance of stormwater |
| Employees: Information not provided by District |
| Date of Formation: 1985 |
| Enabling Legislation: Water Code Section 50000, et seq |
Rock Creek Reclamation District

Butte County Boundary
City Limits
Communities
Highways
Major Roads
Union Pacific Railroad
Lakes
Streams & Canals

Source: Butte LAFCO

Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries.
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

The Rock Creek Reclamation District coordinates repair of private levees and drains and attempts to control improper blocking of flood capacity. The District serves agricultural and rural residential property owners of approximately 4,644 acres in the Nord area, between State Highway 99 and the Sacramento River, north of Big Chico Creek. The land use in the area within the District boundaries is primarily agriculture with very low-density, single-family residences. Rock Creek Reclamation District (RCRD) has an estimated population of approximately 146 within its boundaries (utilizing methodology identified in the Introduction).

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 4-2), assuming a growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments 2006–2030 growth projections.

**Figure 4-2. Rock Creek Reclamation District Estimated Population Growth**
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

Land use within the District boundaries consists primarily of large agricultural parcels. Butte County’s General Plan designates two land use designations in the District: Agriculture – 40-acre minimum and a few parcels of Agriculture – 10-acre minimum. Additionally, 22 of the 76 parcels are held in voluntary agricultural land conservation under rolling 10-year contracts associated with the Williamson Act (http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/index.htm). There is the potential for division of the larger parcels. However, division of agricultural parcels in this area is unlikely due to economic and land-use trends associated with the intensity of agriculture within the District and the significant acreage under Williamson Act contracts.

Impervious surfacing plays an important roll in drainage capabilities. Imperviousness is a measure of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and roads). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 24 percent impervious cover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination RCRD – 1 (Growth):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1 The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Infrastructure

A. Conveyors/Detention

Rock Creek Reclamation District does not own any facilities or infrastructure. The purposes of the District include: 1) coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide for the maintenance, repair and improvements of private levees and drains, and 2) to assist in controlling improper blocking of flood capacity. Levees within the District used for
channeling floodwaters, irrigation and stormwater drainage are located along the north and south sides of Rock Creek, which runs through the District from State Highway 99 in the north to near the junction of Mud Creek to the south.

The District contracts out necessary maintenance duties to private vendors on an as-needed basis. For example, gravel bars form on Rock Creek and these are removed periodically in order to accommodate stormwater flows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Determination RCRD – 2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-1  The District does not own any facilities or infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2  The District’s purpose is to coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide maintenance of existing infrastructure from flooding and erosion threats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Capacity**

Information regarding the District’s drainage capacity was not provided. The primary source of flooding in the District is a result of increased impervious surface area associated with development located east of State Highway 99. These impervious surfaces cause longer peak flows to pass through District drainages, and this is described in detail in Appendix C. Additionally, it should be noted that because the majority of the District is located within a 100-year flood inundation area as mapped by FEMA, large storm events will likely cause widespread flooding regardless of the District’s drainage capacities.

District representatives expressed concern regarding the effects of increasing urbanization along the east side of Highway 99. Requiring the installation of stormwater detention reservoirs would assist in reducing the effects of increased impervious surfacing associated with urbanization. Coordination between the County Planning Department and RCRD is needed to develop conditions of approval and this may include submittal of engineered drainage plans that ensure post-project peak flow conditions do not exceed pre-project conditions.
**Determination RCRD – 3 (Capacity):**

3-1 During storm events, increased and longer duration peak water flows are experienced in District drainages and result from increased impervious surfaces upstream in the watershed. To reduce this impact that is associated with development, it is recommended that the local Planning Department coordinate with RCRD to develop appropriate mitigation and conditions for all new development. It is recommended that these mitigations and conditions be enforced during construction and prior to occupancy of the development.

3-2 The majority of the District lies within the 100-year floodplain as mapped by FEMA.

---

C. Facilities

The District does not own any facilities. Existing levees are privately owned. The primary purpose of the District is to coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide for the maintenance, repair, and improvement of existing levees from flooding and erosion threats.

**Determination RCRD – 4 (Facilities):**

4-1 The District does not own any lands, facilities or equipment.

---

**FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING**

District financial documents were not provided to the consultant and therefore public information concerning the District’s financial status is limited. Because no financial documents were provided, the consultant was unable to prepare a financial summary graph as was included in other District sections.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The District does not currently collect assessments and does not have a rate schedule.
Rock Creek Reclamation District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan and does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF).

The District contracts out necessary maintenance duties to private vendors on an as-needed basis. Because no assessments or scheduled rates are collected by the District, fees are collected on a voluntary basis. In the event maintenance or improvement work is performed, the landowners benefiting from the work are billed individually.

Representatives of the District noted that increased permit fees from the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) create a hardship on the District. District activities to maintain drainage conveyors, specifically vegetation removal within levees and waterways to maximize drainage capacity, requires a permit from DFG. The District pays DFG permit fees in the amount of $2,500 every five years and DFG utilizes these fees to manage and protect diverse fish, wildlife, and plant resources.

**Determination RCRD – 5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>The District does not collect assessments and does not have a rate schedule. Fees are collected on a voluntary basis from landowners who benefit from necessary repairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The District has no overhead costs. It has no employees, facilities, or infrastructure. All maintenance duties are contracted out on an as-needed basis. The District has mutual aid agreements with County Service Area (CSA) Number 86 and Sacramento River Reclamation District. The details of the mutual aid agreement were not provided to the consultant.
**Determinations RCRD – 6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>The District has no overhead costs and all maintenance is provided by outside contractors on an as-needed basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>The District has mutual aid agreements with CSA No. 86 and the Sacramento River Reclamation District. The details of the mutual aid agreements should be provided to LAFCO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The District is an autonomous Special District of the State of California formed under the Water Code Section 50000, et seq. in 1985. The District is governed by a four-member Board of Trustees, who are subject to election every four years. Information regarding the next election was not readily available to the consultants.

The current governing board for the District consists of the following trustees:

**Current Trustees**

- Paul A. Behr – Chairman
- Robert Hennigan – Trustee
- Bruce McGowan – Trustee
- Robert Vanella – Trustee

The Rock Creek Reclamation District holds quarterly meetings. Additionally, annual meetings are held for which landowners are invited. Information on how the District complies with the Brown Act and whether or not the public is notified of meetings was not provided to the consultant.

**Determinations RCRD – 7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>Annual landowner meetings are noticed by invitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>It is recommended that the District consider publishing notice of its meetings in the local newspaper or other local media in order to provide a greater opportunity for public involvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY RECLAMATION SERVICE PROVIDER

MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES

The Rock Creek Reclamation District operates under direct management of a Board of Trustees. The District has no employees. Insufficient information was provided to make a determination regarding the efficiency of the District’s management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination RCRD – 8 (Management Efficiencies):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-1 The District operates under direct management of the Board of Trustees. The District has no employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Determinations for Rock Creek Reclamation District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCRD – 1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1 The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RCRD – 2 (Conveyors/ Detention Facilities) | 2-1 The District does not own any facilities or infrastructure.  
2-2 The District’s purpose is to coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide maintenance of existing infrastructure from flooding and erosion threats. |
<p>| RCRD – 3 (Capacity) | 3-1 During storm events, increased and longer duration peak water flows are experienced in District drainages and result from increased impervious surfaces upstream in the watershed. To reduce this impact that is associated with development, it is recommended that the local Planning Department coordinate with RCRD to develop appropriate mitigation and conditions for all new development. It is recommended that these mitigations and conditions be enforced during construction and prior to occupancy of the development. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-2</td>
<td>The majority of the District lies within the 100-year floodplain as mapped by FEMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRD – 4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRD – 5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRD – 6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRD – 7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRD – 8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 SACRAMENTO RIVER RECLAMATION DISTRICT

District Characteristics

The Sacramento River Reclamation District (SRRD) was formed on November 8, 1999, under Water Code Section 50000, et seq. The District was formed to address the needs of parcel owners within its boundaries relating to flooding from the Sacramento River, including flooding, erosion and deposition of flood-borne materials; the need for coordination of efforts by private landowners to provide for the maintenance of existing land features in the face of flooding and erosion threats, including existing levees; and the coordination of their land uses to minimize damage and injury to property, and potential injury to life from flooding. The District provides flood control services to approximately 20,725 acres of agricultural and single-family residential parcels on the east side of the Sacramento River, north of Big Chico Creek (Figure 4-3).

The District’s western boundary is defined by the Sacramento River. Additionally, Pine Creek flows through the District and joins Mud and Big Chico Creeks in the southern portion of the District. The majority of the Sacramento River Reclamation District has been identified as a 100-year flood zone on Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps. The District is also located in dam failure inundation areas for Shasta and Whiskeytown Dams. The District is located in the Pine Creek Watershed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>20,725 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population Within District:</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>PO Box 3668, Chico, CA 95927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Address needs of landowners relating to Sacramento River flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>November 8, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>Water Code Section 50000, et seq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

The Sacramento River Reclamation District provides flood control representation to and for the agricultural and residential property owners of approximately 20,725 acres in the area east of the Sacramento River, north of Big Chico Creek. The land use in the area within the District boundaries is primarily intensive agriculture with very low-density, single-family residences. The District has an estimated population of approximately 267 within its boundaries (utilizing methodology identified in the Introduction).

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 4-4), assuming a growth rate of 1.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments 2006–2030 growth projections.

Figure 4-4. Sacramento River Reclamation District Estimated Population Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY RECLAMATION SERVICE PROVIDER

B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

Land use within the District boundaries is primarily intensive agricultural. Butte County’s General Plan designates two zoning districts in the District: Agriculture – 40-acre minimum and Agriculture – 160-acre minimum. Additionally, 59 of the 139 parcels are held in voluntary agricultural land conservation under rolling 10-year contracts associated with the Williamson Act (http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/index.htm). There is the potential for division of the larger parcels. However, division of agricultural parcels in this area is unlikely due to economic and land-use trends associated with the intensity of agriculture within the District and the significant acreage under Williamson Act contracts.

Although the District does not itself provide or maintain drainage infrastructure, impervious surfacing plays an important roll in drainage capabilities. Imperviousness is a measure of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and roads). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 17 percent impervious cover.

**Determination SRRD – 1 (Growth):**

1-1 The population within the District may grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/Detention

The District does not own or maintain any facilities or infrastructure. The purposes of the District include: 1) coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide for the maintenance of existing land features, including existing levees given flooding and erosion threats, and 2) coordinate private land uses to minimize damage and injury to property and to reduce potential injury to life from flooding.
Determination SRRD – 2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):

2-1 The District does not own or maintain any facilities or infrastructure.

2-2 The District’s purpose is to coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide maintenance of existing infrastructure from flooding and erosion threats.

B. Capacity

The District’s drainage capacity is unknown. The primary source of flooding in the District is overflow from the Sacramento River. The District indicates that no capacity problems have been reported. However, it should be noted that because the majority of the District is located within a 100-year flood inundation area as mapped by FEMA, large storm events will likely cause widespread flooding regardless of the District’s drainage capacities.

Determination SRRD – 3 (Capacity):

3-1 The primary source of flooding is the Sacramento River during large storm events. The majority of the District lies within the River’s 100-year floodplain as mapped by FEMA.

C. Facilities

The District does not own any facilities. Existing levees are owned privately. The Reclamation Board and Army Corps of Engineers have participated in levee repairs of private levees within the District. The primary purpose of the District is to coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide for the maintenance of existing land features including existing levees given flooding and erosion threats. Additionally, the District serves as a vehicle for obtaining flood control monies from State and federal sources as it becomes available.

Determination SRRD – 4 (Facilities):

4-1 The District does not own any lands, major facilities, or equipment.
The Sacramento River Reclamation District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. A summary of estimated revenue and expenditures was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2004–2005 and proposed/approved budget for FY 2005–2006.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue raising methods. The District’s fee schedule was set by the resolution approving the District’s formation at $4.00 per acre. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms.

In FY 2004–2005, the District maintained a fund balance of $1,775. Major sources of revenue included interest and charges for current services. Operating revenues totaled $7,016. Operating expenses totaled $8,791 and consisted of services and supplies. The total operating income decreased from FY 2003–2004 to FY 2004–2005 by $2,905. Assessments make up the entirety of the District’s revenue unless grant, State, or federal funds are obtained. The District does not consistently collect assessments from the landowners as it does not provide maintenance services and intends to serve as a vehicle for State or federal funding of levee and drainage improvements or repairs. The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan and does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF).
In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. District officials have complied with this requirement through submittal of annual budgets to the County Auditor.

**Determination SRRD – 5 (Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

5-1 Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner and maintains a small balance for unexpected expenses.

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The District has minimal costs, primarily services and supplies. It has no employees, facilities, or infrastructure, nor do Trustees receive compensation for their services. The District was formed to coordinate landowners in their flood control structure maintenance efforts and to serve as a vehicle to obtain State and federal funding, should it become available.
**GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The District is an autonomous Special District of the State of California formed under the Water Code Section 50000, et seq. in 1999. The District is governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees, who are subject to election every four years. Elections and appointments are at large.

The current governing board for the District consists of the following trustees:

**Current Trustees**

Shirley Lewis – President/Trustee  
Donald O’Dell – Trustee  
Jim Paiva – Trustee  
Mark Peterson – Trustee  
Peter D. Peterson – Trustee  
Roy Roney – Trustee  
Richard Wright – Trustee

The Sacramento River Reclamation District holds quarterly or semi-annual meetings depending on need. During flooding and drainage periods, meetings may occur more frequently. The public is invited to meetings through verbal and written notice of items coming up on the agenda which may affect them.

**Determination SRRD – 7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

7-1 The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances.

7-2 Public meetings are announced verbally and through written notice. It is recommended that the District consider publishing notice of the meetings in the local newspaper or other local media in order to provide a greater opportunity for public involvement.
MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES

The Sacramento River Reclamation District operates under direct management of a Board of Trustees. The District has no employees. No inefficiencies in management of the District were noted.

**Determination SRRD – 8 (Management Efficiencies):**

8-1 The District operates under direct management of the Board of Trustees. No management inefficiencies were noted.

**Summary of Determinations for Sacramento River Reclamation District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRRD – 1 (Growth)</th>
<th>1-1</th>
<th>The population within the District is expected to grow at a rate of approximately 1.1 percent annually for the foreseeable future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRRD – 2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>The District does not own or maintain any facilities or infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-2</td>
<td>The District’s purpose is to coordinate the efforts of private landowners to provide maintenance of existing infrastructure from flooding and erosion threats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRRD – 3 (Capacity)</td>
<td>3-1</td>
<td>The primary source of flooding is the Sacramento River during large storm events. The majority of the District lies within the River’s 100-year floodplain as mapped by FEMA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRRD – 4 (Facilities)</td>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>The District does not own any lands, major facilities, or equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRRD – 5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)</td>
<td>5-1</td>
<td>Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner and maintains a small balance for unexpected expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRRD – 6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>The District has minimal costs for services and supplies and does not provide any services for their customers except for coordination efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRRD – 7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-1</td>
<td>The District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings are announced verbally and through written notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>It is recommended that the District consider publishing notice of the meetings in the local newspaper or other local media in order to provide a greater opportunity for public involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRRD – 8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
<td>The District operates under direct management of the Board of Trustees. No management inefficiencies were noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833

District Characteristics

Reclamation District No. 833 (RD833) was initially formed in 1921 under the State Reclamation Act. The District provides flood control services to approximately 38,000 acres of agricultural and single-family residential parcel owners in the Biggs and Gridley area (Figure 4-6). While the District consists primarily of intensive agriculture in the form of rice farming, the District also includes a portion of the urbanized areas of Biggs and Gridley. Additionally, the District owns and operates a 720-acre property in the Butte Sink area located in Sutter County for drain-water management, duck hunting, and farming.

The western portion of the District is within the Cherokee watershed and the eastern portion of the District is within the Feather River/Lower Honcut watershed. Portions of the District have been mapped within a number of dam failure inundation zones, including Shasta Dam, Whiskeytown Dam, Black Butte Dam, Oroville Dam and Thermalito Forebay and Afterbay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size:</th>
<th>38,025 acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels within District:</td>
<td>4,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Population Within District:</td>
<td>9,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Location:</td>
<td>PO Box 247, Gridley, CA 95948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>Maintain primary drainages for conveyance of irrigation water and stormwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees:</td>
<td>2 full-time, 1 seasonal, 1 part-time office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Formation:</td>
<td>1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling Legislation:</td>
<td>State Reclamation Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reclamation District No. 833

BUTTE LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Source: Butte LAFCO
Service area boundaries and sphere of influence boundaries are based on best available data, are provided for general representational purpose only, and should not be considered final LAFCO approved boundaries
4.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY RECLAMATION SERVICE PROVIDER

Review and Analysis of Service Provision

GROWTH AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Growth and Population

A. Population: Existing and Projected

The District provides drainage services to the agricultural and residential property owners of approximately 38,000 acres in the unincorporated areas surrounding the Biggs and Gridley region in southwestern Butte County. The primary land use within the 38,000-acres in the District is intensive agriculture with very low-density, single-family residences. The District also serves portions of the incorporated cities of Biggs and Gridley, each with an estimated population of 1,780 and 5,949, respectively (BCAG 2006 estimates). The District has an estimated population of approximately 9,468 within its boundaries (utilizing the methodology described in the Introduction).

For purposes of this analysis, the expected population growth in the District has been projected to the year 2030 (Figure 4-7) assuming a growth rate of 1.1, 5.2, and 5.1 percent, which corresponds to the projected growth in the unincorporated portions of the County and the Cities of Biggs and Gridley, respectively, as estimated by the Butte County Association of Governments projections for 2006–2030.
B. Land Use/Significant Growth Areas

Agriculture is the primary land use in the region, including 81 parcels which are held in voluntary agricultural land conservation under rolling 10-year contracts associated with the Williamson Act (www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/lca/index.htm). However, the two urban areas of Gridley and Biggs are also within the District boundaries and land-use within these communities is primarily single-family residential and commercial. State Highway 99 runs north and south through the District, providing a main thoroughfare between Sacramento to the south and Chico to the north. There are four proposed developments between Biggs and Gridley that are currently in the preliminary planning phases; however, no land-use development applications have been submitted to the County for either City as of yet. Given the preliminary discussions between local property owners, developers, and County staff regarding potential future general plan amendments and existing general plan policies, there is the potential for an additional 3,000 dwelling units in this area. The Cities of Biggs and Gridley and Butte County are both in the preliminary phases of updating their general plans.

The City of Gridley is currently in the process of updating its General Plan and seeking an expansion of its Sphere of Influence (SOI). The City is currently proposing to expand its SOI
roughly one mile northward, which would increase the City’s potential for growth in a northerly direction. The expansion proposes to include an additional 1,250 acres, an increase of almost 50 percent.

The City of Biggs is also proposing to expand its Planning Boundary and Sphere of Influence south and east to encompass several large areas of potential development. Approximately 1,300 acres of land held by various landowners, and located in the unincorporated areas of Butte County between the cities of Biggs and Gridley have preliminary development plans in process. The majority of those potential developments are located in the South Biggs area, which has been designated as an “Area of Concern” by the Cities of Biggs, Gridley and Butte LAFCO. The Area of Concern designation indicates that due to the area location between the two cities, and the probability that the Cities of Biggs and Gridley may share a common boundary line in the future, planning activities within this area are of mutual interest to both parties. Due to the preliminary status of the potential developments, it is unclear whether or not the proposed developments will undergo annexation and to which City they will annex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination RD833 – 1 (Growth):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1 Agriculture in the western portion of the District is a stable land-use. However, the area between Biggs and Gridley and near Highway 99 is entering a phase of potential land-use transitions. Future changes in land use could negatively affect the capacity of Reclamation District No. 833 to provide services, given the District’s limited infrastructure and financing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Infrastructure**

A. Conveyors/Detention

Reclamation District No. 833 maintains a network of approximately 157 miles of drainage ditches within the District boundaries. The drainage ditches are a combination of District ownership and easements across private properties. The District provides no maintenance of private laterals, which are the responsibility of individual landowners within the District. The District also owns and maintains 720 acres in the Butte Sink area for drainage-water detention,
duck hunting, and farming. After fall harvest is completed, the property is flooded for winter erosion control, which simultaneously provides habitat for waterfowl, such as ducks and geese. Additional responsibilities include maintenance of the Moulton Cut and the 833 Weir in the Butte Sink area.

There are four stormwater detention facilities within the City of Gridley and one in the City of Biggs, all of which are maintained through separate maintenance districts. Reclamation District No. 833 assumes no responsibility for those detention facilities.

Reclamation District No. 833 is part of a multi-party maintenance agreement established in 1936 that stipulates a cost-share based on the total acreage of the agreement parties, which also includes Butte Slough Irrigation District, Butte Creek Drainage District, Drainage District No. 100, and Drainage District No. 200 (Figure 3-8). Reclamation District No. 833’s share is based on the combined acreage of the District and Drainage District No. 200, which amounts to approximately 50 percent. The agreement identifies maintenance responsibilities for Butte Creek and Moulton Cut. However, there appears to be some miscommunication or misunderstanding as to who undertakes actual maintenance duties which should be clarified to all districts involved.

Maintenance is typically performed annually or semi-annually on an as-needed basis. The Butte County Storm Water Management Plan (September 2003) addresses issues associated with storm water pollution. Additionally, Reclamation District No. 833 participates in a Water Quality Coalition.

**Determination RD833 – 2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities):**

2-1 The District is part of a multi-district maintenance agreement with Butte Slough Irrigation District, Butte Creek Drainage District and Drainage Districts Nos. 100 and 200 for shared maintenance of Butte Creek and Moulton Cut. Additionally, the District maintains a 720-acre drainage management area in the Butte Sink area located in Sutter County, and includes the 833 Weir. The details of how the maintenance agreement is fulfilled are unclear to all districts involved, in addition to Butte LAFCO.
B. Capacity

The District’s drainage capacity has not been quantified. However, Butte Creek, which provides conveyance of irrigation and flood waters for a number of districts, including Reclamation District No. 833, has a capacity of 1,000 cubic feet per second. The District has adequate capacity during the dry months of the year and is at, or exceeds, capacity during the wet months of the year. Additionally, there are circumstances beyond the District’s control that significantly impact its drainage system. The Board of Reclamation also utilizes the Butte Sink area for overflow from the Sacramento River during large storm events. During these occurrences, water can back up several miles toward the City of Gridley, severely impacting the District’s drainage capabilities. During this type of event there is widespread flooding throughout the District, particularly south of Gridley.

Historically, flooding in the area was caused by the natural flood regime of the Feather River. The watershed has been significantly altered by construction of the following:

- Oroville Dam and associated facilities
- Levees
- State water project
- Residential and commercial buildings
- Roads and other impervious surfaces

Additionally, agricultural practices have evolved over the years. Given all these changes in the watershed, there is disagreement regarding the primary source of peak flows and flooding during the wet season. It is unlikely that irrigation water is the cause of winter peak flows or flooding because farmers do not irrigate their crops during the wet season; hence irrigation flows are reduced during this time period.

There is concern that additional growth in the Biggs/Gridley area may cause additional flooding due to an increase in impervious surfacing. There are existing regulations that require all new developments to engineer their design for a no net increase in peak flow, which must be enforced in order to meet the District’s peak capacity.
In March 2005, a Settlement Agreement (Agreement) between the City of Gridley and Reclamation District No. 833 was reached in response to concerns from both parties of the management of assessments and development within the urbanized areas in and surrounding the City (Appendix E). The Agreement clarifies allocation of District income within the urbanized areas surrounding the City be utilized solely for administration, maintenance and improvement of those drainage facilities, in whole or portion, located within the urban area as defined in Exhibit “B” of the Agreement. Additionally, the Agreement limits the District’s involvement in growth issues to matters relating to an agreed upon drainage detention standard (Exhibit “B” of the Agreement). The Agreement has been included in the Appendices for further reference.

During large storm events, there is flooding in the majority of the District’s ditches, which the District attributes to the increase in impervious surfacing from new development. In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). As described in further detail in Appendix C, this District has an average of 28 percent impervious cover.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination RD833 – 3 (Capacity):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-1 Historically, flooding in the area was caused by the natural flood regime of the Feather River. During large storm events, there is flooding in the majority of the District’s ditches, which suggests a lack of capacity to accommodate peak flows. Given the alterations that have occurred within the watershed, there is disagreement regarding the primary source of peak flows and flooding during the wet season. However, the District attributes the cause of this flooding to the increase in impervious surfacing from new developments within the watershed. Regardless of the attribution of the cause of flooding, RD 833 would benefit from participation in a regional drainage study as recommended in Determination #6 in the Introduction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District infrastructure is not able to accommodate any increase in peak flow. It is recommended that all future developments be required to submit to the appropriate local government jurisdiction and to the District engineered drainage plans to ensure that post-project peak flow conditions do not exceed pre-project conditions. Furthermore, it is recommended the plans be made a part of project approval and enforced during construction and prior to occupancy of the project.

C. Facilities

The District owns a one-acre parcel in Gridley where its offices and maintenance buildings are located. Additionally, the District owns 720 acres in the Butte Sink, which is located in Sutter County. The Butte Sink is used for water detention, duck hunting, and farming. The District is responsible for maintenance of 157 miles of drainage ditches that are held by the District in a combination of fee-ownership and easements across private property. Additionally, the District holds a number of easements across private property in order to allow maintenance personnel access to the drainage ditches for maintenance and operation purposes.

The District owns construction equipment used for operation and maintenance of facilities, canals, and ditches, including the following: 1981 backhoe, 1981 excavator, 1973 dump truck, 1990 and 2006 pickups for spraying and maintenance work, and a 2005 pickup for the manager. The equipment ranges from fair-to-excellent in condition.

**Determination RD833 – 4 (Facilities):**

4-1 The District’s facilities are generally well-maintained, albeit within a severely restricted budget that does not allow for significant contingencies. No need for additional facilities were identified.
FINANCING AND RATE RESTRUCTURING

The District follows the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards. A summary of estimated revenue and expenditures was provided with the actual budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2004–2005 and proposed/approved budget for FY 2005–2006.

Proposition 218 restricts local government’s ability to impose assessment and property-related fees and requires elections to approve many local governmental revenue-raising methods. Any change in the amount of the assessment must be approved by a majority of the voters in the District at a duly-called election pursuant to Proposition 218 and legislation implementing its terms. The District currently has no fee schedule. Rates are based on assessment only and are managed by the Butte County Tax Collector, which acts as fiduciary agent. Current assessments are based on acreage and consist of $12.00 per acre for parcels less than 1.0 acre and $3.00 per acre for parcels 1.01 acres or larger in size.

In FY 2004–2005, the District maintained a fund balance of $215,843. Major sources of revenue included property taxes and interest. Operating revenues totaled $292,404. Operating expenses totaled $246,710. The total operating income for FY 2005–2006 showed a gain of $45,694. Although there are no emergency funding strategies or reserve policies in place, there remain sufficient carryover funds from year to year for the operating expenses required for this District’s operational costs (Figure 4-8). (Note: the fund balance for FY 2002–2003 was not provided in the financial documents.)
The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan and does not provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERAF).

The District is currently in litigation with the Colusa Shooting Club and Rancho Caleta, LLC, for continued use of road easements for maintenance purposes on RD 833’s 720-acre beanland parcel in the Butte Sink. The litigation is ongoing and involves the District’s right to use road easements for access for hunting purposes. Additionally, the District was recently party to a lawsuit with the City of Gridley over assessments on parcels within the City boundaries and the relationship between the City and District regarding growth and development. The case has been settled and the District is currently paying towards its attorney fees in annual payments of $10,000. Additional District debt consists of a bridge construction loan, which also incurs annual payments. The District is a member of the Special Districts Insurance Program.

In accordance with Government Code Section 53901, every local agency shall file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor of the County in which it conducts its principal operations, unless exempted by the County Auditor 60 days after the beginning of its fiscal year. District officials have complied with this requirement through submittal of annual budgets to the County Auditor.
**Determination RD833 – 5 ( Financing and Rate Restructuring):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-1</th>
<th>The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner and maintains a minimal balance for emergencies or unexpected expenses. It is currently in the process of rebuilding its reserves following litigation with the City of Gridley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**COST AVOIDANCE AND FACILITIES SHARING**

The District has undergone a number of cost-saving efforts in the past few years. It has reduced the total number of employees, converted some full-time positions to part-time, and eliminated the Board of Trustees’ meeting stipend.

The District made application to assume maintenance responsibility for Area 13, a levee that crosses through the District and is maintained by the Department of Water Resources. The result of the shift in responsibility would have been a reduction in maintenance cost to the landowners and ease of maintenance coordination for the District. Although the proposal was approved at the State Reclamation Board level, it received no further support at the state and federal levels and failed.

**Determination RD833 – 6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing):**

| 6-1 | The District has made a number of cost reductions in past years and is operating at or below budget. |

---

**GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE AND LOCAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

The District is an autonomous Special District of the State of California formed under the State Reclamation Act in 1915. The District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees who are subject to election every four years. Elections are staggered in two-year intervals. In the event that no one runs for Trustee, the County Board of Supervisors must appoint a Trustee.
The current governing board for the District consists of the following three trustees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trustees</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles H. Johnson, Jr. – President</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William B. Fiedler – Trustee</td>
<td>December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane Andes – Trustee</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reclamation District No. 833 holds monthly meetings, which adhere to the Brown Act by posting the notice onsite and providing a copy of the notice to the City of Gridley. The monthly meetings comply with the Brown Act.

**Determination RD833 – 7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability):**

7-1 *In its day-to-day operations, the District maintains accountability and compliance in its governances, and public meetings appear to be held in compliance with Brown Act requirements.*

7-2 *There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.*

**MANAGEMENT EFFICIENCIES**

The Board of Trustees appoints a General Manager to oversee staff. The General Manager, whose position is full-time, supervises one full-time employee, one seasonal employee, and one part-time office staff person. The ratio of managers to workers is appropriate and does not appear to be top-heavy. The management structure of the District is relatively simple and is well suited to the type of operations undertaken by the District. No inefficiencies in management of the District were noted.

**Determination RD833 – 8 (Management Efficiencies):**

8-1 *The overall management structure of the District is sufficient to account for necessary services and to maintain operations in an efficient and effective manner.*
### Summary of Determinations for Reclamation District No. 833

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RD833 – 1 (Growth)</strong></td>
<td>1-1 <em>Agriculture in the western portion of the District is a stable land use. However, the area between Biggs and Gridley and near Highway 99 is entering a phase of potential land use transitions. Future changes in land use could negatively affect the capacity of Reclamation District No. 833 to provide services, given the District’s limited infrastructure and financing.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **RD833 – 2 (Conveyors/Detention Facilities)** | 2-1 *The District is part of a multi-district maintenance agreement with Butte Slough Irrigation District, Butte Creek Drainage District and Drainage Districts Nos. 100 and 200 for shared maintenance of Butte Creek and Moulton Cut. Additionally, the District maintains a 720-acre drainage management area in the Butte Sink area located in Sutter County, and includes the 833 Weir.*  

*It is recommended that the details of how the maintenance agreement is fulfilled be made clear to all districts involved, in addition to Butte LAFCO.*
### RD833 – 3 (Capacity)

| 3-1 | Historically, flooding in the area was caused by the natural flood regime of the Feather River. During large storm events, there is flooding in the majority of the District’s ditches, which suggests a lack of capacity to accommodate peak flows. Given the alterations that have occurred within the watershed, there is disagreement regarding the primary source of peak flows and flooding during the wet season. However, the District attributes the cause of this flooding to the increase in impervious surfacing from new developments within the watershed. Regardless of the attribution of the cause of flooding, RD 833 would benefit from participation in a regional drainage study as recommended in Determination #6 in the Introduction. |

| 3-2 | District infrastructure is not able to accommodate any increase in peak flow. It is recommended that all future developments be required to submit to the appropriate local government jurisdiction and to the District engineered drainage plans that ensure post-project peak flow conditions do not exceed pre-project conditions. Furthermore, it is recommended the plans be made a part of project approval and enforced during construction and prior to occupancy of the project. |

### RD833 – 4 (Facilities)

| 4-1 | The District’s facilities are generally well-maintained, albeit within a severely restricted budget that does not allow for significant contingencies. No need for additional facilities was identified. |

### RD833 – 5 (Financing and Rate Structuring)

| 5-1 | The District does not have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan. |
### 4.0 REVIEW OF SERVICES BY RECLAMATION SERVICE PROVIDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-2</td>
<td>Historically, the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner and maintains a minimal balance for emergencies or unexpected expenses. It is currently in the process of rebuilding its reserves following litigation with the City of Gridley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD833 – 6 (Cost Avoidance and Facilities Sharing)</td>
<td>6-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD833 – 7 (Government Structure and Local Accountability)</td>
<td>7-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-2</td>
<td>There are sufficient opportunities for local involvement in District activities, and information regarding the District is readily available to members of the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD833 – 8 (Management Efficiencies)</td>
<td>8-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS
5.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Introduction

This section of the Municipal Service Review addresses written and oral comments received on the Public Review Draft MSR. Butte LAFCO directed the preparation and circulation of a public review Draft MSR for Irrigation, Drainage, and Reclamation Service Providers within the County. The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) requires a minimum 21-day public review period. In this case, the Draft MSR was posted on Butte LAFCO’s website on January 23, 2007, and was available for public review. The LAFCO Commission formally opened the public comment period during their February 1, 2007, public hearing, and the public comment period was closed at the end of the April 5, 2007, public meeting. This resulted in an overall public comment period on the Draft MSR and the Draft Final MSR of two months.

The following comments were submitted on the Draft MSR:

1. South Feather Water and Power Agency, Michael Glaze, letter dated 1/18/07
2. LAFCO Commissioner, via e-mail from Steve Betts, dated 1/25/07
3. Reclamation District 833, Maxine Farrar, letter dated 1/26/07
4. City of Gridley, Andrea Redamonti, letter dated 1/30/07
5. Western Canal Water District, Ted Trimble, telephone call with Steve Lucas, comments provided to report preparer via e-mail from Steve Lucas dated 1/30/07
6. Drainage District No. 2 and Butte Creek Drainage District, Ted Trimble, via e-mail from Steve Betts dated 1/31/07
7. Butte LAFCO, Steve Betts, e-mail dated 2/7/07
8. Richvale Irrigation District, Brad Mattson, via fax dated 2/16/07
9. Biggs-West Gridley Water District, Margaret Haury, e-mail dated 2/28/07
10. Butte County CSA, Thomas Blixt, e-mail dated 3/20/07
Additionally, oral comments on the Draft MSR were received during the February 1, 2007, public hearing, and oral comments on the Draft Final MSR were received during the April 5, 2007, public hearing.

A copy of all the comments received and LAFCO’s response to each comment is provided in this section. Comments and responses are numbered so that they correspond to each other.

Some of the comments provide clarification of factual information or address issues of grammar and sentence structure. Other comments provide opinions, alternate views of appropriate methodology or conclusions, and similar commentary. All comments received are responded to in some form. Many of the comments requested that additional information be provided in the MSR, and the preparers of this report included this new information in the Draft Final MSR, which was the subject of the April 5, 2007, public hearing. In the Draft Final MSR, only those sections that were updated were included and changes were made in strikeout/underline format. This Final MSR was approved by Resolution No. 20 2006/07 on April 5, 2007, by the Commission. For the sake of clarity, all of the approved changes have been incorporated into this Final MSR in normal format, without the strikeouts and underlining.

**Comments Received on the Draft MSR**

This section contains comment letters, oral comments, and responses to comments received during the public review period for the Draft MSR and Draft Final MSR.
January 18, 2007

Stephen Betts, Senior Planner
Butte LAFCo
1453 Downer Street, Suite C
Oroville, California 95965-4950

Re: Draft MSR – Irrigation, Drainage, and Reclamation Service Providers

Dear Mr. Betts:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Municipal Service Review for South Feather Water and Power Agency’s irrigation service, as submitted by your January 10, 2007 cover letter.

The purpose of this letter is to suggest a minor correction in the draft’s data regarding SFWPA’s average annual consumption. On page 2-7 of the submitted draft, it states that SFWPA’s “average annual consumption is approximately 21,000 AF...with one-quarter (5,300 AF) of that being delivered to residential users...” I apologize that we did not catch this error when we reviewed the draft we received from Uma Hinman (Kleinschmidt Associates) in mid-November, 2006.

The correct information can be found in Section 2.11 (page 3) of Butte LAFCo’s Municipal Service Review – Domestic Water and Wastewater Service Providers (2006). “The Agency’s average annual consumption is approximately 28,000 AF (acre-feet), with one-quarter (7,000 AF) of that being delivered to residential users and the rest (21,000 AF) going to agricultural users.”

Please let me know if you have questions or need additional information. I hope this tardy response will not be an inconvenience for you or your consultant.

Sincerely,

South Feather Water and Power Agency

Michael C. Glaze, General Manager

c: Matt Colwell, Water Division Manager
Response to Comment #1, letter from South Feather Water and Power Agency

Information and corrections provided by South Feather Water and Power Agency were all incorporated into the Draft Final MSR and the Final MSR. Please see updated text in Section 2.1.
COMMENT LETTER #2 – E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE

From: Betts, Steve [sbetts@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2007 3:30 PM
To: Kateri Harrison; Uma Hinman
Cc: Lucas, Steve
Subject: Missing Pages; Further Explanations

Kateri and Uma,

Hello. A little problem popped up today – one of our commissioners called and said that there were pages missing from his copy of the draft MSR. We checked into it, and sure enough pages 3-33 through 3-45 were missing from all of the printed copies that you provided to us. I didn’t review the printed copy so I didn’t catch it. We made copies of the missing pages and mailed them off to everyone today. I also e-mailed the missing pages to them (attached).

The same commissioner also had some questions about several sections of the draft MSR:

Figure 2-15, on Page 2-56. There is no bar for Total Net Assets for 2006 in this table, although bars for revenues and expenditures for 2006 are shown. Was this because the 2006 total net assets data was not available or was it just inadvertently omitted? If the total net assets data for 2006 is available this table needs to be revised to show it. If the total net assets data for 2006 is not available the table should be revised to state so.

Determination RID-5, on Pages 2-56 and 2-62. The determination states that the District’s expenditures exceeded its revenues in 2005, but Table 2-15 also shows that expenditures exceeded revenues in 2004 and 2006. If true, this determination needs to be revised to state that expenditures exceeded revenues in the last three years. The determination also states that the District has operated in a fiscally sound manner, but if expenditures are exceeding revenue during the last three years is the RID really operating in a fiscally sound manner? Some of the commissioners may have a tough time making this determination when the facts state otherwise. Maybe there is some reason for the higher expenditures, such as one time purchases of expensive equipment?

Page 4-28, Paragraph B. The first paragraph states that the district infrastructure and facilities are able to accept more water into their system, but it is not able to accommodate any additional peak flow as its system is at or exceeds capacity during large storm events. This paragraph should be revised because it seems odd that on one hand we are stating the district can take in more water but on the other hand saying they can’t take any more water. It probably should be revised to state that the district has adequate capacity during the dry months of the year and is at or exceeds capacity during the wet months of the year.

That’s it for now. Please provide us with an answer for the above three items as soon as possible so we can review them prior to the 2/1 meeting.
Thanks!

-S-

Stephen Betts
Senior Planner, Butte LAFCO
1453 Downer St., Suite C, Oroville, CA 95965-4950
Desk - (530) 538-7151, Fax (530) 538-2847
www.buttelafco.org
Response to Comment #2 from LAFCO Commissioner, via e-mail from Steve Betts, dated 1/25/07

Please accept our apologies for inadvertently leaving several pages out of the printed version of the Draft MSR. The PDF file posted on LAFCO’s website did contain all the pages. A printed handout of the section was provided during the February 1, 2007, public hearing.

The Draft Final MSR and the Final MSR include corrections to Figure 2-15, Financial Summary for Richvale Irrigation District, as requested by the commenter.

The Draft Final MSR and the Final MSR include corrections to Determination RID-5 in Section 2.6 as requested by the commenter.

The first two paragraphs on page 4-28 in Section 4.3 were revised in the Draft Final MSR as requested by the commenter. The updated text is also shown on page 4-27 of this Final MSR.
Butte Local Agency Formation Commission  
1453 Downer Street, Suite C  
Oroville, CA 95965  

Attention: Stephen Betts, Senior Planner  

Subject: DRAFT Municipal Service Review  

Dear Mr. Betts:  

RD 833 has the following corrections for the subject draft:  

Page 4-27 line 14 should read Moulton Cut (not Cute)  

Page 4-31 paragraph 3 beginning “The District is currently........purposes.” (2 sentences), needs to be rewritten as follows:  

The District is currently in litigation with Colusa Shooting Club and  

Rancho Caleta, LLC, for continued use of road easements for maintenance  

purposes on RD 833’s 720 acre beanland parcel in the Butte  

Sink. The litigation is ongoing and involves the District’s right to use road  

easements for access for hunting purposes.  

Sincerely,  

RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833
Response to Comment #3, letter from Reclamation District No. 833, dated 1/26/07

Information and corrections provided by Reclamation District No. 833 were all incorporated into the Draft Final MSR and the Final MSR. Please see updated text in Section 4.3.
January 30, 2007

Stephen Betts, Senior Planner
Butte Local Agency Formation Commission
1453 Downer Street, Suite C
Oroville, CA 95965

Re: Draft Municipal Service Review – Irrigation, Drainage, and Reclamation Service Providers in Butte County.

Dear Mr. Betts:

The City has received the above-noted Draft MSR for review and would like to submit the following comments for consideration:

In section 4.3, Reclamation District No. 833, there are several comments that the City does not necessarily agree with (i.e., "im pervious surfacing is now the primary cause of flooding in the District"). The information provided in the MSR represents information and conclusions of RD 833 and do not necessarily represent the City’s view. The agreement between the City and RD 833 requires new development to provide detention so that peak run- off doesn’t exceed predevelopment conditions. In addition, the City of Gridley was incorporated 15-20 years prior to construction of any RD 833 drainage facilities. Other factors to consider with regards to flooding should include laser leveling, changing agricultural uses/practices, and importation of irrigation water (which substantially exceeds any rainfall for this region).

Drainage District 1 is not included in the review due to a lack of response from the District. Does this mean there drainage issues within this district will not be considered?

Although RD 2056 is partially located in Sutter County, a large portion of the district is located in Butte County. Does the Sutter County MSR for Irrigation, Drainage and Reclamation Services review facilities located within Butte County? How is this inter-jurisdictional review processed?

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document. If you need additional information or would like me to clarify any of the comments, please do not hesitate to call me at (530) 846-3631.

Sincerely,

Andrea Redamonti
Community Development Director
Response to Comment #4, letter from City of Gridley, dated 1/30/07

It appears that the City of Gridley and the Richvale Irrigation District have not yet reached a complete consensus regarding the cause of drainage problems in this area. The Draft Final MSR included revisions to Section 4.3, in a manner that provides both view points.

Drainage District No. 1 did provide information for the MSR on March 26, 2007. This information was incorporated into a draft Section 3.1 and provided to the Commission for their April 5, 2007 public meeting. Please see Section 3.1 in this Final MSR for additional information.

Sutter County is responsible for preparing a MSR for RD2056. Please contact Steve Lucas, Executive Director of Butte LAFCO for additional information.
COMMENT LETTER #5 – E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE

From: Betts, Steve [sbetts@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2007 11:31 AM
To: Kateri Harrison; Uma Hinman
Cc: Lucas, Steve
Subject: Western Canal Water District Changes

Kateri and Uma,

I spoke with Ted Trimble yesterday afternoon and he provided me with some changes to the Western Canal Water District chapter. Unfortunately, he hasn’t had the time to put the changes in writing. The changes he requested are:

Page 2-33, second paragraph

Ted said that they have approximately 150 customers, not the 258 customers as stated in this paragraph. The 258 is the number of canal turnouts that the district has (a canal turnout is where water flows from a district canal into a private lateral). Maybe this sentence should be revised to state:

The District has 258 canal turnouts, supplying water to approximately 150 customers for agricultural irrigation, rice straw decomposition, waterfowl and wildlife, and other agricultural uses within its boundaries.

Page 2-35, first paragraph, and Page 2-36, second paragraph

Same issue as the above

Page 2-35, first paragraph

Ted said that the 500 acres referenced in this paragraph are not within the District’s SOI and are located within the Llano Seco Unit of the Upper Butte Basin Wildlife Area. The referenced 356 acres in Glenn County is within the SOI.

Maybe this paragraph can be revised to state:

The District also serves approximately 500 acres located in the Llano Seco Unit of the Upper Butte Basin Wildlife Area of Butte County, which is outside the District’s boundary and its SOI, and 356 acres in Glenn County, which also fall outside of the boundaries of the District but are within its SOI.
Page 2-39, first paragraph.

Ted said that it is the District’s policy to not provide water service during this time period due to maintenance of their infrastructure. Maybe this sentence can be revised to state:

It is the District’s policy to not provide water service from mid-January through March to allow for maintenance of the District’s infrastructure, which is during a time period when there is no demand for irrigation service.

Page 2-39, second paragraph, last sentence.

Ted suggested this sentence be revised to state:

Out-of-district transfers are only allowed by individual landowners electing to idle in-District crops, or ground water substitution pumping, to free up water and must be approved by the Board of Directors and the DWR.

Page 2-40, second paragraph under the Financing and Rate Restructuring section.

Ted said that the district is not required to, and does not, file a copy of its annual budget with the County Auditor and is not subject to a yearly County audit. I did not ask him why they don’t do this, and this is something that we will have to look into further.

Page 2-40, third and fourth paragraphs under the Financing and Rate Restructuring section.

Ted would like these sentences revised to state:

Rates are based on volume as measured in acre feet and are set annually by the Board of Directors. Standby rates are based on acreage and are also regulated by Proposition 218.

Figure 2-12 (Page 2-43)

The Butte Water District is shown on this map, which shouldn’t be on the map, and the Butte Creek Drainage District, which should be on the map, is missing. The map needs to be revised to remove the Butte Water District and show the Butte Creek Drainage District.

Last one! Page 2-46, Determination WCWD-2.
This is not an error - Ted is concerned that LAFCO will deny any SOI amendment, even a small SOI addition, based upon this determination. I told Ted that the determination says the analysis/plan may be required for a SOI update, which looks at a whole new SOI, not just a small area. This is probably something Steve L and I need to discuss but I think the determination is fine the way it is written.

That’s it for now.

-S-

Stephen Betts
Senior Planner, Butte LAFCO
1453 Downer St., Suite C, Oroville, CA 95965-4950
Desk - (530) 538-7151, Fax (530) 538-2847
www.buttelafco.org
Response to Comment #5, letter from Western Canal Water District

Information and corrections provided by Western Canal Water District were all incorporated into the Draft Final MSR and the Final MSR. Please see updated text in Section 2.5.
COMMENT LETTER #6 – E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE

From: Betts, Steve [sbetts@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2007 3:33 PM
To: Kateri Harrison; Uma Hinman
Cc: Lucas, Steve
Subject: DD2 and BCDD Comments

Kateri and Uma,

Ted Trimble provided me with some comments regarding Drainage District 2 and the Butte Creek Drainage District:

DD2

Page 3-3:

Ted said that this district does not have any employees, so the “One” should be changed to “None” in the box at the bottom of this page.

Page 3-10, first paragraph, first sentence:

Change WCWS to WCWD

Page 3-10, first paragraph, second sentence:

Ted said that it is the WCWD that provides the in-kind service to DD2 for WCWD to maintain Little Dry Creek and suggested that the first part of the second sentence be eliminated.

Page 3-13, first paragraph: Page 3-10, first paragraph, second sentence

Same issue as the above (Page 3-10, first paragraph, second sentence)

BCDD

Page 3-39, first paragraph, first sentence:
5.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Change WCWS to WCWD

Page 3-39, Board of Trustees table:

The profile for BCDD on page 1-32 gives the term of the trustees, although it says their appointments expires in 1998. Ted thought the terms expired in 2008. We will have to get Ted to provide us with the correct dates.

None of these changes seem significant and we probably don’t need to address them at tomorrow’s meeting.

-S-

Stephen Betts
Senior Planner, Butte LAFCO
1453 Downer St., Suite C, Oroville, CA 95965-4950
Desk - (530) 538-7151, Fax (530) 538-2847
www.buttelafco.org
Response to Comment #6, Ted Trimble regarding Drainage District No. 2 and Butte Creek Drainage District, telephone call to Steve Betts on 1/31/07. Information relayed via e-mail from Steve Betts dated 1/31/07

Comments regarding Drainage District No. 2 on pages 3-3, 3-10, and 3-10 were each incorporated into the Draft Final MSR and the Final MSR. Please see updated text in Section 3.2

Comments regarding Butte Creek Drainage District were each incorporated into the Draft Final MSR and the Final MSR. Please see updated text in Section 3.5
COMMENT LETTER #7 – E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE

From: Betts, Steve [sbetts@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2007 2:47 PM
To: Kateri Harrison
Cc: Lucas, Steve
Subject: CSA 26 (Thermalito Drainage)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Kateri,

We talked to the County about this CSA, and also went through our records, and have determined that this CSA is not empowered to provide drainage services and does not provide such services. Because it is not a drainage district, we have determined that the MSR does not need to discuss CSA 26, and Section 3.10 and any other references to CSA 26 can be removed from the MSR. For your information, I have attached a few documents regarding rescinding the storm drainage powers from CSA 26.

Steve

Stephen Betts
Senior Planner, Butte LAFCO
1453 Downer St., Suite C, Oroville, CA 95965-4950
Desk - (530) 538-7151, Fax (530) 538-2847
www.buttelafco.org
Response to Comment #7, Butte LAFCO Senior Planner, Steve Betts, e-mail dated 2/7/07

The Section regarding CSA No. 26 was deleted from the Draft Final MSR and the Final MSR.
COMMENT LETTER #8

Comments on Draft MSR

Richvale Irrigation District, from Brad Mattson dated 2/16/07.

Miscellaneous corrections to typographical errors and other minor edits to the MSR section discussing Richvale Irrigation District were provided via fax. This fax is provided in LAFCO’s public file.
Response to Comment #8, Richvale Irrigation District Manager, Brad Mattson, dated 2/16/07

Mr. Brad Mattson provided various miscellaneous edits to Section 2.6. Each of these edits was incorporated into the Final Draft MSR. Please see Section 2.6 of this document.
COMMENT LETTER #9 – E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE

From: Shawn Flynn  
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 2:20 PM  
To: 'Margaret Haury'  
Cc: Kateri Harrison  
Subject: RE: Municipal Service Review  

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you, Margaret.

Shawn M. Flynn  
Planning Technician  
Kleinschmidt Associates  
251 S. Auburn St., Suite C  
Grass Valley, CA  95945  
(530) 852-4837

-----Original Message-----
From: Margaret Haury [mailto:mhaury@bwgwater.com]  
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:59 PM  
To: Shawn Flynn  
Subject: RE: Municipal Service Review  

I ended up mailing everything straight to LAFCo as that is what the letter instructed.

From: Shawn Flynn [mailto:Shawn.Flynn@KleinschmidtUSA.com]  
Sent: Friday, March 02, 2007 1:48 PM  
To: Margaret Haury  
Subject: RE: Municipal Service Review  

Dear Margaret,

Thank you so much for providing us with this information. We will be sure to incorporate your answers into the MSR. Don't worry about the delay, as we are now in the process of making final
changes/corrections. We have not yet received the attachments, but we will keep an eye on the mail for them.

Shawn M. Flynn  
Planning Technician  
Kleinschmidt Associates  
251 S. Auburn St., Suite C  
Grass Valley, CA  95945  
(530) 852-4837

-----Original Message-----
From: Margaret Haury [mailto:mhaury@bwgwater.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 3:38 PM
To: Shawn Flynn; Kateri Harrison
Subject: RE: Municipal Service Review -

I’m having a problem with the attachments. I will burn them and put them in the mail.

From: Margaret Haury [mailto:mhaury@bwgwater.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 3:36 PM
To: Shawn.Flynn@KleinschmidtUSA.com'; 'Kateri.Harrison@KleinschmidtUSA.com'
Subject: FW: Municipal Service Review -

From: Margaret Haury [mailto:mhaury@bwgwater.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 3:29 PM
To: 'uma.hinman@kleinschmidtusa.com'
Cc: 'slucas@buttecounty.net'
Subject: Municipal Service Review -

I’m am in the process of compiling information on the Biggs-West Gridley Water District for your review. I would like to apologize for the delay, I had started but then thought the deadline was up. Margaret Haury

Phase 1
A-1. Biggs-West Gridley Water District

A-2. Bernoy Bradford, Manager, 1713 W. Biggs Gridley Road, Gridley CA 95948  530-846-3317  bbradford@bwgwater.com

Alternate: Margaret Haury, Office Administrator, W. Biggs Gridley Road, Gridley CA 95948  530-846-3317, mhaury@bwgwater.com

A-3 – A hard copy of the Agree will be in the mail to you

A-4 – 1942

A-5 Attachment BWGWD pic

A-6 a. Five member elected board by the landowners which meets the 3rd Wednesday of every month.

b. Directors serve a four year term. Richard Cassady, Richard Storm, Gary Justeson, Thomas Coleman and Phillip Haynes. They are given $50 for each meeting they attend and health insurance.

c.

d. All meetings are conducted using the laws of the Brown Act.

A-7 – No

B-1. Irrigation Water

B-2 Yes, a hard copy of the joint working agreement will be in the mail to you.

B-3 No

B-4 Yes, Purpose is insurance

C-1

C-2 a. Anyone who applies for water – They must come in annually

b. If they aren’t serviced then they aren’t a customer

c. List is attached

d. unknown

e. unknown
5.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

C-3. Yes, if they are not within another district but can receive water with an agreement

C-4. Agriculture and duck ponds – no proposed changes

C-5.
   a. Manager Bradford to respond
   b. Yes, USBR is doing a study to provide more water to Gray Lodge

D-1. Hard copies will be mailed to you

D-2

E-1

E-2

F-1. Everything goes into RD 833 drains

F-2. None

G-1. Map attached

G-2

G-3.
   a. 1969 Agreement with DWR for water from lake Oroville, hard copy will follow in mail
   b. No
   c. In 1969 Agreement
   d. 

G-4. Manager Bradford will follow up with information

Phase II

A-1. Biggs-West Gridley Water District

B-1. Yes we own land – a copy of parcels will be mailed to you

B-2. Yes, office building – copy of parcel map will be mailed
B-3  Yes – equipment list in the mail

C-1  a. will be mailed
     b. We have emergency funds in LAIF
     c. cost of living, price of gas

C-2  No

C-3  a. Attached: crop tolls
     b. Rates vary as different crops require different amounts of water

C-4  a. Yes
     b. In the mail
     c. No

C-5  No

C-6  No

C-7  a. No
     b. N/A
     c. N/A
     d. No

C-8  No

C-9  Yes, we use JPIA for our insurance

D-1  No set plan

D-2  a. None, if anything it will decrease due to development
     b. no
     c. no

D-3  a. Manager Bradford to repond
b. no

E.1 We maintain the District to provide the finest service to our landowners. The crew manufactures gates, headwalls and many different items.

E-2  a. No

b. no
Response to Comment #9, Biggs-West Gridley Water District, Margaret Haury, e-mail dated 2/28/07

Information regarding Biggs-West Gridley was not available in time for inclusion in the public review Draft MSR. However, it was incorporated into the Draft Final MSR and also the Final MSR. Thank you for providing the information.
COMMENT #10 – E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE

From: Blixt, Thomas [TBlixt@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 10:17 AM
To: Kateri Harrison
Subject: RE: finances

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Maybe if someone from your company had bothered to respond to my prior comments someone would have looked a little deeper into how the budgets works - see below -

I read through the draft MSR on the irrigation, drainage and reclamation service providers and found some outright errors that should be corrected.

Pages 1-33, 1-35, 1-37, 1-39, and 1-43 incorrectly lists the current Board of Supervisors names and term expire dates - Mary Anne Houx is listed for District 3 and she passed away last year, Bill Connelly is not the Vice Chair and Jane Dolan's and the new Supervisor Kirk's terms do not expire in 2007.

There also needs to be corrections to the references to the Board of Supervisors for the CSA accounts in the MSR listed in pages 3-46 thru 3-106.

Also the figures referring to the Financial Summary for FY 2001-02 through 2003-04 for the CSA accounts is misleading as it lists Fund Balance when actually it should be Fund Balance Available which is the balance carried over from the prior year. It also does not equate to actual fund balance which is a far different amount that is not shown on the budget form schedule 16.

I have attached the final budget pages that show CSA 23 annual budgets as well as the pages for the final budgets that show the schedule 15 reserves / designations for the CSA accounts. This information should be available off the County's webpage or through our Auditor Department. The budget sheets I provided your company are my working copies of the budget but final budget figures are under the control of the Auditor - a different department then Public Works. Fund balance available figures are what is rolled over from a prior year's budget and provisions for reserves / designations go off the schedule 16 budget sheet and onto schedule 15 which shows the accumulated reserves being set aside for the unforeseen major work that could potentially become a reality in a drainage CSA account that has a levee.

Can Public Works bill someone for the time and expense of providing all this information for a Drainage District MSR that for some reason included County Service Areas that are not set up as a drainage districts?

-
Response to Comment #10, Butte County CSA Administrator, Thomas Blixt, e-mail dated 3/20/07

The Consulting Team and LAFCO staff contacted Butte County often to encourage their participation in the MSR and the provision of accurate and timely information. The information provided in this comment was incorporated into the updated text provided for the financial section covering each CSA in the Final Draft MSR. County budget information, including Schedule 15 and 16 is included in Appendix G of the MSR.
### Verbal Comments Received on Draft MSR

**Butte LAFCO Public Meeting**  
**February 1, 2007, at 9:00 a.m.**  
**Located at Butte County Board Chambers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Conduct research to determine how the parcels in the area shown on Figure 2-16 as being within both Drainage District No. 100 and Drainage District No. 200 are being assessed by the County Assessor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Those Districts that did not respond should be deemed “incomplete” within this MSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Scott Browne, LAFCO’s Counsel</td>
<td>The MSR should include a general statement regarding water quality issues; including the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Commissioner Beck</td>
<td>The financial sections for several Districts do not “add-up.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>CSA No. 87 was originally formed with two mandates, roads and drainage. Development of a comprehensive analysis and plan may help resolve the existing drainage problems noted in this area. The funding mechanism that CSA No. 87 provides may be needed in the future to fund drainage infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Reclamation District No. 833 is experiencing the classic problem where local ditches were originally designed for agriculture but now land use has changed to urban uses. Development of a comprehensive analysis and plan may help resolve the existing drainage problems noted in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Carol Perkins</td>
<td>Durham Mutual Water Company (DMWC) chose not to submit information to this MSR. However, DMWC is affected by drainage issues. DMWC welcomes further discussion of issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gray Steel</td>
<td>Western Canal Water District serves 18,000 acres in an adjoining County. Figure 2-9 should be modified to show areas served in Glenn County. Additionally, Glenn County and Colusa County should be notified of this MSR and provided with an opportunity to offer comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Verbal Comments Received on Draft Final MSR
Butte LAFCO Public Meeting
April 5, 2007, at 9:00 a.m.
Located at Butte County Board Chambers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment #</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Commissioner Beck</td>
<td>The dates shown for expiration of terms of the South Feather Water and Power Agency Board of Directors are not correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Commissioner Beck</td>
<td>Moulton “Cute” is a typographical error.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS


Response to Comment #11

The preparers of this report contacted the Butte County Assessor’s Department and asked whether parcels shown on Figure 2-16 as being within both Drainage District No. 100 and Drainage District No. 200 are assessed twice (double) by the County Assessor. Sue Lightell of the County Assessor’s office indicated that each parcel is assessed only once. Please see the following e-mail message dated 3/7/07.

COMMENT #11 – E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE

From: Lightell, Sue [SLightell@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Wednesday, March 07, 2007 4:03 PM
To: Kateri Harrison
Subject: Butte County Water District Overlaps

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Kateri: This was given to me to check out.

There is no way possible for parcels within two districts to be double assessed. Each parcel number is assigned a tax rate area and so can only be taxed one time. I checked with the auditor just to be sure and she assured me that it is impossible to be double assessed on one parcel. She also noted that a parcel may be in two or more districts to receive various services from one or another district but they are not double assessed. Each district would be apportioned under the individual tax rate area assigned to a particular parcel number.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to call me at (530) 538-7738 or email me at slightell@buttecounty.net.

Thank you!

Sue Lightell
Assessor Mapping Dept.
Response to Comment #12

Comment noted. Durham Mutual Water Company (DMWC) and Drainage District No. 200 did not respond to repeated requests for information for this MSR. However, because DMWC is a private company, they are not required to participate. DMWC did provide public comment during the 2/1/07 public hearing. Additionally, they invited Stephen Lucas, Butte LAFCO Executive Director, to their Board meeting. Mr. Lucas attended their March Board meeting and reported that DMWC is open to future discussion regarding relevant issues.

Butte LAFCO sent a letter to Drainage District No. 200 in February 2007 regarding their lack of participation in the MSR.

Response to Comment #13

The Introduction was revised to include several paragraphs regarding water quality issues, including the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System per the commenter’s request.

Response to Comment #14

The financial sections for all the CSAs were revised to include more details regarding their available fund balance and the County’s budgeting process, per the commenter’s request.

Response to Comment #15

Determinations 5-1 and 6-1 for CSA No. 87 were revised to reflect the Commission’s direction.

Response to Comment #16

Determination 3-1 for Reclamation District No. 833 was revised to reflect the Commission’s direction. Additionally, General Determination #6 was added to the Introduction.

Response to Comment #17

Thank you for participating in the public hearing process. Butte LAFCO welcomes future discussions with Durham Mutual Water Company.
Response to Comment #18

Butte LAFCO’s GIS Analyst conducted additional research to determine the boundaries for Western Canal Water District in Glenn County. The updated map (now numbered as Figure 2-11) is shown in this Final MSR. LAFCO staff has noted your suggestion regarding notification of adjacent counties.

Response to Comment # 19

The SFWPA Board of Directors’ term expiration dates have been updated as shown on page 2-13 of this Final MSR.

Response to Comment # 20

We have corrected the typographical error in this Final MSR, per the commenter’s request.
BCAG. Butte Regional Growth Projections 2006–2030.


Acre-Foot/Feet (AF): Measurement of water volume—the volume of water that would cover one acre of land to a depth of one foot, equivalent to 325,851 gallons of water.

Agricultural Demand: the quantity of raw water allocated for irrigation of an agricultural crop or other agricultural use, such as livestock.

Annexation: The annexation, inclusion, attachment, or addition of territory to a city or district.

Buildout: The maximum development potential when all lands within an area have been converted to the maximum density allowed under the General Plan.

Board of Directors: The legislative body or governing board of a district.

Board of Supervisors: The elected board of supervisors of a county.

Canal Flow: Total flow of water delivered in cubic feet per second (cfs) at the head of a canal. Canal flows typically include agricultural and urban/suburban raw water delivered to raw (untreated) water customers, raw water supplied to water treatment plants, and canal conveyance and exit losses.

City: Any charter or general law city.

Consolidation: The uniting or joining of two or more districts into a single new successor district. In the case of consolidation of special districts, all of those districts shall have been formed pursuant to the same principal act.

Conveyance loss: Loss of water from a canal due to exfiltration through the canal bottom and walls (the canal’s wetted perimeter), and to evapotranspiration.

Contiguous: In the case of annexation, territory adjacent to an agency to which annexation is proposed. Territory is not contiguous if the only contiguity is based upon a strip of land more than 300 feet long and less than 200 feet wide.

Cost avoidance: Actions to eliminate unnecessary costs derived from, but not limited to, duplication of service efforts, higher than necessary administration/operation cost ratios, use of outdated or deteriorating infrastructure and equipment, underutilized equipment or buildings or facilities, overlapping/inefficient service boundaries, inefficient purchasing or budgeting practices, and lack of economies of scale.

County Service Area (CSA): A dependent agency governed by the board of supervisors of a County pursuant to §25210.1–§25211.33 of the Government Code. A CSA may perform most services, which the county is authorized to perform by law, but is limited by the county’s ability to show that the proposed level of extended service is not otherwise provided on a county-wide basis.
**Cubic Foot Per Second (cfs):** A unit of measuring the rate of one cubic foot of water moving past a given point in one second.

**Dependent Special District:** A special district whose board of directors is another legislative body, such as a city council or board of supervisors. Also see special district.

**Detachment:** The detachment, de-annexation, exclusion, deletion, or removal from a city or district of any portion of the territory of that city or district.

**Dissolution:** The dissolution, disincorporation, extinguishment, and termination of the existence of a district and the cessation of all its corporate powers, except for the purpose of winding up the affairs of the district.

**District or Special District:** An agency of the state, formed pursuant to general law or special act, for the local performance of governmental or proprietary functions within limited boundaries. “District” or “special district” includes a county service area.

**District of Limited Powers:** An airport district, community services district, municipal utility district, public utilities district, fire protection district, harbor district, port district, recreational harbor district, small craft harbor district, resort improvement district, library district, local hospital district, local health district, municipal improvement district formed pursuant to any special act, municipal water district, police protection district, recreation and park district, garbage disposal district, garbage and refuse disposal district, sanitary district, or county sanitation district.

**Dissolution:** The termination of the existence of a district.

**Enabling Legislation:** Legal statute authorizing the creation of the agency or district considered.

**FEMA:** Federal Emergency Management Agency.

**Floodplain:** A generally flat, low-lying area adjacent to a stream or river that is subjected to inundation during high flows. The relative elevation of different floodplains determines their frequency of flooding, ranging from rare, severe storm events to flows experienced several times a year. For example, a “100-year floodplain” would include the area of inundation that has a frequency of occurring, on average, once every 100 years.

**Formation:** The formation, incorporation, organization, or creation of a district.

**Function:** Any power granted by law to a local agency or a county to provide designated governmental or proprietary services or facilities for the use, benefit, or protection of all persons or property.

**Functional Revenues:** Revenues generated from direct services or associated with specific services, such as a grant or statute, and expenditures.
FY: Fiscal year.

**General Plan:** A document containing a statement of development policies including a diagram and text setting forth the objectives of the plan. The general plan must include certain state mandated elements related to land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open-space, noise, and safety.

**General Revenues:** Revenues not associated with specific services or retained in an enterprise fund.

**Impervious:** Unable to infiltrate, no way through.

**Impervious Cover:** Any surface in the urban landscape that cannot effectively absorb or infiltrate rainfall; for example, sidewalks, rooftops, roads, and parking lots.

**Incorporation:** The incorporation, formation, creation, and establishment of a city with corporate powers. Any area proposed for incorporation as a new city must have at least 500 registered voters residing within the affected area at the time commission proceedings are initiated.

**Independent Special District:** Any special district having a legislative body all of whose members are elected by registered voters or landowners within the district, or whose members are appointed to fixed terms, and excludes any special district having a legislative body consisting, in whole or in part, of ex officio members who are officers of a county or another local agency or who are appointees of those officers other than those who are appointed to fixed terms. "Independent special district" does not include any district excluded from the definition of district contained in §56036.

**Infrastructure:** Public services and facilities, such as pipes, canals, levees, water-supply systems, other utility, systems, and roads.

**Irrigation Season:** Typically, the time of year when crops are irrigated. Generally, April 15 to October 14, although this may vary by irrigation district and/or by crop.

**LAFCO:** Local Agency Formation Commission.

**Local Accountability and Governance:** A style of public agency decision making, operation and management that includes an accessible staff, elected or appointed decision-making body and decision making process, advertisement of, and public participation in, elections, publicly disclosed budgets, programs, and plans, solicited public participation in the consideration of work and infrastructure plans; and regularly evaluated or measured outcomes of plans, programs or operations, and disclosure of results to the public.

**Local Agency:** A city, county, special district, or other public entity that provides public services.
Management Efficiency: The organized provision of the highest quality public services with the lowest necessary expenditure of public funds. An efficiently managed entity (1) promotes and demonstrates implementation of continuous improvement plans and strategies for budgeting, managing costs, training and utilizing personnel, and customer service and involvement, (2) has the ability to provide service over the short and long term, (3) has the resources (fiscal, manpower, equipment, adopted service or work plans) to provide adequate service, (4) meets or exceeds environmental and industry service standards, as feasible considering local conditions or circumstances, (5) and maintains adequate contingency reserves.

Merger: The termination of the existence of a district, and the assumption of the district's responsibilities by a city.

Miner’s Inch (MI): A unit of measuring the rate of water flow. Equivalent to 1/40 cfs or 11.2 gallons per minute.

Municipal Services: The full range of services that a public agency provides, or is authorized to provide, except general county government functions such as courts, special services and tax collection. As understood under the CKH Act, this includes all services provided by Special Districts under California law.

Municipal Service Review (MSR): A study designed to determine the adequacy of governmental services being provided in the region or sub-region. Performing service reviews for each city and special district within the county may be used by LAFCO, other governmental agencies, and the public to better understand and improve service conditions.

Mutual Water Company or Mutual Water Association: An entity which purchases raw water service and distributes water from its service to its members. This entity is not considered a government agency or district.

Overlapping Territory: Territory which is included within the boundaries of two or more districts or within one or more districts and a city or cities.

Peak Flow: Maximum measured daily flow in cfs.

Plan of Reorganization: A plan or program for effecting reorganization and which contains a description of all changes of organization included in the reorganization and setting forth all terms, conditions, and matters necessary or incidental to the effectuation of that reorganization.

Prime Agricultural Land: An area of land that has not been developed for a use other than agriculture and meets certain criteria related to soil classification or crop and livestock carrying capacity.

Principal Act: In the case of a district, the law under which the district was formed and, in the case of a city, the general laws or a charter, as the case may be.
**Principal LAFCO for Municipal Service Review:** The LAFCO with the lead responsibility for a Municipal Service Review. Lead responsibility can be determined pursuant to the CKH Act definition of a Principal LAFCO as it applies to government organization or reorganization actions, by negotiation, or by agreement among two or more LAFCOs.

**Proceeding:** A course of action; procedures.

**Public Agency:** The state or any state agency, board, or commission, any city, county, city and county, special district, or other political subdivision, or any agency, board, or commission of the city, county, city and county, special district, or other political subdivision.

**Rate Restructuring:** Rate restructuring does not refer to the setting or development of specific rates or rate structures. During a municipal service review, LAFCO may compile and review certain rate related data, and other information that may affect rates, as that data applies to the intent of the CKH Act (§56000, §56001, §56301), factors to be considered (§56668), SOI determinations (§56425) and all required municipal service review determinations (§56430). The objective is to identify opportunities to positively impact rates without adversely affecting service quality or other factors to be considered.

**Raw Water:** Untreated surface water which flows from a source (such as rivers) downstream to a water supply reservoir or conveyance structure and serves agricultural, urban/suburban customers and water treatment plants.

**Reorganization:** Two or more changes of organization initiated in a single proposal.

**Responsible LAFCO:** The LAFCO of a county other than the Principal County that may be impacted by recommendations, determinations or subsequent proposals elicited during a municipal service review being initiated or considered by the Lead LAFCO.

**Retained Earnings:** The accumulated earnings of an enterprise or intragovernmental service fund which have been retained in the fund and are not reserved for any specific purpose (debts, planned improvements, and contingency/emergency).

**Reserve:** (1) For governmental type funds, an account used to earmark a portion of fund balance, which is legally or contractually restricted for a specific use or not approvable for expenditure. (2) For proprietary type/enterprise funds, the portion of retained earnings set aside for specific purposes. Unnecessary reserves are those set aside for purposes that are not well defined or adopted or retained earnings that are not reasonably proportional to annual gross revenues.

**RWQCB:** Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**Service Review:** A study and evaluation of municipal service(s) by specific area, subregion or region culminating in written determinations regarding nine specific evaluation categories.
Special Reorganization: A reorganization that includes the detachment of territory from a city or city and county and the incorporation of that entire detached territory as a city.

Specific Plan: A policy statement and implementation tool that is used to address a single project or planning problem. Specific plans contain concrete standards and development criteria that supplement those of the general plan.

Sphere of Influence (SOI): A plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the LAFCO.

Sphere of Influence Determinations: In establishing a sphere of influence, the Commission must consider and prepare written determinations related to present and planned land uses, need and capacity of public facilities, and existence of social and economic communities of interest.

Stormwater Best Management Practice: A structural or non structural technique designed to temporarily store or treat stormwater runoff in order to mitigate flooding, reduce pollution, and provide other amenities.

Stormwater Runoff: Rainwater which does not infiltrate into the soil and runs off the land.

Subject Agency: Each district or city for which a change of organization is proposed or provided in a reorganization or plan of reorganization.

SWRCB: State Water Resources Control Board.

Treated Water: Raw water which has been treated for human consumption through secondary or tertiary processes at a water treatment plan (WTP).

Watershed: An area of land that drains water, sediment, and dissolved materials to a common receiving body or outlet. The term is not restricted to surface water runoff and includes interactions with subsurface water. Watersheds vary from the largest river basins to just acres or less in size. In urban watershed management, a watershed is seen as all the land which contributes runoff to a particular water body.

Zoning: The primary instrument for implementing the general plan. Zoning divides a community into districts or “zones” that specify the permitted/prohibited land uses.
APPENDIX A

DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE
Butte Local Agency Formation Commission
2006 Municipal Service Review of
Irrigation and Reclamation Service Providers
Phase I

Information Request to Assist in Determining:

-- Infrastructure needs or deficiencies
-- Growth and population projections for the affected area
-- Financing constraints and opportunities
-- Opportunities for rate restructuring
-- Opportunities for shared facilities
-- Government structure options, including advantages and disadvantages of consolidation and/or reorganization of service providers
-- Evaluation of management efficiencies
-- Local accountability governance
Instructions

Thank you for your assistance in this Municipal Service Review. The information you provide is very important to the accuracy of the study results. If you have any questions about the study or the information requested here, please call Uma Hinman at 530-852-4837.

In support of this Municipal Service Review, you are asked to provide information about the management of your agency, district or service area; services provided; capital holdings; finances; service area; future plans; level of service; and potential cost savings opportunities.

We are requesting this information in two phases: This request constitutes Phase I. Information is due back to Kleinschmidt Associates on Friday July 7, 2006. Please answer all questions to the best of your ability. If any of the information requested is readily available in an existing document, please reference that document and provide it with your submittal. If there is additional information that you feel should be included in the Municipal Service Review, please attach that information as well. Supplemental materials may be provided in hard copy, electronically, or by referencing a web site posting. All materials may be sent either by email to Uma.Hinman@KleinschmidtUSA.com or by mail to:

Uma Hinman
Kleinschmidt Associates
251 South Auburn Street, Suite C
Grass Valley, CA 95945

For your convenience, we have provided a checklist of material that we ask you to provide in Phase I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Request</th>
<th>Copy Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports, Studies, Plans or Other Documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Annual Inspection Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Customer List (Electronic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ District Charter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Enabling Legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Federal, State, Local Permits, Licenses, and Evaluation Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Organization Chart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Water Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Drainage Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Levees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Water Supplies, Canals, and Support Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Major Facilities Owned or Leased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Major Land Holdings Owned or Leased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A. **AGENCY / DISTRICT / SERVICE AREA DESCRIPTION**

A-1. **Official name of the Agency, District or Service Area:**

A-2. **Name of Contact:** The individual who will coordinate your response to the questionnaire and will serve as your liaison with LAFCO for this project:

- Name:
- Title:
- Address:
- Phone:
- Fax:
- Email:

**Name of Alternate Contact:** The individual to contact when the primary contact is unavailable:

- Name:
- Title:
- Address:
- Phone:
- Fax:
- Email:

A-3. **Principal Act:** Identify the statute or enabling legislation under which the agency, district, or service area was formed and operates. The answer should identify specific laws or statutory code sections. Attach a copy of the enabling legislation.

A-4. **Date** the agency or district was created or established:

A-5. **Boundary:** Please review the GIS map that shows the boundaries of your district that was provided by Butte LAFCO. Please note any errors on the map and return it to Kleinschmidt with this survey.

A-6. **Governing Body:**

- a.) Describe the method of selecting your governing body, whether elections or appointments are at large or by division, and your schedule of regular meetings (monthly, quarterly, annually, etc.).

- b.) Please provide a list of members of your governing body, their terms in office and any compensation and benefits.

- c.) Please provide a copy of your district charter.
d.) Describe how the district complies with Open Meeting Regulations (the Brown Act). How do you seek to involve the public in your meetings?

A-7. **Organizational Chart:** Does your agency, district or service area have an organizational chart?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If “yes” enclose a copy of your current organization chart.

If “no”, provide a general description of staff roles and number of full-time/part-time/seasonal/contract employees (e.g., management, maintenance, accounting, customer service, etc.).

B. **SERVICES PROVIDED**

B-1. **Types of Services Provided By Your Agency, District or Service Area:**

Please describe the types of services your District provides (i.e. irrigation water, drainage, levee protection, reclamation). If you contract with another agency, district or service area to deliver the service, indicate the name of the provider. Otherwise we assume that you are the actual service provider.

B-2. **Joint Agreements:**

a.) Does your agency, district or service area jointly own or share capital facilities or services with other agencies? Examples include joint purchasing agreements, common maintenance, sharing staffs, sharing facilities or equipment.

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, identify the client agency(ies), type of facility or service and geographic areas served in this manner.

b.) Are there areas your agency currently serves that might be served more efficiently by another agency?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes”, identify the areas.

B-3. **Mutual or Automatic Aid Agreements.** Do you maintain mutual aid or automatic aid agreements?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, identify the agency(ies), type of service and areas served in this manner.

B-4. **Joint Power Authorities:** Does your agency, district or service area belong to or participate in any joint power authorities (JPAs) or joint decision-making efforts?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, what is the purpose of each JPA?
C. **SERVICE AREA**

C-1. **Sphere of Influence:**

a.) When was the last time the Sphere of Influence was updated?

b.) Do you feel that the Sphere of Influence boundary is adequate for protected future needs?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

C-2. **Customers:**

a.) Who is considered a “customer” of your agency, district or service area? How do you track “customers” (i.e., population; dwelling units; households; connections; parcels; etc.)?

b.) How many customers within your district boundaries are currently receiving service?

c.) Please provide a customer list (electronic), including County Assessor Parcel Numbers.

d.) What is the current population within your agency, district or service area boundaries?

e.) What is the current population within your Sphere of Influence?

C-3. **Customers Outside Boundaries:** Do you serve customers outside of your boundaries? If so, please describe. Do you have interagency agreements to serve specific customers?

C-4. **Land Use:** Describe the primary land uses within your district boundaries. Are there any proposed changes to these land uses? If so, please describe.

C-5. **System Capacities:**

a.) Describe the design capacity of your system.

b.) Are there any proposed or planned increases to the capacity of the system?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes”, please describe.
D. LEVEL OF SERVICE

D-1. Regulatory, Permitting and Accrediting Agencies:

a.) List Federal, state, local or other agencies from which you receive permits, licenses or accreditations and for what purposes. When was your permit, license or accreditation last renewed and how frequently is it reviewed? Provide a copy of the latest permits, licenses or accreditation and the accompanying evaluation report.

b.) Do you prepare or receive annual reports or inspection reports from these agencies? For other agencies? Please explain and provide a copy of the latest reports.

D-2. Distinguished Service: Describe any awards, honors or other accomplishments of your agency or its personnel within the last five years.

E. RECLAMATION PROVIDERS

E-1. Flooding: Describe the history of flooding within the district. How does your agency, district or service provider respond to flood occurrences?

E-2. Levees: Provide a map showing the location of levees within your boundaries.

F. DRAINAGE SERVICE PROVIDERS

F-1. Drainage Facilities: Identify and provide a map of the type and location of your district or service area’s drainage facilities, and the end point of where the system drains. Please also describe number of detention facilities.

F-2. Please describe any drainage problem areas within your district or service area (i.e. flooding, ponding, lack of adequate facilities or infrastructure, etc.)

G. IRRIGATION WATER PROVIDERS

G-1. Irrigation Canals: Identify and provide a map of the type and location of your agency or district’s water supplies, canals and support facilities.

G-2. Exit Flows: Do the irrigation canals have exit flows?

☐ Yes  ☐ No   If “yes” identify which canals have exit flows, the flow volume and where they exit (river, lake, etc.).
G-3.  **Water Supply:**

a.) Describe factors that influence your agency or district’s ability to supply and/or deliver water to your customers.

b.) Does your agency or district have any current water supply purchase agreements?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes” please identify and describe the agreements.

c.) Describe the type and amount of water rights that your district holds. Please provide copies, if possible.

d.) Please describe the average annual total supply of water that your agency has available.

G-4.  **Water Demand:** Describe your agency or district’s annual and seasonal (summer and winter) water demands. What are the peak and average deliveries in each season?
Butte Local Agency Formation Commission
2006 Municipal Service Review for
Irrigation and Reclamation Service Providers
Phase II

Information Request to Assist in Determining:

-- Infrastructure needs or deficiencies
-- Growth and population projections for the affected area
-- Financing constraints and opportunities
-- Opportunities for rate restructuring
-- Opportunities for shared facilities
-- Government structure options, including advantages and disadvantages of consolidation
  and/or reorganization of service providers
-- Evaluation of management efficiencies
-- Local accountability governance
Instructions

Thank you for your assistance in this Municipal Service Review. The information you provide is very important to the accuracy of the study results. If you have any questions about the study or the information requested here, please call Uma Hinman at 530-852-4837.

In support of this Municipal Service Review, you are asked to provide information about the management of your agency, district or service area; services provided; capital holdings; finances; service area; future plans; level of service; and potential cost savings opportunities.

We are requesting this information in two phases: This request constitutes Phase II. Information is due back to Kleinschmidt Associates on **Friday, July 14, 2006**. Please answer all questions to the best of your ability. If any of the information requested is readily available in an existing document, please reference that document and provide it with your submittal. If there is additional information that you feel should be included in the Municipal Service Review, please attach that information as well. Supplemental materials may be provided in hard copy, electronically, or by referencing a web site posting. All materials may be sent either by email to Uma.Hinman@KleinschmidtUSA.com or by mail to:

Uma Hinman  
Kleinschmidt Associates  
251 South Auburn Street, Suite C  
Grass Valley, CA 95945

For your convenience, we have provided a checklist of material that we ask you to provide in Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Request</th>
<th>Copy Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hard Copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reports, Studies, Plans or Other Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ 5 Year Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Annual Budgets (FY 2002-03, FY 2003-04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Annual Financial Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Capital Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Current Rates and Fee Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Debt Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Financial Audits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Groundwater Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Master Services Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Public Facilities Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Strategic/Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Urban Water Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Watershed Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A. AGENCY / DISTRICT / SERVICE AREA CONTACT

A-8. Official name of the Agency, District or Service Area:

B. CAPITAL HOLDINGS

B-1. Lands: Does your agency own or lease any lands?

☐ Yes If yes, for each parcel of land, identify the approximate acreage, its purpose, and whether it is owned or leased. Provide a map showing the location of all major land holdings leased or owned by the agency.

☐ No

B-2. Facilities: Does your agency own or lease any major facilities? Major facilities could include storage sheds, office buildings, maintenance garages or water treatment plants.

☐ Yes If yes, for each major facility, identify its purpose, the approximate size of the facility, whether it is owned or leased and the agency responsible for maintenance. Provide a map showing the location of all major facilities leased or owned by the agency.

☐ No

B-3. Equipment:

a) Does your agency own or lease any construction equipment used in the operation and maintenance of your facilities?

☐ Yes If yes, identify the equipment, the age of the equipment in years, and provide a general condition description for each.

☐ No

C. FINANCIAL STATUS

C-1. Budget:

a) Enclose your last two most recently adopted budgets. Please detail revenue sources, operating, and maintenance costs.

b) Describe emergency funding strategy, depreciation policies, reserve policies for lawsuits, other potential liabilities, and so forth.

c) Please describe any programmatic changes, such as new regulatory requirements, that have impacted your budget.
C-2. **Proposition 218**: Are there any Proposition 218 opportunities for your agency, district or service area?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes”, please describe.

C-3. **Rate Schedule**:

a) Enclose your current rate and fee schedule and describe your rate setting methodology or policies.

b) Explain any variances in rates, fees or taxes charged to customers.

C-4. **Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) or Independent Audited Financial Statement**:

a.) Does your agency, district or service area follow the General Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 34 (GASB 34) accounting standards?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

b.) Attach your two most recent comprehensive annual financial reports (audits). Indicate which fiscal years have been attached and the auditing firm for each year.

c.) Did the two most recent audits contain any recommendations for your agency, district or service area?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes”, have you complied with any of the recommendations? Please explain.

C-5. **Capital Improvement Plan**:

Does your agency, district or service area have an adopted Capital Improvement Plan?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes” enclose a copy of the most recent Plan.

C-6. **State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds**:

Does your agency, district or service area provide an annual contribution to the State Education Revenue Augmentation Funds (ERA)F)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes”, what was the annual amount for FY 2004/2005 and the amount projected for FY 2005/2006?
Public Debt:

a.) Does your agency have any outstanding debt?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

b.) If “yes” describe the purpose of the debt, the type of debt and issuing organization, and how the debt is being retired. Enclose the most recent official statement.

c.) If known, what is your agency’s bond rating? From which rating agency did you receive the rate, and when was it determined?

d.) Has your agency ever defaulted on repayment of any bonds or other debt?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes”, explain the date and circumstances.

C-7. Outstanding Litigation: Has your agency been a party to any legal actions other than employee-related cases in the past 10 years that affect its financial status? Is there outstanding litigation at this time? If so, please describe.

C-8. Professional Insurance: Does your agency, district or service area maintain insurance for professional activities?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If “yes”, do you participate in pooled insurance coverage with other agencies, districts or service areas? Please explain.

D. FUTURE PLANNING

D-1. Agency Goals and Plans: How does your agency set and adopt long range goals and objectives? If your agency has adopted any planning documents, please provide a copy.

D-2. Service Demand Projections:

a.) What is the anticipated growth rate of your district?

b.) Does your agency prepare service demand projections for the next 5, 10, and/or 20 years for your residential and/or agricultural customers?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, please explain the methodology, how these projects are correlated with the population forecasts, and provide us a copy of your projections.

c.) Are the existing facilities sized to accommodate the anticipated growth for the next 5, 10, and/or 20 years for your residential and/or agricultural customers?
Future Challenges and Issues.

d.) What regulatory issues, infrastructure, or other challenges do you see confronting your agency in the next 12 months? In the next five years?

e.) Are there any potential actions by LAFCO or others that could assist you in addressing these challenges?

☐ Yes ☐ No If “yes”, please explain.

E. SERVICE EFFICIENCY AND COST SAVING OPPORTUNITIES

E-1. Cost Saving Opportunities:

a.) What actions has your agency taken in the last five years to save money, lower expenses or improve services at the same costs? Examples might include competitive bidding, interagency purchasing or other agreements, sharing operational staff and so forth.

b.) Describe plans or opportunities for your agency, district or service area to reduce overhead and operational costs.

c.) Describe availability of any excess capacity to serve customers or other agencies, districts or service areas.

E-2. Jurisdictional Reorganizations:

a.) Have partial or complete reorganizations of your agency, district or service area or consolidations with other agencies been considered or completed during the past 10 years?

☐ Yes ☐ No If “yes” describe.

b.) Are there structural reorganizations such as consolidations or reorganizations that your agency, district or service area thinks should be evaluated in the next few years to benefit recipients of your agency’s services or improve the provision of services generally?

☐ Yes ☐ No If “yes” describe.
APPENDIX B

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION FOR
JUNE 21, 2006 KICK-OFF MEETING
Municipal Service Review

Irrigation and Reclamation Service Providers

Butte LAFCo

June 21, 2006
Definitions

- **LAFCO: Local Agency Formation Commission**
  - LAFCO is an acronym for Local Agency Formation Commission. It is a regulatory agency with county-wide jurisdiction, established by state law to discourage urban sprawl and to encourage orderly and efficient provision of services, such as water, sewer, fire protection, etc. LAFCO operations are governed by the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000.

- **Municipal Services**
  - A full range of services that a public agency provides or is authorized to provide

- **Sphere of Influence (SOI)**
  - A plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the commission
LAFCo

- 58 LAFCos in CA – one in each county
- Goals
  - To balance the county’s competing needs for efficient services, affordable housing, economic opportunity, and conservation of natural resources
- Objectives
  - To encourage the orderly formation of local government agencies
  - To preserve agricultural resources and open space
  - To discourage urban sprawl
- Roles & Responsibility
  - To have a comprehensive knowledge of the:
    - Services available within its county
    - Current efficiency of providing service within various areas of the county
    - Future needs for each service
    - Expansion capacity of each service provider
Cortese-Knox Act

- Signed into California law in 1963
  - Most recent revision: Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000
  - Requires all Municipal Services be reviewed and updated every 5 years or whenever an SOI is created or updated
    - Municipal Service Review

Municipal Service Review (MSR)

- A comprehensive study of each identifiable public service provided by counties, special districts, and the cities in the region
- Only those public agencies with a Sphere of Influence (SOI) are required to undergo the review process
MSR Goals & Objectives

- Promote orderly growth & development in appropriate areas
- Encourage infill development & direct growth
- Learn about service issues and needs
- Plan for provision of high quality infrastructure needed to support healthy growth
- Provide tools to support regional planning efforts
- Develop a structure for dialogue among agencies that provide services
- Develop a support network for smaller or ill funded districts
- Provide backbone information for service provider directories or inventory reference documents
- Develop strategies to avoid unnecessary costs, eliminate waste, and improve public service provision
- Provide ideas about opportunities to streamline service provisions
- Promote shared resource acquisition, insurance policies, joint funding requests or strategies
MSR Content

- MSR’s are a written statement of LAFCO’s determination of the following:
  - Infrastructure needs or deficiencies
  - Growth and population projections for the affected area;
  - Financing constraints and opportunities;
  - Cost avoidance opportunities;
  - Opportunities for rate restructuring;
  - Opportunities for shared facilities;
  - Government structure options, including advantages and disadvantages of consolidation or reorganization of service providers;
  - Evaluation of management efficiencies; and
  - Local accountability and governance.
Butte County LAFCo MSR of Irrigation & Reclamation Service Providers

- Task 1 – Project kick-off and survey design
- Task 2 – Information collection and verification
- Task 3 – Working (Admin) Draft Service Review
- Task 4 – Final Draft Service Review
- Task 5 – Final Service Review Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Start of work</th>
<th>Kick-off meeting</th>
<th>Complete Phase I Survey</th>
<th>Complete Phase II Survey</th>
<th>Develop Admin Draft MSR</th>
<th>Develop Public Review MSR</th>
<th>Conduct Public meeting</th>
<th>Prepare Final MSR</th>
<th>MSR Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 25</td>
<td>June 19</td>
<td>July 7</td>
<td>July 14</td>
<td>July 21</td>
<td>August 4</td>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>November 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

DESCRIPTION OF IMPERVIOUS COVER
APPENDIX C

Discussion of percent impervious cover

Many of the Districts described in this report provide storm drainage services. In order to correctly design or evaluate the size, quantity, and placement of storm drain infrastructure, one must consider the percent impervious area and associated land uses in the drainage basin. Imperviousness is a measure of the inability of the ground to absorb water. The infiltration of surface water into the ground is directly related to the soil type, vegetation, and the percent impervious cover (roofs, driveways, and streets). Land-use density and spatial configuration has an important effect on the percent impervious area. When land is converted from native vegetation or agriculture to residential, commercial, or industrial uses, the percent impervious area increases, thereby increasing the quantity of water runoff and changing the timing of water flow during storms.

The level of impervious cover for Butte County is depicted on Figure C-1 shown below. Cities typically have the highest amount of impervious cover and this is reflected in the clusters of red color shown on the map. This map is based on data from the U.S. Geological Survey. Based on this data we calculated the average percent impervious cover in each of the districts that provide storm drainage services and in each of the local watersheds. CSA 23 – Pleasant Valley Drainage has the highest average percent cover among the Districts. Overall, Big Chico Creek Watershed has the highest percent cover. This information is shown in Table C-1 below.
Table C-1. Average percent impervious surfaces within drainage districts and watersheds in Butte County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storm Drainage Districts</th>
<th>Average % Imperviousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District No. 1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District No. 2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District No. 100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District No. 200</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte Creek Drainage District</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 4 – Sierra Del Oro Drainage</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 23 – Pleasant Valley Drainage</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 24 – Chico Mud Creek Drainage</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 25 – Shasta Union Drainage</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 26 – Thermalito Drainage</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA No. 87 – Keefer Road/Rock Creek Drainage</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation District No. 833</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Reclamation District</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento River Reclamation District</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watersheds</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pine Creek Watershed</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Chico Creek Watershed</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Chico Creek Watershed</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte Creek Watershed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee Watershed (Dry Creek/Cherokee Channel)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feather River/Lower Honcut Watershed</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an area undergoes land-use changes, it may be necessary to provide additional detention basins, overflow areas, culverts, pipes, weirs and other storm drainage facilities, to efficiently move water to nearby streams and to prevent flooding. City and County planners recognize the importance of working closely with local drainage districts during the permitting phases of proposed land-use changes to evaluate needed storm drainage infrastructure. Specifically, the City of Chico requires that all new development be constructed so as to have no net impact on the existing drainage infrastructure and no net change in storm drainage discharge flows. Typically new developments include their own on-site drainage infrastructure (detention ponds and pipes) to be maintained by a homeowners’ association or by the City. Butte County planners often require similar conditions on new development in the unincorporated areas.
Figure C-1. Impervious surfacing in Butte County
APPENDIX D

DISTRICT RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE
AND FOLLOW-UP CORRESPONDENCE
2.1 SOUTH FEATHER WATER & POWER AGENCY

Phase I

A-1.

A-2. Michael Glaze, General Manager
2310 Oro-Quincy Highway
Oroville, CA 95966
(530) 533-4578, ext. 202
(530) 533-9700
glaze@southfeather.com

Matt Colwell, Water Division Manager
2310 Oro-Quincy Highway
Oroville, CA 95966
530) 533-4578, ext. 212
(530) 533-9700
mcolwell@southfeather.com

A-3. The Agency is an irrigation district under the Irrigation District Law, Division 11 of the Water Code (Section 20500 et seq) of the State of California (statute is available online).

A-4. 1919

A-5.

A-6. a) Directors are elected by for staggered four-year terms. To qualify as a candidate, one must reside within a geographical division for which board of directors seat is up for election. Voters throughout the district vote for each candidate.
   b) Division 1 – Dee Hunter (exp 12/06)
      Division 2 – Vivian Meyer (exp 12/08)
      Division 3 – Jean Brown (exp 12/06)
      Division 4 – Jim Edwards (exp 12/08)
      Division 5 – Lou Cecchi (exp 12/06)
   c) The Agency is an irrigation district under the Irrigation District Law, Division 11 of the Water Code (Section 20500 et seq) of the State of California (statue is available online). No other “charter for operations” is applicable to the Agency.
   d) Agendas and supporting documents for open sessions are posted on the Agency’s web site at least 72 hours before each meeting. Hard copies of agendas and supporting documents are also provided to individuals who have submitted a written request for same within the past 12 months.

The general manager is responsible for ensuring compliance with Brown Act, with support from the Agency’s legal counsel. All Brown Act requirements are met by the Agency.
A-7. Yes.

B-1. SFWPA provides irrigation (raw) water service to approximately 550 seasonal accounts. Domestic (treated) water service is provided to approximately 6,650 accounts. The Agency’s hydropower project produces electricity (110 MgW capacity) that is wholesaled to PG&E (contract expires in 2010).

B-2. a) No.
   b) No. CA Water Company (a private water company serving the City of Oroville) has extended its PUC-approved service area into a small portion of the northeast corner of the Agency’s service area, and provides domestic water service there. Neither California Water or SFWPA have irrigation-water distribution facilities in that vicinity.

B-3. Yes. A mutual aid agreement exists between SFWPA and Yuba County Water District whereby SFWPA assists YCWD with operation and maintenance of treatment, domestic distribution, and irrigation distribution facilities.


C-1. a) Unknown.
   b) No. It should be coterminous with SFWPA’s “place-of-use” boundary as designated by the State Water Resources Control Board regarding the approved area for distribution of water under the Agency’s water rights.

C-2. a) Customers are parcels to which irrigation or treated water is served through an Agency-approved flow-measurement device.
   b) Answered above.
   c) SFWPA considers account information as confidential.
   d) Approximately 17,500.
   e) Unknown.

C-3. No interagency agreements exist. SFWPA currently serves water to six customers outside its boundaries via surplus water agreements that are considered for renewal annually.

C-4. Residential.

C-5. a) Raw water reservoirs:
   Little Grass Valley – 94,660 AF
   Sly Creek – 65,650 AF
   Lost Creek – 5650 AF
   Ponderosa – 4750 AF
   Miners Ranch – 815 AF

   Treated water reservoirs: SFWPA maintains four reservoirs for treated water with a combined capacity of 5.2 million gallons.
b) Additional storage will be needed in the future as the Agency’s customer base grows and demand increases. Surplus property was recently sold by the Agency and a portion of the proceeds were placed into a reserve account restricted for the purpose of purchasing property upon which to build future storage facilities. The location for, and size of, future storage will be determined through the soon-to-be-completed distribution model.

D-1. a) FERC (operating license for South Feather Power Project); U.S. Forest Service (special use permits to operate recreational facilities around major reservoirs); State Water Resources Control Board (water rights permits); U.S. Geological Survey (flow-measurement requirements); EPA (water treatment/distribution regulations); California State Department of Health Services (water treatment/distribution regulations); State Division of Safety of Dams.


E-1.

E-2.

F-1.

F-2.

G-1.

G-2. Yes. All – minimally.

G-3. a) Distribution-system capacity.

b) No.

c) The water source for SFWPA’s customers is derived from the watershed of the upper South Fork of the Feather River and the upper portion of the Slate Creek watershed. Through a series of dams, canals and tunnels, it is delivered to the Miner’s Ranch Reservoir, which serves as the terminal reservoir for the system. SFWPA has pre-1914 and appropriated water rights on the South Fork of the Feather River and its tributaries that exceed the actual yield of said watershed.

d) SFWPA has sufficient water rights to capture and store the entire runoff from the South Fork of the Feather River, averaging over 320,000 AF annually.

G-4. Domestic: Minimum deliveries in February (154 AF in 2006); maximum deliveries in August (793 AF in 2005).

Irrigation: Minimum deliveries in March (42 AF in 2006); maximum deliveries in August (607 AF in 2005).

These volumes represent “delivered,” as opposed to “diverted,” quantities.
Phase II

A-1.

B-1. Yes. Raw water reservoirs:
   Little Grass Valley – 94,660 AF
   Sly Creek – 65,650 AF
   Lost Creek – 5650 AF
   Ponderosa – 4750 AF
   Miners Ranch – 815 AF

   Treated water reservoirs: SFWPA maintains four reservoirs for treated water with a combined capacity of 5.2 million gallons.

B-2.

B-3.

C-1. a)  
    b)  
    c)  

C-2.

C-3. a)  
    b)  

C-4. a)  
    b)  
    c)  

C-5.

C-6.

C-7. a)  
    b)  
    c)  
    d)  

C-8.

C-9.

D-1.

D-2. a)  
    b)  
    c)  

D-4
D-3.  
   a)  
   b) 

E-1.  
   a)  
   b)  
   c) 

E-2.  
   a)  
   b)
Message
From: Glaze, Mike [glaze@southfeather.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 12:30 PM
To: Uma Hinman
Subject: RE: MSR Map request clarification

We have all parcels with the district’s boundaries in the GIS system. I’m sure we’ll be able to get you the information you need.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

From: Uma Hinman [mailto:Uma.Hinman@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 12:15 PM
To: Glaze, Mike; westerncan@aol.com; rid@pulsarco.com; pbehr1@aol.com; pminasian@minasianlaw.com
Cc: Kateri Harrison
Subject: RE: MSR Map request clarification

Hi Mike,

Thank you for the clarification. Part of the process is a verification that LAFCo's GIS layers have the correct boundaries. We are just requesting that you identify any boundary errors that you see on the map. If you don't have the SOI information or see any areas of concern, please just note that on the map and return it. It would be great if you have a map of your service area boundaries, to provide a copy of that with the survey so that we can make sure our information is accurate.

Thank you so much for your time and efforts,

Uma

-----Original Message-----
From: Glaze, Mike [mailto:glaze@southfeather.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 11:46 AM
To: Uma Hinman; westerncan@aol.com; rid@pulsarco.com; pbehr1@aol.com; pminasian@minasianlaw.com
Cc: Kateri Harrison
Subject: RE: MSR Map request clarification
LAFCo should be the entity to verify the SOI boundaries for each district. SFWPA keeps track of its "place-of-use boundary" as authorized by the State Water Resources Control for water rights' diversion purposes. I don't think we even include the LAFCo-approved SOI boundary as a layer in our GIS system.

------------------------------------------------------------------------

From: Uma Hinman [mailto:Uma.Hinman@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 10:34 AM
To: Ted Trimble (westerncan@aol.com); Brad Mattson (rid@pulsarco.com); Glaze, Mike; Paul Behr (pbehr1@aol.com); Paul Minasian (pminasian@minasianlaw.com)
Cc: Kateri Harrison
Subject: MSR Map request clarification

Hello,

I'm following up on my email from yesterday regarding the Butte LAFCO Irrigation, Drainage and Reclamation District MSR. For the maps you will be receiving, please verify that the boundaries of your service area and Sphere of Influence (SOI) identified on the maps are correct; mark corrections on the map if you find errors, and return them with Phase I of the survey. We will be able to identify any parcels served outside your set boundaries and SOI with the customer information you provide. Hopefully this will save you a little time.

Again, please feel free to contact me with any questions you have.

Thank you,

Uma Hinman
Planner & Environmental Analyst
Kleinschmidt Consultants
(530) 852-4837
www.kleinschmidtusa.com

Message
From: Colwell, Matt [mcolwell@southfeather.com]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 9:35 AM
To: Uma Hinman
Subject: RE: SFWPA Irrigation MSR

I believe it is a planning boundary generated by LAFCO called the Sphere of Influence. If LAFCO wants it delineated that is fine however it is not our existing SWRCB place of use and Agency boundary.
-----Original Message-----
From: Uma Hinman [mailto:Uma.Hinman@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 9:31 AM
To: Colwell, Matt
Subject: RE: SFWPA Irrigation MSR

Matt:

Thank you for bringing that to my attention and I apologize for not catching it before. I will have the correction made for the Public Draft MSR. Does the green boundary (titled South Feather Water & Power Agency) on the map have any relevance to the Agency? Is it an old boundary or some other boundary that should be kept in the system for historical or other purposes? Or was it just an incorrect delineation of the Agency's boundary?

Thank you for your attention in reviewing the draft, we so appreciate your assistance in making this the most accurate document possible.

Sincerely,

Uma

-----Original Message-----
From: Colwell, Matt [mailto:mcolwell@southfeather.com]
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2006 9:07 AM
To: Uma Hinman
Subject: FW: SFWPA Irrigation MSR

Uma, please refer to second paragraph. The map is still incorrect. Lafco, Steve Lucas staff, have received correct boundaries provided by Chris Crown of my staff.

-----Original Message-----
From: Colwell, Matt
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2006 4:51 PM
To: 'Uma.Hinman@Kleinschmidtusa.com'
Cc: Glaze, Mike
Subject: SFWPA Irrigation MSR

Ms. Hinman, Attached is relative information that pertain to your request for information. I am assuming that you have the Domestic Water MSR that was performed for Butte LAFCo. There should be a significant portion of what you need in that document. Much of the attached information was generated for that project. I have an additional SFWPA Water System Conveyance Evaluation document that I am having trouble converting to PDF so I will attempt to get it to you later.
The information packet that was sent to me included a map that indicated a couple of Agency boundaries. The LAFCo boundaries identified as SOUTH FEATHER WATER AND POWER AGENCY are incorrect. Please do not use them. Please use the other boundary identified as SOUTH FEATHER SWRCB BOUNDARY. This has been previously provided to LAFCo with similar instructions.

Please review the information provided and extract what you need. I am available to answer additional questions and provide additional information.

Matt Colwell
Water Division Manager
South Feather Water & Power
2310 Oro-Quincy Hwy
P.O. Box 581
Oroville, CA 95965
mcolwell@southfeather.com
530.533.4578 x212
2.3 BIGGS-WEST GRIDLEY WATER DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Biggs-West Gridley Water District

A-2. Bernoy Bradford, Manager
    1713 W. Biggs Gridley Road
    Gridley CA  95948
    530-846-3317
    bbradford@bwgwater.com

    Alternate: Margaret Haury, Office Administrator
    W. Biggs Gridley Road
    Gridley CA  95948
    530-846-3317
    mhaury@bwgwater.com

A-3. A hard copy of the Agree will be in the mail to you

A-4. 1942

A-5. Attachment BWGWD pic

A-6. a. Five member elected board by the landowners which meets the 3rd Wednesday of every month.
    b. Directors serve a four year term. Richard Cassady, Richard Storm, Gary Justeson, Thomas Coleman and Phillip Haynes. They are given $50 for each meeting they attend and health insurance.
    c.
    d. All meetings are conducted using the laws of the Brown Act.

A-7. No

B-1. Irrigation Water

B-2. Yes, a hard copy of the joint working agreement will be in the mail to you.

B-3. No

B-4. Yes, Purpose is insurance

C-1.

C-2. a. Anyone who applies for water – They must come in annually
    b. If they aren’t serviced then they aren’t a customer
    c. List is attached
    d. unknown
    e. unknown
C-3. Yes, if they are not within another district but can receive water with an agreement

C-4. Agriculture and duck ponds – no proposed changes

C-5. a. 750 cfs
   b. Yes, 850 cfs

D-1. Hard copies will be mailed to you

D-2.

E-1.

E-2.

F-1. Everything goes into RD 833 drains

F-2. None

G-1. Map attached

G-2.

G-3. a. 1969 Agreement with DWR for water from lake Oroville, hard copy will follow in mail
   b. No
   c. In 1969 Agreement
   d. The total supply of water that our agency has available is 160,950 acre feet

G-4. 10 year average annual 160,000 summer and 45,000 winter.
   Peak summer 750 csf, peak winter 300 cfs
   Summer = start of water year to Oct. 31
   Winter = Nov. 1 to end of water year
Phase II

A-1.  Biggs-West Gridley Water District

B-1.  Yes we own land – a copy of parcels will be mailed to you

B-2.  Yes, office building – copy of parcel map will be mailed

B-3.  Yes – equipment list in the mail

C-1.  a.  will be mailed
    b.  We have emergency funds in LAIF
    c.  cost of living, price of gas

C-2.  No

C-3.  a.  Attached:  crop tolls
    b.  Rates vary as different crops require different amounts of water

C-4.  a.  Yes
    b.  In the mail
    c.  No

C-5.  No

C-6.  No

C-7.  a.  No
    b.  N/A
    c.  N/A
    d.  No

C-8.  No

C-9.  Yes, we use JPIA for our insurance

D-1.  No set plan

D-2.  a.  None, if anything it will decrease due to development
    b.  no
    c.  no

D-3.  a.  Manager Bradford to respond
    b.  no
E-1. We maintain the District to provide the finest service to our landowners. The crew manufactures gates, headwalls and many different items.

E-2. a. No
b. no
2.4 BUTTE WATER DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Butte Water District

A-2. Mark Orme, Manager
    735 Virginia Street

    Phone: 530-846-3100
    Fax: 530-846-2519
    Email: morme_bwd@wcisp.com

    Vivian Turner, Office Manager
    same as above
    same as above
    same as above
    vturner_bwd@wcisp.com


A-4. July 12, 1956

A-5.

A-6. a) Governing body is selected by election. Regular board meetings are held the second
    Wednesday of each month.
    b) Robert Waller – 4 year term – $100 per month plus $50 per additional meeting
    Ron Giovanetti – 4 year term – $100 per month plus $50 per additional meeting
    Joseph Bozzo – 4 year term – $100 per month plus $50 per additional meeting
    Steven Pantaleoni – 4 year term – $100 per month plus $50 per additional meeting
    Gregory Correa – 4 year term – $100 per month plus $50 per additional meeting
    c) n/a
    d) We comply by posting board meeting agendas in a timely manner. We also
    occasionally make an announcement of times and dates in the local newspaper.

A-7. No. General Manager (1) (full-time)
    Assistant Manager (1) (full-time)
    Office Manager/Bookkeeping (1) (full-time)
    Maintenance (1) (full-time)
    Ditchtenders (4) (full-time)

B-1. Butte Water District provides irrigation water.

B-2. a) Yes. We share common maintenance, facilities, and equipment with the Joint Water
    Districts.
    b) No.

B-3. No.
B-4. Yes. The Joint Water District Board for protection of water rights and maintenance and improvements of joint conveyance system and facilities.

C-1. a) September 2006.
   b) Yes.

C-2. a) Water users are considered customers.
   b) Approximately 550.
   c) Per Jeff Meith of Minasian Law Firm – not public information. Land owner list may be acquired from County tax rolls.
   d) n/a
   e) n/a

C-3. Yes. Approximately 2 customers are served outside our boundaries. Yes, for one customer.

C-4. Agricultural. Possible commercial and housing development.

C-5. a. 750 cfs
   b. Yes, 850 cfs

D-1. a) None.
   b) None.

D-2. None.

E-1. n/a

E-2. n/a

F-1. n/a

F-2. n/a

G-1. 

G-2. Yes. Reclamation drains, Sutter Bypass, and Butte Creek.

G-3. a) a.) Drought. B.) Receiving 100% entitlement from the state. c.) Capacity.
   b) No.
   c) Pre-1914 water right to 133,200 a/f per year.
   d) 133,200 a/f with the option to purchase surplus water from the remaining Joint Districts.

G-4. Approximately 100,000 a/f during summer and approximately 10,000 a/f during winter.
Phase II

A-1.  Butte Water District

B-1.  Yes.  
   a. APN: 021-132-040  
   b. Various canals and waterways.

B-2.  Yes.  
   a. APN: 009-082-006-000  
   b. APN: 009-122-003-000  
   c. APN: 009-122-009-000

B-3.  Yes.

C-1.  
   a) (see budget)  
   b) (see district audit)  
   c) (see district audit)

C-2.  No.

C-3.  
   a) Rates are set according to the budget.  
   b) (based on type of crops)

C-4.  
   a) Yes.  
   b) Audits for 2003 and 2004, completed by Michael Hinz, CPA, are attached.  
   c) No.

C-5.  No.

C-6.  No.

C-7.  
   a) No.  District bonds have been paid off.  
   b)  
   c) Unknown.  
   d) No.

C-8.  Yes.  No.

C-9.  Yes.  ACWA/JPIA.

D-1.  Through staff planning and board approval.

D-2.  
   a) Declining growth.  
   b) No.  
   c) Yes.

D-3.  
   a) Water quality and commercial/residential development encroachment, along with the  
   possibility of providing M&I service in addition to agriculture.  Water transfers.  
   b) Yes.  Having the opportunity to respond to general plan updates and future planning  
   within the district’s service area.
E-1.  
a) Staff cuts.
b) n/a
c) We have excess water to serve to other agencies, districts, and service areas, in addition to districts within our own service area. There is also the possibility of serving M&I water.

E-2.  
a) No.
b) No.
2.5 WESTERN CANAL WATER DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Western Canal Water District

A-2. Ted Trimble, General Manager
PO Box 190
Richvale, CA 95974
Phone (530) 342-5083
Fax (530) 342-8233
tedtrim@aol.com

A-3. Western Canal Water District is a political subdivision of the State of California formed and existing pursuant to the provisions of Division 13 of the Water Code of the State of California

A-4. December 21, 1984

A-5. There was a detachment in 2003. It is noted on the Boundary map.

A-6 a) The Board of Directors is elected at large. Regular Board of Directors meetings are the third Tuesday of each month.
b) Eric Larrabee, President (term ending 2007); Ken Anderson, Vice President (2007); Homer Lundberg, Director (2007); Lance Tennis, Director (2009); Milt LaMalfa, Director (2009). Directors of Western Canal Water District will be compensated in accordance with the provision of Section 20200, et seq. of Division 10 of the Water Code of the State of California. Attendance at meetings of the Board, or attendance at meetings on behalf of the Board as directed by the Board of Directors shall be considered as a day of service on behalf of the District. Other service rendered as a member of the Board of Directors at the request of the Board will be compensated in accordance with the determination of the Board as to the reasonable time required for such services to the District.
c) See attached
d) WCWD complies with all aspects of the Brown Act

A-7 No. General Manager: Implements the policies of the Board and oversees all operation of the District. Office Manager/Bookkeeper: Oversees office operations and finances. Operations Manager: Serves as water master and supervises field crew. Office Clerk: Customer service and light office duties. Six ditchtender/maintenance positions. One or two seasonal workers as needed.

B-1. WCWD provides irrigation, waterfowl and other wildlife, and rice straw decomposition water.

B-2. a) No.
b)

B-3. No.
B-4. No.

C-1. a) Unknown.
    b) Yes.

C-2. a) Anybody (landowner, grower, refuge manager, or duck club operator) who orders water from us. Customers are tracked by connections (meter delivery stations).
b) 258 irrigation deliveries from 2006 water service applications.
c) See attached. WCWD does not have Parcel Numbers.
d) Unknown.
e) Unknown.

C-3. WCWD serves a small acreage (approx 200 acres) on a regular yearly basis. No interagency agreements.

C-4. Intensive Agriculture (mostly rice). No known proposed land uses changes.

C-5. a) 1200 cfs in Western Main Canal, 50 cfs in Western Lateral.
b) No.

D-1. a) N/A.
b) N/A.

D-2.

G-1. See attached map.

G-2. Yes. See attached map.

G-3. a) Aging infrastructure could become a problem over time. Canal capacity is occasionally limited during spring “flood-up.” Supply is subject to curtailment during drought periods.
b) No.
c) See Attached water delivery agreement.
d) 295,000 Acre feet.

G-4. Annual demand is approximately 280,000 Af/year with peak demands in summer (the growing season). About 75% of demand is for irrigation (April–September), 25% of demand is environmental (October–January). Water service is not available (nor is there a demand) mid-January through March.
Phase II

A-1. Western Canal Water District

B-1. Yes. Own District Headquarters. Lease Reservoir for water conveyance: see attached.


B-3. Yes. John Deere6715 Tractor & Loader – 0 years, excellent; John Deere 6400 w/loader – 10 years old, fair condition; Cat Backhoe 436C – 7 years old, good condition.

C-1. a) The District keeps at least one year of operating expenses in reserve but it can be higher. The District self-funds its capital depreciation (items over $1000).
   b) There have been no changes but broad-based water user diversion fees could have a big impact on the budget.

C-2. Yes. Standby rates are subject to Prop 218.

C-3. a) Rates are set annually by the Board of Directors
   b) 

C-4. a) Yes.
   b) Attached are 2005 and 2004, our auditing firm is Matson & Isom.
   c) No.

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.
   b) 
   c) 
   d) No.

C-8. No.

C-9. Yes. Pooled insurance through Association of California Water Agencies/JPIA.

D-1. The only long range planning that the District undertakes pertains to aging elevation control check structures. About five years ago, the District assessed all check structures and found most to be in good shape. Priority was assigned for replacement of a few of the structures. Admittedly, the District should do better long range planning.

D-2. a) No anticipated growth.
   b) No.
   c) Yes.
D-3. a) Aquatic weed control is becoming more of an issue as it can decrease carrying capacity of the conveyance system. Proposed broad based water user fees will impact the District and its landowners.
   b) No.

E-1. a) Financial Planning. The District, in response to California’s budget crisis has diversified its financial portfolio. In addition to utilizing the LAIF, the District invested in short (1–5 years), medium (6–10 years), and long term (11–15 years) bonds and other issues.
   b) None at this time.
   c) None at this time.

E-2. No.

E-3. No.
2.6 RICHVALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Richvale Irrigation District

A-2. Brad Mattson, General Manager
PO Box 147
Richvale, CA 95974
Phone (530) 882-4243
Fax (530) 882-4580
rid@pulsarco.com

A-3. Division 11 of the Water Code of the State of California

A-4. July 7, 1930

A-5. See map.

A-6 a) Directors are elected by the landowners in the district. They are at large. They serve 4 year terms. The board then appoints the Treasurer. The Manager of the District acts as the Secretary to the Board. The meetings are held on the Third Thursday of the month at 1:30 pm. During Spring work and Harvest they are moved to the third Wednesday at 7:30 pm
b) Gene Harris, President - Per diem of $100 per meeting. Walt Meyer, Director - Per diem of $100 per meeting. Lyle Job, Director - Per diem of $100 per meeting. Gerald Mattson, Treasurer/Assessor - Per diem of $100 per meeting.
c) See attached
d) Meetings are posted and anyone interested are encouraged to attend. We use an attorney to make sure we are complying with the Brown Act.

A-7 No. The Board of directors directs the manager. The manager then directs the employees. There is a Water master, Shop foreman, an equipment operator, and 3 ditchtenders. There are 7 employees including the manager.

B-1. Irrigation water.

B-2. a) Yes. We are a member of the Joint Water Districts, collectively we hold our water right. It includes Richvale Irrigation District, Biggs-West Gridley water District, Butte Water District, and Sutter Extension Water District. We own mutual things. All necessary for the effective use of the water we provide our growers.
b) Yes. I think if we were to combine DD100 and DD200 into our district we would be a lot better off and better able to serve our customers.

B-3. CDF does use our canals to acquire water if it is needed for an emergency. But no formal agreement exists.

B-4. We are a part of ACWA/JPIA Insurance. This allows us a better rate for our insurance.
C-1.  
a) Do not know.  
b) Yes.

C-2.  
a) Land owners and tenants who use and pay for water service  
b) 125.  
c) See attached.  
d) Approximately 250.  
e)

C-3.  No.

C-4.  Not that I know about.

C-5.  
a) Around 750 CFS.  500 at the Richvale Main and 250 at the Minderman.  
b) 

d) Approximately 250.

e)

D-1.  
a) We have a contract with DWR.  
b) 

D-2.  

E-1.  DWR and DD 100 and DD200 and Butte Creek Drainage and DD 2. These entities take care of all Drainage in the system.

E-2.

G-1.  The water Supply is from Lake Oroville. The water is from the Feather River. If there is a drought we can get cut up to 50% in a year.

G-2.  There is small operational spills in the system but they are small. Any exit flows go into drains and end up in Butte Creek.

G-3.  
a) Feather River Flows into Oroville and Capacity of canals.  
b) No.  
c) Pre-1914, Senior to the State.  
d) 149,850 Acre Feet.

e)

G-4.  It depends on the amount of Rice planted and the amount of winter water needed.
Phase II

A-1. Richvale Irrigation District

B-1. Yes. We own some canals and laterals in the system others are just easements. Map will be provided during interview.

B-2. We own 1140 Richvale Hwy. This serves as our maintenance shop and yard.

B-3. Yes. We own a John Deere 6420, John Deere 160 LC excavator, John Deere 410G Backhoe, Cat D-4G dozer, numerous trucks and pickups, as well as support equipment. All the equipment is in good shape.

C-1. a) You will receive during interview
   b) The board of directors chooses to keep a reserve fund for emergencies, we depreciate items fully.
   c) Workers comp and Insurance seem to impact us a bit. Diversion fees would destroy our budgets.

C-2. We have to comply with Prop 218 for our standby charges.

C-3. a) Will receive during interview.
   b)

C-4. a) Yes. You will receive during interview.
   b)
   c)

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.
   b)
   c)
   d)

C-8. Yes, very expensive, around $80,000.

C-9. Yes, we are a member of the ACWA/JPIA insurance pool.

D-1. In progress.

D-2. a) Do not see any growth to our boundaries.
   b)
   c)
D-3.  a) Water supply, drought, levee repairs, ESA, aging infrastructure, commodity prices, population growth.
b) Help with communication of community.

E-1.  a) I have been trying to combine the drainage districts and the irrigation district into one through a JPA or the sorts. This would be a huge cost savings to the DD. We have the people and equipment to work on irrigation canals, drainage canals are basically the same. We mow one side of the road and they mow the other side.
b) 
c) 

E-2.

E-3.
3.2 DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 2

Phase I

A-1. Drainage District No. 2

A-2. Ted Trimble, Manager
    PO Box 190 Richvale, CA 95974
    342-5083
    342-8233
    tedtrim@aol.com

    Christie Rogers, Secretary
    PO Box 190 Richvale, CA 95974
    342-5083
    342-8233
    westerncan@aol.com

A-3. Drainage District No. 2 was formed under Section 5 of Act 985 of the Legislature of the State of California, entitled “An Act to Promote Drainage”

A-4. February 11, 1920

A-5.

A-6. a) Semiannual. Elected by ballot and serve until a successor is elected.
    b) Compensation and Benefits have been waived by Trustees. John Sheppard, Dennis Thengvall, Eric Lundberg.
    c) See Attachment.
    d) The District complies with all aspects of the Brown Act.

A-7. The District contracts with Western Canal Water District for Manager and Secretary. Manager is responsible for preparing meeting agendas, correspondence, securing liability insurance. Secretary coordinates financial transactions with Butte County (the District’s fiscal agent).

B-1. Provides Ditch Maintenance through outside vendors.

B-2. a) Butte Creek Drainage District’s boundaries fully encompass Drainage District 2. Both Districts were formed under the same enabling statute and have the same functions.
    b)

B-3.

B-4.

C-1. a) Unknown.
    b)
C-2. a) Landowners that drain land.
    b) Unknown.
    c) We do not have this information. It may be within the Butte County Assessor’s Office or Auditor/Controller’s Office.
    d) Unknown.
    e) Unknown.
C-3. Yes, through Drainage Licenses.
C-4. Intensive Agriculture.
C-5. a) Unknown.
    b) 
D-1. a) N/A
    b) N/A
D-2. N/A
E-1.
E-2.
F-1. No Infrastructure Map Available. The ending point is Butte Creek. No Detention Facilities.
F-2. No problems.
G-1.
G-2.
G-3. a)
    b)
    c)
    d)
G-4.
Phase II

A-1. Drainage District #2

B-1. No.

B-2. No.

B-3. No.

C-1. a)  
b) No strategy or policies are in place. 
c) N/A

C-2. Yes. Since Drainage District #2 boundaries are completely within Butte Creek Drainage District boundaries, dissolution is a possibility. Assessments could be increased.

C-3. a) Butte County Tax Collector is the fiduciary agent for DD#2. 
b) 

C-4. a) Yes. Every three years as required by law. 
b)  
c) Yes. The District has complied with Recommendations #1 and #2 and intends to comply with #3. 
   1. Board members should be elected by the District’s landowners rather than appointed by the Board. 
   2. Board meetings should be held at least once a year. 
   3. The District should have a formal, board approved administrative agreement with Western Canal Water District to detail and clarify the arrangement between the two entities.

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No. 
b)  
c)  
d) No.

C-8. No.

C-9. Yes. Special Districts Insurance Program.

D-1. The District has not set long term goals and objectives.

D-2. a) None. 
b) No. 
c)
D-3.  
    a) Unknown.
    b)

E-1.  
    a) The District utilizes administrative services of Western Canal Water District. WCWD provides up $1000 of in-kind service for the purpose of maintaining Little Dry Creek for drainage. Trustees have waived Board compensation.
    b) Unknown.
    c)

E-2.  
    a) Yes. Western Canal Water District provides administrative activities to the District at no cost.
    b) Yes. Consolidation with Butte Creek Drainage District or a dissolution of the District is a possibility.
3.3 DRAINAGE DISTRICT NO. 100

Phase I

A-1.

A-2. John A. Marta
    Asst. Secty
    P.O. Box N Yuba City, CA 95992
    530-674-9661
    530-671-4120
    jmarta9673@aol.com


A-4. 1913.

A-5.

A-6. a) Elections at large, monthly mtgs
    b) In our audit report. $50/mtg.
    c) Don’t have one.
    d) By only meeting monthly.

A-7. No.

B-1. Drainage.

B-2. a) No.
    b) No.

B-3. No.

B-4. No.

C-1. a) Unknown.
    b)

C-2. a) An owner of a parcel greater than 1 acre, within the District.
    b) Approx 200
    c) On record w/ Butte Co.
    d) Don’t know w/ precision probably 1500±
    e) Don’t know.

C-3. No.

C-4. Rice Farming. No.
C-5.  a) ?  
   b) No.

D-1.  a) None.  
   b) N/A

D-2.  N/A

E-1.  

E-2.  

F-1.  You have. None.

F-2.  None.

G-1.  

G-2.  

G-3.  a)  
   b)  
   c)  
   d)  

G-4.  

Phase II

A-1.

B-1. Yes. Approx 2 acres w/ office & shop bldg.

B-2. No.

B-3. Yes. 2 backhoes, 1 mower, 1 pickup, 2 trucks – all in good condition

C-1. a) 
b) N/A 
c) N/A

C-2. No.

C-3. a) 4.50/ac per year. Has not changed in approx 6 years. 
b) N/A

C-4. a) Yes. 
b) 
c) No.

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No. 
b) 
c) No. 
d) No.

C-8. None.

C-9. Yes.

D-1. N/A

D-2. a) 0 
b) No. 
c) Yes.

D-3. a) None. 
b) No.
E-1.  a) 
b) 
c) 

E-2.  a) No. 
b) No.
From: JMARTA9673@aol.com  
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 11:02 AM  
To: Uma Hinman  
Subject: Re: Follow up questions for MSR

Dear Uma     I will answer your questions in the order asked:

1. The District is part of a multiparty maintenance agreement with RD833

2. DD100 compensation ratio is .1914 of one-half (9.57%). I don't know the percentages for the other participants.

3. Don't have a copy but I believe it was entered into in 1923.

4. The District staff does all of the maintenance within the district. The District does not provide services to any other districts.

5. No flooding problems

6. We do not maintain any weirs in Butte Sink.

7. Current Board Members:  Marvin Lundburg Dec 2007  
                            Dennis Thengval Dec 2007  
                            Michael Arens Dec 2010

If you need anything else, please let me know.

John Marta
From: JMARTA9673@aol.com  
Sent: Thursday, September 14, 2006 1:55 PM  
To: Uma Hinman  
Subject: Re: Follow up questions for MSR

The agreement covers maintenance along Butte Creek that is outside of our district but covers drainage for all of the Districts involved. Seems like someone thought it logical that the involved districts share the maintenance of the common drain to the Sacramento River.
3.5 BUTTE CREEK DRAINAGE DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Butte Creek Drainage District

A-2. Ted Trimble, Manager
PO Box 190, Richvale, CA 95974
342-5083
342-8233
tedtrim@aol.com

Christie Rogers, Secretary
PO Box 190 Richvale, CA 95974
342-5083
342-8233
westerncan@aol.com

A-3. Butte Creek Drainage District was formed under Section 5 of Act 985 of the Legislature of the State of California, entitled “An Act to Promote Drainage”

A-4. 11/27/20

A-5. The map we have shows a little more acreage included in the southern end of the District. We cannot verify the accuracy of the information. See attached boundary map.

A-6. a) Semiannual. Elected by ballot and serve until a successor is elected.
b) Trustees receive $50 in compensation per meeting, no other benefits. Lance Tennis, Eric Larrabee, and Gene Harris, Trustees.
c) See Enclosure.
d) The District complies with all aspects of the Brown Act.

A-7. The District contracts with Western Canal Water District for Manager and Secretary. Manager is responsible for preparing meeting agendas, correspondence, securing liability insurance. Secretary coordinates financial transactions with Butte County (the District’s fiscal agent).

B-1. BCDD Contracts with Reclamation District No. 833 for maintenance.

B-2. a) Butte Creek Drainage District’s boundaries fully encompass Drainage District 2. Both Districts were formed under the same enabling statute and have the same functions.
b) No.

B-3. No.

B-4. No.

C-1. a) Unknown.
b)
C-2.  
a) Landowners that drain land within the District boundaries.
b) Unknown.
c) We do not have this information. It may be within the Butte County Assessor’s Office or Auditor/Controller’s Office.
d) Unknown.
e) Unknown.

C-3.  
No.

C-4.  
Intensive Agriculture.

C-5.  
a) Unknown.
b) 

d) 

e) 

D-1.  
a) N/A  
b) N/A  

D-2.  
None.

E-1.  

E-2.  

F-1.  
No Infrastructure Map Available. The ending point is Butte Creek. No Detention Facilities.

F-2.  
No problems.

G-1.  

G-2.  

G-3.  
a)  
b)  
c)  
d)  

G-4.  

Phase II

A-1. Butte Creek Drainage District

B-1. No.
B-2. No.
B-3. No.

C-1. a) No strategy or policies are in place.
b) N/A

c-2. No.

c-3. a) Butte County Tax Collector is the fiduciary agent for BCDD.
b) 

c-4. a) Yes. Every three years as required by law.
b) 
c) Yes. The District has complied with Recommendations #1 and #2 and intends to comply with #3.
1. Board members should be elected by the District’s landowners rather than appointed by the Board.
2. Board meetings should be held at least once a year.
3. The District should have a formal, board approved administrative agreement with Western Canal Water District to detail and clarify the arrangement between the two entities.

c-5. No.

c-6. No.

c-7. a) No.
b) 
c) 
d) No.

c-8. No.

c-9. Yes. Special Districts Insurance Program.

D-1. The District has not set long term goals and objectives.

D-2. a) None.
b) No.
c)
D-3. a) Unknown.
   b) 

E-1. a) The District utilizes administrative services of Western Canal Water District at no cost to the District.
   b) Unknown.
   c) 

E-2. a) Western Canal Water District provides administrative activities to the District at no cost.
   b) No.
Ms. Hinman

My name is Mary, I will be answering several questions you had about Butte Creek Drainage District.

1) There is not a contract, but there is an agreement dated for June 2, 1936. BCDD shares a portion of the expense with 2 other entities for maintenance on Butte Creek and Smith Bridge when they enlarged the capacities of Moulton Cut and Butte Creek. Reclamation District 833 and Drainage District 100. BCDD and DD #100 share 50% BCDD's portion breaks down to .4719 of 50% Example as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance $2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RD 833 is billed for 50% = 1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCDD is billed for .4719 of $1000 = 471.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 100 is billed for .5281 of $1000 = 528.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2000.00

This maintenance is done annually or later as needed.

2) No, BCDD doesn't perform maintenance on Butte Creek directly.

3) There aren't any Capacity Problems.

4) The District’s Purpose is addressed in several areas throughout the Bylaws we mailed to you. Specific areas in the Bylaws are Article VI, pg 4, item 10 and article XVII.

5) The term for office originally was one year, or until their successors were elected, office expired in an unspecific date in February, the area in the Bylaws where this is addressed is in Article II pg's 1 and 2. It was changed later to four years or until their successors are elected, which was addressed in the minutes in 1957 at a special meeting of the landowners dated May 8. I was not able to locate the specific year in which it was changed.

Thank you,

Mary Rauch
Hello,

Yes it is a 3 way agreement, no contract. RD 833 would perform the work and then send the bill out to DD 100 & BCDD. In 2005 RD 833 sent both drainage districts a letter asking if they would agree with contracting out the work. All were in agreement so it is contracted out now, and it may not be to any one particular company. In 2005 it was done by Anderson Dragline, Inc. BCDD's Share of the bill was $1,315.89 and that included some RD 833 overhead in getting the work scheduled etc. In the year 2005 RD 833 paid it, and then billed the two drainage districts. In this case the funds went to RD 833 not to Anderson Dragline, of course RD 833 sent BCDD the itemized bills from the company used. How it will be billed and who the funds go to in the future is undetermined right now. We'll see how it goes. It will be handled on a case to case basis.

The terms for the current Board Members, actually they are called Trustees, end in an unspecific date in February every four years or until their successors are elected. There were no elections this year. An election has not been determined as of yet. I have been With Western Canal for four years, and the same people have sit in the Trustee seats at least as long, excepting for one, and that person has served for approximately 2 years. That is the best I can answer about the current seats. I would like to let you know, in case the question comes up in your mind. The Trustee's must own land in the District to be in office. Article I in the Bylaws will more clearly outline that.

I hope this helped you. If you have anymore questions feel free to contact me.

Have a nice day.

Mary
3.6 CSA NO. 4 – SIERRA DEL ORO LIGHTING, DRAINAGE AND WATER TESTING DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Sierra Del Oro Lighting, Drainage and Water Testing District – CSA 4

A-2. Tom Blixt
   Administrative Analyst, Senior
   7 County Center Drive – Oroville, CA 95965
   530-538-7266
   530-538-7171
   tblixt@buttecounty.net

   Stuart Edell
   Land Development Manager
   Same
   Same
   Same
   sedell@buttecounty.net

A-3. County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1.

A-4. 7/23/63

A-5.

A-6. a) Board of Supervisors.
b) Current Butte County Board members.
c) N/A
d) Meetings are held during regular Board of Supervisors meetings.

A-7. No. There are no employees in this CSA.

B-1. Provides street lighting, water quality testing and drainage services.

B-2. a) No.
b) No.

B-3. No.

B-4. No.

C-1. a) 1990
   b) Yes.
C-2.  
   a) Customers are the parcel owners within County Service Area.
   b) There are 4,389 parcels within the CSA receiving services.
   c) Requested from the Property Tax Division.
   d) N/A
   e) N/A

C-3.  No.

C-4.  Residential. No.

C-5.  
   a) N/A
   b) No.

D-1.  
   a) RWQCB for water quality testing. Unknown – Environmental Health Department is
       in charge of water quality testing – my file has no documentation of permits or licenses.
       The Butte County Environmental Health Department may have this information.
   b) Unknown. Unknown. The Butte County Environmental Health Department may
       have this information.

D-2.  N/A

E-1.  No known flooding. Road crews will clean out any roadside ditches that may become
      clogged with debris.


F-1.  Detailed map not available – drainage facilities consist mainly of roadside ditches/swales.

F-2.  N/A

G-1.  

G-2.  

G-3.  
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 

G-4.  

D-43
Phase II

A-1. CSA 4 – Sierra Del Oro Lighting, Drainage and Water Testing District

B-1. No.

B-2. No.

B-3. No.

C-1. a) Attached.
   b) N/A
   c) None.

C-2. No.

C-3. a) Assessments only – there is no fee schedule.
   b) No audits have been done.
   c) No audits have been done.

C-4. a) Yes.
   b) No audits have been done.
   c) Yes.

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.
   b) N/A
   c) N/A
   d) No.

C-8. No. No.

C-9. No.

D-1. Not done.

D-2. a) None anticipated.
   b) No.
   c) Yes.

D-3. a) None. None.
   b) No.
E-1.  
   a) None.
   b) None planned.
   c) N/A

E-2.  
   a) No.
   b) No.
Message
From: Monica Berreman
Sent: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 3:01 PM
To: Uma Hinman
Subject: FW: CSA 4 annual budgets

-----Original Message-----
From: Blixt, Thomas [mailto:TBlixt@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2006 11:34 AM
To: Monica Berreman
Subject: RE: CSA 4 annual budgets

That is a line item to accumulate funds into an account for repair/replacement of facilities - for example - if a levee failed there would be sufficient funds available to repair to levee without seeking loans or higher assessment fees.

From: Monica Berreman [mailto:Monica.Berreman@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2006 11:25 AM
To: Blixt, Thomas
Subject: RE: CSA 4 annual budgets

Dear Mr. Blixt,

I am currently writing up the information on CSA#4. I have a quick question concerning the Budget sheet. What are Provisions for Reserves/Designations under the Summary of Financing Requirements? Are they capital improvement projects? Thank you for your help. Monica Berreman

-----Original Message-----
From: Uma Hinman
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2006 11:38 AM
To: Monica Berreman
Subject: FW: CSA 4 annual budgets
-----Original Message-----
From: Blixt, Thomas [mailto:TBlixt@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 8:32 AM
To: Uma Hinman
Subject: CSA 4 annual budgets

Additional CSA 4 information.

Tom Blixt
Administrative Analyst
Department of Public Works
Land Development Division
Storm Water Management
7 County Center Drive
Oroville, CA 95965
(530) 538-7266
(530) 538-7171 FAX

tblixt@buttecounty.net or
stormwater@buttecounty.net

www.buttecounty.net/publicworks/stormwater.html
3.7 CSA NO. 23 – PLEASANT VALLEY DRAINAGE

Phase I

A-1. CSA 23 – Pleasant Valley Drainage

A-2. Tom Blixt  
Administrative Analyst, Senior  
7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA 95965  
530-538-7266  
530-538-7171  
tblixt@buttecounty.net

Stuart Edell  
Manager, Land Development Department  
Administrative Analyst, Senior  
7 County Center Drive, Oroville, CA 95965  
530-538-7266  
530-538-7171  
osedell@buttecounty.net

A-3. County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1. N/A.


A-5. 

A-6. a) Board of Supervisors.  
b) Current Butte County Board members.  
c) N/A  
d) Meetings are held during regular Board of Supervisors meetings.

A-7. No.

B-1. Drainage.

B-2. a) No.  
b) No.

B-3. No.

B-4. No.

C-1. a) Annexations done in 2004.  
b) Yes.
C-2. a) Parcel owners within CSA boundaries. Property tax rolls.
b) 1940 parcel owners.
c)
d) Unknown.
e) Unknown.

C-3. Indirectly – parcel downstream benefit by drainageways within CSA. No.

C-4. Residential, agricultural and open space. Possible depending on General Plan update.

C-5. a) Drainage system consists of underground pipe, open channels and drop inlets that drain into Sycamore Creek, a tributary of Mud Creek.
b) No.

D-1. a) N/A
b) No. No.

D-2. N/A

E-1.

E-2.

F-1.

F-2.

G-1.

G-2.

G-3. a)
b)c)
d)

G-4.
Phase II

A-1. CSA 23 – Pleasant Valley Drainage

B-1. No.

B-2. No.

B-3. No.

C-1. a) Attached.
    b) N/A
    c) N/A

C-2. No.

C-3. a) N/A
    b) N/A

C-4. a) Yes.
    b) N/A
    c) N/A

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.
    b)
    c)
    d) No.

C-8. No. No.

C-9. No.

D-1. N/A

D-2. a) Not anticipated.
    b) No.
    c) N/A

D-3. a) None. None.
    b) No.
E-1.  a) Equipment sharing between CSA accounts.
b) Equipment sharing between CSA accounts.
c) None.

E-2.  a) No.
b) No.
3.8 CSA NO. 24 – CHICO MUD CREEK DRAINAGE

Phase I

A-1.

A-2. Tom Blixt
    Administrative Analyst, Senior
    7 County Center Drive – Orvalle, CA 95965
    530-538-7266
    530-538-7171
    tblixt@buttecounty.net

    Stuart Edell
    Land Development Manager
    Same
    Same
    Same
    Same
    sedell@buttecounty.net

A-3. County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1.)


A-5.

A-6. a) Board of Supervisors.
    b) Current Board of Supervisors.
    c)
    d) Meetings are held during regular Board of Supervisors meetings.

A-7. No.

B-1. Maintenance of project levees and the Lindo Channel Diversion Structure. Project channels maintained by the Department of Water Resources.

B-2. a) No.
    b) No.

B-3. No.

B-4. No.

C-1. a) 1994
    b) Yes.
C-2.  
   a) Parcels owners within CSA boundary. Property tax supplemental assessments.  
   b) There are 13,216 parcels within CSA 24.  
   c) Attached.  
   d) Unknown – do not need to know that information.  
   e) Unknown – do not need to know that information.  

C-3.  
   Indirectly. Drainage improvements upstream will benefit property downstream. No. 

C-4.  
   Residential, agricultural and open space. Unknown at this time – depends on General  
   Plan update.  

C-5.  
   a) Project design was to pass 6,000 cfs to Lindo Channel.  
   b) No.  

D-1.  
   a) None. N/A.  
   b) No. No.  

D-2.  
   N/A  

E-1.  

E-2.  

F-1.  
   Attached. None.  

F-2.  
   N/A  

G-1.  

G-2.  

G-3.  
   a)  
   b)  
   c)  
   d)  

G-4.
Phase II

A-1. County Service Area 24 – Chico-Mud / Sycamore Maintenance

B-1. No.

B-2. No.


C-1. a) Attached.
    b) N/A
    c) N/A

C-2. No.

C-3. a)
    b)

C-4. a) Yes.
    b) N/A
    c)

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.
    b)
    c)
    d) No.

C-8. No. No.

C-9. No.

D-1. No.

D-2. a) None anticipated.
    b) No.
    c) Yes.

D-3. a) None. None.
    b) No.
E-1.  a) Rental of equipment to other County Service Area accounts or to Public Works for Road Operations.
     b) None.
     c) None.

E-2.  a) No.
     b) No.
3.9 CSA NO. 25 – SHASTA UNION DRAINAGE DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Shasta Union Drainage District County Service Area

A-2. Tom Blixt
    Administrative Analyst, Senior
    7 County Center Drive – Oroville, CA 95965
    530-538-7266
    530-538-7171
    tblixt@buttecounty.net

    Stuart Edell
    Land Development Manager
    Same
    Same
    Same
    Same
    sedell@buttecounty.net

A-3. County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1.


A-5.

A-6. a) Board of Supervisors.
    b) Current Butte County Board members.
    c) N/A
    d) Meetings are held during regular Board of Supervisors meetings.

A-7. No. There are no employees in this CSA.

B-1. Drainage services.

B-2. a) No.
    b) No.

B-3. No.

B-4. No.

C-1. a) LAFCo would have that information.
    b) Yes.
C-2.  a) Parcel owners within CSA boundaries. Number of parcel owners tracked through property tax department.
    b) 3,268
    c) Attached.
    d) Unknown.
    e) Unknown.


C-5.  a) Unknown.
    b) No.

D-1.  a) N/A. N/A. N/A.
    b) No. No.

D-2.  N/A

E-1.

E-2.

F-1.  Drains to Mud Creek, see attached map.

F-2.  None.

G-1.

G-2.

G-3.  a)
    b)
    c)
    d)

G-4.
Phase II

A-1. Shasta Union Drainage District County Service Area

B-1. No.

B-2. No.


C-1. a) Attached.
   b) N/A
   c) N/A

C-2. No.

C-3. a) N/A
   b) 

C-4. a) Yes.
   b) N/A
   c) No.

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.
   b) 
   c) 
   d) No.

C-8. No. No.

C-9. No.

D-1. N/A

D-2. a) None anticipated.
   b) No.
   c) Yes.

D-3. a) None. None.
   b) No.
E-1.  
a) N/A  
b) N/A  
c) N/A  

E-2.  
a) No.  
b) No.
3.11 CSA NO. 87 – KEEFER ROAD / ROCK CREEK DRAINAGE

Phase I

A-1. CSA 87 – Keefer Road / Rock Creek Drainage

A-2. Tom Blixt
   Administrative Analyst, Senior
   7 County Center Drive – Oroville, CA 95965
   530-538-7266
   530-538-7171
   tblixt@buttecounty.net

   Stuart Edell
   Land Development Manager
   Same
   Same
   Same
   sedell@buttecounty.net

A-3. County Service Area Law (Chapter 2.2, Part 2, Division 2, Title 3 of the Government Code, commencing with Section 25210.1.


A-5.

A-6. a) Butte County Board of Supervisors.
    b) Current Butte County Board of Supervisors members.
    c) N/A
    d) Regular Board of Supervisors meetings.


B-1. County Service Area 87 was created to fund the development of the North Chico Specific Plan. No other services were delivered.

B-2. a) No.
    b) No.

B-3. No.

B-4. No.

C-1. a) May 21, 1999
    b) Yes.
C-2.  a) Parcel owners. Supplemental property tax rolls.
    b) 956
    c) 
    d) Unknown.
    e) Unknown.

C-3.  No. No.

C-4.  Residential and agricultural land – some designated open space. No.

C-5.  a) N/A
    b) No.

D-1.  a) None. N/A. N.A.
    b) No. No.

D-2.  None.

E-1.

E-2.

F-1.  Within this district’s area are developed subdivisions with their own detention facilities – not associated with CSA 87.

F-2.  During a large storm event, Keefer Slough may overflow and cause sheet flow flooding over Highway 99.

G-1.

G-2.

G-3.  a) 
    b) 
    c) 
    d) 

G-4.
Phase II

A-1. CSA 87 – Keefer Road / Rock Creek Drainage

B-1. No.

B-2. No.

B-3. No.

C-1. a)
   b) N/A
   c) N/A

C-2. No.

C-3. a) Annual supplemental property tax assessments.
   b) N/A

C-4. a) Yes.
   b) N/A
   c) No.

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.
   b)
   c) N/A
   d) No.

C-8. No. No.

C-9. No.

D-1. N/A

D-2. a) None.
   b) No.
   c) N/A

D-3. a) N/A. N/A.
   b) No.
E-1. a) N/A  
b) N/A  
c) N/A  

E-2. a) No.  
b) No.
E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE – CSA NO. 87

From: Blixt, Thomas [TBlixt@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 29, 2006 8:03 AM
To: Uma Hinman
Cc: Edell, Stuart
Subject: RE: MSR for CSA 87

1. The original intention of services for CSA 87 was drainage but was inactive then the powers were expanded to include planning for the future development of the North Chico Specific Area and out of that came the North Chico Specific Plan document. It is a drainage CSA but without a service charge there is not sufficient funds to do anything within the CSA.

2. Approximately 1,100 acres.

3. Attached.

Remember you are doing MSR on irrigation and reclamation districts but CSA 87 is a County Service Area that does not fit the same mold as a reclamation or drainage district.

---

From: Uma Hinman [mailto:Uma.Hinman@KleinschmidtUSA.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 09, 2006 11:08 AM
To: Blixt, Thomas
Cc: Kateri Harrison
Subject: RE: MSR for CSA 87

Hi Tom,

I am in the process of drafting the MSR section for CSA 87 and have a few questions.

1. You noted in your responses to Phase I of the survey (B-1) that the CSA “was created to fund the development of the North Chico Specific Plan. No other services were delivered.” In reading the resolution creating the CSA (Res. No. 83-130), the stated purpose of the CSA was “for storm drain maintenance”. Can you please explain what you meant by your response? I am a bit unsure of the purpose of the District and what you mean by “to fund the development of...”

2. Do you know the size (acreage) of the CSA?

3. You provided copies of the FY 2003-04 budget. Can you please provide copies of the FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06 budgets so that we see the trends in revenue/expenditures?

Thank you for your assistance,

Uma
-----Original Message-----
From: Blixt, Thomas [mailto:TBlixt@buttecounty.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 21, 2006 1:21 PM
To: Uma Hinman
Subject: MSR for CSA 87

One more done.

Tom Blixt
Administrative Analyst
Department of Public Works
Land Development Division
Storm Water Management
7 County Center Drive
Oroville, CA 95965
(530) 538-7266
(530) 538-7171 FAX

tblixt@buttecounty.net or
stormwater@buttecounty.net

www.buttecounty.net/publicworks/stormwater.html
4.1 ROCK CREEK RECLAMATION DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Rock Creek Reclamation District

A-2. Minasian, Attorney
P.O. 1679 Oroville, Calif
530-533-2885

Paul Behr, Chairman
5556 Wilson Landing Road
Chico, Calif 95973


A-4. 1990 approx.

A-5.

A-6. a) Quarterly.
b) Attached.
c) None.
d) Yes. Annual meetings – invite landowners.

A-7. No.

B-1. District coordinates repair of private levees and drains. Attempts to control improper blocking of flood capacity.

B-2. a) No.
b) No.

B-3. Yes. County Service Area 86, Sac Reclamation Dist.

B-4. No.

C-1. a) About 1990.
b) Yes.

C-2. a) Landowners.
b) All.
c) d) About 50–100 residents.
e) Same.

C-3. No.

C-4. Agricultural.
C-5. a) Levees channel floods and drainage.
   b) No.

D-1. a) None.
   b) No.

D-2. N/A

E-1. District coordinates maintenance, repair and improvements.

E-2. Along north and south side of Rock Creek. Hwy 99 west to area of Nord.

F-1. Same as above.

F-2. Development east of Hwy 99 causes longer peak flows to pass into our area.

G-1. N/A

G-2. No.

G-3. a) No.
   b) No.
   c) None.
   d) None.

G-4.
Phase II

A-1. Rock Creek Reclamation District

B-1. No.

B-2. No.

B-3. No.

C-1. a) County Auditor office has.
   b) Assessments.
   c)  

C-2. Yes. Any assessments have to be approved by voters.

C-3. a)  
   b)  

C-4. a) Yes.
   b)  
   c) No.

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.
   b)  
   c)  
   d) No.

C-8. None.

C-9. No.

D-1.  

D-2. a) 0%
   b) No.
   c)  

D-3. a) The District has increasing urbanization coming east of Hwy 99. The urbanization is not installing retention reservoirs to reduce peak flows from storms which are increased by urbanization.
   b) No.
E-1.  
   a) District has no overhead.  
   b)  
   c)  

E-2.  
   a) No.  
   b) No.
4.2 SACRAMENTO RIVER RECLAMATION DISTRICT

Phase I

A-1. Sacramento River Reclamation District

A-2. Paul R. Minasian, Attorney for District, PO Box 1679, Oroville, California 95965, (530) 533-2885. No alternate contact other than the Board of Trustee members.


A-5. The map GIS appears to be correct.

A-6. a) Elections and appointments are at large. The District has historically scheduled quarterly meetings or semi-annual meetings. During flooding and drainage periods, meetings can occur more often.
   b) The members of the governing body do not receive compensation for their service. They are as follows:

   Richard Wright, Trustee
   12788 Gianella Road
   Chico, California 95973

   Peter D. Peterson, Trustee
   Post Office Box 3668
   Chico, California 95927-3668

   Shirley Lewis, Trustee
   12634 Gianella Road
   Chico, California 95973-9742

   Jim Paiva, Trustee
   13193 Carmen Lane
   Chico, California 95973

   Bill Waggershauser, President/Trustee
   9 Northwood Commons Pl.
   Chico, CA 95973

   Roy Roney, Trustee
   5970 Anita Road
   Chico, California 95973

   Donald O’Dell, Trustee
   6169 Wilson Landing Road
   Chico, California 95973
c) There is no District charter.
d) The District complies with the Brown Act by creating agendas for all of its meetings, providing an opportunity for the public to speak. Because the District has not been involved in litigation, it has not been required to utilize the executive session or closed meeting portions of the Brown Act. We invite the public to the meetings by giving individuals interested in specific items the specific verbal and written notice of items coming up on the Agenda which may affect them.

A-7. The District does not have an organizational chart.

B-1. The main purpose of this District is to coordinate and regulate changes in levees, land leveling plans, drainage water across roads, or similar facilities or farming practices which could serve to change the pattern of flood water or drainage water entering or leaving the area from the Sacramento River or Pine Creek during flooding. The District was formed as an alternative to Reclamation Board declarations and regulation of a designated floodway in Butte County. The Reclamation Board is a State agency with little or no ability to regulate in a useful fashion this complex area.

As an alternative, an agreement was entered into between the Reclamation Board, the County of Butte, and the Sacramento River Reclamation District as a delegated agency under the Butte County Ordinance in which changes in land surface, proposed alterations of levees, new levees, new drainage works, or similar works, are first reviewed by SRRD and determined whether or not they would constitute an encroachment in the designated floodway under the County of Butte’s Ordinance. If they would meet the standard of an encroachment, the District works with the landowner to provide for measures which will reduce or prevent any adverse impacts, and then provides recommendations to the County of Butte if jurisdiction exists because as its proposed change remains an encroachment, which requires a permit. The system has worked well since the District became fully operational in approximately 2000. Landowners have voluntarily altered their plans to avoid the classification of changes in land surface which in turn makes it unnecessary to receive a permit for an encroachment. Instead, the landowners are often able to modify their proposed action of leveling or pad construction for buildings to avoid impacts upon neighboring landowners, public works, or similar facilities.

The District further has the responsibility to monitor the meanderings of the Sacramento River. Condition of private levees along the Sacramento River which continue to be subject to Reclamation Board regulation and to attempt, if Federal or State monies are available, to expedite the receipt of those monies. Although some serious meanderings and eating away of low-level plains adjacent to the Sacramento River within the boundaries of the District and damage to landowners’ lands is occurring, there have been no major overtoppings of levees or failures of levees. Floods and overflow occur, but through landowner and District efforts, the inundation can be exhausted from the area fast enough that little deposition occurs and disease of the orchards is minimized. The District continues to monitor the availability of Federal or State monies to prevent or anticipate Sacramento River meanderings to attempt to keep drains free and open so that if flooding does occur, water can be exhausted from the area through natural drains in a rapid fashion, avoiding phytophthora and other damage to the valuable orchards planted within the area, and providing for the monitoring of the deposition of sand, gravel and floating vegetation during flooding periods so that the least amount of damage will be
done to the improvements, the orchards, and the surface of the land within the District boundaries, and to areas in neighboring communities.

B-2.  

a) Yes, as described above in regard to the County of Butte, Reclamation Board. Rock Creek Reclamation District, which lies to the east and adjacent to the Sacramento River Reclamation District, and has peculiar problems with the flows from Keefer Slough. The community of Nord is threatened by both Rock Creek and the Sacramento River. It is not economic to provide for 1–100 year flood protection or a higher level of flood protection for Nord. The agricultural lands within Rock Creek Reclamation District and Sacramento River Reclamation District generally accept the fact that they will be flooded periodically, and the object of the District’s activities is to avoid damage or to reduce damage to private property and public works during those episodes. Communication occurs with the Hamilton City interests who seek new levee construction but did not wish to join the SRRD in the effort.

b) No.

B-3. Yes. Rock Creek Reclamation District and Sacramento River Reclamation District coordinate their efforts. SRRD and Butte County Public Works work together to compare observations in regard to proposed building permits and similar requests and to anticipate flooding so that public roads will suffer the least amount of damage.

B-4. No.

C-1.  

a) 1998
b) Yes. The sphere of influence should be exactly the boundaries of the District. There is no need for any annexations to the District.

C-2.  

a) Landowners and residents within the boundaries of the District.
b) All of the landowners and residents receive the Districts’ services.
c) Copy of the County assessor’s parcel numbers is included.
d) Approximately 100 people.
e) Approximately 100 people.

C-3. No, other than to coordinate services in regard to flood protection, awareness of flood damage and drainage damage which can occur after floods.

C-4. Agricultural.

C-5.  

a) Not applicable.
b)

D-1.  

a) The District generally uses private landowners to clean drains. This work is done under Fish & Game Code Section 1601 and 1603 authorization. If the District is concerned in regard to the condition of the levees or the existence of an encroachment in flood plain areas, coordination occurs with the County of Butte and State Reclamation Board.
b) Yes, we receive reports from the Reclamation Board if there is an encroachment. Periodically, if requests are made, we also receive reports of communications between the Reclamation Board and landowners within the District in regard to the condition of their private levees or orchard planting or maintenance practices.

D-2. Not applicable.

E-1. The District floods to varying degrees depending on the frequency of flooding. Generally the whole of the District will flood if there is a 1–15 to 1–20-year storm. Areas of the District will be subject to ponding water, backflow, and a failure to drain through Pine Creek during a 1-in-7 to 1-in-15 year event.

E-2. Private levees exist under almost all circumstances along the Sacramento River frontage. The levees south of Highway 32 are being intentionally allowed to degrade by environmental agencies such as the Department of Fish & Game, United States Fish & Wildlife Service, and Nature Conservancy. No permits or authority for this “return to nature” project despite substantial public funding.

F-1. The District owns no facilities for drainage. Natural channels are used for the drainage.

F-2. Drainage is a substantial danger to the lands and improvements within the District. If flood waters or accumulated ponded waters due to high levels of water in the Sacramento River do not backfill the area prior to overtopping from the River, and then if those flows do not exhaust the District rapidly, extreme damage can occur to the plantings of permanent orchard crops through erosion and then phytophthora and disease. Thus, drains and channels must be kept open to both backfill, and if the Sacramento River flows overtop levees, to avoid erosion and scouring or deposition, and if debris from the Sacramento River or Pine Creek floats into the area it must be curtailed so it does not block the drains that will exhaust water when the Sacramento River levels decline.

G-1. All irrigation waters are provided by private landowners. Generally, wells are utilized rather than diversions from the Sacramento River or Pine Creek.

G-2. Not applicable.

G-3. a) Answered above.
   b) Not applicable.
   c) Not applicable.
   d) Not applicable.

G-4. Water demand depends upon the irrigation system and the crop planted. Generally, groundwater is the source of water utilized in this area. Although some ranches along the Sacramento River have pumping plants within the River and extract Sacramento River water for portions of their plantings.
Phase II

A-1. Sacramento River Reclamation District

B-1. No.

B-2. No.

B-3. No.

C-1. a) Enclosed are two recently adopted Budgets. The Districts, although authorized to collect an assessment of up to $3.00 per acre per year, collects substantially less monies since one of its purposes in having funding and a reserve is to be ready when and if there is Federal or State funding available and a local sponsor needed for drainage or flood improvements or mitigation measures to be able to participate in levee improvements or erosion control measures.

C-2. Yes, the District passed a 218 election at the time it was formed authorizing up to $3 per acre assessment.

C-3. a) The District does not have a rate schedule.

C-4. a) Yes.

C-5. No.

C-6. No.

C-7. a) No.

C-8. None.

C-9. None.

D-1. Yes, the District periodically sets policy in regard to administration of the ordinances of the County of Butte and the Reclamation Board’s agreement with the County of Butte describing encroachments and the avoidance of encroachment into the flood plain in such a fashion that harm will be done to landowners’ property or public works.
D-2.  a) There is no growth rate applicable to the District’s activities.
b) 
c) 

D-3.  a) The continued use of the Sacramento River to transport irrigation water creates clear water erosion and causes damages to other unstable banks and channels. In addition, the proposed expansion of Shasta Dam would enhance this damage. Prior to 1970, substantial funding was available from the Bureau of Reclamation, and United States Army Corps of Engineers for protection and amelioration of these impacts of man’s activities. Since that time, the attitude towards levees and the armor-plating of river banks to avoid clear water erosion from the artificial transportation of stored water year-round in the Sacramento River has caused funding to dry up. At some point, further funding will be available for levee improvement, channel improvements, armor plating and revegetation of areas to provide stabilization. Sacramento River Reclamation District will be a local sponsor of appropriate projects when that funding and the public recognition of the damage that the neglect of this subject is causing occurs. A substantial California bond issue for levee and flood plain corridor maintenance and improvements is on the ballot in November 2006.
b) 

E-1.  a) The District does not expend monies until it sees an opportunity to improve the circumstances within the District. The District works with private landowners to provide for the cleaning of drains and the maintenance of the drainage pattern within the area.
b) The District has no overhead.
c) The District does not have excess capacity.

E-2.  a) Yes. The District periodically attempts to determine whether or not the landowners would be better off if the District were to dissolve, and was subject to the State Reclamation Board jurisdiction. The terms and provisions of the agreement with the Reclamation Board and the County of Butte allowed the District to do that at any given time. The conclusion, however, is that the County of Butte does not understand or have the interest in monitoring the activities within this broad agricultural area related to levee funding, drainage and floodplain management, and the Reclamation Board is so out of touch with the reality of the need to protect the agricultural lands while watching the Sacramento River, and has become an organization only interested in environmental goals such as the wild meanderings of the River as if it were a natural waterway. In fact, it is not a natural waterway and is used most of the year for transportation of stored water from agricultural, municipal and industrial consumption, yet the transporters of the water do not wish to pay any of the costs caused by their activities. The District becomes the tool to protect agricultural uses within the area.
b) No.
4.3 RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833

Phase I

A-1. Reclamation District No. 833

A-2. Charles O. Nuchols
    District Manager
    P.O. Box 247, Gridley, CA 95948
    530-846-3303
    N/A
    N/A

    Charles H. Johnson, Jr.
    President of the Board of Trustees
    P.O. Box 247, Gridley, CA 95948
    530-846-3303
    N/A
    N/A

A-3.

A-4. 1921

A-5. Have questions about the north boundary of the district.

A-6. a) Election every four years.
    b) Charles H. Johnson, Jr., President – 4 years; Dane Andes, Trustee – 4 years; William
       B. Fiedler, Trustee – 4 years. No compensation or benefits.
    c) N/A
    d) Agenda posted on front window and faxed to City of Gridley.

A-7. No.

B-1. Maintenance of District ditches to provide drainage to all landowners within the RD 833
    boundaries.

B-2. a)
    b)

B-3.

B-4.

C-1. a)
    b)
C-2.  
a) All taxpaying landowners within the District.  
b) Exact number unknown.  
c) This has to be done through the County Assessor’s office.  
d) Unknown.  
e) N/A

C-3.  No.
C-4.  Urban & Agricultural. No.

C-5.  
a) The District oversees 38,000 acres/maintains 157 miles of ditch.  
b) No.

D-1.  
a) N/A  
b) 

D-2.  N/A

E-1.  From impacted ditches caused by rainfall. With employees & equipment.

E-2.  RD 833 is not responsible for levees within our boundaries. Responsible parties are the Dept. of Water Resources and Maintenance Area 13.

F-1.  The City of Gridley has four (4) detention facilities; City of Biggs has one (1).

F-2.  All ditches within the 833 system are impacted and unable to accept any more water. There is flooding in most 833 ditches during times of heavy rains.

G-1.  N/A

G-2.  N/A

G-3.  
a) N/A  
b) N/A  
c) 
d) N/A

G-4.  N/A
Phase II

A-1. Reclamation District No. 833

B-1. 1 acre – 1643 West Biggs Gridley Rd., Gridley, CA 95948; 720 acres in the Butte Sink.

B-2. 500 sq.ft. office building; 30x50 shop.


C-1. a)
   b)
   c) N/A

C-2. RD 833 has an assessment based on acreage; landowners are taxed $12 for parcels less than 1.0 acre and $3.00/acre for parcels 1.01 or larger in size.

C-3. a)
   b)

C-4. a)
   b)
   c)

C-5.

C-6.

C-7. a) Yes.
   b) Minasian Law Firm – Lawsuit between RD 833 & City of Gridley; RD 833 is currently paying $10,000/yr towards this debt. Vimark – Bridge structure; RD 833 makes a yearly payment towards this debt.
   c) N/A
   d) N/A

C-8. Colusa Shooting Club for road easements.

C-9. No.

D-1. Through the Board of Trustees.

D-2. a)
   b)
   c) No.

D-3. a) Developers.
   b) No.
E-1.  a)
b)  
c)

E-2.  a)
b)
Message
From: Maxine [jfarrar@cwnet.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 17, 2006 9:53 PM
To: Uma Hinman
Subject: Re: Follow up questions for MSR

Good morning Uma,

Answers:

1. Will put in Monday's mail

2. Butte Slough Irrigation District - 1/2 share
   Butte Creek Drainage District - .4719 of 1/2 share
   DD200 - .1365 of 833's cost (.3367 of 1/2)
   DD100 - .1914 of 1/2 share

3. Not by RD 833

4. A. RD 833 is responsible for ditches, not landowners property
   B. Yes

5. Yes - Tarke's do not have a weir, it's known as the 833 weir.

6. Refer back to #1 & #2

7. We need further information - don't know what you mean

8. Charles H. Johnson, Jr. - ex 12/07
   Dane Andes, ex 11/09
   William B. Fiedler, ex 12/07

I'll be in the office Monday from 11 - 3 if you need anything more.

Maxine
Dear Maxine,

I wanted to let you know that we haven't forgotten about sending your District a draft of our summary before the document is put together. We've run into a number of hurdles that have taken some time to work through and our schedule has gotten off track.

I am in the process of writing RD 833's section and had some follow up questions I was hoping you could forward or print out for Chuck? If you'd prefer I use an alternate way to contact him, please just let me know.

Following is a list of questions we would very much appreciate some assistance with:

1.. Please provide a copy of the maintenance agreement with BCDD and DD100 if available.
2.. Please verify compensation ratios for maintenance agreement: is it RD 833 - 50%, BCDD - 47.19%, DD 100 - 52.81%?
3.. Have any flooding problems been reported to maintenance personnel in BCDD?
4.. Is the District responsible for properties within the City limits of Biggs and Gridley? Are properties within the city limits within the district boundaries?
5.. Does the District maintain any weirs in Butte Sink (Tarken Weir?)
6.. Does the District have a maintenance agreement with DD200?
7.. In our meeting, Chuck indicated that there was roads/bridge Maintenance Agreement. What County was that in and for what entity? Sutter? BCDD? Can you provide a copy of the agreement?
8.. When do the current Board members terms expire?

Upon receipt of your responses we will finish the draft of your District's section and send it to you for review.

Thank you so much for your assistance and if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call or email me.

Uma Hinman
Planner & Environmental Analyst
Kleinschmidt Consultants
(530) 852-4837
www.kleinschmidtusa.com
Good morning Uma.......... 

1. Some of the research I've done seems to indicate that the District provides some irrigation services. Can you please verify that? RD 833 DOES NOT PROVIDE IRRIGATION SERVICES. Is it to customers within the District or to the 720 acres in the Butte Sink area? If so, please answer the following questions as well: WE HAVE WATER WHEELING AGREEMENTS WITH BIGGS WEST GRIDLEY WATER DISTRICT AND BUTTE WATER DISTRICT

   a. Where does the District obtain its irrigation water from?
   b. Does the District have water rights and what do those rights consist of (quantity, date of rights, etc)?
   c. What season is the irrigation provided? Summer farming? Winter waterfowl?

2. The District maintains 157 miles of ditches. How many miles of those are irrigation ditches and how many are drainage ditches? 157 MILES OF DRAINAGE DITCHES, NO IRRIGATION DITCHES

   a. Does the District own the 157 miles of ditches or are they easements? If it’s a combination of both, please indicate how much is owned and how much is under easement. COMBINATION; INFO NOT AVAILABLE ON AMOUNTS

3. Is the demand for irrigation water expected to increase, decrease or remain stable? N/A

4. The survey says that the District was formed/established in 1921; however, we have a copy of the District By-Laws dated May 28, 1915. Can you please clarify the dates? DISTRICT WAS FORMED IN 1915, WENT BROKE, CAME BACK IN 1921

Please let me know if you need clarification on any of these questions. Thank you so much for all your time and assistance. HOPE THIS HELPS

Maxine Farrar, RD 833

Uma Hinman
Planner & Environmental Analyst
Kleinschmidt Consultants
(530) 852-4837
www.kleinschmidtusa.com
APPENDIX E

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF GRIDLEY AND RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833
Plaintiff, CITY OF GRIDLEY and Defendants, RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833, hereby stipulate and agree to resolve Action No. 127360 pursuant to the provisions of CCP §664.6 and, specifically, request that the Court enter a Consent Decree and reserve jurisdiction to superintend and enforce the provisions of this Judgment following entry of Judgment. In that regard, the parties stipulate that the Court
shall reserve all powers available to it including without limitation the power to impose appropriate
injunctions to declare the rights of the parties, to award appropriate costs, fees, damages or sanctions should
a party fail to conform its conduct in keeping with the provisions of this Judgment. In accordance with the
foregoing, these settling parties hereby stipulate and agree that Judgment shall enter as follows:

1.

SEGREGATION OF RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833
INCOME AND ESTABLISHMENT OF RESERVES

The income of Defendant, RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833 (hereinafter,
THE DISTRICT) shall be segregated into two categories for purposes of future accountings. The two
categories, as defined hereinafter shall be designated as “urban” and as “agricultural”. The “urban” income
shall be the income attributable to those parcels currently within the CITY OF GRIDLEY’S sphere of
influence as well as urban areas within the County of Butte and adjacent to the CITY OF GRIDLEY,
(whether or not within its sphere of influence) all as more specifically designated on that certain map
attached hereto as EXHIBIT “A” and incorporated herein. THE DISTRICT shall create (through a Board
of Equalization Request) a separately coded tax area for parcels in the Urban Area. This separate tax area
code will assist in the identification of urban and agricultural income sources as provided in this Judgment.

In the future, there shall be added to EXHIBIT “A” (and included within the “urban” area) those properties
which are annexed into the CITY OF GRIDLEY as well as those properties which come within the
CITY’S sphere of influence. THE DISTRICT income attributable to the urban area shall include income
directly traceable to the parcels within the urban area (in particular, real property taxes (such as THE
DISTRICT’S share of Proposition 13 taxes) and assessments, including the benefit assessment adopted by
THE DISTRICT on July 4, 2002, by Resolution 2002-2, namely the assessment which is the subject of
these actions (hereinafter THE ASSESSMENT)) as well as an allocation of all other sources of income (to
include interest income, if any) of THE DISTRICT which are not directly traceable to the urban parcels
(for example, rents, issues and profits of real property such as the property commonly known as the “Bean
Field Property”), income received from work privately contracted by THE DISTRICT (for example, work
done by THE DISTRICT Manager for private landowners) and all other income, based upon the formula
set forth below. The “agricultural” area of THE DISTRICT shall be comprised of all parcels of property
within THE DISTRICT, including the CITY OF BIGGS, other than those parcels which are designated as
“urban” on EXHIBIT “A”, but does not include property owned by THE DISTRICT directly, such as the
“Bean Field” property. Properties included within the “agricultural” areas shall be removed therefrom as
they are included within the “urban” area. Income attributable to the agricultural area shall be those incomes
directly traceable to the agricultural parcels (such as real property taxes (including THE DISTRICT’S
Proposition 13 taxes)) and assessments, including THE ASSESSMENT, as well an allocation of all other
sources of income of THE DISTRICT which are not directly traceable to the agricultural parcels (for
example, a portion of the rents, issues and profits of real property such as the property commonly known
as the “Bean Field Property”), income received from work privately contracted by THE DISTRICT (for
example work done by the district manager for private landowners) and all other income, based upon the
formula set forth below.

The income received by THE DISTRICT consisting of the rents, issues and profits from real
property (such as monies received attributable to the “Bean Field” property), income from private contracts
(such as income received when THE DISTRICT Manager performs work for private individuals), as well
as all other income sources not directly attributable to a particular parcel shall be apportioned among the
“urban” and “agricultural” categories based upon the percentage of income that is directly attributable to
the urban and agricultural parcels. The formulas for urban and agricultural ratio to allocate otherwise
unattributed income is as follows.

The urban percentage of unallocated income equals (Urban Income / [Urban Income + Agricultural
Income]).

The agricultural percentage of unallocated income equals (Agricultural Income / [Urban Income +
Agricultural Income]).

By way of example, if the total income to THE DISTRICT that is directly traceable to a particular
parcel of property (both urban and agricultural) totaled $100,000.00, and the income directly traceable to
urban parcels was $20,000.00, and the income directly traceable to agricultural parcels was $80,000.00 (i.e.,
the sums of $20,000.00 and $80,000.00 equal the $100,000.00 total) then the percentage of income directly
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attributable to the urban parcels would be 20% and the percentage of income attributable directly to the agricultural parcels would be 80%. If, by way of further example, the income from all other sources (such as real property rents, issues and profits, including the “Bean Field” monies), income from private contracts (such as contracts where THE DISTRICT Manager, or other employees, perform work for private parties) and any other income sources were $90,000.00, then 20% of this amount, namely $18,000.00 would be added to the “urban” monies and 80% of this amount, namely $72,000.00 would be added to the agricultural monies. Utilizing the foregoing examples, the total income of THE DISTRICT would be $190,000.00, of which $100,000.00 can be directly attributable to parcels within THE DISTRICT and $90,000.00 would represent sources of income that was not directly attributable to parcels of property owned by landowners within THE DISTRICT. The $90,000.00 of income would be allocated to the urban and agricultural categories according to the percentage of income directly attributable to those areas, as shown in the example set forth above. This would result in $38,000.00 of income being designated as “urban” and $152,000.00 of income designated as “agricultural” from the total DISTRICT income of $190,000.00.

To allow for efficient allocation, review and testing of the segregated categories, THE DISTRICT shall authorize creation of a Benefit Assessment Fund (FUND) for the purposes of recording assets (including cash and cash equivalents), liabilities, fund balance (including restricted reserves), income, expenditures (expense) and appropriations associated with the “urban” category. This Benefit Assessment Fund (a Special Reserve Fund) will be presented separately from THE DISTRICT’S General Fund in the Annual Fiscal Statements as required by the Government Accounting Standards Board (“GASB”). The FUND will have a segregated budget that is approved in conjunction with THE DISTRICT’S regular budget approval process. If the compliance with the above accounting causes an increase in the cost of THE DISTRICT’S annual external audit, the increased cost, if any, may be charged against urban income.

THE DISTRICT, at a duly noticed public meeting of its Board of Trustees (at the time THE DISTRICT adopts its annual budget) and no later than the month of June each year, shall affirm the calculated amount of revenue to be collected directly from the agricultural and urban parcels for the next fiscal year from July 1, to June 30, and affirm the corresponding percentage to be applied to all other income sources of THE DISTRICT so that the non-specific income from all other sources may be properly
allocated into the urban and agricultural categories which have been established. At this annual meeting, 
THE DISTRICT Board of Trustees shall also establish a percentage of the income it receives which shall 
be set aside as a reserve. The monies existing on the date of this Agreement set aside and designated as 
reserve monies in the future shall be taken in the same percentage from the urban and agricultural income. 
By way of example, if in a particular year THE DISTRICT establishes a 10% reserve, and if the urban area 
income totals $38,000.00 and the agricultural area income totals $152,000.00, then the total reserve of 10% 
(19,000.00) shall be set aside with $3,800.00, coming from the urban monies and $15,200.00 coming from 
the agricultural monies (namely 10% of the urban monies, ($3,800.00), and 10% of the agricultural monies, 
($15,200.00) total $19,000.00 being the 10% reserve established in this example). The reserve monies shall 
be segregated as agricultural and urban and may only be used for emergency use and for repair, maintenance 
or acquisition of capital items, which shall be deemed to be for the benefit of all parcels within THE 
DISTRICT.

2.

OVERHEAD EXPENSES

THE DISTRICT may utilize up to 20% of the urban income for overhead expenses which are not 
directly related to the maintenance and improvement of facilities located within the urban area. Utilizing 
the foregoing example, if the urban income for a particular year totaled $38,000.00, then up to 20% of this 
amount (up to $7,600.00) could be used for DISTRICT overhead expenses not directly traceable to the 
maintenance and improvement of facilities within the urban area. The remainder of funds not utilized by 
THE DISTRICT for general overhead expenses (which utilizing the above example must be at least 80% 
of $38,000.00, namely $30,400.00, or more), must be utilized solely for the maintenance and improvement 
of facilities within the urban area. After the first anniversary of this agreement, THE DISTRICT may 
request that the overhead percentage be amended. Any such request shall be justified by sufficient 
documentation and, if the parties agree, shall establish the overhead percentage for the next five (5) years 
after adjustment. In no event shall the overhead expenses exceed 35% of the urban income. By way of 
example, should THE DISTRICT substantiate overhead expenses of thirty-six percent (36%) the maximum 
allowable overhead expenses shall not exceed thirty-five percent (35%) of the urban income for any given
year. After the initial adjustment, the overhead percentage may not be adjusted more than once every five 
(5) years. The 35% maximum cap on overhead expenses shall increase to 40% effective June 30, 2015, and 
shall continue to June 30, 2025. After June 30, 2025, there shall be no cap on overhead expenses and such 
expenses shall be adjusted, no more than once ever 5 years as the parties agree, and if unable to agree, the 
parties shall submit the determination of overhead expenses to an agreed upon CPA experienced in 
governmental accounting.

3

RESTRICTION ON USE OF URBAN INCOME AND ANNUAL ACCOUNTING

THE DISTRICT income which has been segregated and designated as “urban” may only be utilized 
for the following three purposes:

1. Payment into a Reserve Account in the manner and to be utilized only for those 
purposes specified above.

2. For the payment of overhead expenses in an amount not to exceed 20% of the urban 
income received in any given fiscal year; and

3. For the maintenance of and improvement of THE DISTRICT’S ditches and 
crossings which flow from the urban area through their crossings of the Traynor 
Lateral and to a point 300 yards West of the Traynor Lateral. These ditches include 
Laterals E-1, E-1A, E-6, E-7 and E-7A and the area wherein urban monies must be 
spent is depicted more particularly on that map attached hereto as EXHIBIT “B” 
and incorporated herein. (Hereinafter THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA).

THE DISTRICT expenses which do not fall in the above three categories must only be paid with 
aricultural income. For each fiscal year (i.e., THE DISTRICT’S “fiscal year” which currently begins on 
July 1 of each calendar year and ends on June 30th of the following calendar year) covered by the accounting 
described below, THE DISTRICT shall spend, at a minimum, all of the income allocated to the urban 
income category (less the reserve and overhead amounts established by THE DISTRICT) for the 
maintenance and improvement of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA.

Equipment of THE DISTRICT which is acquired with reserve or overhead funds or which is
maintained with reserve or overhead funds shall be available “free of charge” for use in THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA (the DISTRICT may not bill for the use of equipment acquired or maintained utilizing overhead or reserve monies against its requirements to maintain the urban area, since such equipment shall be deemed to have been acquired and/or maintained with proportionate urban monies because the urban income fund contributes to both the reserve account and overhead expenses). Notwithstanding the foregoing, if THE DISTRICT establishes an equipment replacement fund, urban income may be charged for equipment use from this fund, provided that agricultural income is charged in a similar fashion for equipment usage in the agricultural area. The DISTRICT manager and any of its employees shall be paid from agricultural income, (except for payments from the 20% overhead portion of urban income) however, time spent by the general manager or other employees of THE DISTRICT (and, therefore, his salary and benefits) will be allocated to the urban fund in the same manner that such time is charged to private land owners when providing services to that land owner. Any time allocated shall be supported by time card and time distribution work sheets.

THE DISTRICT shall expend, at a minimum, the balance of the monies allocated to urban income to the maintenance of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA. By way of example, if the balance of the urban income for a particular year (after segregation of overhead and a reserve) totaled $30,400.00, then THE DISTRICT would be required to spend at least the amount of $30,400.00 in the improvement, operation and maintenance of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA for that particular year. Provided however, THE DISTRICT may carry over as a “credit” any excess money spent in the maintenance of the urban area (above the amount required to be spent under this agreement) for the next two (2) annual accounting periods. (So that if THE DISTRICT does not spend the total required in the first (1st) or second (2nd) year after the “credit” it may apply the credit against the deficit). Any credit for excess expenditures shall be lost after the second (2nd) year. By way of example, if THE DISTRICT spends $10,000.00 more than required in “year 1", it may apply this credit as if spent in “year 2" or “year 3"; against any failure to spend the required amounts in “year 2" or “year 3", any unused “credit” cannot be used in “year 4".

On or before December 31, of each year following the end of the preceding fiscal year ending on June 30, of each year, THE DISTRICT shall account, in writing, to THE CITY which accounting shall
contain information sufficient to satisfy THE CITY that THE DISTRICT has complied with the above-stated provisions as to the accounting period in question. The annual accounting shall cover the fiscal year from July 1, to June 30, immediately preceding the date of the accounting. Such accounting, by way of having an “agreed upon procedures” performed by a CPA or CPA firm, shall include, at a minimum, the following information: The agreed upon procedures shall be performed in such a manner to provide the following information as well as to satisfy other components in this Agreement (such as the determination of the “urban” percentage to apply to unallocated income and the percentage to use to allocate overhead expenditures). It is contemplated that the “agreed upon procedures” shall be coordinated with the annual financial audit (as required by statute) as the procedures required for both examinations would cover substantially the same source documents. The annual accounting format would be consistent with the requirements of this Agreement and in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. Included within such accounting shall be the following information:

a. A description of the nature and amount of all income received by THE DISTRICT.

b. A breakdown of income directly attributable to the urban and agricultural areas.

c. A statement of all real property, rents, issues and profits received by THE DISTRICT (from the “Bean Field” and other real property). A summary of all use of funds income (interest) and a statement as to the allocation of the interest to the “urban” fund, “agricultural” component and to the unallocated funds.

d. A description of and the nature and amount of all other income from any other source received by THE DISTRICT.

e. A statement as to the total amount of urban and agricultural income segregated according to the manner described above.

f. A statement of the beginning Reserve balance, the additions to the Reserve from the urban and agricultural income sources, (additions should include any allocation of interest to the reserves for urban and agricultural income sources) the expenditures from the Reserve and the ending Reserve balance.
g. A statement of the amounts spent from the urban and agricultural income sources for overhead expenses.

h. A breakdown demonstrating that, at a minimum, the balance of the income allocated to urban parcels was spent in the operation and maintenance of the urban maintenance area.

To the extent that THE DISTRICT utilizes its own equipment in the operation of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA, the use of such equipment shall not be charged on the basis of an “hourly rental rate” or in any other fashion as a credit towards meeting THE DISTRICT’S required expenditures for maintenance of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA. In other words, the inclusion of a piece of equipment or other item within THE DISTRICT’S overhead shall entitle “THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA” to receive the benefit of such equipment without charge or offset, except for the fact that the urban income shall be reduced by the amount spent for such overhead. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if THE DISTRICT establishes an equipment replacement fund, urban incomemay be charged for equipment use from this fund, provided that agricultural income is charged in a similar fashion for equipment usage in the agricultural area. The salary and benefits of the DISTRICT’S manager and other employees shall not be charged against the monies spent on THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA, except to the extent that the DISTRICT manager or other employees may charge out their time actually spent in the maintenance of the URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA, based on time and distribution records.

Accordingly, the balance of the urban income monies (which THE DISTRICT must spend on THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA) must be spent on items not included within monies spent from THE DISTRICT Reserves or monies included within the ordinary overhead of THE DISTRICT. Examples of expenses that would be properly charged against the urban income fund (after deduction of a reserve and overhead) would include expenses for chemicals, fuel, equipment rental for equipment not already owned and maintained by THE DISTRICT, labor for employees on THE DISTRICT payroll as supported by time card and labor distribution work sheets for operations, maintenance or improvement done in THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA, contract labor hired to perform operations, maintenance or improvements in THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA. Labor otherwise included in overhead shall not be included again. Furthermore, THE DISTRICT maintenance standards shall be uniform throughout.
THE DISTRICT. By way of example, THE DISTRICT cannot contract privately for labor and equipment to maintain ditches and other structures within THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA (and charge those expenses against the urban income fund) unless THE DISTRICT utilizes the same maintenance policies outside of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA. Using the foregoing example, contracting for outside labor and equipment (and charging those expenses against the urban income for accounting purposes) would only be appropriate if THE DISTRICT utilized contracts for outside labor and equipment to operate and maintain its ditches and other facilities outside of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA as well.

In interpreting the foregoing provisions, it should be kept in mind that the Plaintiff has challenged the validity of THE ASSESSMENT adopted by THE DISTRICT for reasons including the allegation that the assessment was not proportional to the benefits received for those parcels within the urban area as shown on EXHIBIT “A”. Part of the consideration for withdrawing objections to THE ASSESSMENT’S validity is that THE DISTRICT, by entry of this Judgment, shall undertake the obligation to spend, at a minimum, the income received from the urban area for the improvement, operation and maintenance of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA (and to annually account that such is the case). The expenditure of the minimum amounts called for herein for the maintenance of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA does not relieve THE DISTRICT of its obligation to independently assess the operation and maintenance of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA and to take such action as might be reasonable or necessary under the circumstances, including the expenditure of funds in excess of the minimum specified herein to properly operate and maintain THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA. Stated differently, THE DISTRICT’S compliance with the terms of this Judgment does not operate to relieve THE DISTRICT of any of its obligations to properly operate and maintain its facilities, including those within THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA.

4.

AUDIT

THE CITY, at THE CITY’S expense, may conduct or contract for a detailed financial and compliance audit of THE DISTRICT records if it has questions regarding the adequacy of THE DISTRICT’S accounting. THE DISTRICT will cooperate with THE CITY and make its records
available for purposes of any such audit, including authorizing current and former public accounting firms
to allow the CITY or its agent to review public audit work papers from preceding annual fiscal audits. If
an audit reveals that THE DISTRICT, for a particular accounting period, failed to expend the amounts
which should have been utilized for maintenance of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA, then in such
event, THE DISTRICT shall allocate for expenses in THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA, the
difference between the amount which should have been expended and the amount which was actually
expended by THE DISTRICT for such purposes. This amount shall be budgeted for and spent by THE
DISTRICT for operations, maintenance and improvements of THE URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA,
(in addition to the minimum amounts required to be budgeted for and spent pursuant to this Judgment) for
the next fiscal year. (For example, if in the accounting period from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005, THE
DISTRICT spent $5,000.00 less than it should have for maintenance in THE URBAN MAINTENANCE
AREA then THE DISTRICT shall be required to budget for and spend for the fiscal year from July 1,
2005, to June 30, 2006, the amount of $5,000.00, in addition to those amounts it would be required to
budget for and spend pursuant to the terms stated above).

The failure of THE DISTRICT to correct any under funding of maintenance expenses for THE
URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA may be enforced on Motion to the Court and the Court shall be
empowered to remedy such failure by appropriate injunctive relief, damages, sanctions or by such other
means as is appropriate under the circumstances

5.

FUTURE CHANGES IN THE ASSESSMENT SHALL BE PROPORTIONAL

Should THE DISTRICT choose to increase or decrease the amount of THE ASSESSMENT in the
future, such increases or decreases shall be proportional to THE ASSESSMENTS currently in existence.

By way of example, should THE DISTRICT decide to increase the amount of its overall assessments by
10%, THE ASSESSMENTS on urban parcels and on agricultural parcels shall increase by 10% across the
board. Likewise, should THE DISTRICT elect to decrease its total assessments by 5%, the urban
assessment rate shall decrease by 5% and the agricultural assessment shall decrease by 5%. Stated
differently, any future change in THE ASSESSMENTS cannot result in a disproportionate change between
the urban and agricultural parcels. (For example, it would not be appropriate to increase THE ASSESSMENT on urban parcels by 10% and to increase THE ASSESSMENT on agricultural parcels by 5%)

6.

CITY'S RIGHT TO PERFORM WORK IN DISTRICT FACILITIES

A. Routine operations.

THE CITY shall have the right, but not the obligation, to perform routine operations within THE DISTRICT'S facilities. As used herein “routine operations” shall involve the cleaning of the Traynor Lateral and any other crossings or structures within THE DISTRICT'S facilities, the removal of trash and debris (trash and debris shall refer generally to the deposit or placement of items into DISTRICT ditches or other facilities, whether intentionally placed or otherwise, which are not a part of the design of such facilities and include without limitation appliances, timber, wood, metal, plastic, rubbish, trash, refuse and similar items) and the spraying of weeds. Should THE CITY wish to perform any such routine maintenance functions within THE DISTRICT'S facilities, it shall give THE DISTRICT 30-days written notice specifying that it considers the project in question to be routine, along with a description thereof. If THE DISTRICT fails to object within 30 days, THE CITY may proceed with the work as proposed. The only basis upon which THE DISTRICT may object to work covered under this paragraph shall be on the basis that the proposed work falls outside THE DISTRICT'S easements. If THE DISTRICT objects that such work falls outside its easements, it must, in writing, state the basis for the objection. THE CITY may thereafter proceed with the work if it agrees to perform the same within the limits specified in THE DISTRICT'S objection. Notwithstanding the foregoing, THE CITY shall have the right to clean, free of all obstructions, the Traynor Lateral and any other crossings within THE DISTRICT'S facilities and there shall be no basis for objection so long as the proposed cleaning does not exceed the extent of the design of the Traynor Lateral crossing or any other crossing that THE CITY proposes to clean.

B. The City's Right to Perform Excavation or Make Structural Changes in District Facilities

THE CITY shall have the right, but not the obligation, to excavate or make structural changes to THE DISTRICT facilities provided such work meets the criteria set out below. Any additional liability
or maintenance costs which arise because of the CITY'S proposed alteration, expansion or addition to
DISTRICT facilities or structures, shall be identified and apportioned in THE CITY'S Plan. THE CITY
shall accept such additional costs and liability as an obligation of THE CITY if it goes forward with its
proposed Plan. THE CITY shall give THE DISTRICT 90 days advance written notice of any proposed
work involving excavation or involving any structural changes in THE DISTRICT'S facilities. If THE
DISTRICT does not object within the 90 days of giving such notice, then THE CITY may proceed with
the project as proposed. If THE DISTRICT objects to the project proposed pursuant to this paragraph, it
must object in writing and state the basis for such objection. If THE CITY agrees to conform its work to
the objections as stated by THE DISTRICT, it may proceed with the project in compliance with such
objections. THE DISTRICT objections to proposed work under this paragraph shall be upon the basis that
the work is not within reasonable engineering standards.

For example, if THE CITY proposes to install a regional detention facility (such as a regional
detention facility in lieu of or in addition to on-site drainage for a development project), and such facility
complies with the above-stated standards, then THE CITY would have the right to undertake the project
in compliance with reasonable engineering standards.

Should THE DISTRICT object to THE CITY'S proposal and THE CITY is in disagreement with
THE DISTRICT'S objections and unwilling to proceed with the project in conformance with such
objections, the parties agree that any such disputes will be resolved by the appointment of a qualified
engineer (either by agreement of THE CITY and THE DISTRICT, or upon Motion to the Court if the
parties cannot so agree). Such engineer shall review the proposed project and THE DISTRICT'S
objections, and, applying reasonable engineering standards and practices, shall determine in what fashion
and under what conditions the proposed project may proceed. THE PARTIES agree to be bound by the
determination of the Arbitrator/Engineer who may apportion the costs of arbitration equitably based upon
the reasonableness/unreasonableness of a particular party's position.

None of the rights conferred to THE CITY pursuant to these paragraphs 6A or 6B, shall impose any
duty or obligation upon THE CITY to propose any work or project within facilities of THE DISTRICT.
Should THE CITY choose to take such action, such action is entirely within THE CITY'S sole discretion.
THE CITY shall assume no consequences or obligations arising out of its failure to take any action herein and THE CITY'S rights under this paragraph (or any other provision of this Judgment) create no rights in any third parties.

7.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENT DETENTION STANDARDS

THE CITY and THE DISTRICT have agreed on the drainage detention standards as set forth below. THE DISTRICT'S interest in future development, as a Reclamation District, shall be limited to the implementation of the detention standard and arrangements to assure future maintenance of facilities constructed to that standard as more particularly described below.

THE DISTRICT further recognizes and agrees that THE CITY is the primary agency responsible for the decisions relating to THE CITY'S land use, development and growth. In the future, THE DISTRICT will limit its involvement in growth issues to matters related to the detention standard. As long as THE CITY maintains the detention standard as established by this Agreement, or as may be subsequently revised with the consent of THE DISTRICT and THE CITY, THE DISTRICT will not oppose any land use decision, annexation, or amendment to THE CITY'S sphere of influence and will be deemed to have approved such projects.

THE CITY and THE DISTRICT agree, that with respect to the release of storm waters from future development projects within THE CITY, that any requirements of THE DISTRICT with respect to such detention shall be satisfied if the detention facilities meet or exceed the standards set forth on EXHIBIT “C” attached hereto and incorporated herein. Unless THE DISTRICT will operate and maintain the detention facilities in question, THE DISTRICT shall have no right to object to the project based upon the design of the facility (although THE CITY will consider any comments THE DISTRICT may submit regarding the proposed design). The only question over which THE DISTRICT shall have input shall be as to the location and design of the pipe or other structure which enters THE DISTRICT'S facilities from the development project and whether or not the detention facility meets the engineering criteria as set forth on EXHIBIT “C”. However, THE CITY

STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT & CONSENT DEGREE JUDGMENT
Final approved version 11-18-2004 - Joint Session of Reclamation District 833 Board and Gridley City Council
shall reasonably consider comments of THE DISTRICT that it may have regarding design, to the extent such design effects DISTRICT operations. In the event THE DISTRICT'S engineer and the engineer of THE CITY (or the developer) do not agree that the criteria of EXHIBIT "C" have been satisfied then the parties agree to submit the matter to a qualified Engineer/Arbitrator (either agreed to by the CITY and DISTRICT or appointed by the Court) who shall consider the positions of the parties insofar as it concerns the criteria expressed in EXHIBIT "C". The parties agree to be bound by the decision of the Engineer/Arbitrator who may apportion the costs of arbitration equitably based upon the reasonableness/unreasonableness of a particular party's position.

Provided the detention facilities meet the criteria as specified in EXHIBIT "C", (as clarified by the Engineer/Arbitrator if necessary) then THE DISTRICT shall not be entitled to object to the project in question and shall be deemed to have approved the project. As used herein a "Project" includes changes in THE CITY'S sphere of influence, annexations into the City, as well as the subdivision or other development or change in land use of any properties in THE CITY.

8

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Each settling party shall bear their respective costs and attorney fees incurred to the date of entry of Judgment. In the event a party incurs costs or fees (including reasonable attorney fees) to seek future enforcement of this Judgment, (other than the apportionment of costs and fees by arbitration as provided in Sections 6 and 7, above) the Court may award to the non-defaulting party that party's costs and fees, including reasonable attorney fees incurred by such party, to include the cost and fees incurred prior to bringing a Motion or seeking other relief from the Court. Pursuant to CCP §664.6, the Court shall retain jurisdiction of these actions after entry of Judgment, said retention of jurisdiction to include the ability to issue appropriate injunctive relief, damages, sanctions (including contempt sanctions) and all other appropriate remedies to carry out the provisions of this Judgment.

...
This Stipulation may be executed in counter-parts and the provisions of this Stipulation incorporated into the Judgment of the Court as set forth below.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Stipulation For Entry of Judgment on the date set forth below.

Dated: 2-25-05

CITY OF GRIDLEY
Plaintiff,

BY: Frank W. Cook
FRANK W. COOK, Its Mayor

RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833
Defendant,

By: Lea W. Finch
Its Acting President

ATTEST:

JOHN W. SLOTA
City Clerk

Dated: 2/25/05

ATTEST:

Maxine Farrar
Clerk of Reclamation District No. 833

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Dated: 2-25-05

RICH, FUDGE, MORRIS & IVERSON, INC.

BY: Brant J. Bordsen,
Attorneys for Plaintiff, CITY OF GRIDLEY

MINASIAN, SPRUANCE, BABER,
MEITH, SOARES & SEXTON, LLP

BY: Paul R. Minasian,
Attorney for Defendant,
RECLAMATION DISTRICT NO. 833
CONSENT JUDGMENT ON STIPULATION

Pursuant to the provisions of CCP, Section 664.6, the above Stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Judgment shall enter in Action #127360 as a consent Judgment pursuant to the provisions of the above Stipulation which are incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in full.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED pursuant to CCP Section 664.6, that the Court shall retain jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of this Judgment.

Dated: MAR 15 2005

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
EXHIBIT "B"
(page 1)

DESCRIPTION AND MAP OF
URBAN MAINTENANCE AREA

The District facilities to be maintained within the Urban Maintenance Area include all laterals and ditches that have been traditionally maintained within the Urban Maintenance Area and which flow generally in a southwesterly direction out of the Urban Maintenance Area to a point 300 yards west of the crossing of the Traynor Lateral as to each District lateral flowing from the Urban Maintenance Area. These ditches include but are not limited to Laterals E-1, E-1-A, E-6, E-7, E-7-A and all District ditches draining from the Urban Maintenance Area into these laterals to a point 300 yards west of the Traynor Lateral. Special attention shall be given to irrigation ditch undercrossings.
EXHIBIT "C"

Detention Facility Standards

Design Objective:

The peak stormwater discharge flow rate from the gross area of the land development project site, and all tributary public rights-of-way, after full development during a 100-year (1% probability) design storm event of any duration shall not exceed the peak stormwater discharge flow rate from the undeveloped project site and all tributary public rights-of-way, based upon a 100-year (1% probability) design storm event.

Design calculations and drawings shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer to demonstrate that this design objective is fulfilled. Calculations and drawings shall be site-specific for the proposed land development site, and shall be based upon actual construction conditions. (The improvements to be constructed must be hydraulically consistent with the design assumptions presented in the calculations.)

Design Storm Parameters:

The 100-year (1% probability) design storm events for the development site shall be based upon the rainfall intensity-duration data presented in the Gridley Public Works Construction Standards. The storm drainage detention facility shall have adequate storage capacity for a 100-year (1% probability) design storm event of any duration with adequate freeboard, subject to the approval of the City Engineer.

Design Time of Concentration:

For the undeveloped site, the overland flow portion of the time of concentration shall be determined with the following overland flow equation (Caltrans Design Manual):

\[ t_o = 1.80 \left( 1.10 - C \right) \left( \frac{L}{S} \right)^{0.56} \]

Where:
- \( t_o \) = Overland flow travel time in minutes
- \( C \) = Runoff coefficient used in the Rational Formula
- \( L \) = Length of overland flow path in feet
- \( S \) = Slope of overland flow path in percent

For the developed site, the time of concentration shall be a combination of overland flow time, as determined by the above equation, and the flow time in gutters and/or pipes to the point being evaluated. However, the time of concentration need not be less than 10 minutes.
Design Runoff Coefficients:

Design runoff coefficients for use in the Rational Formula shall be “weighted average” values for different surface permeabilities, using values compatible with the following representative values:

- Agricultural Land: 0.25
- Landscaped Areas: 0.30
- Gravel Walks and Driveways (loose): 0.40
- Compacted Aggregate Base: 0.80
- Asphalt or Concrete Surfaces: 0.90
- Roof Areas: 0.95

Runoff rates used to determine storm runoff detention volumes shall include flows from public areas, including streets, sidewalks, driveways and landscape areas, as well as private areas including buildings, porches, patios, walkways, driveways and landscape areas.

Detention Facilities Outflow Rates:

The outflow rate used to design the detention facility shall be the rate actually flowing from the facility under design conditions. The maximum allowable discharge rate shall only be used when the design calculations demonstrate that this flow rate will be achieved by the facility as constructed.

Adequate provisions shall be included in the detention facility’s design to accommodate overflows of the detention facility from storms of greater intensity than the design storm, or for malfunction of the detention facility, and for discharge of the water without damaging structures or property.

Detention Basin Design Features:

Surface impoundments used for storm water detention and/or storage shall have adequate security fencing to control access, while providing adequate clearance for maintenance.

Side slopes of impoundments shall not exceed 2:1, or the maximum slope recommended by a site-specific soils report, whichever is flatter. Adequate erosion control materials shall be provided to ensure the stability of the banks.

Surface impoundments with a least dimension of the top width greater than twenty feet, as well as impoundments which do not have adequate clearance on the tops of the banks for maintenance equipment, shall include ramps to facilitate equipment access to the bottom of the basin for maintenance.

The basin and all appurtenances shall be designed to minimize standing water which may promote mosquito breeding.
APPENDIX F

COVER LETTER TO DISTRICTS REQUESTING REVIEW
OF ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT SECTIONS
APPENDIX F

District Review Request Letter

DATE

XXX, Manager
XXX
XXX
XXX, CA XXXXX

Subject: MSR for Butte LAFCO

Dear XXXXX:

Thank you for completing the questionnaire regarding XXXX. Your responses were very helpful in our preparation thus far on the irrigation, drainage, and reclamation district Municipal Service Review (MSR) for Butte LAFCO.

Enclosed for your review is a rough draft of the Municipal Service Review section for XXX. Please carefully review the enclosed draft section and attached district map and provide any comments you might have as to the accuracy of information. Please provide comments, concerns, and/or questions by DATE. The enclosed draft section is preliminary and is not considered a public document. Our goal is to ensure that the MSR contains the most accurate information possible and your review will provide valuable input that will be used towards obtaining that goal.

If you have any questions, please feel free to either call me or to send them back with the draft section. We would also be happy to meet with you and discuss your comments and/or concerns in person. If you would like to set up an appointment, please contact me at (530) 852-4837 or by e-mail at Uma.Hinman@KleinschmidtUSA.com.

Sincerely,

KLEINSCHMIDT ASSOCIATES

Uma Hinman
Planner & Environmental Analyst

UAH:smf
Enc: Draft district section and boundary map
APPENDIX G

DISTRICT BUDGET FORM
SCHEDULES 15 AND 16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description-Purpose</th>
<th>Reserve / Designations Balance as of June 30, 2003 (actual)</th>
<th>Decreases by Cancellations Made Available for Financing</th>
<th>Increases of New Reserves / Designations to be Provided in Budget Year</th>
<th>Total Reserves / Designations for Budget Year</th>
<th>Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA #1-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>F-0210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #4-DFB</td>
<td>278,425</td>
<td>62,609</td>
<td>62,609</td>
<td>341,034</td>
<td>F-0220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #11-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>F-0240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #12-DFB</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>F-0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #14-DFB</td>
<td>16,496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,496</td>
<td>F-0270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #15-DFB</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>580</td>
<td>F-0280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #16-DFB</td>
<td>6,703</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>7,733</td>
<td>F-0290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #18-DFB</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>F-0310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 1-DFB</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>F-0320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>F-0322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 4-DFB</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>F-0324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #22-DFB</td>
<td>25,108</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>4,657</td>
<td>29,765</td>
<td>F-0330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #23-DFB</td>
<td>50,268</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>59,471</td>
<td>F-0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #24-DFB</td>
<td>497,718</td>
<td>91,646</td>
<td>91,646</td>
<td>589,364</td>
<td>F-0360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #25-DFB</td>
<td>743,731</td>
<td>115,091</td>
<td>115,091</td>
<td>858,822</td>
<td>F-0370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #27-DFB</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>F-0390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #31-DFB</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>15,539</td>
<td>F-0410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #33-DFB</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>F-0430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #34-DFB</td>
<td>67,849</td>
<td>36,645</td>
<td>36,645</td>
<td>104,494</td>
<td>F-0440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #36-DFB</td>
<td>13,729</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>15,555</td>
<td>F-0480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #37-DFB</td>
<td>24,641</td>
<td>15,723</td>
<td>15,723</td>
<td>40,364</td>
<td>F-0490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #40-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>F-0520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #46-DFB</td>
<td>17,958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,958</td>
<td>F-0680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #47-DFB</td>
<td>16,815</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>19,771</td>
<td>F-0690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #56-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>F-0680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #63-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F-0963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #66-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F-0966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #67-DFB</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>F-0967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #69-DFB</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>F-0969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #70-DFB</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>F-0970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #71-DFB</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>F-0971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #73-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>F-0730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #76-DFB</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>F-0976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #78-DFB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F-0978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>F-0979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F-0949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #80-DFB</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>F-0980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #82-DFB</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>F-0200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #87-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>F-0987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 2-DFB</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5,458</td>
<td>F-0990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 3-DFB</td>
<td>5,377</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>7,077</td>
<td>F-0903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #94-DFB</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>F-0994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #95-DFB</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>F-0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #96-DFB</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>F-0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #97-DFB</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>F-0997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #98-DFB</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>F-0998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #100-DFB</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>F-0800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #101-DFB</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7,075</td>
<td>F-0801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COUNTY OF BUTTE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Governing Board: Board of Supervisors  

### DETAIL OF PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES / DESIGNATIONS OF SPECIAL DISTRICTS  

State Controllers County Budget Act (1985)  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2002-2003  
DISTRICT BUDGET FORM  
SCHEDULE 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description-Purpose</th>
<th>Reserve/Designations Balance as of June 30, 2002 (actual)</th>
<th>Decreases by Cancellations Made Available for Financing</th>
<th>Increases of New Reserves/Designations to be Provided in Budget Year</th>
<th>Total Reserves/Designations for Budget Year</th>
<th>Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSA #1-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>F-0210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #4-DFB</td>
<td>233,668</td>
<td>44,557</td>
<td>278,425</td>
<td>F-0220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #11-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>F-0240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #12-DFB</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>F-0250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #14-DFB</td>
<td>13,855</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>16,496</td>
<td>F-0270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #15-DFB</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>F-0280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #16-DFB</td>
<td>5,642</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>F-0290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #18-DFB</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>F-0310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 1-DFB</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>F-0320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>F-0324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #22-DFB</td>
<td>18,913</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>F-0330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #23-DFB</td>
<td>33,281</td>
<td>16,987</td>
<td>50,268</td>
<td>F-0340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #24-DFB</td>
<td>363,377</td>
<td>131,341</td>
<td>497,718</td>
<td>F-0360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #25-DFB</td>
<td>610,966</td>
<td>743,731</td>
<td>1,354,697</td>
<td>F-0370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #27-DFB</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>F-0390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #31-DFB</td>
<td>23,019</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>25,019</td>
<td>F-0410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #33-DFB</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>F-0430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #34-DFB</td>
<td>35,319</td>
<td>5,493</td>
<td>40,812</td>
<td>F-0440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #36-DFB</td>
<td>12,882</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>13,729</td>
<td>F-0460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #37-DFB</td>
<td>3,382</td>
<td>21,259</td>
<td>24,641</td>
<td>F-0490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #47-DFB</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>16,215</td>
<td>16,815</td>
<td>F-0590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #46-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17,998</td>
<td>17,998</td>
<td>F-0680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #63-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F-0963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #67-DFB</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>F-0967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #69-DFB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>F-0969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #70-DFB</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>F-0970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #71-DFB</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>F-0971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #73-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F-0730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #76-DFB</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>F-0975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #78-DFB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F-0978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>F-0979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F-0949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #80-DFB</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>F-0980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #82-DFB</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,019</td>
<td>F-0200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 2-DFB</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4,658</td>
<td>F-0990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 3-DFB</td>
<td>3,677</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>5,377</td>
<td>F-0903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #94-DFB</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>F-0994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #95-DFB</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>F-0995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #96-DFB</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>F-0996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #97-DFB</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>F-0997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #98-DFB</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>F-0998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #100-DFB</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>F-0800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #101-DFB</td>
<td>5,075</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>F-0801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #102-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>F-0802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #107-DFB</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>F-0807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #108-DFB</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>F-0808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #109-DFB</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>F-0809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description-Purpose</td>
<td>Reserve / Designations Balance as of June 30, 2004 (actual)</td>
<td>Decreases by Cancellations Made Available for Financing</td>
<td>Increases of New Reserves Designations to be Provided in Budget Year</td>
<td>Total Reserves / Designations for Budget Year</td>
<td>Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #1-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>20,890</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>F-0210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #4-DFB</td>
<td>341,034</td>
<td>57,958</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>398,962</td>
<td>F-0220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #11-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>F-0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #12-DFB</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>17,397</td>
<td>18,298</td>
<td>F-0270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #14-DFB</td>
<td>16,496</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>17,946</td>
<td>F-0280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #15-DFB</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>8,903</td>
<td>10,073</td>
<td>F-0290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #16-DFB</td>
<td>7,733</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>9,853</td>
<td>F-0300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #17-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>F-0310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #18-DFB</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,041</td>
<td>F-0320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 1-DFB</td>
<td>44,959</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>46,959</td>
<td>48,959</td>
<td>F-0330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>F-0322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 4-DFB</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>F-0324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #22-DFB</td>
<td>29,765</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>33,326</td>
<td>33,326</td>
<td>F-0330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #23-DFB</td>
<td>58,877</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>59,471</td>
<td>59,471</td>
<td>F-0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #24-DFB</td>
<td>534,271</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>534,646</td>
<td>534,646</td>
<td>F-0360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #25-DFB</td>
<td>858,822</td>
<td>20,368</td>
<td>858,160</td>
<td>858,160</td>
<td>F-0370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #27-DFB</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>F-0390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #31-DFB</td>
<td>15,559</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>39,424</td>
<td>39,424</td>
<td>F-0410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #33-DFB</td>
<td>3,364</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>F-0430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #34-DFB</td>
<td>89,940</td>
<td>11,174</td>
<td>107,114</td>
<td>107,114</td>
<td>F-0440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #36-DFB</td>
<td>15,555</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>16,464</td>
<td>16,464</td>
<td>F-0480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #37-DFB</td>
<td>40,364</td>
<td>11,016</td>
<td>51,380</td>
<td>51,380</td>
<td>F-0490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #40-DFB</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>F-0520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #47-DFB</td>
<td>19,771</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>22,594</td>
<td>22,594</td>
<td>F-0590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #56-DFB</td>
<td>20,646</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>22,648</td>
<td>22,648</td>
<td>F-0660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #67-DFB</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>F-0697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #69-DFB</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>F-0699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #71-DFB</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,895</td>
<td>5,895</td>
<td>F-0971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #73-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>F-0730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #75-DFB</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>F-0976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #78-DFB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F-0978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>F-0979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F-0949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #80-DFB</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>F-0860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #82-DFB</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>F-0820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #87-DFB</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>F-0867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 2-DFB</td>
<td>4,638</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5,438</td>
<td>5,438</td>
<td>F-0990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 3-DFB</td>
<td>5,837</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>7,537</td>
<td>7,537</td>
<td>F-0903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #94-DFB</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>5,867</td>
<td>5,867</td>
<td>F-0994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #95-DFB</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>3,454</td>
<td>F-0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #96-DFB</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>F-0996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #97-DFB</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>F-0997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #98-DFB</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>F-0998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #100-DFB</td>
<td>7,088</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>F-0800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #101-DFB</td>
<td>7,075</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>8,075</td>
<td>8,075</td>
<td>F-0801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #102-DFB</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>F-0802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #107-DFB</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>F-0807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #108-DFB</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>F-0808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description-Purpose</td>
<td>Reserve / Designations Balance as of June 30, 2005 (actual)</td>
<td>Decreases by Cancellations Made Available for Financing</td>
<td>Increases of New Reserves / Designations to be Provided in Budget Year</td>
<td>Total Reserves / Designations for Budget Year</td>
<td>Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #1-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>F - 0210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #4-DFB</td>
<td>398,992</td>
<td>11,288</td>
<td>24,883</td>
<td>415,644</td>
<td>F - 0220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #11-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(8,231)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>F - 0230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #11-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>3,694</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>F - 0230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #12-DFB</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>F - 0250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #14-DFB</td>
<td>17,397</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>18,445</td>
<td>18,445</td>
<td>F - 0270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #15-DFB</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>F - 0280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #16-DFB</td>
<td>8,903</td>
<td>(553)</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>5,492</td>
<td>F - 0290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #17-DFB</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>F - 0290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #18-DFB</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>3,076</td>
<td>F - 0300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 1-DFB</td>
<td>46,959</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>F - 0310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>F - 0322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 4-DFB</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>F - 0324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #22-DFB</td>
<td>33,362</td>
<td>(1,183)</td>
<td>4,533</td>
<td>36,712</td>
<td>F - 0330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #23-DFB</td>
<td>59,471</td>
<td>(589)</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>67,182</td>
<td>F - 0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #24-DFB</td>
<td>534,271</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>51,270</td>
<td>565,541</td>
<td>F - 0360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #25-DFB</td>
<td>858,822</td>
<td>(55,000)</td>
<td>76,395</td>
<td>880,217</td>
<td>F - 0370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #27-DFB</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>F - 0390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #30-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>F - 0400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #31-DFB</td>
<td>39,424</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,634</td>
<td>66,058</td>
<td>F - 0410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #33-DFB</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td></td>
<td>354</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>F - 0430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #34-DFB</td>
<td>107,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,129</td>
<td>132,569</td>
<td>F - 0440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #36-DFB</td>
<td>16,464</td>
<td>(191)</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>17,815</td>
<td>F - 0480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #37-DFB</td>
<td>51,380</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,299</td>
<td>51,380</td>
<td>F - 0490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #40-DFB</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #47-DFB</td>
<td>22,594</td>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>23,594</td>
<td>F - 0590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #56-DFB</td>
<td>22,287</td>
<td>(952)</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>22,984</td>
<td>F - 0590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #57-DFB</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #59-DFB</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>F - 0999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #71-DFB</td>
<td>5,895</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>F - 0971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #73-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>935</td>
<td></td>
<td>936</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #76-DFB</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #78-DFB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #80-DFB</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #82-DFB</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>(1,500)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>F - 0200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #87-DFB</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 2-DFB</td>
<td>5,638</td>
<td>(379)</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>F - 0990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 3-DFB</td>
<td>7,337</td>
<td>(509)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>8,836</td>
<td>F - 0903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #94-DFB</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>(339)</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>6,239</td>
<td>F - 0994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #95-DFB</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #96-DFB</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #97-DFB</td>
<td>6,193</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #98-DFB</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>(132)</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #100-DFB</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9,088</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #101-DFB</td>
<td>8,075</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9,075</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #102-DFB</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>(500)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>F - 0902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description-Purpose</td>
<td>Reserve / Designations Balance as of June 30, 2006 (estimated)</td>
<td>Decreases by Cancellations Made Available for Financing</td>
<td>Increases of New Reserves Designations to be Provided in Budget Year</td>
<td>Total Reserves / Designations for Budget Year</td>
<td>Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #1-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>2,277</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>F - 0210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #4-DFB</td>
<td>415,644</td>
<td>20,083</td>
<td>435,727</td>
<td>F - 0220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #11-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>F - 0230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #11-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>4,378</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4,483</td>
<td>F - 0240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #12-DFB</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>F - 0250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #14-DFB</td>
<td>18,445</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>19,195</td>
<td>F - 0270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #15-DFB</td>
<td>4,523</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>5,523</td>
<td>F - 0280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #16-DFB</td>
<td>8,676</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9,176</td>
<td>F - 0290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #17-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>F - 0300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #17-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>F - 0302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #18-DFB</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>F - 0310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 1-DFB</td>
<td>55,578</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>56,501</td>
<td>F - 0320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>F - 0322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #21-Zn 4-DFB</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>F - 0324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #22-DFB</td>
<td>36,712</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>38,186</td>
<td>F - 0330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #23-DFB</td>
<td>67,182</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>67,627</td>
<td>F - 0340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #24-DFB</td>
<td>585,541</td>
<td>5,475</td>
<td>591,016</td>
<td>F - 0360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #25-DFB</td>
<td>880,217</td>
<td>14,385</td>
<td>894,592</td>
<td>F - 0370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #27-DFB</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>F - 0390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #30-DFB</td>
<td>925</td>
<td></td>
<td>925</td>
<td>F - 0400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #31-DFB</td>
<td>66,058</td>
<td></td>
<td>66,058</td>
<td>F - 0410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #33-DFB</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>F - 0430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #34-DFB</td>
<td>133,569</td>
<td>3,862</td>
<td>137,431</td>
<td>F - 0440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #36-DFB</td>
<td>17,572</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>18,293</td>
<td>F - 0480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #37-DFB</td>
<td>51,380</td>
<td></td>
<td>51,380</td>
<td>F - 0490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #40-DFB</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
<td>F - 0520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #47-DFB</td>
<td>18,884</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>19,176</td>
<td>F - 0590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #56-DFB</td>
<td>22,984</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>23,226</td>
<td>F - 0680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #67-DFB</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>F - 0967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #69-DFB</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>F - 0969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #71-DFB</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>8,408</td>
<td>F - 0971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #73-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>936</td>
<td></td>
<td>936</td>
<td>F - 0730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #76-DFB</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>F - 0976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #78-DFB</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F - 0978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn1-DFB</td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,961</td>
<td>F - 0979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #79-Zn2-DFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>F - 0949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #80-DFB</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>F - 0980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #82-DFB</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>F - 0200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #87-DFB</td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,778</td>
<td>F - 0987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 2-DFB</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>F - 0990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #90-Zn 3-DFB</td>
<td>8,228</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,228</td>
<td>F - 0903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #94-DFB</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6,501</td>
<td>F - 0994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #85-DFB</td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>F - 0995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #96-DFB</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>F - 0996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #97-DFB</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>F - 0997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #98-DFB</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>F - 0998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #100-DFB</td>
<td>9,088</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10,088</td>
<td>F - 0800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA #101-DFB</td>
<td>9,075</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10,075</td>
<td>F - 0801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 - 2007

### SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE, OTHER FINANCING SOURCES, AND RESIDUAL EQUITY TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4110100 Current Secured Property Tax (net)</td>
<td>78,753</td>
<td>79,423</td>
<td>92,478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110200 Current Supplemental Property Tax</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110300 Current Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>4,144</td>
<td>4,396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110500 Prior Secured Property Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110700 Prior Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130500 Miscellaneous Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400001 Int &amp; Rent - CSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410101 Interest - County Treasury</td>
<td>14,199</td>
<td>9,545</td>
<td>10,648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500001 Aid from Other Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515200 Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530106 RDA City of Chico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services (Gate Receipts-Pools Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700001 Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712520 Coll-Ins Reimburse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712531 Reimburse for Prior Year Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4829000 Fund Equity Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUE**

103,325 97,456 112,775 0

**FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE**

49,727 44,804 0 0

**TOTAL**

153,052 142,260 112,775 0

### SUMMARY OF FINANCING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>523 Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536901 Charges from County Departments</td>
<td>4,616</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Special Department Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Utilities</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554 Interfund Services - Auditor</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554010 Interfund Services - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554030 Interfund Services - Road Fund</td>
<td>51,375</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554100 Interfund Services - Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554181 Interfund Service - General Services</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Interest Expense (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563 Fixed Assset - Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 Appropriations for Contingencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS**

58,521 117,377 92,692 0

**PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES/DESIGNATIONS**

49,727 24,883 20,083 0

**TOTAL REQUIREMENTS**

108,248 142,260 112,775 0

5823F/16 (Modified)

Submitted by:
Mike Crump, Director of Public Works
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## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE, OTHER FINANCING SOURCES, AND RESIDUAL EQUITY TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4110100</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>6,397</td>
<td>5,401</td>
<td>5,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110200</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110300</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110700</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410101</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>1,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530106</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td>4,188</td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>5,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4829000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUE**

|                   | 13,945 | 13,734 | 13,043 | 13,043 |

**FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE**

|                   | 40,994 | 17,148 | 6,376  | 6,376  |

**TOTAL**

|                   | 54,939 | 30,882 | 19,419 | 19,419 |

## SUMMARY OF FINANCING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>523 Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536901 Charges from County Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Special Department Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554 Interfund Services - Auditor</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554010 Interfund Services - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554030 Interfund Services - Road Fund</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>7,309</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554100 Interfund Services - Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554181 Interfund Service - General Services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Interest Expense (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563 Fixed Asset - Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 Appropriations for Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS**

|                   | 4,510 | 7,519 | 10,216 | 10,216 |

**PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES/DESIGNATIONS**

|                   | 33,281 | 16,987 | 9,203  | 9,203  |

**TOTAL REQUIREMENTS**

|                   | 37,791 | 24,506 | 19,419 | 19,419 |
### SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE, OTHER FINANCING SOURCES, AND RESIDUAL EQUITY TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4110100 Current Secured Property Tax</td>
<td>6,401</td>
<td>6,222</td>
<td>5,558</td>
<td>5,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110200 Current Supplemental Property Tax</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110300 Current Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110500 Prior Secured Property Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110700 Prior Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130500 Miscellaneous Taxes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400001 Int &amp; Rent - CSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410101 Interest - County Treasury</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500001 Aid from Other Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4512000 Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530105 RDA City of Chico</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>4,764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700001 Charges for Current Services (Gate Receipts-Pools Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712520 Coll-Ins Reimburse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712531 Reimburse for Prior Year Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4829000 Fund Equity Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>10,305</td>
<td>13,945</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>6,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE</strong></td>
<td>37,326</td>
<td>40,994</td>
<td>17,148</td>
<td>17,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>47,631</td>
<td>54,939</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>23,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF FINANCING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S23 Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27 Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30 Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31 Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S36901 Charges from County Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S41 Special Department Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S44 Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54 Interfund Services - Auditor</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54010 Interfund Services - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54030 Interfund Services - Road Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54100 Interfund Services - Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54181 Interfund Service - General Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S55 Interest Expense (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S63 Fixed Asset - Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S80 Appropriations for Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>6,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES/DEN\ISATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,281</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>37,791</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>23,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5823F/16 (Modified)

Submitted by: Mike Crump, Director of Public Works
## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE, OTHER FINANCING SOURCES, AND RESIDUAL EQUITY TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Secured Property Tax</td>
<td>6,397</td>
<td>6,727</td>
<td>4,881</td>
<td>5,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Supplemental Property Tax</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Secured Property Tax</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int &amp; Rent - CSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - County Treasury</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>1,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid from Other Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA City of Chico</td>
<td>4,188</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>7,209</td>
<td>7,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Current Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Current Services (Gate Receipts-Pools Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coll-Ins Reimburse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimburse for Prior Year Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Equity Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>13,734</td>
<td>15,289</td>
<td>14,315</td>
<td>14,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE</strong></td>
<td>17,148</td>
<td>6,376</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>30,882</td>
<td>21,665</td>
<td>14,315</td>
<td>14,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SUMMARY OF FINANCING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges from County Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Department Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Services - Auditor</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Services - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Services - Road Fund</td>
<td>7,309</td>
<td>12,847</td>
<td>13,941</td>
<td>13,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Services - Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfund Service - General Services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Expense (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Asses - Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations for Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td>7,519</td>
<td>13,051</td>
<td>14,315</td>
<td>14,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES/DESIGNATIONS</strong></td>
<td>16,987</td>
<td>8,609</td>
<td></td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REQUIREMENTS</strong></td>
<td>24,506</td>
<td>21,660</td>
<td>14,315</td>
<td>14,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# COUNTY OF BUTTE
## COUNTY SERVICE AREA #23 - DISTRICT BUDGET DETAIL
### PLEASANT VALLEY - DRAINAGE

**BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005-2006**

## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE, OTHER FINANCING SOURCES, AND RESIDUAL EQUITY TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4110100 ** Current Secured Property Tax (net)</td>
<td>6,727</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>3,890</td>
<td>3,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110200 Current Supplemental Property Tax</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110300 Current Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110500 Prior Secured Property Tax</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110700 Prior Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130500 Miscellaneous Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400001 Int &amp; Rent - CSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410401 Interest - County Treasury</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500001 Aid from Other Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515200 Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530106 RDA City of Chico</td>
<td>5,555</td>
<td>5,977</td>
<td>8,667</td>
<td>8,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services (Gate Receipts-Pools Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700001 Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712520 Coll-Ins Reimburse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712531 Reimburse for Prior Year Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4829000 Fund Equity Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL REVENUE | 15,289 | 15,749 | 14,627 | 14,627 |
| FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE | 6,376 | 5 | | |
| TOTAL | 21,665 | 15,753 | 14,627 | 28,675 |

## SUMMARY OF FINANCING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>523 Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536501 Charges from County Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Special Department Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554 Interfund Services - Auditor</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554010 Interfund Services - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554030 Interfund Services - Road Fund</td>
<td>12,847</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554100 Interfund Services - Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554181 Interfund Service - General Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Interest Expense (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563 Fixed Asset - Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 Appropriations for Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS | 13,051 | 1,701 | 13,375 | 20,375 |
| PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES/DESIGNATIONS | 8,609 | 5 | 1,252 | 8,300 |
| TOTAL REQUIREMENTS | 21,660 | 1,706 | 14,627 | 28,675 |

**Revenue & Taxation Code 97 72 - 97 73 - ERAF Revenue Shift: $678,50**

Submitted by:
Mike Crump, Director of Public Works
### SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE, OTHER FINANCING SOURCES, AND RESIDUAL EQUITY TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4110100 Current Secured Property Tax (net)</td>
<td>6,493</td>
<td>7,226</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>4,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110200 Current Supplemental Property Tax</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110300 Current Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110500 Prior Secured Property Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110700 Prior Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130500 Miscellaneous Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400001 Int &amp; Rent - CSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410101 Interest - County Treasury</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>1,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500001 Aid from Other Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515200 Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530106 RDA City of Chico</td>
<td>5,977</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>9,716</td>
<td>9,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services (Gate Receipts-Pools Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700001 Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712520 Coll-Ins Reimburse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712531 Reimburse for Prior Year Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4829000 Fund Equity Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUE**  
15,749 19,906 16,837 16,837

**FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE**  
5 14,048

**TOTAL**  
15,753 33,954 16,837 16,837

### SUMMARY OF FINANCING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>523 Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53901 Charges from County Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Special Department Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554 Interfund Services - Auditor</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554010 Interfund Services - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554030 Interfund Services - Road Fund</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554100 Interfund Services - Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554181 Interfund Service - General Services</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Interest Expense (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563 Fixed Assest - Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 Appropriations for Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS**  
1,701 4,649 16,392 16,392

**PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES/DESIGNATIONS**  
5 8,300 445 445

**TOTAL REQUIREMENTS**  
1,706 12,949 16,837 16,837

5823F/16 (Modified)  
Submitted by: Mike Crump, Director of Public Works
## COUNTY OF BUTTE
COUNTY SERVICE AREA #24 - DISTRICT BUDGET DETAIL
CHICO - MUD CREEK - DRAINAGE

### BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006 - 2007

#### SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE, OTHER FINANCING SOURCES, AND RESIDUAL EQUITY TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4110100 Current Secured Property Tax (net)</td>
<td>88,015</td>
<td>80,781</td>
<td>91,827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110200 Current Supplemental Property Tax</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110300 Current Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>4,613</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110500 Prior Secured Property Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110700 Prior Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130500 Miscellaneous Taxes</td>
<td>24,249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400001 Int &amp; Rent - CSA</td>
<td>14,836</td>
<td>15,286</td>
<td>14,993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410101 Interest - County Treasury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500001 Aid from Other Governments</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515200 Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>19,516</td>
<td>28,019</td>
<td>35,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530106 RDA City of Chico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700001 Charges for Current Services (Gate Receipts-Pools Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712520 Coll-Ins Reimburse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712531 Reimburse for Prior Year Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4829000 Fund Equity Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUE** | 158,712 | 132,725 | 151,367 | 0 |

**FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE** | 19,525 | 84,420 | 0 |

**TOTAL** | 178,237 | 217,145 | 151,367 | 0 |

#### SUMMARY OF FINANCING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>523 Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536901 Charges from County Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Special Department Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554 Interfund Services - Auditor</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554010 Interfund Services - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554030 Interfund Services - Road Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554100 Interfund Services - Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554181 Interfund Service - General Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Interest Expense (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563 Fixed Assest - Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 Appropriations for Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>591 Rebates &amp; Refunds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS** | 93,818 | 165,875 | 145,892 | 0 |

**PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES/DESIGNATIONS** | | | 51,270 | 5,475 |

**TOTAL REQUIREMENTS** | 93,818 | 217,145 | 151,367 | 0 |

5823F/16 (Modified)

Submitted by:
Mike Crump, Director of Public Works
### SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED REVENUE, OTHER FINANCING SOURCES, AND RESIDUAL EQUITY TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110100 Current Secured Property Tax (net)</td>
<td>57,424</td>
<td>52,858</td>
<td>63,641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110200 Current Supplemental Property Tax</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110300 Current Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>3,073</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110500 Prior Secured Property Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4110700 Prior Unsecured Property Tax</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4130500 Miscellaneous Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400001 Int &amp; Rent - CSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410101 Interest - County Treasury</td>
<td>32,034</td>
<td>22,233</td>
<td>24,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500001 Aid from Other Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4515200 Homeowners Property Tax Relief</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4530106 RDA City of Chico</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>16,462</td>
<td>20,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4600001 Charges for Current Services (Gate Receipts-Pools Only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4700001 Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712520 Col-I Ins Reimburse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4712531 Reimburse for Prior Year Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4829000 Fund Equity Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUE** | 108,142 | 97,233 | 114,777 | 0 |
**FUND BALANCE AVAILABLE** | 15,155 | 129,537 | 0 |
**TOTAL** | 123,297 | 226,770 | 114,777 | 0 |

### SUMMARY OF FINANCING REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523 Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530 Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536901 Charges from County Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Special Department Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554 Interfund Services - Auditor</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554010 Interfund Services - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554030 Interfund Services - Road Fund</td>
<td>6,261</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554100 Interfund Services - Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554181 Interfund Service - General Services</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555 Interest Expense (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563 Fixed Asset - Equipment</td>
<td>42,156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580 Appropriations for Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Repayment (Loan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS** | 48,760 | 150,375 | 100,392 | 0 |
**PROVISIONS FOR RESERVES/DESIGNATIONS** | (55,000) | 76,395 | 14,385 | |
**TOTAL REQUIREMENTS** | (6,240) | 226,770 | 114,777 | 0 |

5823F/16 (Modified)

Submitted by: Mike Crump, Director of Public Works
APPENDIX H

RESOLUTION NO. 20 2006/07
APPROVING THIS MSR
ADOPYON OF SERVICE REVIEW AND WRITTEN DETERMINATIONS
PREPARED FOR THE
IRRIGATION, DRAINAGE, AND RECLAMATION SERVICE PROVIDERS
IN BUTTE COUNTY

WHEREAS, §56430 of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 requires that LAFCOs conduct service reviews prior to or in conjunction with, establishing a Sphere of Influence (SOI) as defined in §56425 or §56426.5; and

WHEREAS, as part of such service reviews, LAFCOs must compile and evaluate service-related information and make written determinations regarding infrastructure needs or deficiencies, growth and population projections for the affected area, financing constraints and opportunities, cost avoidance opportunities, opportunities for rate restructuring, opportunities for shared facilities, government structure options including advantages and disadvantages of consolidation or reorganization of service providers, evaluation of management efficiencies, and local accountability and governance; and

WHEREAS, Butte LAFCO initiated a service review of Irrigation, Drainage, and Reclamation Service Providers in Butte County on June 19, 2006; and

WHEREAS, LAFCO consulted with affected and interested agencies, and interested parties; and

WHEREAS, LAFCO gathered and compiled the information necessary to conduct the required review and independently evaluated such information; and

WHEREAS, LAFCO issued a public Draft Service Review in January 2007, and provided a minimum 21-day public review of said document; and

WHEREAS, LAFCO considered the data, recommendations, and determinations contained in the Draft Service Review at a noticed public hearing held on February 1, 2007, and received all oral testimony and evidence, which were made, presented or filed, and all persons present were given the opportunity to hear and be heard in respect to any matter relating to the review; and

WHEREAS, the Consultant prepared a Final Municipal Service Review incorporating comments received where appropriate and presented the Final to the Commission and affected agencies; and

WHEREAS, LAFCO considered the data, recommendations and determinations contained in the Revised Draft Service Review at a noticed public hearing held on April 5, 2007, and received all oral testimony and evidence, which were made, presented or filed, and all persons present were given the opportunity to hear and be heard in respect to any matter relating to the review, its data, recommendations and determinations; and
RESOLUTION NO. 20 2006/07

WHEREAS, LAFCO has considered and is approving this Municipal Service Review as a feasibility and planning document and is therefore not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to §15262.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to powers provided in §56430 of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, the Local Agency Formation Commission of the County of Butte adopts written determinations as set forth in the Municipal Service Review for Irrigation, Drainage, and Reclamation Service Providers dated April 5, 2007, and adopts the Municipal Service Review for Irrigation, Drainage, and Reclamation Service Providers in Butte County as provided by the following agencies:

Irrigation Service Providers
Biggs-West Gridley Water District
Butte Water District
Richvale Irrigation District
South Feather Water and Power Agency
Western Canal Water District

Drainage Service Providers
Butte Creek Drainage District
Drainage District No. 1
Drainage District No. 2
Drainage District No. 100
County Service Area No. 4 – Sierra Del Oro Drainage
County Service Area No. 23 – Pleasant Valley Drainage
County Service Area No. 24 – Chico Mud Creek Drainage
County Service Area No. 25 – Shasta Union Drainage
County Service Area No. 87 – Keefer Road/Rock Creek Drainage

Reclamation Service Providers
Reclamation District No. 833
Rock Creek Reclamation District
Sacramento River Reclamation District

ADOPTED by the Butte Local Agency Formation Commission at a regular meeting of said Commission, held on the 5th day of April, 2007, as moved by Commissioner Lotter, and seconded by Commissioner Beck, by the following vote of the Commission:
RESOLUTION NO. 20 2006/07

AYES: Commissioners Lotter, Hunter, Connelly, Busch, Dolan, Vice Chair Beck, and Chair Leverenz

NOES: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

ABSENT: None

ATTEST:

[Signature]

Clerk of the Commission

[Signature]

CARL LEVERENZ, Chair
Butte Local Agency Formation Commission