

FINAL
Municipal Service Review
Solano County Water, Irrigation, Reclamation, and Flood
Management Agencies

Prepared for:



Solano County LAFCO
744 Empire St., Suite 216
Fairfield, CA 94533
(707) 438-1785

Contact: Shaun Pritchard, Executive Officer

Prepared by:

Michael Brandman Associates
2000 "O" Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95811
916.447.1100

Contact: Elliot Mulberg, Senior Environmental Planner



April 13, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: Introduction 1
1.1 - Role and Responsibility of LAFCO..... 1
1.2 - Purpose of the Municipal Service Review..... 1
1.3 - California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) 4
1.4 - Long-Term Environmental Issues 4

Section 2: Executive Summary 5
2.1 - Introduction 5
2.2 - Water Districts..... 5
2.3 - Reclamation Districts 8
2.4 - Key Findings 8

Section 3: Municipal Service Review Water Agencies 12
3.1 - Solano County Water Agency 12
3.2 - Solano Irrigation District..... 32
3.3 - Maine Prairie Water District 43
3.4 - Rural North Vacaville Water District..... 50

Section 4: Municipal Service Review Reclamation and Levee Districts 56
4.1 - Collinsville Levee Maintenance District..... 56
4.2 - Reclamation District No. 501 (Ryer Island) 60
4.3 - Reclamation District No. 536 (Egbert Tract) 64
4.4 - Reclamation District No. 1607 (Van Sickle Island)..... 68
4.5 - Reclamation District No. 2034..... 73
4.6 - Reclamation District No. 2060 (Hastings Tract) 76
4.7 - Reclamation District No. 2068..... 81
4.8 - Reclamation District No. 2084..... 88
4.9 - Reclamation District No. 2093 (Liberty Island)..... 92
4.10 - Reclamation District No. 2098..... 97
4.11 - Reclamation District No. 2104 (Peters Pocket Tract)..... 103
4.12 - Reclamation District No. 2112 (Schafer Pintail) 106
4.13 - Reclamation District No 2127 (Simmons Wheeler)..... 110
4.14 - Reclamation District No. 2129 (Frost Lake) 114
4.15 - Reclamation District No. 2130 (Honker Bay) 119
4.16 - Reclamation District No. 2134 (Denverton)..... 123
4.17 - Reclamation District No. 2135 (Sunrise Island) 127
4.18 - Reclamation District No. 2136 (Grizzly West) 131
4.19 - Reclamation District No. 2138 (Morrow Island)..... 135
4.20 - Reclamation District No. 2139 (Can Can/Greenhead) 138
4.21 - Reclamation District No. 2141 (Joice Island) 142
4.22 - Reclamation District No. 2142 (Suisun Slough West)..... 145

Section 5: References..... 148

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Total Demand for the Five Cities and Projections 2000 to 2015 (AF/yr) 6

Table 2: Reliability Factors for Common Supplies (percent) 6

Table 3: Member Agency Water Entitlements (acre-feet) 7

Table 4: Excess Supply for the Five Cities (AF)..... 8

Table 5: Reclamation District (RD) and Collinsville Levee Maintenance District
Characteristics..... 9

Table 6: State and Regional Water Organizations..... 14

Table 7: Total Demand and Projections 2000 to 2015 for the Five Cities (AF/yr) 15

Table 8: Facilities and Capacity of the Solano Project..... 16

Table 9: Solano Project Water Contracts..... 17

Table 10: North Bay Aqueduct Supply (AF) 19

Table 11: Member Agency Water Sources Entitlements (acre-feet)..... 22

Table 12: Reliability Factors for Common Supplies (Percent) 23

Table 13: Net Supply for the Five Cities (AF)..... 23

Table 14: Solano County Water Agency Revenues and Expenditures 26

Table 15: Cooperative Water Agency Agreements..... 28

Table 16: Average Water Deliveries 38

Table 17: Solano Project Drought Measures Agreement..... 38

Table 18: Solano Irrigation District Revenues and Expenditures 39

Table 19: Water Consumption by Source 45

Table 20: Solano Project Drought Measures Agreement..... 45

Table 21: Maine Prairie Water District Revenues and Expenditures 46

Table 22: Rural North Vacaville Water District Revenues and Expenses 52

Table 23: New Rate Schedule 53

Table 24: Collinsville Levee Maintenance District Revenues and Expenditures..... 58

Table 25: Reclamation District No. 501 Revenues and Expenditures 62

Table 26: Reclamation District No. 536 Revenues and Expenditures 64

Table 27: Reclamation District No. 1607 Revenues and Expenditures 70

Table 28: Reclamation District No. 2034 Revenues and Expenditures 73

Table 29: Reclamation District No. 2060 Revenues and Expenditures 76

Table 30: Reclamation District No. 2068 Revenues and Expenditures 84

Table 31: Percent of Revenue as Budgeted 84

Table 32: Reclamation District No. 2084 Revenues and Expenditures 90

Table 33: Reclamation District No. 2093 Revenues and Expenditures	94
Table 34: Reclamation District No. 2098 Revenues and Expenditures	99
Table 35: Reclamation District No. 2104 Revenues and Expenditures	103
Table 36: Reclamation District No. 2112 Revenues and Expenditures	106
Table 37: Reclamation District No. 2127 Revenues and Expenditures	110
Table 38: Reclamation District No. 2129 Revenues and Expenditures	116
Table 39: Reclamation District No. 2130 Revenues and Expenditures	119
Table 40: Reclamation District No. 2134 Revenues and Expenditures	123
Table 41: Reclamation District No. 2135 Revenues and Expenditures	127
Table 42: Reclamation District No. 2136 Revenues and Expenditure	131
Table 43: Reclamation District No. 2138 Revenues and Expenditure	135
Table 44: Reclamation District No. 2139 Revenues and Expenditure	138
Table 45: Reclamation District No. 2141 Revenues and Expenditure	142
Table 46: Reclamation District No. 2142 Revenues and Expenditure	145

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1: Boundary Map Solano County Water, Irrigation, Reclamation, and Flood.....	2
Exhibit 2: Boundary Map Solano County Water Agency.....	13
Exhibit 3: Boundary Map, Solano Irrigation District.....	33
Exhibit 4: Boundary Map Maine Prairie Water District	44
Exhibit 5: Boundary Map Rural North Vacaville Water District.....	51
Exhibit 6: Boundary Map Collinsville Levee Maintenance District.....	57
Exhibit 7: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 501	61
Exhibit 8: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 536	65
Exhibit 9: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 1607	69
Exhibit 10: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2034	74
Exhibit 11: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2060	78
Exhibit 12: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2068	82
Exhibit 13: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2084	89
Exhibit 14: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2093	93
Exhibit 15: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2098	98
Exhibit 16: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2104	104
Exhibit 17: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2112	107
Exhibit 18: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2127	111

Exhibit 19: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2129 115
Exhibit 20: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2130 120
Exhibit 21: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2134 124
Exhibit 22: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2135 128
Exhibit 23: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2136 132
Exhibit 24: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2138 136
Exhibit 25: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2139 139
Exhibit 26: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2141 143
Exhibit 27: Boundary Map Reclamation District No. 2142 146

ABBREVIATIONS

ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
AF	acre-foot
AFY	acre-feet/year
AWMC	Agricultural Water Management Council
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CIMIS	California Irrigation Management Information System
CKH	Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000
CUWCC	CA Urban Water Conservation Council
DSMWS	Dixon-Solano Municipal Water Service
DWR	CA Department of Water Resources
FCAC	SCWA's Flood Control Advisory Committee
IRWMP	Integrated Regional Water Management Plan
JEPA	Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement
JPA	Joint Powers Authority
LAFCO	Local Agency Formation Commission
MPWD	Main Prairie Water District
MSR	Municipal Service Review
NAWCA	North American Wetlands Conservation Act
NBA	North Bay Aqueduct
NDWA	North Delta Water Agency
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
RD	Reclamation District
RNVWD	Rural North Vacaville Water District

SCWA	Solano County Water Agency
SID	Solano Irrigation District
SOI	Sphere of Influence
SP	Solano Project
SSWA	Suisun-Solano Water Authority
SWA	Solano Water Authority
SWP	State Water Project
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TPL	The Trust for Public Land
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USBR	United States Bureau of Reclamation
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VPW	Vallejo Permit Water

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Role and Responsibility of LAFCO

The fundamental role of a Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) is to implement to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg (CKH) Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Government Code Section 56000, et seq.), providing for the logical, efficient, and most appropriate formation of local municipalities, service areas, and special districts. The CKH requires all LAFCOs, including the Solano LAFCO, to conduct a municipal service review (MSR) prior to updating the spheres of influence (SOI) of the various cities and special districts in the County (Government Code Section 56430). The focus of this MSR is to provide LAFCO with all necessary and relevant information related to services provided by the Solano County Water Agency (SCWA), Solano Irrigation District (SID), Maine Prairie Water District (MPWD), Rural North Vacaville Water District (RNVWD), the Collinsville Levee District, and the twenty one Reclamation Districts under LAFCO purview.

1.2 - Purpose of the Municipal Service Review

The purpose of the MSR is to collect data in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of service provision by SCWA, SID, MPWD, RNVWD, Collinsville Levee District, and the 21 Reclamation Districts within Solano County (Exhibit 1). This MSR will provide Solano LAFCO with an informational document and make determinations in each of the six areas prescribed by CKH. This service review evaluates the ability of each district to provide services within the County. A boundary map for each district is also contained within this document.

This MSR evaluates the structure and operation of the Districts and discusses possible areas for improvement, coordination, the need to update to the SOI, or possible changes in organization. Key sources for this study were agency-specific information gathered through surveys, strategic plans, general plans, websites, financial reports, agency audits, research, personal communication, and the Municipal Service Review Guidelines published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR).

The report contains one section for each service provider and addresses the following six elements in each section as prescribed by CKH.

- (1) Growth and Population Projections for the Affected Area.
- (2) Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Services Including Infrastructure Needs or Deficiencies.
- (3) Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Services.
- (4) Status of and Opportunities for Shared Facilities.
- (5) Accountability for Community Service Needs, Including Government Structure and Operational Efficiencies.
- (6) Matters Related to Effective or Efficient Service Delivery Required by Commission Policy.

1.2.1 - Growth and Population Projections

This section reviews projected growth within the existing service boundaries of the Districts and analyzes the District's plans to accommodate future growth.

1.2.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Adequacy of Public Services Including Infrastructure Needs or Deficiencies

This section evaluates the Districts current and projected facilities, and the adequacy of public services including infrastructure needs and deficiencies.

1.2.3 - Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Services

The section reviews the service provider's fiscal data and rate structure to determine viability and ability to meet service demands.

1.2.4 - Status of and Opportunities for Shared Facilities

This section evaluates shared facilities amongst service providers as well as opportunities for shared facilities to reduce costs.

1.2.5 - Accountability for Community Service Needs, Including Government Structure and Operational Efficiencies

This section examines the service provider's current government structure, and considers the overall managerial practices. This section also examines how well the districts makes their processes transparent to the public and invites and encourages participation.

1.2.6 - Matters Related to Effective or Efficient Service Delivery Required by Commission Policy

This section includes a discussion of any local policies that may affect the ability of the District to provide efficient services.

1.3 - California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq., also known as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), requires public agencies to evaluate the potential environmental effects of their actions. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) states "To ensure compliance with CEQA, and avoid unnecessary legal challenges, OPR recommends that LAFCOs consider municipal service review as projects subject to CEQA." Solano LAFCO has determined that this municipal service review (MSR) is exempt under Class 6 categorical exemption. "Class 6 consists of basic data collection, research, experimental management, and resource evaluation activities which do not result in a serious or major disturbance to an environmental resource. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15262)

1.4 - Long-Term Environmental Issues

There are additional long-term environmental issues that will need to be addressed in the future but not in this MSR cycle. Of interest to water agencies and reclamation districts are the ongoing discussions and the strategic plan for the Delta by the Governor's Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force (Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force 2008). The goal of the plan is to restore the Delta ecosystem and create a more reliable water supply for California. Included in the Delta water system are the North Bay Aqueduct and the Putah South Canal, both major sources of water for Solano County. Our discussion of issues in this MSR identifies some of the issues, such as the Delta Smelt, that are a key part of the plan for restoring the ecosystem.

The report also discusses a dual conveyance system through and around the Delta to be studied and completed by 2030. The conveyance system around the Delta refers to the peripheral canal. A Draft Environmental Impact Report may be out in the next year to year and one half. However, the debate is expected to continue for another decade.

Neither of these issues will be resolved in the next 5 years, the timeframe of this MSR. However, these are ongoing discussions that may impact service delivery in the future.

SECTION 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 - Introduction

The Municipal Service Review (MSR) process is a comprehensive assessment of the ability of government agencies to provide services effectively to residents and users. The form and content of the MSR is governed by requirements of the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reformation Act of 2000 (CKH). This MSR considers the operations of the Solano County Water Agency, Solano Irrigation District, the Main Prairie Water District, the Rural North Vacaville Water District, the Collinsville Levee District and the 21 Reclamation Districts within Solano County as shown in Exhibit 1.

The MSR contains analysis and conclusions, referred to in this document as determinations, regarding six topic areas set forth in CKH. These areas of analysis contain the essential operational and management aspects of each district, and together constitute a review of the ability of each provider to meet the service demands of the residents within their boundaries. Within the body of the MSR, each of the six areas includes; a summary of determinations, areas of concern, specific recommendations for further action, and outstanding issues. The six topic areas are:

- Growth and population projections
- Present and planned capacity of public facilities
- Financial ability of agencies to provide services
- Status of and opportunities for shared facilities
- Governmental structure, accountability for community service needs, and operational efficiencies
- Matters related to effective or efficient service delivery required by Commission policy

2.2 - Water Districts

This Municipal Service Review includes the Solano County Water Agency, the Solano Irrigation District, the Maine Prairie Water District, and the Rural North Vacaville Water District. The main sources of water for these districts are the Solano Project, the North Bay Aqueduct, and groundwater. In addition, there are some local reservoirs maintained by the cities of Vallejo and Benicia. The Solano Project includes Lake Berryessa, Lake Solano, and the Putah South Canal. The North Bay Aqueduct is part of the State Water Project.

Population projections for the County estimate an increase of 25 percent between 2000 and 2015. Most of the growth is slated to occur in the larger cities, Benicia, Fairfield, Suisun City, Vacaville,

and Vallejo. The demand for the five cities and projected demand based on population increase is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 summarizes the water entitlements of each agency.

Table 1: Total Demand for the Five Cities and Projections 2000 to 2015 (AF/yr)

	2000 ¹	2005 ²	2010 ²	2015 ²
Benicia	16,203	11,896	12,421	12,943
Fairfield	22,257	28,048	34,466	39,249
Suisun City	4,379	5,041	5,709	6,104
Vacaville	17,489	17,975	20,132	22,288
Vallejo	23,687	28,719	29,921	31,857
Total	84,015	91,678	102,648	112,440
¹ Source: Solano County 2004 ² Source: SCWA 2008				

The available water supply needed to meet the demand will depend on precipitation. There are normal or wet years, dry years, a series of 3 dry years, and a worst-case drought lasting up to 6 years. During the dry years, the reliability for some sources decreases. Table 2 shows reliability factors for the four scenarios. As seen in the table, the supply for normal years is 100 percent of the entitlement for Solano Project Water and Fairfield and Vacaville Settlement water. The State Water Project water is approximately 20 percent less than the entitlement.

Table 2: Reliability Factors for Common Supplies (percent)

Hydrologic Scenario	Solano Project	State Water Project	Settlement Water for Fairfield and Vacaville	Settlement Water for Benicia
Normal/Wet	100	81	100	72
Single Year Dry	99	51	100	73
3 Year Drought	92	29	100	71
Longest Drought	95	30	100	70
Source: SCWA 2008				

Table 3 shows the entitlements for the various member agencies of the Solano County Water Agency. Using the factors in Table 2, the entitlements in Table 3, and the projected demand in Table 1, we can estimate the excess of supply over demand for normal years, a 3-year drought, and the worst-case drought. These estimates are shown in Table 4. The data show there is adequate supply for the expected growth in the five cities through 2015.

Table 3: Member Agency Water Entitlements (acre-feet)

Agency	Solano Project	NBA	Water Rights Settlement	Lake Herman	VPW	Ground	Surface	Other	Total
Benicia	—	17,200	10,500	500	5500	—	—	5,500	39,200
Dixon	—	1,500	—	—	—	3,500+	—	—	5,000+
Fairfield	9,200	14,678	11,800	—	2,600+	—	—	19,018 ¹	57,296
Rio Vista	—	1,500	—	—	—	—	—	1,700+	3,200+
Suisun City	1,600	1,300	—	—	—	—	—	3,200+	6,100+
Vacaville	5,750	8,978	9,320	—	—	8,000	—	3,880 ²	35,928
Vallejo	14,600	5,600	—	—	17,287	—	—	400	37,887
SID	141,000	—	—	—	—	10,000	—	10,000 ³	161,000
MPWD	5,000	—	—	—	—	—	variable	20,000	25,000+
CSP Solano	1,200	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,200
UC Davis	4,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,000
RD 2068	—	—	—	—	—	—	75,000	—	75,000
Totals	182,350	50,756	31,620	500	25,387	21,500	75,000+	63,698	450,811

Notes:

¹ Includes SID agreements 16,018 AF and recycled 3,000 AF

² Includes SID agreements 3,000 AF and recycled 3,000 AF

³ MPWD exchange

VPW = Vallejo Permit Water

NBA = North Bay Aqueduct

SID = Solano Irrigation District

MPWD = Maine Prairie Water District

CSP = California State Prison

Source: Solano County, 2004.

Table 4: Excess Supply for the Five Cities (AF)

Hydrologic Scenario	2005	2010	2015
Normal	68,689	72,037	66,020
3 Year Drought	29,406	30,466	24,247
Longest Drought	26,844	26,665	20,522

Source: SCWA, 2008.

The Rural North Vacaville District has two wells, which are designed to provide water to 533 customers and fire hydrants for fire suppression to all residences within their boundary. The District currently supplies potable water to 190 customers with capacity for an additional 343.

2.3 - Reclamation Districts

This Municipal Service Review also reviews services provided by 21 reclamation districts and the Collinsville Levee Maintenance District. Table 5 summarizes some of the key characteristics of each district.

Table 5 shows some of the districts have higher expenditures than revenues. Generally, reclamation districts, when faced with a shortfall, get members to increase contributions or sell warrants to cover shortfalls. The table also shows that many districts have fewer than 12 registered voters and are considered uninhabited as defined by Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg. Many districts also do not have employees but rely on landowners and contractors for maintenance and repair.

2.4 - Key Findings

Each section contains a summary of determinations for each agency with respect to the six areas identified in Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg. Some of the key findings and issues include:

Solano County Water Agency

Solano Project Issues

Anadromous Fish

Anadromous fish include salmon and steelhead. The Putah Creek Accord provides flows that benefit these species. The Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee wants to improve habitat to attract more salmon and steelhead. The Accord is a legal settlement that provides some assurances that additional flows for fish will not be requested by the parties to the Accord.

Rehabilitation and Betterment.

The Solano Project is nearly 50 years old. The SCWA has been spending an increasing amount of resources on maintenance and rehabilitation. The SCWA staff and the Solano Irrigation District staff have been improving water measurement and water management procedures for the Solano Project.

Table 5: Reclamation District (RD) and Collinsville Levee Maintenance District Characteristics

District	Acreage	Population	Most Recent Revenues	Most Recent Expenses	Employees	Board of Trustees	Meetings per Year
RD 501	11,891	450	\$331,609	\$317,646	3	3	3 rd Saturday in September
RD 536	6,000	5	\$57,465	\$63,926	0	3	2 or as needed
RD 1607	10,000	22	\$680,906	\$678,478	2	5	3-4 or as needed
RD 2034	2,500	0	unknown	unknown	0	informal	—
RD 2060	6,940	40	\$39,176	\$40,435	0	3	1 st Tuesday June and as needed
RD 2068	13,200	100	\$1,171,740	\$1,163,720	7	5	2 nd Thurs. monthly
RD 2084	2,320	1	\$200,000	\$36,648	0	3	As needed
RD 2093	5,029	0	\$17	\$6,589	0	3	As needed
RD 2098	6,100	25	\$52,881	\$53,020	0	3	As needed
RD 2104	450	12	unknown	unknown	0		Inactive
RD 2112	1,158	0	\$13,700	\$9,942	0	7	Annually in June
RD 2127	3,600	<12	\$25,219	\$23,147	0	5	As needed
RD 2129	1,100	2	\$5,527	\$10,597	0	7	—
RD 2130	816	0	\$215,549	\$217,130	0	5	4-5 times a year
RD 2134	762	0	\$83,967	\$52,075	0	3	Annually or as needed
RD 2135	325	0	unknown	unknown	0	5	As needed
RD 2136	2,798	0	\$89,583	\$89,025	0	7	Annually or as needed
RD 2138	694	0	unknown	unknown	0		Single parcel
RD 2139	1,699	0	unknown	\$13,454	0	3	Annually
RD 2141	901	0	unknown	unknown	0	3	Just formed
RD 2142	1,658	<12	unknown	unknown	0	5	Just formed
Collinsville	206	30	\$8,383	\$30,908	0	3	As needed

North Bay Aqueduct Issues

Reliability

The biggest issue with SWP supplies is their dry year reliability. State Water Projects specify that all SWP water recipients or contractors have their supplies reduced proportionally when there is a shortage. The SWP is making an effort to increase water supply, but the high costs of water projects and environmental constraints limit what can be done and recent court decisions have reduced supply. Most SWP contractors are developing their own projects to augment SWP supplies, such as local surface water storage facilities and groundwater banking. During droughts, contractors will organize purchase pools to obtain water from outside the SWP to distribute to participants.

Water Quality

The NBA is noted for poor water quality. Livestock grazing has been responsible for soil erosion that increased turbidity during the winter runoff season. SCWA has installed fencing and alternate water supplies to prohibit livestock access to much of the waterways. High organic carbon is another problem that may require alternative water treatment methods. The SCWA, through grant funding, is evaluating water treatment technologies to reduce organic carbon in the water. SCWA is developing a project with DWR to provide an alternate intake for the NBA.

Endangered Species

The intake at Barker Slough encroaches on the spawning area of delta smelt, an endangered species. In order to protect larval delta smelt, the US Fish and Wildlife Service previously imposed pumping restrictions when larval delta smelt are present. The pumping restriction or other protective measures could be imposed at any time and could have a major impact on NBA supplies. SCWA has initiated a project with DWR to provide an alternate intake location.

Maine Prairie Water District

The District includes several islands that do not receive irrigation water, yet are in agriculture. Some areas are hilly which would make water delivery difficult without pumping. The District should investigate annexation of the unserved territory.

Collinsville Levee Maintenance District

The General Plan includes a proposal for an industrial park. If the plan is approved the District should consider an update to its Sphere of Influence to include the industrial park as a first step toward annexation.

Because of the size of the population served, the District sometimes has difficulty filling positions on the Board of Directors. If a resident cannot be found, the Board of Supervisors may choose someone outside the District who has special expertise in flood control.

Reclamation District No. 536

Since the District shares a border with the City of Rio Vista, the District may want to explore any opportunities for partnerships or assistance from the City.

Reclamation District No. 2034

The District has two landowners and consists of a duck and hunt club. Because of that arrangement, there is no governing board. There is also no formal financial structure, no records of revenues or expenditures, and the District does not have a budget. The two landowners share costs which consist of the PG&E bill to operate the pump. The District operates the one pump, which is sufficient to maintain the habitat.

Reclamation District No. 2084

Since the District shares a border with the City of Rio Vista, the District may want to explore any opportunities for partnerships or assistance from Rio Vista.

Reclamation District No. 2093

The District provides very limited services. There is no longer any agricultural activity, the pumps are inoperable, the levee breach is not slated for repair, and the District prefers to leave the island in its current state. LAFCO may want to consider dissolving the District; however, the District wants to maintain the structure to allow the District to serve as the lead agency for habitat mitigation, should it be required.

Reclamation District No. 2098

The District shares a portion of the levee and has a contract for administrative services with Reclamation District No. 2068. As a result of the close relationship of between the two districts, LAFCO should consider initiating a study to determine if a consolidation of RD 2098 and RD 2068 would be beneficial to the landowners of both districts.

Reclamation District No. 2104

The District includes three landowners all of whom have been trustees. There has been disagreement among them, and according to the State Controller's report, the District has been inactive since 2003. Solano LAFCO should work with the landowners to determine if they would like to re-activate the District or dissolve the District and transfer any responsibilities for service delivery to a neighboring successor district.

Reclamation District No. 2135

The District consists of a single landowner, the Sunrise Island Duck Club. The District does not have a formal budget process, but needs are determined through consultation with the Suisun Resource Conservation District. The single landowner funds the maintenance operations of the District.

SECTION 3: MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW WATER AGENCIES

3.1 - Solano County Water Agency


Solano County Water Agency (SCWA) is a Special District originally formed in 1951 as the Solano County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (SCFCWCD) by an act of the California Legislature. In 1989, that legislative act was amended, renaming the District the Solano County Water Agency (SCWA).

In total, the District serves approximately 538,782 acres and a population of approximately 421,657 people (SCWA's UWMP 2005). The District has authority to supply untreated water and to provide flood control.

SCWA provides wholesale untreated water to cities (Vallejo, Benicia, Suisun City, Fairfield, and Vacaville), districts (Solano Irrigation District and Maine Prairie Water District), and state agencies (Solano California State Prison and University of California [UC] Davis) in Solano County. The SCWA boundaries also include the portions of UC Davis in Yolo County. The cities, districts, and State agencies are provided fixed amounts of water from the Solano Project, which serves agriculture and cities, and the North Bay Aqueduct, which serves only cities. In addition to providing water, the SCWA protects rights to existing sources of water and participates in efforts to secure new sources of water for future growth in the County.

The SCWA provides flood control services in the form of operation and maintenance of the Ulatis Flood Control Project and the Green Valley Flood Control Project. In addition, SCWA performs stream restoration activities in Putah Creek, and is developing a habitat conservation plan.

SCWA is an active member of several state and regional organizations related to their provision of services. These are summarized in Table 6.



Source: Solano County, Solano County LAFCO 2008, ESRI Resource Center.




Table 6: State and Regional Water Organizations

Organization	Purpose
State Water Contractors	Agencies that contract water from State Water Project
State Water Project Contractors Authority	JPA of State Water Contractors to work with DWR.
Northern CA Salinity Coalition	Bay Area water agencies to cooperate, share information, and seek funding for desalinization projects.
Bay Area Integrated Water Resources Plan	Developers of a Bay Area Integrated Regional Water Management Plan.
Coastal and Northern California Water Bond Coalition	To seek funding from General Obligation Bonds for water projects in constituent counties.
Lake Berryessa Watershed Partnership	Organizations and public agencies in the watershed to monitor and improve water quality in the Lake.
Suisun Creek Restoration Team	Landowners, organizations, and public agencies interested in the resources of Suisun Creek.
CA Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC)	Includes representatives from water agencies and public interest groups whose goal is to increase and implement urban water conservation measures.
Agricultural Water Management Council	The agricultural counterpart of the CUWCC.
Floodplain Management Association	A regional organization involved in multiple aspects of floodplain management including loss reduction, resource protection, and multiple objective management strategies.
Association of CA Water Agencies	Works with water users to encourage orderly development of waters in CA, to make available a dependable water supply, to provide leadership in solving water supply problems, to advocate for policies that serve in the best interest of the association.
CA Central Valley Flood Control Association	Promotes the common interests of its membership in maintaining effective flood control systems in CA Central Valley for protection of life, property and the environment.

3.1.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The Solano County Background Report on Population and Housing forecasts that Solano County’s population will grow to 504,500 people by 2015, a 25-percent increase over the 2000 population. In order to accommodate this expected growth and the demand for water supply, SCWA uses two main water sources along with other supplemental sources to supply to member agencies. Much of this growth will occur in the largest five cities: Benicia, Fairfield, Suisun City, Vacaville, and Vallejo.

The recent SCWA Supply and Demand Study (SCWA 2008) estimates the supply and demand for the projected population growth through 2050 in these five cities.

Table 7 shows the actual and projected demand from 2000 to 2015.

Table 7: Total Demand and Projections 2000 to 2015 for the Five Cities (AF/yr)

City	2000 ¹	2005 ²	2010 ²	2015 ²
Benicia	16,203	11,896	12,421	12,943
Fairfield	22,257	28,048	34,466	39,249
Suisun City	4,379	5,041	5,709	6,104
Vacaville	17,489	17,975	20,132	22,288
Vallejo	23,687	28,719	29,921	31,857
Total	84,015	91,678	102,648	112,440

¹Source: Solano County, 2004.
²Source: Solano County Water Agency, 2008.

Table 7 shows demand is expected to increase approximately 34 percent between 2000 and 2015. Whether the District can accommodate the increase in demand will depend on the reliability and available supply.

3.1.1.1 Determination: The population in Solano County is anticipated to increase by 25 percent between 2000 and 2015 with most of the increase in the five cities of Benicia, Fairfield, Suisun City, Vacaville, and Vallejo. Projected water demand for those five cities is expected to increase by 34 percent during that same period.

3.1.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

Water Sources

The District provides wholesale water from several sources including the Solano Project, the North Bay Aqueduct, groundwater, and other sources.

Solano Project

The Solano Project provides a contracted 207,350 AFY and is considered a dependable water supply during drought situations. The Solano Project was developed to meet the demands of agriculture,

military facilities, and municipalities in Solano County. Prior to the construction of the Solano Project in 1957, as agriculture developed in the County, the use of groundwater increased substantially, creating an overdraft condition. Surface water from the Solano Project was used to offset the overdraft condition and the net result was a recovery of groundwater levels. At the time of its conception, Napa and Yolo Counties were invited to participate, but declined, so the project is sized only for the needs of Solano County. Congress authorized the Solano Project and the first water was delivered in 1959. The total construction cost for the project was \$38 million.

The facilities of the Solano Project include Monticello Dam (Lake Berryessa), the Putah Diversion Dam (Lake Solano), and the Putah South Canal. Table 8 provides details on these facilities.

Table 8: Facilities and Capacity of the Solano Project

Facility	Storage/Capacity	Height/Length	Dam Crest
Lake Berryessa	1,602,000 acre-ft	304 ft	1,023 ft
Lake Solano	750 acre-ft	29 ft	910 ft
Putah South Canal	956 cubic ft/sec	33 miles long	

Source: Solano County Water Agency, January 2004.

The United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) originally performed maintenance and operation of the Solano Project; however, the SCWA has contracted with the Solano Irrigation District to operate the facilities on behalf of SCWA and the USBR.

Water Rights

The process for obtaining water rights starts with an application. Once approved a permit is granted. The next step is to apply for a license. Up until recently, a license meant that the water rights could not be taken away. Recent court cases have ruled that the licenses can be modified. The water rights permits for the Solano Project are held by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). The USBR has applied to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for a water rights license. The SWRCB has been processing the application for several years.

There were two significant water rights cases relating to the Solano Project. The Condition 12 Settlement Agreement, reached in 1995, placed a cap on future water development in the watershed of Lake Berryessa. The agreement also allocates a limited amount of future water development rights to projects in Napa and Lake Counties.

In 2000, a second agreement, the Putah Creek Accord, provides increased flows to Putah Creek. The Putah Creek Accord also includes an agreement with regard to reduced flows when Lake Berryessa is low in storage and a process for addressing illegal surface water diverters in Putah Creek. The settlement requires the previous flow of 21,000 AFY as a baseline with additional flows at specified times. In addition, a Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee, consisting of Yolo and Solano

representatives was formed to address Putah Creek issues that include habitat enhancements, and hiring a Streamkeeper.

The SWRCB is in the process of modifying the water rights for the Solano Project to consolidate terms of the water rights permits, extend some of the terms of the permits, and add Putah Creek to the places for the Solano Project Water. This last action will conform to the Putah Creek Accord.

Water Supply Contracts

In 1999, the original contract with the USBR was renewed for 25 years. The pricing has remained unchanged since 1955, \$15 per acre-foot urban and \$2.65 per acre-foot for agricultural use. Table 9 below lists the allocation or entitlement for each of Solano Project's contracting agencies.

Table 9: Solano Project Water Contracts

Agency	Annual Entitlement (acre-feet)
Fairfield	9,200
Suisun City	1,600
Vacaville	5,750
Vallejo	14,600
Solano Irrigation District	141,000
Maine Prairie Water District	15,000
UC Davis	4,000
CA State Prison – Solano	1,200
Est. operating loss	15,000
Total Project	207,350

Water quality from the Solano Project is excellent for both municipal/industrial use and agriculture. The district, as required by state law, prepares a sanitary survey that analyzes all potential contamination sources and recommends measures to protect water quality. City water treatment plants regularly test Solano Project water and find that it is of high quality. (Solano County 2004)

Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)

A Habitat Conservation Plan is required as part of the contract for the Solano Project to deal with potential impacts to endangered species from the water contract. The HCP will allow State and Federal agencies to issue Incidental Take Permits to local agencies. The HCP provides for mitigation for negative impacts on endangered species as a result of the project and covered activities in the HCP. The HCP plans to cover 36 species.

Issues

Anadromous Fish

Anadromous fish include salmon and steelhead. The Putah Creek Accord provides flows that benefit these species. The Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee wants to improve habitat to attract more salmon and steelhead. The Accord is a legal settlement that provides some assurances that additional flows for fish will not be requested by the parties to the Accord.

Rehabilitation and Betterment

The Solano Project is nearly 50 years old. The SCWA has been spending an increasing amount of resources on maintenance and rehabilitation. The SCWA staff and the Solano Irrigation District staff have been improving water measurement and water management procedures for the Solano Project.

3.1.2.1 Determination: The SCWA has negotiated with parties of interest and settled fishery issues with those parties.

3.1.2.2 Determination: The SCWA will have to continue to spend resources to maintain an aging Solano Project.

North Bay Aqueduct

The North Bay Aqueduct (NBA) is part of the State Water Project (SWP). The SWP exports water from Northern California to the San Francisco Bay Area, the San Joaquin Valley, and Southern California. SCWA is one of 29 public agencies that receive water from the SWP.

The NBA started making water deliveries to Napa County in 1969 and Solano County in 1988. The NBA is an underground pipeline that runs from Barker Slough in the Delta to Cordelia Forebay, just outside of Fairfield. The NBA was designed to deliver 175 cubic feet per second (cfs), but tests have shown it only delivers 142 cfs. SCWA and Napa County are investigating ways to increase the flow to 200 - 250 cfs.

Table 10 identifies the cities that receive water from the NBA and their allocations. In addition to the cities shown in Table 10, the NBA also serves Travis Air Force Base. The cities of Vallejo, Fairfield, and Vacaville have purchased the rights to additional flow capacity in the NBA. In addition, the Dixon and Rio Vista ultimate allocation amounts are not included in the total. If Dixon and/or Rio Vista decided to use their NBA supply the allocations to Benicia, Fairfield and Vallejo would be reduced.

Table 10: North Bay Aqueduct Supply (AF)

City	2004 Allocation	Ultimate Allocation
Benicia	17,200	17,200
Dixon	0	1,500*
Fairfield	14,678	14,678
Rio Vista	0	1,500*
Suisun City	750	1,300
Vacaville	8,978	8,978
Vallejo	5,600	5,600
Total	47,206	47,756
Notes: *Not included in the total Source: Solano County, 2004.		

In addition to the SWP, Vallejo Permit Water (VPW) and Settlement Water are two other water sources that use the NBA. VPW comes from a water rights license held by the City of Vallejo. VPW rights predated the NBA and Vallejo paid for the right to use the NBA to deliver VPW. The VPW also has a higher water rights priority date so it is more reliable than SWP supplies. Particularly in dry years, VPW is an important part of the water supply in Solano County. Vallejo exchanges and sells VPW to other cities to augment their supplies.

Settlement Water is a major new source of water for Benicia, Fairfield, and Vacaville. In 1990, the three cities filed an application for water rights permits for an appropriation of water under the State's Watershed of Origin statutes. Settlement Water is available provided the SWP is not releasing stored water in excess of natural flow. The SWP releases stored water in the summers of all but the very wettest years. Settlement Water is designed to meet the long-term needs of the three cities based on projected water needs identified in the three cities' General Plans.

Issues

Reliability

The biggest issue with SWP supplies is their dry year reliability. State Water Projects specify that all SWP water recipients or contractors have their supplies reduced proportionally when there is a shortage. The SWP is making an effort to increase water supply but can only make small increases, due to the high costs of water projects and environmental constraints. Most SWP contractors are developing their own projects to augment SWP supplies, such as local surface water storage facilities and groundwater banking. Often contractors will organize purchase pools to obtain water from outside the SWP to distribute to participants.

Water Quality

NBA is noted for poor water quality. Livestock grazing has been responsible for soil erosion that increased turbidity during the winter runoff season. SCWA has installed fencing and alternate water supplies to prohibit livestock access to much of the waterways. High organic carbon is another problem that may require alternative water treatment methods. The SCWA, through grant funding, is evaluating water treatment technologies to reduce organic carbon in the water.

Endangered Species

The intake at Barker Slough encroaches on the spawning area of delta smelt, an endangered species. In order to protect larval delta smelt, the US Fish and Wildlife Service imposes pumping restrictions when larval delta smelt are present. While not currently affected, as NBA water use increases, the pumping restriction could have a major impact on NBA supplies. The District has initiated a project with DWR to move the intake location.

3.1.2.3 Determination: Reliability of water supplies for the North Bay Aqueduct, particularly in dry years, will continue to be an issue.

3.1.2.4 Determination: Water quality of the NBA is poor, which is due to organic carbon in the water supply. The SCWA needs to evaluate and review water treatment technologies to reduce organic carbon and/or pursue and alternate intake for the NBA.

Groundwater

The SCWA is responsible for preparing biannual reports on groundwater levels for the Putah Fan-Tehama Formation groundwater basin. This large groundwater basin starts from the foothills above Vacaville and extends to the Sacramento River between Putah Creek and Fairfield. There are two levels: a shallow aquifer provides agricultural water and local domestic supplies, and the Tehama Formation, which varies in depth but is over 1,000 feet deep in the eastern part of the basin. Data for the report comes from DWR and local agencies. Groundwater levels drop in dry years and rebound in wet years. There is no trend to over drafting with current levels of use.

Other Surface Water Sources

Vallejo and Benicia have local reservoirs that provide a portion of their water supply. Vallejo uses the Vallejo Lakes system, which includes Lake Frey, Lake Madigan, and Lake Curry. The largest lake is Lake Curry, which has a storage capacity of 10,700 acre-feet and a yield of 3,750 acre-feet/year. The Vallejo Lakes also provides water to the unincorporated communities of Suisun Valley and Green Valley.

Lake Herman in the hills between Benicia and Vallejo serves Benicia. The lake has a storage capacity of 1,800 acre-feet. The average yield is 500 to 1,000 acre-feet annually with no yield in dry years. The lake also provides storage for excess water delivered through the NBA.

In addition, in the eastern Delta portion of Solano County, many growers divert water directly. There are no records for this type of water use.

Table 11: Member Agency Water Sources Entitlements (acre-feet)

Agency	Solano Project	NBA	Water Rights Settlement	Lake Herman	VPW	Ground	Surface	Other	Total
Benicia	—	17,200	10,500	500	5500	—	—	5,500	39,200
Dixon	—	1,500	—	—	—	3,500+	—	—	5,000+
Fairfield	9,200	14,678	11,800	—	2,600+	—	—	19,018 ¹	57,296
Rio Vista	—	1,500	—	—	—	—	—	1,700+	3,200+
Suisun City	1,600	1,300	—	—	—	—	—	3,200+	6,100+
Vacaville	5,750	8,978	9,320	—	—	8,000	—	3,880 ²	35,928
Vallejo	14,600	5,600	—	—	17,287	—	—	400	37,887
SID	141,000	—	—	—	—	10,000	—	10,000 ³	161,000
MPWD	5,000	—	—	—	—	—	variable	20,000	25,000+
CSP Solano	1,200	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,200
UC Davis	4,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,000
RD 2068	—	—	—	—	—	—	75,000	—	75,000
Totals	182,350	50,756	31,620	500	25,387	21,500	75,000+	63,698	450,811

Notes:

¹ Includes SID agreements 16,018 AF and recycled 3,000 AF

² Includes SID agreements 3,000 AF and recycled 3,000 AF

³ MPWD exchange

VPW = Vallejo Permit Water

NBA = North Bay Aqueduct

SID = Solano Irrigation District

MPWD = Maine Prairie Water District

CSP = California State Prison

Source: Solano County, 2004.

The available water to meet projected demands depends not only on entitlements but also on reliability factors. The factors vary depending on whether there is normal rainfall or drought and the severity of the drought. Reliability for sources for the five cities is shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Reliability Factors for Common Supplies (Percent)

Hydrologic Scenario	Solano Project	State Water Project (NBA)	Settlement Water for Fairfield and Vacaville	Settlement Water for Benicia
Normal/Wet	100	81	100	72
Single Year Dry	99	51	100	73
3 Year Drought	92	29	100	71
Longest Drought	95	30	100	70
Source: SCWA, 2008.				

In a normal year, the difference between supply and demand is the difference between demand shown in Table 7 and the total from entitlements and contracts. For a three-year drought and longest drought, the reliability factors are applied to the various sources. The net supply is shown in Table 13. The data shows that while the net is decreasing, particularly during drought conditions, there is still an ample capacity.

Table 13: Net Supply for the Five Cities (AF)

Hydrologic Scenario	2005	2010	2015
Normal	68,689	72,037	66,020
3 Year Drought	29,406	30,466	24,247
Longest Drought	26,844	26,665	20,522
Source: SCWA, 2008.			

3.1.2.5 Determination: With the projected increase in population, the SCWA appears to have ample supplies through 2015.

Flood Control

One of the other services provided by SCWA is flood control. The flood control projects that SCWA is responsible for are the Ulatis Flood Control Project (Ulatis Project) and the Green Valley Flood Control Project. SCWA is also involved in flood control planning.

Ulatis Flood Control Project

The Ulatis Project was designed to protect agricultural land downstream of Vacaville for a 10-year recurrence level. By contrast, urban flood control is designed for a 100-year event.

The project was constructed from 1962 to 1972 by the Federal Soil Conservation Service (now the Natural Resource Conservation Service). After completion, the SCWA is responsible for maintenance and capital improvements. SCWA contracts with the Solano County Resource Management Department for maintenance of the Ulatis Project. SCWA staff provides engineering, administration, and right-of-way management. The County Resource Management Department is responsible for field operations.

In addition, SCWA monitors the channels to make sure they retain capacity to carry flows that were part of the project design. As development in the watershed continues, SCWA works closely with the City of Vacaville to ensure that development projects adequately mitigate their stormwater runoff impacts.

Green Valley Flood Control Project

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) completed the Green Valley Flood Control Project, located in the Cordelia area, in 1962. The project was designed for a 40-year storm event. Upon completion, the project was turned over to SCWA for maintenance and operation. Like the Ulatis Project, the SCWA contracts with Solano County Resource Management Department for maintenance and field operations, while SCWA provides engineering, administration, and right-of-way management. As development continues, SCWA works closely with the City of Fairfield to ensure that new development mitigates impacts of stormwater runoff.

Flood Control Planning

In 1998, the SCWA adopted a Flood Control Master Plan. Implementation of the plan included installation of new stream gauges to provide better stream flow information and a series of watershed studies on problem areas in the County. Implementation also included an update of the Hydrology Manual, the Ulatis Flood Control Project computer model, and a small flood control grant program.

The SCWA budget has traditionally allocated \$50,000-\$100,000 for the grant program aimed at solving small flood control/drainage problems. Funded projects must benefit more than one landowner, property owners must agree to maintain projects after completion, and projects must not have any adverse impacts downstream.

Strategic Plan

In 2004, the SCWA assembled a stakeholder group to develop a strategic plan. The group included elected officials and a cross-section of technical and policy representatives from agricultural and urban agencies. The stakeholders identified a number of issues and then ranked them in order of importance and implementation. Tier 1 actions have the highest priority for implementation, Tier 2 has moderate priority, and Tier 3 has a lower priority. Some examples of Tier 1 projects include administration of the Solano Project and the NBA, transfer of water within the County, and increasing participation in other water projects, use of ground water, and conjunctive use projects. Tier 2

includes implementing the HCP and Tier 3 includes dealing with emergent contaminants from pharmaceutical and personal care products, to addressing the climate change effects on water supply, water quality, and flooding. The SCWA is in the process of implementing Tier 1 of the plan. The result of this effort was the Solano Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and Strategic Plan.

Water Conservation

Water conservation is part of water management in Solano County. The SCWA has established both an urban and an agricultural water conservation committee. The Urban Water Conservation Committee concentrates on countywide water conservation programs. Cities and districts receiving water from the Solano Project are required to meet federal water conservation standards. In fact, agencies in Solano County meet all the required conservation standards.

The Agricultural Water Conservation Committee works on projects that benefit irrigated agriculture. In the recent past, the Committee has purchased California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) weather- rainfall stations to provide growers with information on how much water their crops need based on weather conditions. The Committee also provides irrigation efficiency evaluations and information on crop water needs to growers so they can use their water supplies more efficiently. The SCWA is a member of the Agricultural Water Management Council with SID, MPWD, and RD 2068.

3.1.2.6 Determination: The District is actively involved in the Ulatris Project and the Green Valley Flood Control Project to provide flood control services.

3.1.2.7 Determination: The District also has a strategic plan to address future flood control and water supply issues including climate change.

3.1.2.8 Determination: Conservation is a major component of services provided and the District works with urban and agricultural users through committees to implement conservation measures.

3.1.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

The District's primary source of funds is property taxes; however, grants are also used to fund specific projects. Table 14 provides information on the District's financial status from 2003 to 2008.

Table 14: Solano County Water Agency Revenues and Expenditures

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-2007	2007-2008
Revenues ¹	\$15,748,371	\$16,018,329	\$18,623,484	\$21,335,439	\$23,841,000
Expenditures ¹	\$13,617,201	\$13,315,813	\$17,286,108	\$19,648,575	\$20,970,258
Fund Balance Beginning ²	—	\$17,040,105	\$19,742,621	\$20,450,783	\$24,614,178
Fund Balance Ending	—	\$19,742,621	\$20,577,057	\$24,614,178	\$27,484,920
¹ Source: California State Controller Local Government Reporting, 2008. ² Source: Solano County Water Agency.					

The cost of water through the NBA is approximately \$146 per acre-foot. The pricing for member cities is \$20.50 per acre-foot to equate the cost from NBA to the Solano Project. A special NBA property tax of \$.02 per \$100 assessed valuation is charged to a benefit zone that includes all the cities and most of the irrigated agricultural lands in the County. The special assessment makes up the difference between city pricing and cost.

Funding for the Ulati Project and the Green Valley Project comes from part of the countywide property tax. In FY 2003-04, the property tax revenue generated \$637,000 for the Ulati Project and \$39,000 for the Green Valley Project. Additional funding from the SCWA general fund supplements property tax revenues.

Property taxes represent the major funding source for the Agency and account for 79 percent of all revenues. Those revenues represent the Agency’s share of the 1-percent property tax collected by the County and a special assessment for a benefit zone that participates in the State Water Project. The remaining 21 percent come from grants, 7 percent from water sales, 8 percent from interest, 4 percent and 2 percent from miscellaneous sources. SCWA’s Capital Project Funding Plan receives any excess funds. The Capital Project Funding Plan has approximately \$14 million available in FY 2007-08

3.1.3.1 Determination: The SCWA has adequate funding to provide water and flood control services.

3.1.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The agency works with all of its member jurisdictions on several projects. As mentioned previously, member jurisdictions include the cities of Vallejo, Benicia, Suisun City, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Dixon, and Vacaville; the Solano Irrigation (SID) and Maine Prairie Water Districts (MPWD); the Solano California State Prison and the University of California, Davis.

While the District’s boundary encompasses all of Solano County, the District does not provide water to all parts of the County. Water districts that do not receive water from the SCWA, but are within

the District boundaries, include the Rural North Vacaville Water District, operated by the California Water Service Company, and Reclamation District 2098. The cities of Rio Vista and Dixon do not get water from SCWA.

According to the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan and Strategic Plan for Solano Agencies, SCWA and its member cities and districts work together to integrate water resources planning efforts, identify means to solve water issues, improve water supply reliability and quality, and address regional issues in order to maximize resources.

The District shares facilities with the State Water Project, which provides water through the North Bay Aqueduct, and the Bureau of Reclamation, which provides water through the Solano Project, including the Monticello Dam and Lake Berryessa.

3.1.4.1 Determination: The District shares the facilities of the State Water Project, which provides water through the North Bay Aqueduct, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

SCWA is also a member of the Northern California Salinity Coalition. Formed in 2003, the Coalition addresses regional salinity issues. The Coalition seeks funding for studies and projects that deal with desalinization of water. The mission statement identifies several areas of concern including seawater desalinization, brackish groundwater desalinization, salinity increases in groundwater basins, the impact on water supplies, and seawater intrusion. An area of concern to SCWA and a concern of the Coalition involves desalinization of recycled water to make it more useable for industrial processes. Coalition members are Alameda County Water District, Contra Costa Water District, East Bay Municipal Utility District, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Santa Clara Valley Water District, Sonoma County Water Agency, and the Zone 7 Water Agency. In recent years, the coalition has not been very active.

In addition, there are a number of water projects where districts and cities work with each other. They are summarized in Table 15 below.

Table 15: Cooperative Water Agency Agreements

Agreements	Water Agency	Receiving Agency	Summary of Agreement
SID/City Agreements	Solano Irrigation District	Fairfield	Fairfield limits expansion into Suisun Valley in exchange for more water from SID
		Vacaville	Vacaville limits expansion in exchange for up 10,050 AF/yr
		Suisun City	A JPA to run Suisun City's water system
		Dixon	JPA creating Dixon Solano Municipal Water Service to provide part of city's water
Solano Project Drought Measures	SP Cities (Fairfield, Vacaville, Vallejo, Suisun City)	SP Agricultural Districts (SID, Maine Prairie Water)	Share water supplies during drought years
Vallejo Agreements	Vallejo	Benicia, Napa County, Fairfield	Sale and exchange of excess water
Mojave Exchange Agreement	SCWA	Mojave Water Agency	Exchange excess wet year water for dry year water at a rate of 2 units wet for 1 unit dry
Highline Canal Study	SWA	Solano Irrigation District	NBA water proposed to be used in SID Highline Canal serving 7400 acres
RD 2068 Conjunctive Use	RD 2068	—	A study of its groundwater basin for potential conjunctive use to improve reliability of the water supplies

Source: Phase 1 Solano County Water Agency, 2004.

The SCWA also shares use of some of the channels of the Ulati Project with other agencies. The Solano Irrigation District and Maine Prairie Water District use the channels for agricultural irrigation. The two districts install eleven temporary dams to store water during the irrigation season and then remove them for the rainy season to allow the Ulati Project to serve in its flood control capacity. The SCWA has contributed to a study that formed a JPA to address drainage in the Dixon area and to some of the costs of the New South Channel that is managed and designed by the JPA.

The SCWA assists a JPA established in 1987 of Solano cities, districts and the County called the Solano Water Authority (SWA). The JPA is structured around joint projects of interest to member

agencies. The projects are subject to project agreements, which define funding and management of the project. The various member agencies fund SWA projects and its members share general administration. The Policy Committee or SWA's governing board, is made up of one representative of each member agency. While the SCWA has all elected officials on the board, member agency managers may represent the SWA members. The SCWA performs some technical work for the SWA, while the Solano Irrigation District staffs the Policy Committee. The SWA has separate legal counsel from the SCWA.

Some examples of SWA current project agreements include the New Water Supply and Coordinated Groundwater Analysis. The New Water Supply project agreement looks for new permanent water supplies for its participants including the following agencies: the Solano Irrigation District, the SCWA, and the cities of Fairfield, Vacaville, Rio Vista, Vallejo, and Benicia. The Coordinated Groundwater Analysis project agreement studies and monitors the Putah Fan/Tehama Formation Groundwater Basin.

3.1.4.2 Determination: The SCWA works cooperatively with a number of local and regional agencies.

3.1.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

SCWA is a Special District and in accordance with the 1988 change in the original legislative act, board members include the five county supervisors, the mayors of all seven cities within the County, and a member from each of the three agricultural irrigation districts (SID, MPWD, and RD 2068). Board members remain on the board as long as they hold office (in the case of county supervisors and city mayors) or as long as they are appointed by their agencies (in the case of the special district representatives). Board members are compensated \$100 per meeting, plus mileage to meetings at the rate determined by the IRS. Board meetings are scheduled on the second Thursday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in the Solano Irrigation District conference Room at 508 Elmira Road in Vacaville. A public comment period is included in each month's meeting. Meetings are noticed in accordance with the Brown Act.

The District has a website that it uses to communicate with residents. The website serves to notify residents of meetings, including posting of the agenda.

The District has had its own staff since 1989 and currently has 11 employees. Staff includes a General Manager, three management personnel, five technical staff, and two administrative personnel.

The SCWA, as a water wholesaler, is a member of the California Urban Water Council and has signed the Memorandum of Understanding to implement best management practices for urban agencies at the wholesaler level.

The legislation that created the SCWA also called for an advisory commission. The SCWA Advisory Commission consists of public works directors and water district managers of member agencies. The Commission provides a forum to discuss and coordinate water issues in Solano County. The Commission meets monthly and makes recommendations to the Board of Directors.

In addition, the Agency invites public participation on the Flood Control Advisory Committee (FCAC). The FCAC consists of seven public members, two members of the SCWA Advisory Commission, and three from resource conservation districts. The FCAC advises the SCWA Board of Directors on flood control matters, monitors implementation of the SCWA Flood Control Master Plan, and acts as liaison between the public and the Board of Directors.

3.1.5.1. Determination: The SCWA is a Special District whose board members consist of County Supervisors, City Mayors, and appointees of various member agencies.

3.1.5.2. Determination: The SCWA meets regularly according to the Brown Act.

3.1.5.3. Determination: The SCWA gets active public participation through its standing committees and communicates regularly through its website.

3.1.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.1.6.1. Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.1.7 - Summary of Determinations

3.1.1.1. Determination: The population in Solano County is anticipated to increase by 25 percent between 2000 and 2015 with most of the increase in the five cities of Benicia, Fairfield, Suisun City, Vacaville, and Vallejo. Projected water demand for those five cities is expected to increase by 34 percent during that same period.

3.1.2.1. Determination: The SCWA has negotiated with parties of interest and settled fishery issues with those parties.

3.1.2.2. Determination: The SCWA will have to continue to spend resources to maintain an aging Solano Project.

3.1.2.3. Determination: Reliability of water supplies for the North Bay Aqueduct, particularly in dry years, will continue to be an issue.

3.1.2.4. Determination: Water quality of the NBA is poor, which is due to organic carbon in the water supply. The SCWA needs to evaluate and review water treatment technologies to reduce organic carbon.

- 3.1.2.5 Determination:** With the projected increase in population, the SCWA appears to have ample supplies through 2015.
- 3.1.2.6 Determination:** The District is actively involved in the Ulati Project and the Green Valley Flood Control Project to provide flood control services.
- 3.1.2.7 Determination:** The District also has a strategic plan to address future flood control and water supply issues including climate change.
- 3.1.2.8 Determination:** Conservation is a major component of services provided and the District works with urban and agricultural users through committees to implement conservation measures.
- 3.1.3.1 Determination:** The SCWA has adequate funding to provide water and flood control services.
- 3.1.4.1 Determination:** The District shares facilities with the State Water Project, which provides water through the North Bay Aqueduct, and the Bureau of Reclamation,
- 3.1.4.2 Determination:** The SCWA works cooperatively with a number of local and regional agencies.
- 3.1.5.1 Determination:** The SCWA is a Special District whose board members consist of County Supervisors, City Mayors and appointees of various member agencies.
- 3.1.5.2 Determination:** The SCWA meets regularly according to the Brown Act.
- 3.1.5.3 Determination:** The SCWA gets active public participation through its standing committees and communicates regularly through its website.
- 3.1.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.2 - Solano Irrigation District

Formed in 1948, the Solano Irrigation District (SID) is an independent special district under the California Water Code, Division 11, to provide irrigation water and potable water, and to operate the hydroelectric power plant at Monticello Dam. The Solano Irrigation District (SID) primarily serves agriculture and some municipal and industrial users. The District encompasses approximately 73,000 acres.

3.2.1 - Growth and Population Projections

As of January 2003, SID serves approximately 11,000 retail customers, 10,000 potable customers and 1,000 non-potable customers. The population within the SID's boundary is approximately 64,000 (Solano LAFCO 2003). Expected growth within SID's boundaries is predicted using data provided by the cities of Vacaville, Fairfield, Suisun, and Dixon.

SID's annexation policy captures the belief that entitlements to water and water service are extremely valuable. The extension of service is constrained by the Solano Project's Place of Use as set by the State Water Resources Control Board. Although the District may apply for an extension of service outside the Place of Use, the District is reluctant to do so. Even if lands are within the Place of Use, the lands must be aggregated so that there are at least 200 acres of productive agriculture or 25 acres of urban land with proven economic viability. In addition, parcels should be contiguous. For urban annexations, the applicant must show that the service would be cost-effective, that the general plan calls for urbanization, and that urbanization is imminent. The District also recognizes that any annexations must go through LAFCO.

The District policy also sets priorities for annexation. They include:

- Highest priority for new service to those lands within the District boundaries that do not have service.
- Next priority to existing customers who subdivided but did not put in a water system.
- Large blocks of prime agricultural land contiguous to the District for which existing capacity service is available.
- Municipal lands that have a commitment to serve.
- Other agriculture on prime agricultural lands.
- To help urban areas in Solano County meet their water needs when it is in the best long-term interest of the District.
- To land that will contribute to the long-term financial stability of the District.

The policy indicates that the District is concerned about increasing demand on its entitlements and is unlikely to increase its customer base too rapidly. As a result, it is unlikely that the District will require an expansion of its boundaries or its Sphere of Influence.

3.2.1.1 Determination: The District is constrained to areas within the Place of Use area for the Solano Project.

3.2.1.2 Determination: The District has a policy that puts stringent requirements on new service areas and emphasizes service to areas within its boundaries and to prime agricultural lands provided water is available.

3.2.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

SID operates the Solano Project, which delivers Lake Berryessa water to four cities, the Maine Prairie Water District and other SID customers. The Solano Project includes the Monticello Dam, Putah Diversion Dam, and the Putah South Canal. SID operates and maintains these Solano Project facilities on behalf of Solano County Water Agency. Lake Berryessa has the ability to store 1,429,786 acre-feet of water. SID provides irrigation water from surface waters but also has its own wells that supplement its surface-water supply from the Solano Project.

SID also owns and operates the hydroelectric power plant located at the base of Monticello dam. The power plant was built in 1983 and has three generators with a combined capacity of 11,500 kilowatts. SID sells electrical power to PG&E and provides additional electricity to Northern California.

SID retains a yearly entitlement to 161,000 acre-feet of agricultural and domestic water for service to many areas in Solano County. There is approximately an 80-percent/20-percent ratio of agricultural water to municipal water. Of SID's 151,000 acre-feet of water per year (AFY), contract rights of up to 141,000 AFY are from the Solano Project, and the remaining 10,000 AFY is obtained from groundwater. Additionally, SID's Irrigation Tail Water Exchange Agreement with Marine Prairie Water District allows SID to exchange irrigation tail water for 10,000 acre-feet of Solano Project water. Under the terms of the agreement, SID can receive 1 acre-foot of Solano Project water for every 2 acre-feet of irrigation tail water exchanged to Marine Prairie Water District.

SID receives 100 percent of its surface water from Lake Berryessa. Groundwater for domestic consumption comes from wells in Elmira, Quail Canyon, Stocking Ranch, and four wells in the Dixon-Solano Municipal Service area. Additionally, SID maintains 29 agricultural wells, which account for 80 percent of its annual groundwater usage.

The SID provides Vacaville with 3,000 AFY and Fairfield with 16,018 AFY. SID also provides domestic-water service to several areas of the unincorporated county, along with the cities of Vallejo, Suisun City, and Vacaville. The District provides potable water service to Dixon-Solano Municipal Water Service, Suisun Solano Water Authority, Elmira, Quail Canyon, Blue Ridge Oaks, Peabody

Road commercial area, Gibson Canyon, Stocking Ranch, and soon, Pleasant Hills Ranch Estates. In addition, agricultural water is provided to Elmira, Vaca Valley, Pleasants Valley, Suisun Valley and the Dixon area. Non-potable water for utilization in landscaping is provided to Tolenas, Green Valley, and businesses and industry located in the Green Valley, Fairfield, Cordelia, and Vacaville areas. SID has a peak demand capacity of 12,000 acre-feet of potable water and 160,000 acre-feet of non-potable water. At present, there are no potable water capital improvement projects scheduled. There are, however, two non-potable water rehabilitation and betterment projects underway. They involve canal lining and a new deep well.

In addition to serving its own service area, SID has various water supply and exchange agreements with other Solano County agencies.

Suisun-Solano Water Authority

The City of Suisun and SID entered into a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Agreement in 1988, referred to as the Suisun-Solano Water Authority (SSWA), and fully implemented in 1991. Under the SSWA, SID operates a water treatment plant to treat water on Suisun's behalf. That water treatment plant treats Suisun's 1600 AFY of contracted Solano Project waters and delivers it to the service area for distribution.

Maine Prairie Water District Exchange

SID maintains an Irrigation Tail Water Exchange Agreement with MPWD, which allows SID to exchange irrigation tail water for 10,000 acre-feet of Solano Project water. Under the terms of the agreement, SID can receive 1 acre-foot of Solano Project water for every 2 acre-feet of irrigation tail water exchanged to MPWD.

On occasion, the Maine Prairie Water District utilizes their full contract amount prior to the end of irrigation demands and sufficient SID tail-water is not available. During those instances, MPWD will purchase supplemental contract water from SID.

Vallejo Exchange

SID maintains a service exchange agreement with the City of Vallejo in which Vallejo provides raw water service to Tolenas, within SID's service area, and in exchange, SID delivers an equal amount of raw water to Vallejo's Green Valley Treatment Plant.

Benicia, MPWD Purchases

The City of Benicia will often negotiate informal purchases with Solano Irrigation District (SID) for Solano Project (SP) water to augment supplies. Such purchases usually occur during the winter months or when water from the North Bay Aqueduct is unavailable.

Fairfield Agreements

Amendment No. 2, executed in 2002, to an agreement between SID and Fairfield entered into in 1974 adds Fairfield-Suisun Sewer District (FSSD) as a party and re-titles the agreement the “Second Amended Agreement.” The Second Amended Agreement provides Fairfield with up to 7,000 AFY of “1974 common boundary SP water” deemed necessary and sufficient to serve all lands that were in the 1974 common boundaries of SID and Fairfield (including, most notably, the Anheuser-Busch brewery). This amount represents a 1,000-AF/year increase over the 1974 agreement. The 1974 agreement and Second Amended Agreement also provide Fairfield with up to 9,018 AF of “pre-1974 option SP water” annually, based on lands that had been in SID prior to 1974 but had detached upon annexing to the City. The total amount of SP water available to Fairfield from the Second Amended Agreement is, therefore, 16,018 AFY.

Fairfield and SID entered a joint exercise of powers agreement (JPA) in 1987 that established a basis for SID to provide the water to serve lands within the common boundaries of the two agencies not covered under the 1974 agreement (now the Second Amended Agreement). Water service under this JPA is typically supplied by dual systems, potable water from Fairfield, and non-potable water from SID. All raw water is supplied by SID or reimbursed to Fairfield. Water supplies are provided under separate “water service sub-agreements” pursuant to the JPA. Since 1987, the two agencies have entered three water service sub-agreements. The three sub-agreements provide a minimum of 1 AFY of raw water per acre or actual quantity reimbursement to Fairfield from SID for potable water served to lands specified. The current total acreage specified is approximately 450 acres. In addition, SID provides direct irrigation water service to a limited number of properties within the Fairfield city limits outside of any agreements between the two agencies. In addition, SID provides water directly to a small number of irrigation customers within the Fairfield city limits based on service that existed prior to the property being annexed into Fairfield (e.g., Vanden High School, Fairfield High School, Busch Properties) or under subsequent outside-district water service agreements (e.g., B. Gale Wilson Elementary School, historic Waterman ranch). The supplies provided under the 1987 JPA are technically to meet SID demands.

Vacaville Agreement

The 1995 Master Water Agreement between SID and Vacaville provides SP water to Vacaville from SID. The delivery schedule started at 1,000 AFY in 1995 and increases incrementally to a maximum of 10,050 AF in 2016. The amount available under the agreement for 2008 is 3,000 AF. The agreement expires in 2045.

Dixon-Solano Municipal Water Service

In 1984, Dixon-Solano Municipal Water Service (DSMWS) was established through a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JEPA) between Dixon and Solano Irrigation District. DSMWS currently serves approximately 1,800 customers from a well network consisting of four wells ranging from 800 to 1,500 feet below the ground surface. The DSMWS service area is within SID’s service area.

Therefore, Dixon is eligible to utilize a share of SID's surface water when necessary. The terms of the JEPA expire in 2009 and are currently under negotiation.

Groundwater

SID also uses groundwater conjunctively with surface water supplies. SID has a groundwater well network consisting of 29 wells ranging from 400 to 1,000 feet below the ground surface. Groundwater is primarily used to supplement irrigation demands in areas constrained by conveyance capacity for surface water deliveries. The historical yield of the groundwater system is 15,000 AFY.

Recycled Water

In the 1974 agreement with Fairfield, SID exchanged 6,000 AFY of its SP contract water to Fairfield for an estimated equivalent amount of recycled wastewater. SID was only able to utilize approximately 1,000 AFY of the recycled water because of water quality constraints. In 2002, the agreement was amended (the Second Amended Agreement) and Fairfield agreed to full and adequate consideration to SID for the acquisition and transfer of SID's recycled water rights. If Fairfield is not using the recycled water then SID is permitted to sell it.

Water Consumption

The District provides water service for nearly 1,950 accounts, in addition to the nearly 11,000 urban customers that each city bills separately, and delivers an average of 105,000 AFY. In addition, the District exchanges approximately 26,000 acre-feet with cities and the Maine Prairie Water District. The distribution of water delivered is shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Average Water Deliveries

Service Classification	Number of Accounts	Annual Use (acre-feet)
Agricultural Water Service		
Below Putah South Canal	672	99,207
Above Putah South Canal	180	180
Municipal and Industrial Water Service		
<i>Non-potable</i>		
Raw Water	471	1,145
Filtered Water	42	669
Filtered and Chlorinated Water	58	181
Public Agency	13	680
Public Water Systems		
Elmira ID	85	52
Quail Canyon ID	36	44
Stocking Ranch ID	4	5
Tolenas	190	66
Gibson Canyon ID	159	217
Peabody ID	17	5
Blue Ridge Oaks ID	17	8
Total	1,944	104,961
Source: The Reed Group, November 2006.		

The District, in conjunction with the other water agencies as part of the Solano Project agreement, has a drought plan in place called the Solano Project (SP) Drought Measures Agreement. In drought years, SID and MPWD will share water allotments with the cities covered by the SP agreement. The allotment for each agency is reduced as shown in Table 17.

Table 17: Solano Project Drought Measures Agreement

SP Storage (acre-feet)	Date	Action
800,000 or less	December 1	Develop Drought Contingency Plan
1.1 million	April 1	Drop plan
550,000 to 800,000	April 1	Parties forgo at least 5% of entitlement
450,000 to 550,000	April 1	Parties forgo at least 10% of entitlement

3.2.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide water to current customers.

3.2.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

The SID is considered an enterprise district that generates revenues primarily through sales of water, water services, and electricity. SID operates on a \$7 million annual budget of its own. SID partners with the cities of Dixon and Suisun City in water delivery utilizing another \$6 million in revenues to accomplish the partnerships' objectives (SID Website). A fixed amount (\$1.5 million), which comes from the SID assessment and Monticello Power Plant revenues are used for infrastructure rehabilitation and betterment.

Table 18: Solano Irrigation District Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006
Revenues					
Water	\$7,754,275	\$10,064,778	\$13,298,045	\$13,290,784	\$12,542,448
Electricity	\$2,971,440	\$3,175,778	\$3,383,223	\$3,467,673	\$3,242,534
Expenditures					
Water	\$6,130,588	\$5,962,252	\$8,582,886	\$9,262,367	\$11,329,050
Electricity ¹	\$2,770,001	\$2,792,294	\$2,812,064	\$2,741,334	\$2,924,509
Notes: ¹ Includes debt service Source: State Controller's Report.					

The table shows that 20 percent of SID revenue comes from electricity generation.

In 2006, the District reviewed a rate increase study to consolidate rates and determine actual costs. Up until that time the District had 40 different water rates, some that applied to only a couple of customers. The study reclassified the rates into the categories shown in Table 16. The study proposed no change in rates in 2007, but a 4-percent increase in 2008, and another 4 percent in 2009. The Board adopted the rate increase in 2007.

3.2.3.1 Determination: Approximately 20 percent of the District's revenues come from electricity generation.

3.2.3.2 Determination: The District consolidated its rate structure and increased rates 4 percent in 2008 and will increase rates another 4 percent in 2009.

3.2.3.3 Determination: The District has the financial ability to provide services.

3.2.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

Management and operational efficiencies are provided by cooperative arrangement with other agencies. These arrangements are provided by the following:

- Solano Water Authority (for which an SID representative serves as Secretary and Treasurer)
- Solano Project Task Force
- Noonan Reservoir Task Force
- Imported Water Supply Task Force
- Coordinated Groundwater Data Analysis Task Force

Additionally SID takes part in several other committees and agreements including:

- Solano County Agricultural Water Management Committee
- Solano Water Education Committee
- SID/Fairfield Water Services Agreement
- SID/Vacaville Master Water Agreement
- SID/Vallejo Agreement (exchange of water)
- SID/Main Prairie Water District Agreement (for coordinating Lake Berryessa water supplies)
- SID/County Agricultural Commissioner Agreement (for sharing shop space at SID yard)
- DSMWS Joint Water Service in Dixon
- SSWA Joint Water Service in Suisun City
- SID/RCD Agreement regarding drainage management
- SCWA/SID Agreement for operation and maintenance of the Solano Project (LAFCO Part II)

The SID also partners with the City of Dixon and Suisun City for water delivery. The SID also participates in purchasing agreements with other local water treatment plants in order to obtain best pricing on chemical purchases, and it is in an insurance pool with the Association of California Water Agencies Joint Powers Insurance Authority.

3.2.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with other municipal agencies and shares facilities with a number of local agencies.

3.2.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The SID has five elected members on its Board of Directors. The District is divided into five divisions, and each board member is elected by division to a 4-year term. Board meetings occur in the SID Board Room located at 508 Elmira Road in Vacaville on the third Monday of every month at 7 p.m. Notice of the Board Meetings are published in three local newspapers and posted at the SID Board Room.

The district maintains a website located at <http://www.sidwater.org>. The website allows the District to communicate with its residents. It includes meeting agendas, information on water quality, irrigation, reports, and key links.

SID has 98 employees of which five are executives or management. There are 14 professional or support staff, 77 in operations and maintenance, and two who work in the water treatment plant.

3.2.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors elected by district to 4-year terms.

3.2.5.2 Determination: The Board of Directors meets monthly and meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act.

3.2.5.3 Determination: The District maintains a website that facilitates communication with residents.

3.2.5.4 Determination: The District has 98 employees with sufficient management to provide efficient services.

3.2.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.2.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.2.7 - Summary of Determinations

3.2.1.1 Determination: The District is constrained to areas within the Place of Use area for the Solano Project.

3.2.1.2 Determination: The District has a policy that puts stringent requirements on new service areas and emphasizes service to areas within its boundaries and service to prime agricultural lands provided water is available.

3.2.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide water to current customers.

3.2.3.1 Determination: Approximately 20 percent of the District's revenues come from electricity generation.

3.2.3.2 Determination: The District consolidated its rate structure and increased rates 4 percent in 2008 and will increase rates another 4 percent in 2009.

3.2.3.3 Determination: The District has the financial ability to provide services.

3.2.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with other municipal agencies and shares facilities with a number of local agencies.

3.2.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors elected by district to 4-year terms.

- 3.2.5.2 Determination:** The Board of Directors meets monthly and meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act.
- 3.2.5.3 Determination:** The District maintains a website that facilitates communication with residents.
- 3.2.5.4 Determination:** The District has 93 employees with sufficient management to provide efficient services.
- 3.2.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.3 - Maine Prairie Water District

The Maine Prairie Water District (MPWD) provides surface irrigation water to its customers for farming operations and does not supply potable water. The District was formed on December 12, 1958, enabled under the California Water Code, Division 13. MPWD's boundaries encompass approximately 14,668 acres of agricultural land located approximately 6 miles south of Dixon and 5 miles east of Vacaville.

3.3.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The District lies in the rural area of Solano County and consists entirely of farming acreage and rural homes. The Solano County Board of Supervisors adopted the General Plan on August 5, 2008 and was passed by the voters on November 4, 2008, extending the Orderly Growth Initiative until December 31, 2008. With the County's City-Centered-Growth policy, no major growth is anticipated within District boundaries. Therefore, there is no anticipated need to expand the Sphere of Influence.

3.3.1.1 Determination: There is no anticipated major growth in the District.

3.3.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

Supply

The District's water supply comes from three sources: the Solano Project, an agreement with the Solano Irrigation District, and local surface water rights.

The District has an annual contract right to 15,000 AF of the Solano Project water. Water is stored in Lake Berryessa, released down Putah Creek from Monticello Dam, and re-captured by the Putah Diversion Dam approximately 13 miles downstream. The water is diverted through the Putah South Canal and Sweeney Creek to the District, approximately 7 miles downstream of the Sweeny turnout. The Solano Project water can also be diverted to the creek system at various other locations in the Solano Irrigation District. The MPWD has the option to purchase additional Solano Project water from the Solano Irrigation District as needed.

In 1984, the MPWD signed the Irrigation Tail Water Exchange Agreement with the Solano Irrigation District (SID). That agreement allows the District to exchange 10,000 acre-feet of Solano Project water for SID's irrigation tail water at a rate of 2 acre-feet of tail water for 1 acre-foot of Solano Project Water. Although the official agreement has expired, the terms have been extended indefinitely by mutual agreement.

The other source for the District comes from surface rights to local streams. The contribution to the District's water supply from local surface water varies from year to year.

There is also a study underway to determine if it possible to fund water system improvements to allow an exchange of some of its Solano Project entitlement. Some of the study options include a

groundwater conjunctive use project and exercising some of the District’s North Delta Water Agency water supplies that are not used.

Water Consumption

Water consumption for 1999-2002 is shown in Table 19.

Table 19: Water Consumption by Source

Source	1999	2000	2001	2002
Solano Project	4,753	5,000	5,000	4,909
SID Exchange	18,389	13,912	18,950	18,985
SID Purchase	0	2,478	220	0
Total	23,142	21,390	24,170	23,894
Source: Solano County, 2004.				

In addition to regular irrigation services, the District provides irrigation water (when available) to a U.S. Navy property outside District boundaries at twice the in-district water charge rate.

At the beginning of each year, an annual allotment for each customer is set by the District. Customers who exceed their assigned allotment are charged \$1.00 per acre-foot. In years in which drought conditions are expected, allocations and the allotment exceedance charge are adjusted.

Peak demand from the District is estimated at 360 acre-feet per day, which could be maintained for 1 to 2 days.

District facilities include three pumping plants, seven dams, and the District office and shop area on 2.2 acres.

The District, in conjunction with the other water agencies, has a drought plan in place called the Solano Project (SP) Drought Measures Agreement. In drought years, the allotment for each agency is reduced as shown in Table 20.

Table 20: Solano Project Drought Measures Agreement

SP Storage (acre-feet)	Date	Action
800,000 or less	December 1	Develop Drought Contingency Plan
1.1 million	April 1	Drop plan
550,000 to 800,000	April 1	Parties forgo at least 5% of entitlement
450,000 to 550,000	April 1	Parties forgo at least 10% of entitlement

Amounts forgone are referred to as Restricted Carryover. Restricted Carryover can only be used when storage conditions improve. The District is further restricted on its use of Restricted Carryover, in that when storage is below 450,000 AF, their Restricted Carryover can only be used or sold for municipal purposes. As part of the plan, the Board of Directors will then set water delivery restrictions. Agricultural water users are informed of the restriction plan so that they may adjust their cropping plans.

3.3.2.1 Determination: The District has sufficient capacity for present and future needs.

3.3.2.2 Determination: The District has a working plan to adjust water delivery in drought years.

3.3.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

The District is an enterprise district. The District charges \$6 per acre-foot for water pumped from a canal or ditch and \$7.50 per acre-foot for water that flows downhill by gravity to a field.

Funding comes from three main sources: standby charges (paid by the landowner), water charges (paid by the water user), and a 1-percent county property tax (received from Solano County). Water sales account for 66 percent of funding, while standby charges, County funds, interest, and other revenues account for 20 percent, 6 percent, 5 percent, and 3 percent, respectively. The District does not receive any other funding and has never received a grant.

Standby charge rates can only be raised by a vote of the District’s landowners. Water charge rates are voted on by the Board of Directors and are set each year with the budget.

Table 21: Maine Prairie Water District Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$498,207	\$463,087	\$452,641	\$516,484	\$424,526
Expenditures	\$423,358	\$424,320	\$439,877	\$473,616	\$444,368
Fund Balance Beg	—	—	—	—	—
Fund Balance End	—	—	—	—	—
Source: State Controllers Report for Special Districts.					

3.3.3.1 Determination: The District, operating as an enterprise district, has the financial ability to provide services.

3.3.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

Some of the canal system maintained by the District also serves as a winter drainage system for the City of Vacaville, the City of Dixon, and the Dixon Resource Conservation District. The District is a member agency of the Solano County Water Agency, and it has a contract to receive water from the Solano Project.

The District and the Solano Irrigation District (SID) have an agreement wherein SID receives 10,000 AFY of the District's Solano Project entitlement. In return, the District receives a larger amount of agricultural return flows.

The District participates in a number of studies and projects with other local agencies. They include the Coordinated Groundwater Analysis Project to study and monitor the Putah Fan/Tehama Formation Groundwater Basin. In addition to the District, participants include the Solano Irrigation District, City of Vacaville, City of Dixon, Reclamation District 2068, Solano County, and the Solano County Water Agency.

Another study of the Dixon watershed was completed to allow the City of Dixon to make improvements along Lateral No. 1 that parallels Highway 113. The District is part of a Joint Powers Agreement for operation and maintenance of this project and other projects that will improve drainage.

The district also participates in the Association of California Water Agencies Joint Powers Insurance Authority and the Agricultural Water Management Council (AWMC). The AWMC concentrates on countywide conservation programs that apply to agricultural uses. As part of the conservation efforts, the District is required to have an agricultural water conservation plan that meets the Federal Central Valley Project standards.

Parts of the District are in the North Delta Water Agency (NDWA), which has an agreement with the Department of Water Resources to provide supplemental water to landowners within the boundary of the NDWA when their water rights from the State Water Resource Control Board are reduced or cut off because of Delta water quality standards.

In addition, the District uses recycled water from the Vacaville wastewater treatment plant discharged into Alamo Creek. During the summer irrigation season the treated wastewater, agricultural return flows, natural runoff, and Solano Project water are stored behind temporary dams installed by the District and the Solano Irrigation District. The water is used for irrigation.

3.3.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively to share facilities with neighboring cities and special districts.

3.3.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

MPWD's Board of Directors consists of five members who are elected at large and serve 4-year terms. If no candidates file for seats, the Board of Supervisors fills vacancies through appointment. Board members must be landowners. They receive no monetary compensation but do receive medical insurance from the District. The Board holds regularly scheduled meetings on the third Tuesday of each month at 2:00 p.m. at the District Office, located at 6595 Pitt School Road in Dixon, California. Agendas are posted 72 hours prior to the meeting time.

The District has a staff of four full-time employees: one executive/management position, one secretary treasurer (clerical), one water tender/maintenance person, and one maintenance/relief water tender. The District's full-time staff also provides education programs for its users.

There are a number of islands within the District boundaries that do not receive irrigation water yet are in agriculture. Some areas are hilly which would make water delivery difficult without pumping. The District should investigate annexation of the unserved territory.

3.3.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors who serve 4-year terms.

3.3.5.2 Determination: The District has a full-time staff of four employees who are capable of managing the District.

3.3.5.3 Determination: The District provides education programs for agricultural water users.

3.3.5.4 Determination: The District includes several islands where no services are provided. The District should consider annexation of those islands.

3.3.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery.

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.3.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.3.7 - Summary of Determinations

3.3.1.1 Determination: There is no anticipated major growth in the District.

3.3.2.1 Determination: The District has sufficient capacity for present and future needs.

3.3.2.2 Determination: The District has a working plan to adjust water delivery in drought years.

3.3.3.1 Determination: The District operating as an enterprise district has the financial ability to provide services.

3.3.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively to share facilities with neighboring cities and special districts.

3.3.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors who serve 4-year terms.

3.3.5.2 Determination: The District has a full-time staff of four employees who are capable of managing the District.

- 3.3.5.3 Determination:** The District provides education programs for agricultural water users.
- 3.3.5.4 Determination:** The District includes several islands where no services are provided. The District should consider annexation of those islands.
- 3.3.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.4 - Rural North Vacaville Water District

Formed on June 25, 1996, the Rural North Vacaville Water District (District) is a community services district that operates under Government Code Section 6100. The District's provides potable water and water for fire protection for property owners in the Stieger Hills and English Hills area north of Vacaville, in the unincorporated portion of Solano County. That area includes 613 parcels and encompasses approximately 10,932 acres. The District began delivering water on January 31, 2003.

3.4.1 - Growth and Population Projections

In January 2003, the estimated population within the agency's boundaries was 750 (Solano LAFCO 2003). The District is currently serving 190 ratepayers who have active water service connections. The water distribution system was designed, engineered, and constructed to support a maximum of 533 water service connections. Several major subdivisions that have entitlements to water service connections, have yet to have them completed. All of the 533 connections have been allocated, although only 190 are in use. Since all planned connections are allocated and there is no anticipated growth, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

3.4.1.1 Determination: The District currently serves 190 customers and with complete buildout is anticipated to serve a total of 533 customers.

3.4.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District operates two wells and maintains two 600,000-gallon storage tanks. One well has been permitted for emergency standby use because of the change in the State and Federal arsenic standards. The agency's estimated peak demand for potable water is 1,869 gallons per minute. The two 600,000 gallon storage tanks serve as additional non-groundwater storage.

The District infrastructure includes 43 miles of pipeline, both PVC, and ductile iron, and 243 fire hydrants. Its other major capital assets include two 500-gallon/minute pumps at the two well sites; four 250-gallon/minute pumps at the two storage tank sites; one backup generator set at tank site #4; a series of air release valves, pressure release valves, blow-offs, and sampling stations; two chlorine injection systems; one electronic Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) System; and three service roads to the well sites and storage tank sites.

In the event of a power outage, Tank Site #4 has a backup generator system to maintain pressure in the high zone of the system. The two well sites are tied to the Fire Station on Cantelow Road and PG&E has given the District an outage block 50 designation, which means minimal outages will occur.

The District currently has 190 customers. There are 533 hookups within the District. Most of the hookups are for undeveloped land and no additional hookups are available.

3.4.2.1 Determination: The District operates two wells with a peak demand capacity of 4,850 gallons per minute, and two 600,000-gallon storage tanks.

3.4.2.2 Determination: The District has the capacity for 533 hookups. All hookups have been allocated, even though there are only 190 customers at present.

3.4.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 22: Rural North Vacaville Water District Revenues and Expenses

	2001-02 ¹	2002-03 ¹	2003-04 ¹	2004-05 ²	2005-06 ²
Revenues	\$1,120,348	\$6,027,323	\$959,561	\$1,293,191	\$1,193,115
Expenditures	\$199,370	\$4,317,010	\$716,906	\$1,383,174	\$1,106,409
Capital/Construction	—	\$4,246,226	—	—	—
Reserves	—	—	—	—	—

¹Source: Solano County Budget.
²Source: State Controllers Report for Special Districts.

The District was formed in 1996 and funded through a special assessment that was approved by the voters. The assessment, as the only source of revenue, provides approximately \$1 million annually. The District began delivery of water in 2003.

The District received two low interest loans for capital improvements. The California Department of Water Resources loaned the District \$5 million to construct 43 miles of water mains that make up the District’s water supply distribution system. The District borrowed an additional \$8,984,099 from the Department of Health Services for the cost of engineering, design, and construction of two deep aquifer wells, two 300,000-gallon storage tanks, and infrastructure to complete the distribution system. The two state construction loans were awarded for a period of 20 years at 2.8 percent interest.

A special debt assessment district was formed by a vote of the property owners for the repayment of the two construction loans. The assessments are based on the principal and interest amounts of the two construction loans that are allocated to each water service connection.

The assessment district includes two zones. Zone 1 provides potable water and water for fire hydrants and Zone 2 funds only fire hydrants. Residents in Zone 1 would be assessed \$20,000, while residents in Zone 2 would be assessed \$2,400. Residents in Zone 2 lie outside district boundaries. In accordance with Proposition 218, a vote was held and weighted by the amount of the assessed value, which passed 79 percent to 21 percent. The assessment was challenged in court by Zone 2 residents but was upheld.

On November 1, 1999, the District adopted a rate structure that includes the fixed costs of the District, its contract operator of the water distribution system, costs for electrical power and chemicals to treat the groundwater, maintenance for service access roads, and the fire protection components of the water distribution system. The District's rate structure is further broken down into four categories of water service connections that include the fixed costs and variable costs of delivering potable water service.

By 2006, the District had determined that the old rate structure provided insufficient funds to cover operating costs. The Board of Supervisors asked voters of the District to approve a rate increase. The measure went to a vote in March 2007 but failed. Rising costs associated with increased electrical costs, maintenance and repairs to the infrastructure, compliance with safe drinking water regulations, and the rebuilding of reserves required another attempt. A rate increase was eventually approved in July of 2008, as the District found that without a rate increase it would be approximately \$50,000 short. Table 23 shows the new rates.

Table 23: New Rate Schedule

Class	Old rate	New Rate
Developed parcels	\$27.84	\$57.49
Undeveloped parcels	\$20.74	\$49.44
Supplemental Connection	\$4.86	\$12.84

3.4.3.1 Determination: The District was underfunded and required a rate increase, which was approved in 2008.

3.4.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

In May 2004, the County Department of Resource management took oversight of operations and maintenance of the District. The County contracted with the California Water Service Company to provide the service. As a result of its capital improvement projects, the District has sufficient equipment and facilities to provide services. No additional opportunities for shared facilities exist.

3.4.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the County and has contracted for operations and maintenance with the California Water Service Company.

3.4.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

When the District was formed in 1996, the County Board of Supervisors served as the initial Board of Directors. On May 3, 2005, the residents voted to have an independent Board of Directors, elected at large for 4-year terms. Because of scheduling of elections, the new Board was elected in August 2007 and seated December 7, 2007. The Board of Directors meets monthly on the second Tuesday of each month at 7 p.m. at the Vacaville Fire Protection District Fire Station #67, 4135 Cantelow Road

in Vacaville. Meetings are noticed in accordance with the Brown Act. Board members receive no compensation.

The District is staffed and supported by the County Department of Resource Management. Operational staffing includes a part-time General Manager and a part-time Staff Analyst, both of whom are contracted to California Water Services Company (Cal Water). The District retains ownership of the water distribution system and all of its components.

The District communicates with residents through its newsletter published on an as-needed basis to inform residents of items of interest. The District also has a website that is part of the Resource Management Department of the County. The website can be accessed through www.co.solano.ca.us/resource_mgmt/rural_north_vacaville_wter_district/default.asp.

3.4.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors elected at large to 4-year terms. Board members receive no compensation.

3.4.5.2 Determination: Meetings are held monthly on the second Tuesday in Vacaville, are open to the public, and noticed according to the Brown Act.

3.4.5.3 Determination: The District is staffed and supported by the County Department of Resource Management.

3.4.5.4 Determination: The District communicates with residents through its newsletter and through its website accessed through the County and maintained by the County.

3.4.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.4.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

3.4.7 - Summary of Determinations

3.4.1.1 Determination: The District currently serves 190 customers and with complete buildout is anticipated to serve a total of 533 customers.

3.4.2.1 Determination: The District operates two wells with a peak demand capacity is 4,850 gallons per minute and two 600,000-gallon storage tanks.

3.4.2.2 Determination: The District has the capacity for 533 hookups. All hookups have been allocated, even though there are only 190 customers at present.

3.4.3.1 Determination: The District was underfunded and required a rate increase, which was approved in 2008.

- 3.4.4.1 Determination:** The District works cooperatively with the County and has contracted for operations and maintenance with California Water Service Company.
- 3.4.5.1 Determination:** The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors elected at large to 4-year terms. Board members receive no compensation.
- 3.4.5.2 Determination:** Meetings are held monthly on the second Tuesday in Vacaville, are open to the public, and noticed according to the Brown Act.
- 3.4.5.3 Determination:** The District is staffed and supported by the County Department of Resource Management.
- 3.4.5.4 Determination:** The District communicates with residents through its newsletter and through its website accessed through the County and maintained by the County.
- 3.4.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

SECTION 4: MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW RECLAMATION AND LEVEE DISTRICTS

4.1 - Collinsville Levee Maintenance District

The Collinsville Levee District was formed on September 2, 1924 by legal authority from the California Water Code Sections 70070, et seq., and Government Code Section 1780. The District is located at the mouth of the Sacramento River where it enters Suisun Bay. The District funds improvements and maintenance of the 1-mile levee that protects the historic town of Collinsville. The levee protects 30 residents and approximately 206 acres.

4.1.1 - Growth and Population Projections

Current land use in Collinsville include natural resources land, utility operations, publicly owned open land, residences, wind farms, and agricultural lands.

Collinsville is included in the Collinsville-Montezuma Hills Area Plan and Program, which addresses the area around the historic community of Collinsville. The plan was drafted to analyze the economic, planning, and environmental conditions related to providing for water-dependent industrial development. While development has yet to occur, an environmental industrial park has been proposed for the area directly to the east of Collinsville (Solano County, 2008). The area study conducted under the Area Plan and Program identified that infrastructure is lacking regarding the provision of septic for the existing homes in Collinsville. As such, substantial residential growth would not be expected to occur in the near future within Collinsville. Should the plan for the expanded industrial area be improved, the District should consider an update to its sphere of influence to include the industrial park.

4.1.1.1 Determination: An industrial park is proposed in the General Plan adjacent to the District's northern boundary. If the plan is approved, the District should consider updating its Sphere of Influence to include the industrial park as a first step toward annexation.

4.1.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District's main service is the provision of levee maintenance. The District owns and maintains a small pump and shed which has been determined to have no dollar value because of its age and condition. Collinsville was flooded in the winter of 2008 when water topped the levee.

4.1.2.1 Determination: Except in extreme flood conditions the District has the capacity to provide services.

4.1.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 24: Collinsville Levee Maintenance District Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$7,241	\$7,452	\$7,827	\$6,540	\$8,383
Expenditures	\$828	\$1,131	\$1,212	—	\$30,908
Fund Balance Beg	—	—	—	—	—
Fund Balance End	—	—	—	—	—

Source: State Controller Reports for Special Districts.

The District is funded primarily through property taxes. In 2007-2008, the District received an additional \$15,974 in reimbursements through the Delta Levee Subvention Program.

Implementation measure SS.I-8 of the Solano County General Plan requires the exploration of additional funding mechanisms for levees and other flood control mechanisms to protect the Collinsville town site. In light of the age of the District’s small pump, the District should look for opportunities to secure funding to purchase an additional pump.

4.1.3.1 Determination: The District is funded primarily through property taxes, which are usually more than expenses. In case of flooding, the District relies on reserves and state subvention funds.

4.1.3.2 Determination: The implementation measures of the 2008 County General Plan calls for exploration of addition funding sources for the levee district.

4.1.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District lies in an area adjacent to the Suisun Marsh with very limited opportunities to share facilities. Consequently, the District shares no facilities, nor are there opportunities to share facilities.

4.1.4.1 Determination: There are no shared facilities, nor are there opportunities for shared facilities.

4.1.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The governing body consists of three members whose terms do not have a set expiration date. Public meetings are held on an as-needed basis. There is currently a vacancy on the Board. The Board of Supervisors may appoint a resident or someone from outside the District with special expertise to the board.

4.1.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three-member board with indefinite terms. The District sometimes has difficulty finding residents to serve.

4.1.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.1.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.1.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.1.1.1 Determination: An industrial park is proposed in the General Plan adjacent to the District's northern boundary. If the plan is approved, the District should consider updating its Sphere of Influence to include the industrial park as a first step toward annexation.

4.1.2.1 Determination: Except in extreme flood conditions the District has the capacity to provide services.

4.1.3.1 Determination: The District is funded primarily through property taxes, which are usually more than expenses. In case of flooding, the District relies on reserves and state subvention funds.

4.1.3.2 Determination: The implementation measures of the 2008 County General Plan calls for exploration of addition funding sources for the levee district.

4.1.4.1 Determination: There are no shared facilities, nor are there opportunities for shared facilities.

4.1.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three-member board with indefinite terms. The District sometimes has difficulty finding residents to serve.

4.1.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.2 - Reclamation District No. 501 (Ryer Island)

Reclamation District No. 501 encompasses some 11,891 acres of Ryer Island. The District maintains the waterways and levees surrounding the island and removes excess water on Ryer Island. Agency formation occurred on May 3, 1887 under Section 3452 of the Political Code. The District serves a population of approximately 450.

4.2.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The District serves a population of 450, including 200 permanent residents and approximately 250 to 300 migrant workers. The current County General Plan identifies the zoning for the District a Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no current plans to convert agricultural lands to residential or commercial use. The population is expected to remain constant, and, as a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand its Sphere of Influence.

4.2.1.1 Determination: The District serves a population of 450 and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.2.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District focuses on levee maintenance and inspection. The primary function of the maintenance program is vegetation control. District programs include mowing, spraying, and burning, for which they apply to the air pollution control district for a permit. State and Federal agencies perform repair work when contacted. The Department of Water Resources and the USACE is currently working on repairing an erosion site.

4.2.2.1 Determination: The District primarily provides levee maintenance services and works with State and Federal Agencies, Department of Water Resources and the USACE, for levee repair.

4.2.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

The District receives \$280,000 annually in property assessments. The amount of the assessment is determined annually by the Board of Trustees and is charged to landowners on a pro-rata basis based on assessed value.

Those revenues are sometimes augmented by state grants. The District participates in the Delta Levee Subvention Program. The program has provided the District in excess of \$45,000 to help maintain the levee system. The subvention fund is vital to helping the District provide essential services since it appears that property assessments alone cannot provide sufficient revenues to fund the services.

The District also raises capital by issuing warrants. In 2005, the District paid 8.75 percent interest on outstanding warrants. The revenues generated by warrants are held by Solano County, which pays the District 2.35 percent.

Table 25: Reclamation District No. 501 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$430,654	\$295,387	\$321,208	\$320,249	\$331,609
Expenditures	\$344,066	\$305,608	\$289,222	\$376,300	\$317,646
Fund Balance Beg	—	—	—	—	—
Fund Balance End	—	—	—	—	—

Source: State Controller Reports for Special Districts.

4.2.3.1 Determination: The District has adequate funding to maintain the levee system, relying on several sources. The District receives most of its funding from assessments and the State Delta Levee Subvention Program. The District issues warrants to cover shortfalls.

4.2.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District operates six pumping stations located strategically to maintain the levees. The District works cooperatively with the Department of Fish and Game to refrain from any maintenance activities that will disturb sensitive habitat between March 15 and June 30. The District relies on the Department of Water Resources and the USACE for much of the levee repair work.

4.2.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Department of Fish and Game to preserve sensitive habitat.

4.2.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The board of directors consists of three members who are elected by District to serve 2-year terms. They receive no compensation. Public meetings are held the third or fourth Saturday of September at the District office on Ryer Island.

The District employs three full-time employees, a superintendent, an assistant superintendent, and a levee maintenance worker. The staff is fully capable of routine levee maintenance. During a flood event or for major levee repairs the District may rely on assistance from the Department of Water Resources and the USACE. Maintenance focuses on vegetation control by burning, spraying, or mowing. The District also provides a pension plan for its employees. The District contributes 10 percent of gross salaries each year to the fund.

4.2.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by an appointed three-member Board of Trustees. The Board meets annually to set a budget.

4.2.5.2 Determination: The District has three employees, which is sufficient personnel to provide services.

4.2.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.2.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.2.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.2.1.1 Determination: There District serves a population of 450 and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.2.2.1 Determination: The District primarily provides levee maintenance services and works with the State and Federal Agencies, Department of Water Resources and the USACE, for levee repair.

4.2.3.1 Determination: The District has adequate funding to maintain the levee system, relying on several sources. The District receives most of its funding from assessments and the State Delta Levee Subvention Program. The District issues warrants to cover shortfalls.

4.2.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Department of Fish and Game to preserve sensitive habitat.

4.2.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by an appointed three-member Board of Trustees. The Board meets annually to set a budget.

4.2.5.2 Determination: The District has three employees, which is sufficient personnel to provide services.

4.2.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.3 - Reclamation District No. 536 (Egbert Tract)

The District was formed on September 4, 1891 to provide flood control for Egbert Tract in accordance with California Water Code Section 51236. The District maintains 15 miles of levees and 15 miles of canals that protect 6000 acres. The District serves a population of five.

4.3.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The current County General Plan identifies the zoning for the District as a Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no current plans to convert agricultural lands to residential or commercial use. The population is expected to remain constant, and, as a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand its Sphere of Influence.

4.3.1.1 Determination: There is no expected population growth within the District boundaries.

4.3.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District operates three pumps and maintains 15 miles of drainage canals. The pumps are sufficient to provide services. The District does not plan to expand services.

4.3.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide levee maintenance and operate the drainage system. Since there is no planned expansion of the District, there is no planned expansion of the capacity to provide services.

4.3.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 26: Reclamation District No. 536 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$55,082	\$70,741	\$53,673	\$48,010	\$57,465
Expenditures	\$70,952	\$55,348	\$8,886	\$56,722	\$63,926
Fund Balance Beg	—	—	—	—	—
Fund Balance End	—	—	—	—	—

Source: State Controller Reports for Special Districts.

Most of the District's revenues are from property taxes. Shortfalls are made up by use of reserves or additional assessments on property owners.

4.3.3.1 Determination: The District receives most of its revenues from property taxes. Shortfalls are made up by reserves or additional assessments on property owners.

4.3.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District shares a part of its southern boundary with the City of Rio Vista. Although the District has the facilities to provide services, there may be opportunities to explore partnerships or assistance with the City, particularly during flood events.

4.3.4.1 Determination: The District should explore opportunities for partnerships with or assistance from the City of Rio Vista.

4.3.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board who are appointed by the Board of Supervisors to 4-year terms. Trustees must be landowners or agents of landowners. Trustees are not compensated and meet at least twice a year on an as-needed basis for the purpose of voting on landowner assessments, discussion, and voting on District business. Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act and held at 3362 Liberty Island Road in Rio Vista.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by District landowners, tenant farm operators, and by contracted services.

4.3.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

4.3.5.2 Determination: The District has paid no staff. Labor requirements are met by contractors, landowners, or tenant farm operators.

4.3.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.3.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.3.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.3.1.1 Determination: There is no expected population growth within the District boundaries.

4.3.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide levee maintenance and operate the drainage system. Since there is no planned expansion of the District, there is no planned expansion of the capacity to provide services.

4.3.3.1 Determination: The District receives most of its revenues from property taxes. Shortfalls are made up by reserves or additional assessments on property owners.

4.3.3.2 Determination: The District should explore opportunities for partnerships with or assistance from the City of Rio Vista.

- 4.3.5.1 Determination:** The District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

- 4.3.5.2 Determination:** The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by contractors, landowners, or tenant farm operators.

- 4.3.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.4 - Reclamation District No. 1607 (Van Sickle Island)

The District was organized on November 25, 1914, under Section 500,000 of Division 15 of the California Water Code. The District provides drainage, irrigation, and reclamation of land on Van Sickle Island. The area served is approximately 10,000 acres with 22 landowners. The District maintains 12 miles of levees that surround the island, the most critical of those levees being that which lies along the southern boundary of the island along the Sacramento River. That area is subject to extreme wind and waves during critical high tide periods.

4.4.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The District serves a population of 22. The area served by the District is currently designated as a Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the island.

4.4.1.1 Determination: The District serves a population of 22, and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.4.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

Reclamation District No. 1607 maintains the 12 miles of levees that surround Van Sickle Island. The levees are in constant need of repair. In addition, the District maintains three 30- to 50-horsepower pumps to drain the island after wind, floods, and to regulate the water levels when the island is flooded for waterfowl management. Of the three pumps, the District owns one, while the other two are privately owned.

The District also maintains several pipes used for flooding and draining the island. The pipes are often difficult to maintain. When metal pipes get rusty and fail they are replaced by plastic pipes, which often cost \$25,000 each. The District has identified four areas that need improvement. The work is expected to take place in the summer of 2008. Funding of up to \$500,000 will be obtained through an agreement with the Department of Water Resources, whereas the District's 25 percent will be matched by Department of Water Resources funds for the remaining 75 percent of the cost.

4.4.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity and the resources to maintain the levees for flood control.

4.4.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

The primary source of revenue is landowner assessments. The landowners are charged \$10 per acre, which generates about \$100,000 per year. In addition, the District receives grants from the Department of Water Resources where the District matches 25 percent of the grant total, as well as subvention funding. In 2008, the District negotiated access to the island with Venoco, Inc., which

operates several gas wells on Van Sickle Island. The agreement generates an additional \$50,000 per year for the right to drive on the levees with large equipment to service its wells. The District has had difficulty raising assessments, since most landowners are restricted in their ability to generate revenues from their property.

In 1998, the District held an election to raise assessments to retire bonds used in levee repairs after the island flooded. That election also authorized the Board of Trustees to continue the assessment increase, if necessary, by a vote of the Board.

Reclamation Districts have the ability to issue warrants. These are essentially interest bearing loans that can generate funds to make up for budget shortfalls. RD 1607 has issued approximate \$70,000 in warrants.

The balance sheets for fiscal years 2005-06 and 2006-07, and the budget for fiscal year 2007-08 are shown below.

Table 27: Reclamation District No. 1607 Revenues and Expenditures

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Revenues	\$529,594	\$489,231	\$680,906
Expenditures	\$ 616,825	\$508,542	\$678,478
Warrants	\$0	\$70,000	\$0
Fund Balance Beg	\$105,663	\$18,432	\$69,122
Fund Balance End	\$18,432	\$69,122	\$71,550

Typically, the District receives between 60 and 75 percent of its revenues from the State through either work agreements or subvention funds. Assessments account for 15 percent of the revenues. Levee repairs and habitat mitigation account for 85 percent of the District's expenditures. The split between habitat mitigation and levee repairs varies from year to year.

4.4.3.1 Determination: The District has been able to provide services with assistance from the State. When there are shortfalls, the District has addressed them by issuing warrants.

4.4.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District's facilities consist of the levee system and 20 water gates to control flooding. The district boundaries are the boundary of the island, with few opportunities to share facilities.

4.4.4.1 Determination: The District has limited facilities, and since the boundaries are those of Van Sickle Island, the District has few opportunities to share facilities.

4.4.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees, each elected at large by the landowners to a 4-year term. The Board meets on an as-needed basis, generally three to four times per year. Board members are not compensated for their time.

The district has two part time employees. One is the secretary who occasionally does routine levee inspections and repairs. The other employee coordinates opening gates for contractors and makes levee inspections during high tides or when the pumps are running to evacuate floodwaters.

The District has a specific purpose: to protect Van Sickle Island from flooding. In that capacity, the District is not looking to expand its boundaries. Therefore, there is no consideration of an expanded Sphere of Influence.

4.4.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees elected at large. The Board meets on an as-needed basis.

4.4.5.2 Determination: Staff is adequate to manage the affairs of the District and does routine levee inspections to make sure they are properly maintained.

4.4.5.3 Determination: The District encompasses Van Sickle Island and does not seek to expand. The Sphere of Influence should be coterminous with district boundaries.

4.4.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.4.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.4.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.4.1.1 Determination: The District serves a population of 22 and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.4.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity and the resources to maintain the levees for flood control.

4.4.3.1 Determination: The District has been able to provide services with assistance from the State. When there are shortfalls, the District has addressed them by issuing warrants.

4.4.4.1 Determination: The District has limited facilities, and since the boundaries are Van Sickle Island, the District has few opportunities to share facilities.

4.4.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees elected at large. The Board meets on an as-needed basis.

- 4.4.5.2 Determination:** Staff is adequate to manage the affairs of the District and does routine levee inspections to make sure they are properly maintained.
- 4.4.5.3 Determination:** The District encompasses Van Sickle Island and does not seek to expand. The Sphere of Influence should be coterminous with district boundaries.
- 4.4.6.1. Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.5 - Reclamation District No. 2034

Formed in order to maintain habitat and repair levees, the District consists of two landowners and approximately 2,500 acres. The district is primarily a duck and hunt club. The district operates under California Water Code Section 50000.

4.5.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The District is uninhabited. No growth is expected in the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.5.1.1 Determination: The District is uninhabited and no growth is expected in the future.

4.5.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The district operates one pump to move water through the slough. The single pump is sufficient to maintain the habitat.

4.5.2.1 Determination: The District has sufficient capacity to maintain the levees and the habitat.

4.5.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 28: Reclamation District No. 2034 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Note: No data available.					

The District includes two landowners who share the costs of the District. The only regular expenses are the PG&E bill whose cost is prorated by acreage between the two owners.

4.5.3.1 Determination: There is no formal financial structure, no records of revenues or expenditures, and the District does not have a budget. The only cost is the PG&E bill to operate the pump. The cost is shared by the two landowners.

4.5.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District operates one pump to maintain habitat and sees no opportunities for shared facilities.

4.5.4.1 Determination: The District is fully self-sufficient and does not share facilities, nor are there any opportunities to share facilities.

4.5.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

There apparently is no formal government structure. The District until recently was owned entirely by the Chadbourne family. There are no records of a board of trustees meetings, no records of revenues or expenditures.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by District landowners.

4.5.5.1 Determination: The District does not have a governing Board of Trustees. There are only two landowners of the District.

4.5.5.2 Determination: The District landowners have no regular meetings.

4.5.5.3 Determination: The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by the landowners.

4.5.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.5.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.5.7 Summary of Determinations

4.5.1.1 Determination: The District is uninhabited and no growth is expected in the future.

4.5.2.1 Determination: The District has sufficient capacity to maintain the levees and the habitat.

4.5.3.1 Determination: There is no formal financial structure, no records of revenues or expenditures, and the District does not have a budget. The only cost is the PG&E bill to operate the pump. The cost is shared by the two landowners.

4.5.4.1 Determination: The District is full self-sufficient and does not share facilities, nor are there any opportunities to share facilities.

4.5.5.1 Determination: The District does not have a governing Board of Trustees. There are only two landowners of the District.

4.5.5.2 Determination: The District landowners have no regular meetings.

4.5.5.3 Determination: The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by the landowners.

4.5.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.6 - Reclamation District No. 2060 (Hastings Tract)

The District was formed on January 3, 1922 to provide flood control and levee maintenance for Hasting Tract, under California Water Code Section 50000. The District maintains 16.02 miles of levees that protect 6,940 assessed acres. Lands within the District include diversified row crop agriculture (alfalfa, corn, wheat, barley, safflower, oat hay, sunflower, triticale, melons, garlic, onions, and tomatoes), permanent pasture for livestock, and a hunting preserve licensed by the State of California. The District serves a population of 40, including a trailer park for weekend visitors to the hunting preserve.

4.6.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The District lies in an area designated for agricultural use. The area served by the District is currently designated as a Resource Conservation Overlay in the County's General Plan. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the island. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand its Sphere of Influence.

4.6.1.1 Determination: There is no anticipated growth in the near future.

4.6.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The district does not provide irrigation water. Its only services are flood control. The district has an Appropriative Water License, #002833, and falls under the North Delta Water Agency contract with the Department of Water Resources. Irrigation water comes from the Lindley and Cache Sough, but private landowners supply their own irrigation water and drainage water facilities. The District has sufficient capacity for present and anticipated service needs.

4.6.2.1 Determination: The District has sufficient capacity for present and anticipated service needs.

4.6.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 29: Reclamation District No. 2060 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$120,977	\$60,728	\$37,359	\$14,180	\$39,176
Expenditures	\$136,857	\$47,208	\$30,359	\$14,501	\$40,435
Fund Balance Beg		\$(5,880)	\$7,640	\$14,640	\$14,319
Fund Balance End	\$(5,880)	\$7,640	\$14,640	\$14,319	\$13,150

Source: State Controller Reports for Special Districts.

The District receives revenue from assessments, levee road permit fees, interest revenues, and subvention funds. In 2005 and 2006, subvention funds accounted for approximately 61 percent of the

revenues while property assessments accounted for 21 percent. Levee road use and permit fees accounted for another 7 percent. Interest revenues ranged from 8 to 11 percent of all revenues.

As of December 31, 2006, the District had approximately \$160,000 in cash available and \$32,000 as subvention fund reimbursements. The District maintains \$145,000 of the \$160,000 in an interest bearing money market account. The interest generated in 2006 amounted to approximately \$6,000.

4.6.3.1 Determination: The District receives most of its revenues from State subvention funds.

4.6.3.2 Determination: The District has sufficient cash available to in case any shortfalls arise.

4.6.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District has no capital assets. No facilities are available for sharing with other agencies. The District is primarily in agriculture.

4.6.4.1 Determination: There are no facilities within the District, nor does the District share facilities with neighboring districts. There are no other opportunities for shared facilities.

4.6.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board of landowners, elected to 4-year terms. Quite often, there are no candidates that file and the Board of Supervisors then must make an appointment. Trustees receive no compensation. They hold their regular meeting on the first Tuesday of June. In addition, the Board of Trustees has numerous special meetings throughout the calendar year. All meetings are noticed in accordance with the Brown Act and are held at the Hastings Island Land Company offices located on Hastings Tract.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by District landowners, tenant farm operators and by contracted services.

4.6.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees that meets annually or more often on an as-needed basis.

4.6.5.2 Determination: The District has no paid staff. Levee maintenance is performed by District landowners, tenant farm operators, or by contractors.

4.6.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.6.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.6.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.6.1.1 Determination: There is no anticipated growth in the near future.

4.6.2.1 Determination: The District has sufficient capacity for present and anticipated service needs.

- 4.6.3.1 Determination:** The District receives most of its revenues from State subvention funds.
- 4.6.3.2 Determination:** The District has sufficient cash available to in case any shortfalls arise.
- 4.6.4.1 Determination:** There are no facilities within the District, nor does the District share facilities with neighboring districts. There are no other opportunities for shared facilities.
- 4.6.5.1 Determination:** The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees that meets annually or more often on an as-needed basis.
- 4.6.5.2 Determination:** The District has no paid staff. Levee maintenance is performed by District landowners, tenant farm operators, or by contractors.
- 4.6.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.7 - Reclamation District No. 2068

Reclamation District 2068 was formed in April 7, 1924, with the intent to provide agricultural irrigation water, drainage, and levee maintenance. The District maintains 8.23 miles of federal project levees that protect a portion of its 13,200 acres. The District operates under the authority of California Water Code Division 15 Section 50000. The District serves a population of approximately 100.

The District is a multi-county district, serving Solano and Yolo Counties. The principal County is Solano County since 80 percent of assessed value lies within Solano County.

4.7.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The County General Plan identifies the zoning for the District as intensive agriculture. A portion of the agricultural area lies within the Yolo Bypass, which is used to convey floodwaters from the Sacramento Valley at such times that the Sacramento River flows exceed the river's physical capacity to move water into the Delta. The area served by the District is currently designated as a Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no plans to convert agricultural lands to residential or commercial use in the County's General Plan. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.7.1.1 Determination: There is no expected population growth within the District boundaries.

4.7.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District provides water for irrigation, flood protection through levee maintenance, and drainage services.

Water Service

The District does not treat the water it supplies for agricultural uses. The District supply is principally from the Sacramento River under appropriate licenses. The District does not use any groundwater. The District supply is under contract with the California Department of Water Resources and the North Delta Water Agency. The District also has agreements with the Maine Prairie Water District and the Dixon Resource Conservation District for the transfer of water that reaches the District.

The District operates an open canal, gravity distribution system supplied by a network of four primary pumping plants. The river diversion is capable of delivering approximately 360 cubic feet per second for delivery to the second pumping plant and subsequent delivery to pumping plants 3 and 4. Gravity delivery to the canal system is made from pumping plants 2, 3, and 4. The system has a reserve capacity of approximately 25 percent at its first two lifts (plants 1 and 2).

Recaptured irrigation water is available to approximately 20 percent of District lands for direct reuse. All water received from Maine Prairie Water District and Dixon Resource Conservation District is pumped into the main canal system for reuse.

The District operates with no physical constraints. Because of the cyclic nature of agricultural water demands, periodic localized hydraulic capacity constraints may lead to allocation of water on a first come first served basis. However, this situation is infrequent and brief.

4.7.2.1 Determination: The District has sufficient capacity and facilities to provide irrigation water.

Flood Protection and Drainage Services

The District maintains the federal Sacramento River Flood Control Project levee. Responsibility for the adequacy of the levee and the flood control associated with the federal Sacramento River Flood Control Project levee rests with the State.

The District provides drainage services for agricultural purposes. The system includes approximately 50 miles of drainage channel and a single pumping plant, PS #5. The drainage operation is integrated with the District's irrigation water supply system. The District drainage system provides access to all lands and uses within the agency, including the provision of drainage to county roads.

The drainage system is designed for limited capacity and does not provide a specified level of flood protection. The purpose of the system is to facilitate irrigation and storm drainage to remove excess water. Flood prevention is not anticipated or provided for in the system design or operation. The District does attempt to minimize the duration of flooding without redirecting the impacts of localized flooding. Most drainage outlets operate by gravity. The operation of PS #5 is limited to those times when the Yolo Bypass flood conveyance prevents the operation of the gravity outfall into the Bypass.

The District does not anticipate significant expansion of its service area or change in water use other than seasonal and crop planting variability.

4.7.2.2 Determination: The District has sufficient capacity and facilities to provide drainage services and levee maintenance.

4.7.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

The District operates on a fiscal year that begins on January 1 and ends on December 31. The calendar year corresponds more directly with the growing season.

Table 30: Reclamation District No. 2068 Revenues and Expenditures

	2005	2006	2007
Water Sales	\$579,925	\$600,100	\$622,000
Transfer from Fund Balance	\$240,000	\$220,000	\$220,000
Total Revenues	\$1,129,665	\$1,129,820	\$1,171,740
Capital Improvements	\$69,000	\$52,000	\$57,000
Total Expenditures	\$1,129,532	\$1,129,810	\$1,163,720
Source: Budget information supplied by District.			

Table 31: Percent of Revenue as Budgeted

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Water Rate	47.3	49.4	54.1	52.9	50.1
Standby	6.3	6.4	6.4	6.2	5.7
M & O	5.0	6.1	8.1	9.9	13.4
Misc.	5.0	7.0	7.0	6.5	7.7
General	22.0	17.5	18.4	21.6	21.2
Unfunded	14.5	13.6	5.9	2.8	1.8
Notes: Water Rate The revenue for water delivery. Standby The revenue derived from the standby rate established for all parcels with available water service. M & O The special assessment revenue based upon the benefit assessment role of the District. Misc. The receipts derived from merchandise sales, sale of assets, service charges, labor, truck and machinery reimbursement, insurance rebates, interest, drainage agreements, interagency service agreements, and discounts. General These are revenues from the District's Capital Improvements Fund and authorized by the Board of Trustees for use in operations. These are non-operating revenues. Unfunded These are funds carried forward from prior year operations or depletion of fund balances as authorized by the Board of Trustees. Source: Agency responses to survey					

The District also receives revenues from lease rentals and royalties from land rights held by the District. The rents and royalties are based on specific lease agreements. Total revenues from these sources amounted to \$80,962 in 2002 and \$138,800 in 2001.

The District is subject to Proposition 218. The District does not anticipate the use of additional funding mechanisms. Several years ago, the District determined that use of a portion of its undesignated reserve funds for operations as warranted and has been used periodically as part of its revenue budget.

The District reviews its rates annually during the budget process. The District considers anticipated agency costs, crop mix and associated water sales, anticipated fallow lands, available non-operating or reserve funds, and available funds from prior years in determining the need to change rates.

The District uses the Solano County Treasurer as Treasurer of the District. Revenues are collected and held in the Maintenance and Operations Fund, the Irrigation Fund, or the General Fund. The reserves are also invested in the State Treasurer's Local Agency Investment Fund.

4.7.3.1 Determination: The District has sufficient funding sources to provide services.

4.7.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District provides regional cooperation in the management of water and drainage in the Dixon regional watershed and the North Delta Water Agency. The District is among the agencies that operate the Dixon area regional drainage system. Other agencies include the Dixon Resource Conservation District, Maine Prairie Water District, and the City of Dixon.

The District has representatives on various committees related to delivery of irrigation water. The District has a seat on the Solano County Water Agency, the Solano Water Advisory Commission, and the Solano County Water Authority. The District also participates in the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority and the Solano Agricultural Water Conservation Committee. The District has previously managed the Countywide agricultural pump test program for RD 2068, the Solano Irrigation District, and the Main Prairie Water District.

In addition, the District is a partner in funding and management of the Dixon Regional Aquatic Pesticide NPDES permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The District has joint facilities operations agreements with the Dixon Resource Conservation District and the Maine Prairie Water District.

The District, in cooperation with the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority, is planning a regional drainage improvement project extending from the City Dixon to near Haas Slough. Phase 1 includes an enlarged channel approximately 3 miles long, identified as the Dixon Main Drain and V-Drain segment in the Eastside Drain Project Conceptual Design Report.

The District is adjacent to and its levees are continued into Reclamation District (RD) No. 2098. The District works with RD 2098 to provide an integrated flood protection system. In fact, the District also has a contract to provide administrative services to RD 2098.

4.7.4.1 Determination: The District actively participates in the Solano County Water Agency, Solano County Water Authority, the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority, and the Solano Agricultural Water Conservation Committee.

4.7.4.2 Determination: The District has joint facilities operations agreements with the Dixon Resource Conservation District and the Maine Prairie Water District.

4.7.4.3 Determination: The District in cooperation with the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority is planning a regional drainage improvement project.

4.7.4.4 Determination: The District contracts with RD 2098 to provide administrative services.

4.7.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a five-member board who are elected to 4-year terms. Trustees must be landowners or legal representatives of landowners. Trustees receive a compensation of \$150 per month. They meet on the second Thursday of each month at 2 p.m. at 7178 Yolano Road in Dixon. Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act.

The District has seven full-time employees, one executive staff, one executive support staff, and five operations staff. The General Manager also acts as Secretary to the Board. The executive support staff is responsible for routine office operations and financial reporting. The operations staff is responsible for general maintenance and operation of the water distribution, drainage, and levee systems.

As a member of the Agricultural Water Conservation Committee, the District in conjunction with member agencies publishes *The Irrigator*. The publication is a way to communicate information to growers about water conservation. The Irrigator is published quarterly.

4.7.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees elected to 4-year terms who are landowners or representatives of landowners. Trustees are compensated \$150 per month.

4.7.5.2 Determination: The Board of Trustees meets the second Thursday of each month. Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act.

4.7.5.3 Determination: The District has seven full-time employees who adequately provide for administration and maintenance and operation of the water distribution system.

4.7.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other LAFCO policies that will affect service delivery.

4.7.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that will affect service delivery.

4.7.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.7.1.1 Determination: There is no expected population growth within the District boundaries.

- 4.7.2.1 Determination:** The District has sufficient capacity and facilities to provide irrigation water.
- 4.7.2.2 Determination:** The District has sufficient capacity and facilities to provide drainage services and levee maintenance.
- 4.7.3.1 Determination:** The District has sufficient funding sources to provide services.
- 4.7.4.1 Determination:** The District actively participates in the Solano County Water Agency, Solano County Water Authority, the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority, and the Solano Agricultural Water Conservation Committee.
- 4.7.4.2 Determination:** The District has joint facilities operations agreements with the Dixon Resource Conservation District and the Maine Prairie Water District.
- 4.7.4.3 Determination:** The District in cooperation with the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority is planning a regional drainage improvement project.
- 4.7.4.4 Determination:** The District contracts with RD 2098 to provide administrative services.
- 4.7.5.1 Determination:** The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees elected to 4-year terms who are landowners or representatives of landowners. Trustees are compensated \$100 per month.
- 4.7.5.2 Determination:** The Board of Trustees meets the second Thursday of each month. Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act.
- 4.7.5.3 Determination:** The District has seven full-time employees who adequately provide for administration and maintenance and operation of the water distribution system.
- 4.7.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that will affect service delivery.

4.8 - Reclamation District No. 2084

Reclamation District No. 2084's organization occurred on November 15, 1946 under Division 15 of the Water Code. The district is composed of 3,100 acres of land, of which 2,320 acres are in agricultural production. The balance is in irrigated pasture, levees, drainage ditches, and row crops. The District is bounded by Cache Slough and the Ship Channel on the east and north. The entirety of District 2084 is the last property in the Yolo Bypass and the state has flowage easements over the property. Through deed restrictions, there can be no structures of any kind built on the property.

4.8.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The area served by the District is currently designated as a Resource Conservation Overlay in the County's General Plan. That designation is designed to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. The district is slated to remain in agriculture and no structures may be built on the property by deed restrictions. There are no anticipated changes in population. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.8.1.1 Determination: The district is slated to remain in agriculture and no structures may be built on the property by deed restrictions. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.8.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

District facilities include pumping stations, an irrigation canal, and the levees. The pumping station on the north end of the District includes a 40 HP pump, while the pumping station on the south end includes a 100 HP pump and two 75 HP pumps. The irrigation canal runs from the east to the west boundary, then south and east to the middle of the property. The drainage canal, which traverses the middle of the District, occasionally requires cleaning.

The District is responsible for maintaining the levees on the east and north sides. The levees have been well maintained as are the roads that service the levees. There are no planned additions to current services.

4.8.2.1 Determination: The current services are adequate to provide services. There are no planned additions.

4.8.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Although the law does not require the District to use formal budgetary procedures, the District follows the County budget requirement by preparing an annual budget. The District collects sufficient revenues through assessments to provide service. The assessments are distributed amongst the three owners based on assessed value. Floyd Pederson contributes nearly 60 percent, Union Farms 38 percent and Walter Powell 2 percent.

Table 32: Reclamation District No. 2084 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$120,000	\$60,000	\$120,000	\$200,000	\$E60,000
Expenditures	\$51,730	\$130,047	\$200,312	\$36,648	\$52,400
Fund Balance Beg	\$E(58,498)	\$9,772	(\$76,272)	\$(156,584)	\$6,768
Fund Balance End	\$9,772	\$(76,272)	\$(156,584)	\$6,768	\$14,378

The District’s general fund showed a deficit as of the end of FY 2003-04 of \$76,272. The deficit was due to cost of the reconstruction of a pump structure totaling \$124,591. The deficit was resolved through the collection of an assessment to property owners.

The annual budget is approximately \$60,000. The State Controller’s report for 2005-06 listed no revenues but expenses of \$52,400. In October 2007, the District had a cash balance of just under \$18,000.

4.8.3.1 Determination: The District is able to fund the services provided. When Capital improvements are required, any deficits are resolved by self-assessments.

4.8.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District shares a part of the southwestern boundary with the City of Rio Vista. Although the District has the facilities to provide services, there may be opportunities to explore partnerships or assistance with the City, particularly during flood events.

4.8.4.1 Determination: The District should explore opportunities for partnerships or assistance with the City of Rio Vista.

4.8.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees. The Solano County Board of Supervisors appoints the Trustees to 4-year terms. The Trustees meet on an as-needed basis. Since the one resident landowner serves on the Board of Trustees, the interests of the landowners and the public are well represented.

The District has no employees and contracts for maintenance services.

4.8.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees that includes the landowners and the lone resident. The interests of all parties are well represented.

4.8.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.8.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.8.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.8.1.1 Determination: The district is slated to remain in agriculture and no structures may be built on the property by deed restrictions. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.8.2.1 Determination: The current services are adequate to provide services. There are no planned additions.

4.8.3.1 Determination: The District is able to fund the services provided. When Capital improvements are required, any deficits are resolved by self-assessments.

4.8.4.1 Determination: The District should explore opportunities for partnerships or assistance with the City of Rio Vista.

4.8.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees that includes the landowners and the lone resident. The interests of all parties are well represented.

4.8.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.9 - Reclamation District No. 2093 (Liberty Island)

Reclamation District 2093 originally formed as “Liberty Reclamation #1” on March 5, 1918 under Division 15 of the California Water Code. The original purpose was to protect the island with a levee system to allow for agriculture. The boundaries encompass the 5,029 acres of Liberty Island.

In 1959, because of the changes in landowners, the formation of the Sacramento Port District, and the Deep Water Channel, Reclamation District No. 2093 replaced Liberty Reclamation #1 under Section 50300 of the Water Code. In 1998, The Trust for Public Land purchased 96 percent of the island. The remaining 4 percent is owned by Wildlands, Inc. Since that time there has been no agricultural activity, the levee was breached, and much of the island was flooded.

4.9.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The district is uninhabited. The Trust for Public Lands allows hunting on the property but no camping or dwelling of any sort. The area served by the District is currently designated as a Resource Conservation Overlay in the County’s General Plan. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the island. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand its Sphere of Influence.

4.9.1.1 Determination: The District is uninhabited with no planned increase in population.

4.9.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District has no paid employees but the Trust for Public Land does not have immediate plans to repair the levees and drain the island to allow renewed agricultural activities. The four pumps on the island are inoperable. The District prefers to leave the island in its natural state. Other than making the island available for hunting, the District provides no additional services.

4.9.2.1 Determination: The District has made the island available for hunting but has no plans for activities that would again allow agricultural uses..

4.9.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

District funding comes from sources other than taxes. The Trust for Public Land, with 96 percent ownership, is the primary source of the funding. The Trust for Public Land (TPL) loans the District sufficient funds to cover expenses. The costs are divided proportionally by percent of ownership. RD 2093 intends to levy an assessment on landowners when the outstanding loan amount attributed to the other 4 percent of the ownership equals or exceeds the cost of a Proposition 218 election. Most of the expenses incurred are associated with the audit of the District by the County and legal expenses. That cost has been estimated at \$10,000 to \$15,000 annually.

Table 33: Reclamation District No. 2093 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$557	\$242	\$54	\$8	\$17
Expenditures	\$6,224	\$5,148	\$5,415	\$	\$6,589
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Source: State Controller's Reports.

The District has no income-generating operations. The District has operated at deficits for the last several years. At present, the account with Solano County Treasury is depleted. The District has designated TPL to pay its bills and has received a loan from TPL without having a cash balance. Many of the more recent expenses have been either for regular audits of the District's financial activities or legal expenses related to the District's ongoing activities.

4.9.3.1 Determination: The District often operates at a deficit, which is funded by the majority property owner, The Trust for Public Land.

4.9.3.2 Determination: Assessments are increased to the landowners of the other 4 percent of the District when the cost of a Proposition 218 election is less than or equals the total of the assessment to the 4 percent of the landowners.

4.9.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District has no facilities that are available for sharing with other agencies. There are no structures on the island.

4.9.4.1 Determination: There are no facilities on the island, nor does the District share facilities with neighboring districts. There are no other opportunities for shared facilities.

4.9.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees appointed by the Board of Supervisors to 4-year terms. Members are required to be landowners or representatives of landowners. All landowners are represented on the Board of Trustees. They receive no compensation.

Meetings are held on an as-needed basis and are open to the public. The Board of Trustees meets in the spring to develop the budget and at least one other time on an as-needed basis. The meetings are held at the TPL offices in Sacramento.

The District has no paid employees. When maintenance work is required, the District uses private contractors.

The District provides very limited services. There is no agricultural activity, the pumps are inoperable, the levee breach is not slated for repair, and the District prefers to leave the island in its current state. LAFCO may want to consider dissolving the District; however, the District wants to maintain the structure to allow the District to serve as the lead agency for habitat mitigation, should it be required.

4.9.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees that includes all landowners.

4.9.5.2 Determination: The District meets at the offices of The Trust for Public Land in Sacramento to develop an annual budget and on an as-needed basis thereafter.

4.9.5.3 Determination: The District has no paid employees and contracts for the levee maintenance as required.

4.9.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.9.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.9.7 - Summary of Determinations:

4.9.1.1 Determination: The District is uninhabited with no planned increase in population.

4.9.2.1 Determination: The District has made the island available for hunting but has no plans for activities that would again allow agricultural uses.

4.9.3.1 Determination: The District often operates at a deficit, which is funded by the majority property owner, The Trust for Public Land.

4.9.3.2 Determination: Assessments are increased to the landowners of the other 4 percent of the District when the cost of a Proposition 218 election is less than or equals the total of the assessment to the 4 percent of the landowners.

4.9.4.1 Determination: There are no facilities on the island, nor does the District share facilities with neighboring districts. There are no other opportunities for shared facilities.

4.9.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees that includes all landowners.

4.9.5.2 Determination: The District meets at the offices of The Trust for Public Land in Sacramento to develop an annual budget and on an as-needed basis thereafter.

4.9.5.3 Determination: The District has no employees and contracts for the levee maintenance as required.

4.9.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.10 - Reclamation District No. 2098

The USACE improved levees along the east, west, and south boundaries of the current District along Cache, Haas, and Shag Sloughs as part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. Those levees were turned over to the State of California for operation and maintenance. Those responsibilities were subsequently given to the landowners, who in turn, formed RD 2098, on September 26, 1963, to assume the operation and maintenance of the levee, under California Water Code Section 50000. The District includes 6,100 acres and serves a population of 25.

4.10.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The nearest city is the City of Rio Vista. The General Plan identifies cities and their Spheres of Influence. The area served by the District has a current designation as a Resource Conservation Overlay. The intent of that designation is to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for further growth or development of the island. As a result, there is no anticipated need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.10.1.1 Determination: There is no expected population growth within the District boundaries.

4.10.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

In 2005, MBK Engineers surveyed the District's levees and found some problems with the system. They found several areas that exhibited stability problems during high water events, several areas of landside instability and a number of areas showing crown subsidence. Subsidence has been measured at 4 to 6 inches, which is not considered substantial. In addition, the MBK report identified a 4,000 ft section that showed erosion problems.

The levees experienced substantial damage during the December 2006-January 2007 flood events. The resulting erosion damage was submitted to the USACE for repair under the public law 84-99 restoration program. Initial analysis resulted in a determination of "no federal interest" in the repairs. Subsequently the District worked with Reclamation District No. 2068 to redesign the repair project to meet federal economic criteria. The USACE reevaluated the request and qualified the project for restoration. Anticipated repairs are now expected to be completed in the fall of 2008.

The District is active in maintaining its portion of the levee system. An inspection in the fall of 2006 determined the levee maintenance to be deficient. The District immediately initiated an enhanced levee maintenance program in 2007. The levee was re-examined in the fall of 2007 and received a satisfactory inspection. The District expects to continue an enhanced levee maintenance program. The expected result will be increased levee reliability and improved inspection reports.

The USACE has assumed the District has approximately an 8-year level of protection. That means there is a statistical probability of levee failure of 12.5 percent each year. Nevertheless, the District has never experienced a levee failure. The District has recently considered capital improvements to raise the protection level, however there are no proposed projects or available funding at the present.

4.10.2.1 Determination: The District has an assumed 8-year level of protection. The District currently has no plans to improve the level of protection.

4.10.2.2 Determination: The District has found some problem areas in its levee system that include instability during high water events, crown subsidence, and a large area of erosion. The District is working independently and with the USACE to correct those problems.

4.10.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 34: Reclamation District No. 2098 Revenues and Expenditures

	2003-04*	2004-05*	2005-06*	2006-07*	2007-08*
Revenues	\$10,931	\$19,712	\$21,736	\$20,635	\$52,881
Expenditures	\$4,050	\$11,613	\$20,408	\$23,099	\$53,020
Fund Balance Beg	\$5,663	\$12,544	\$20,643	\$21,971	\$19,507
Fund Balance End	\$12,544	\$20,643	\$21,971	\$19,507	\$19,368
*Source: State Controller’s Reports for Special Districts. †Source: District Response to Survey Questionnaire.					

During budget year 2006-07, the District initiated repairs to damages from the January 2006 flood event. The response required additional funding of \$32,000 that was advanced by individual landowners. The District did not issue warrants, but advances are repaid out of the next year’s assessments.

The District receives revenue as a portion of the property taxes collected by the County and a maintenance fee. Reclamation District No. 2098 also participates in the Delta Levee Maintenance Program. The Delta Levee Maintenance Program is a state funded program that reimburses districts for eligible maintenance completed in the prior year. Overall, the District receives 27 percent of its revenues from property taxes, and 72 percent from maintenance fees. The Delta Levee Maintenance Program historically reimburses districts for about half of what has been spent on eligible maintenance in the prior year.

4.10.3.1 Determination: The District has sufficient funding to maintain the levees. Property taxes and fees are augmented by State subvention funds.

4.10.3.2 Determination: The District has made use of additional contributions from landowners to cover costs of emergency repairs.

4.10.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The district contracts for administrative services with RD 2068, which lies adjacent to the District. Together with RD 2068, the District maintains a common levee system of about 20 miles. Both districts depend on each other to maintain their portion of the levee system, since failure in one section will affect both districts.

4.10.4.1 Determination: The District works closely with Reclamation District No. 2068 since they share a common levee system.

4.10.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board appointed to 4-year terms by the Board of Supervisors. Trustees must be landowners or an authorized representative of a landowner. Trustees are not compensated and meet once a year or whenever necessary.

Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act, however there are no locations within the District that suitable and accessible to the public so meetings are held at the nearby offices of Reclamation District No. 2068.

The District does not conduct public outreach or education activities. Because of its small area and number of landowners, the District is able to communicate directly with landowners on an as-needed basis.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by District landowners, tenant farm operators and by contracted services. Administrative services are provided by contract with Reclamation District No. 2068.

Because of the close relationship and interdependency of the District and Reclamation District No. 2068, it may seem logical to consider a consolidation of the two districts. LAFCO may want to initiate a study to determine if consolidation would benefit both districts. Questions that should be addressed in the study relate to administrative costs and how they would be shared by the landowners in the consolidated district.

4.10.5.1 Determination: The Board of Trustees is a three-member board appointed by the Board of Supervisors and serve without compensation.

4.10.5.2 Determination: The District can communicate with residents on an informal basis owing to its small size.

4.10.5.3 Determination: The District has no paid staff. Labor is performed by contract or by local landowners. The District contracts for administrative services with RD 2068.

4.10.5.4 Determination: Because of the close relationship of the District and RD 2068, LAFCO should consider initiating a study to determine if a consolidation of RD 2098 and RD 2068 would be beneficial to landowners of both districts.

4.10.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other LAFCO policies that will affect service delivery.

4.10.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that will affect service delivery.

4.10.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.10.1.1 Determination: There is no expected population growth within the District boundaries.

4.10.2.1 Determination: The District has an assumed 8-year level of protection. The District currently has no plans to improve the level of protection.

4.10.2.2 Determination: The District has found some problem areas in its levee system that include instability during high water events, crown subsidence, and a large area of erosion. The District is working independently and with the USACE to correct those problems.

4.10.3.1 Determination: The District has sufficient funding to maintain the levees. Property taxes and fees are augmented by State subvention funds.

4.10.3.2 Determination: The District has made use of additional contributions from landowners to cover costs of emergency repairs.

4.10.4.1 Determination: The District works closely with RD 2068 since they share a common levee system.

4.10.5.1 Determination: The Board of Trustees is a three-member board appointed by the Board of Supervisors and serves without compensation.

4.10.5.2 Determination: The District can communicate with residents on an informal basis owing to its small size.

4.10.5.3 Determination: The District has no paid staff. Labor is performed by contract or by local landowners. The District contracts for administrative services with RD 2068.

4.10.5.4 Determination: Because of the close relationship of the District and RD 2068, LAFCO should consider initiating a study to determine if a consolidation of RD 2098 and RD 2068 would be beneficial to landowners of both districts.

4.10.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that will affect service delivery.

4.11 - Reclamation District No. 2104 (Peters Pocket Tract)

The District was formed on May 26, 1964, under California Water Code Section 50000, to provide flood control for Peters Pocket Tract. The District maintains 7.4 miles of levees that protect 450 acres. The District serves a population of 12.

4.11.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The District includes three landowners, all of whom have been trustees. There has been disagreement among them and according to the State Controller’s report, the District has been inactive since 2003. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.11.1.1 Determination: The District has been inactive since 2003 and lies in an area designated for agriculture. There are no anticipated changes in population.

4.11.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

4.11.2.1 Determination: The District has been inactive since 2003 and does not provide services.

4.11.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

The District has been inactive since 2003 and has no financial data, nor does it provide services.

Table 35: Reclamation District No. 2104 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Note: No data available					

4.11.3.1 Determination: The District has been inactive since 2003 and has no financial data available, nor does it provide services.

4.11.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District has been inactive since 2003 and has no shared facilities, nor is there an opportunity for shared facilities.

4.11.4.1 Determination: The District has been inactive since 2003 and has no shared facilities, nor is there an opportunity for shared facilities.

4.11.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District has been considered inactive. The Board of Trustees no longer meets, however any maintenance activities are performed by individual landowners. When one of the landowners was informed the District was inactive, he expressed surprise. He contacted the other landowners in an effort to re-activate the District.

4.11.5.1 Determination: Solano LAFCO should work with the landowners to determine if they would like to re-activate the District or dissolve the District and transfer any responsibilities for service delivery to a neighboring successor district.

4.11.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.11.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.11.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.11.1.1 Determination: The District has been inactive since 2003 and lies in an area designated for agriculture. There are no anticipated changes in population.

4.11.2.1 Determination: The District has been inactive since 2003 and does not provide services.

4.11.3.1 Determination: The District has been inactive since 2003 and has no financial data available, nor does it provide services.

4.11.4.1 Determination: The District has been inactive since 2003 and has no shared facilities, nor is there an opportunity for shared facilities.

4.11.5.1 Determination: Solano LAFCO should work with the landowners to determine if they would like to re-activate the District or dissolve the District and transfer any responsibilities for service delivery to a neighboring successor district.

4.11.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.12 - Reclamation District No. 2112 (Schafer Pintail)

Institution of the District occurred in the fall of 1979 to provide flood control for Grizzly Island, under California Water Code Section 50400. There are no residents within the District. The District maintains the levees that protect 1158 acres of the island as required for habitat by the Suisun Resource Conservation District guidelines.

4.12.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The area served by the District is currently designated as a Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no anticipated changes in population. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.12.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.12.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District was formed by landowners in order to maintain existing flood control and tidal levees that surround the District. No new reclamation activities or facilities are anticipated.

4.12.2.2 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide levee maintenance and flood control. Since there is no planned expansion of the District, there is no planned expansion of the capacity to provide services.

4.12.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 36: Reclamation District No. 2112 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$9,309	\$27,403	\$12,716	\$15,632	\$13,700
Expenditures	\$10,665	\$17,738	\$24,913	\$10,977	\$9,942
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$(1,356)	\$8,309	\$(3,888)	\$767
Fund Balance End	\$(1,356)	\$8,309	\$(3,888)	\$767	\$4,525

Source: State Controller Reports for Special Districts.

The district operations are funded by the landowners, who as Trustees essentially assess themselves. As noted in the audit report and in the above table there was a deficit balance as of June 30, 2004. The deficit fund balance was resolved through an assessment on District property owners. Each landowner is assessed between \$12 and \$16 per acre at present. Assessments vary according to anticipated needs. The Trustees try to set aside some funding for a reserve to be used in case of emergencies.

The District is not subject to a Gann appropriation limit since it is funded by sources other than “proceeds of taxes”.

4.12.3.1 Determination: The District is funded by an assessment to landowners that ranges from \$12 to \$16 per acre.

4.12.3.2 Determination: The District is working to set aside a reserve in case of emergencies.

4.12.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District maintains water control structures and levees. The District works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.12.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.12.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees who serve 4-year terms. Trustees must be landowners and may serve several terms, as there are no term limits. Since there are seven parcels in the District, each property is represented on the board. Trustees are not compensated and meet annually. Usually they meet, in the third week of June depending on the issues before them. The meeting takes place at the headquarters of the Pintail Ranch Headquarters. Since all landowners are trustees, they are all notified.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by District landowners and by contracted services.

4.12.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a seven-member board that includes a representative of each of the landowners of the District.

4.12.5.2 Determination: The District meets annually depending on availability of trustees and issues before them.

4.12.5.3 Determination: The District has no staff, and labor is performed by landowners, tenant operators, or contractors.

4.12.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other LAFCO policies that will affect service delivery.

4.12.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that will affect service delivery.

4.12.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.12.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.12.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide levee maintenance and flood control. Since there is no planned expansion of the District, there is no planned expansion of the capacity to provide services.

4.12.3.1 Determination: The District is funded by an assessment to landowners that ranges from \$12 to \$13 per acre.

4.12.3.2 Determination: The District is working to set aside a reserve in case of emergencies.

4.12.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.12.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a seven-member board that includes a representative of each of the landowners of the District.

4.12.5.2 Determination: The District meets annually depending on availability of trustees and issues before them.

4.12.5.3 Determination: The District has no staff, and labor is performed by landowners, tenant operators, or contractors.

4.12.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that will affect service delivery.

4.13 - Reclamation District No 2127 (Simmons Wheeler)

The District saw formation on June 23, 1992, under California Water Code Section 50000, at the request of landowners representing 85 percent of the District lands. The purpose was to provide for habitat conservation and an organized means of maintaining the levees that protect the five duck clubs within the District. In all, the levees protect approximately 3600 acres.

4.13.1 - Growth and Population Projections

There are fewer than 12 registered voters within the District and the only residents are the caretakers of the duck clubs. The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.13.1.1 Determination: There is no anticipated growth in the near future.

4.13.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

There is no data as to whether the District has the capacity to provide public services.

4.13.2.1 Determination: There is no information about the present and planned capacity of public services.

4.13.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 37: Reclamation District No. 2127 Revenues and Expenditures

	2002-03	2004-05*	2005-06
Revenues		\$25,219	
Expenditures		\$23,147	
Fund Balance Beg		\$2,086	
Fund Balance End		\$4,158	

*Source: Don Gall, Solano County Auditors Office.

Very little financial data is available. The data from the County Auditors office shows that the District receives approximately \$10,000 from assessments or 42 percent of its revenues, and the remainder comes from annual member contributions. As is the case in other reclamation districts, the landowners typically make additional contributions to cover costs of repairs. From the one year shown above the District has the ability to fund maintenance and repairs. Additional data is desirable to be sure this one year is typical of operations.

4.13.3.1 Determination: Because of lack of financial reporting, it is uncertain as to whether the District has the financial ability to provide services.

4.13.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District provides levee maintenance for a system of levees that only protects the District. The levee system is not connected to the levee system of the neighboring districts, nor is the District near enough to any of the cities to be able to share facilities with another agency.

4.13.4.1 Determination: There are no opportunities for shared facilities.

4.13.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a five-member board who are elected to 4-year terms. Trustees are representatives of the five duck clubs within the District boundaries and receive no compensation. There are no scheduled meetings. The Trustees meet as needed, at least once a year, generally in the fall.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by District landowners or by contracted services.

4.13.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees representing each of the five duck clubs. They meet at least once a year on an as-needed basis.

4.13.5.2 Determination: The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by the landowners or by a contractor.

4.13.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.13.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.13.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.13.1.1 Determination: There is no anticipated growth in the near future.

4.13.2.1 Determination: There is no information about the present and planned capacity of public services.

4.13.3.1 Determination: Because of lack of financial reporting, it is uncertain as to whether the District has the financial ability to provide services.

4.13.4.1 Determination: There are no opportunities for shared facilities.

4.13.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees representing each of the five duck clubs. They meet at least once a year on an as-needed basis.

4.13.5.2 Determination: The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by the landowners or by a contractor.

4.13.6.1 Determination: There is no anticipated growth in the near future.

4.14 - Reclamation District No. 2129 (Frost Lake)

District 2129 saw formation on June 30, 1998, under California Water Code Section 50000, in order to maintain the water delivery and drainage systems common to properties within the District. Primarily responsibilities include irrigation and habitat enhancement for approximately 1100 acres. The District has a population of one household containing two residents and provides services to nine duck clubs, eight inside the District and one outside the District.

4.14.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The District contains fewer than 12 registered voters and so is considered uninhabited according to Government Code 56046. The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.14.1.1 Determination: The District contains fewer than 12 registered voters and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.14.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District's purpose is to permit duck clubs to maintain existing and proposed ditches, levees, and water control structures. The District uses brackish water from Montezuma Slough to maintain the habitat for the duck clubs. In normal years, the water varies from near fresh from March through the middle of June and becomes brackish the rest of the year. In drought years, the salinity is greater.

There are approximately 775 acres that use water from the District. Of this acreage, 500 acres are flooded. Water is taken from the slough through two fish screens, then enters the Solano Cut, a ditch maintained by the District. Each property has a privately maintained turnout or floodgate. During flood up for hunting season, the turnouts are open. After that, they are closed to approximately 10 percent of their capacity. This provides circulation to avoid stagnant water problems.

Some, but not all, properties drain into Frost Lake. The District maintains two 48-inch gates that drain Frost Lake into Montezuma Slough. The District also has an auxiliary drainage gate, which is rarely used, that empties into a drainage ditch operated by the Department of Fish and Game. Each property that drains into Frost Lake is responsible for maintaining its own drainage infrastructure. There is one riser box used to control the level in the Solano Cut that is in need of repair. Those repairs are slated for the summer of 2008.

The District has no exterior levees except for the small areas that protect the fish screens and drain gates. They have not experienced any maintenance problems in any of these areas.

4.14.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide the public services and no expansion is planned.

4.14.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 38: Reclamation District No. 2129 Revenues and Expenditures

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Cash Balance Beg	\$1,464	\$450	\$5,527
Revenues	\$5,066	\$8,547	\$10,597
Expenditures	\$5,360	\$7,838	\$13,250
Estimated Cash Balance End	\$1,186	\$1,159	\$2,874
Source: Survey results from RD 2129.			

Administrative costs are generally around \$3,000 per year. Other costs for flooding and draining are estimated at the June meeting and prorated on a per acre basis to the landowners.

The District also receives grants for capital improvements. Some examples include \$567,550 from Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District for purchase and installation of two fish screens, \$94,000 through the North American Wetland Conservation Act (NCWA) for the construction and installation of two drain gates, and \$192,000 for the construction and installation of water control structures and a ditch to deliver water. In 2007, the District received a grant of \$3,686 for a new pipe and canal gate.

The District participates in a required audit. The audit is scheduled every 5 years.

4.14.3.1 Determination: The District collects sufficient funds from the duck clubs to provide services.

4.14.3.2 Determination: The District applies for and receives grants for capital improvement projects.

4.14.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The only other similar service provider is the Department of Fish and Game, which maintains a drainage ditch, connected to the District’s auxiliary drain gate. There are no other similar service providers.

4.14.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Department of Fish and Game. There are no other opportunities for share facilities.

4.14.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a seven-member board who are appointed to 4-year terms. Vacancies on the Board are noticed and if no candidates apply, the board will recommend candidates, for appointment by the Board of Supervisors. The terms are staggered so approximately half the board is appointed or reappointed every 2 years. Trustees must be landowners and receive no compensation.

The Trustees meet annually, on the first Friday of June. Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act. The Trustees meet primarily to adopt a budget for the next fiscal year.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by contracted services.

4.14.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees consisting of landowners and they are not compensated.

4.14.5.2 Determination: The Board of Trustees meets annually on the first Friday of June. The meeting is noticed according to the Brown Act.

4.14.5.3 Determination: The District has no paid staff and labor requirements are met by contracted services.

4.14.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.14.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.14.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.14.1.1 Determination: The District contains fewer than 12 registered voters and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.14.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide the public services and no expansion is planned.

4.14.3.1 Determination: The District collects sufficient funds from the duck clubs to provide services.

4.14.3.2 Determination: The District applies for and receives grants for capital improvement projects.

4.14.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Department of Fish and Game. There are no other opportunities for share facilities.

4.15.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees consisting of landowners who are not compensated.

4.15.5.2 Determination: The Board of Trustees meets annually on the first Friday of June. The meeting is noticed according to the Brown Act.

4.14.5.3 Determination: The District has no staff, and labor requirements are met by contracted services.

4.14.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery

4.15 - Reclamation District No. 2130 (Honker Bay)

Formed on August 5, 1999, under California Water Code Section 50000, to provide drainage, irrigation, and complete reclamation of land within District boundaries. District 2130 includes 816 acres. The District serves the five landowners on Honker Bay.

4.15.1 - Growth and Population Projections

The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.15.1.1 Determination: There is no anticipated growth in the near future.

4.15.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District was formed to provide drainage, irrigation, and reclamation of land within its boundaries. The District has been able to maintain the levees by contracting for services and sharing the costs among the landowners. There is no expectation of expanding services.

4.15.2.1 Determination: The District has the ability to maintain the current levee system by contracting for services.

4.15.2.2 Determination: There are no plans for expanding services.

4.15.3 - Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 39: Reclamation District No. 2130 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02 ¹	2002-03 ¹	2003-04 ¹	2004-05 ¹	2005-06 ²
Revenues	\$	\$	\$10,229	\$94,529	\$215,549
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$6,740	\$92,243	\$217,130
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$3,489	\$5,775
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$3,489	\$5,775	\$4,194

¹Source: State Controller Reports for Special Districts

²Source: Auditors Report

The District does not prepare an annual budget, nor is it required to adopt formal budgetary procedures. However, the District must file a listing of anticipated revenues and expenses with the County. The District also does not maintain commercial insurance even though the District is exposed to risks of loss related to torts, theft of assets, and errors and omissions.

The big increase in revenues and expenses evident in the 2005-2006 figures in the table above are due to increased levee repairs resulting from winter storms. The District receives public and private grants to repair and maintain the levees. In addition, each landowner is assessed based on acreage and benefits.

4.15.3.1 Determination: The District does not prepare an annual budget and is not required to do so. The District must file a list of anticipated revenues and expenses with the County.

4.15.3.2 Determination: Costs are spread among the five landowners based on acreage and benefit.

4.15.3.3 Determination: The District receives both public and private grants to repair levees.

4.15.4 - Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District currently shares no facilities. The District works cooperatively with the Solano Resource Conservation District.

4.15.4.1 Determination: The District currently shares no facilities but works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.15.5 - Accountability and Government Structure

The Board of Trustees consists of five members with one representative from each landowner. The Trustees serve 4-year terms and are not compensated. The Board meets four to five times each year. Meetings are held at the offices of one of the trustees depending on availability.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by contracted services.

4.15.5.1 Determination: The Board of Trustees consists of five members with each landowner having a representative.

4.15.5.2 Determination: The District has no employees and labor requirements are met by contract services.

4.15.6 - Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.15.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.15.7 - Summary of Determinations

4.15.1.1 Determination: There is no anticipated growth in the near future.

4.15.2.1 Determination: The District has the ability to maintain the current levee system by contracting for services.

4.15.2.2 Determination: There are no plans for expanding services.

4.15.3.1 Determination: The District does not prepare an annual budget and is not required to do so. The District must file a list of anticipated revenues and expenses with the County.

4.15.3.2 Determination: Costs are spread among the five landowners based on acreage and benefit.

4.15.3.3 Determination: The District receives both public and private grants to repair levees.

4.15.4.1 Determination: The District currently shares no facilities but works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.15.5.1 Determination: The Board of Trustees consists of five members with each landowner having a representative.

4.15.5.2 Determination: The District has no employees and labor requirements are met by contract services.

4.15.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.16 - Reclamation District No. 2134 (Denverton)

The purpose of the District is to share the cost of levee and road maintenance and to make federal and state grant money available for levee repair and habitat maintenance. The District was formed under California Water Code Section 50000 in 2001. There is only one landowner in the District, the CCF III LLC that is part of the California Conservation Fund. The District consists of two parcels of approximately 762 acres.

4.16.1 - Growth and Population Projections

Denverton used to be a shipping terminal in the 19th century when goods were loaded onto barges to be transported to market. As newer and more efficient transport means developed, Denverton lost its prominence and today may be considered a ghost town.

The area is currently designated as marshland, included within the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs.

There are no residents within District boundaries. A caretaker lives just across the road that forms one of the District boundaries. There are no anticipated changes in population.

4.16.1.1 Determination: The District is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.16.2 - Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District maintains the roads and levees associated with the needs for water control, drainage, irrigation, and to provide upkeep of the habitat within the District. There is no anticipated growth and no changes in the capacity of services.

4.16.2.1 Determination: The District maintains the levees and the roads on top of the levees. The District plans to continue those functions at the current level of service.

4.16.3 Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 40: Reclamation District No. 2134 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Revenues	\$	\$	\$18,000	\$22,901	\$83,967
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$26,199	\$8,461	\$52,075
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Source: State Controller Reports for Special Districts					

The District receives most of its revenues from property tax assessments, about \$50,000 annually. In addition, the District receives limited federal funding which varies from year to year for the purpose of repairing the levees. The District is also working with the California Waterfowl Organization to obtain North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) grant money to develop habitat for waterfowl.

The District does not have a budget, but it does report anticipated revenues and expenses to the County. Needs are determined in consultation with the Suisun Resource Conservation District. The District also participates in an audit performed by the County.

4.16.3.1 Determination: The District does not have a formal budget process, but it does submit a report of anticipated revenues and expenses to the County.

4.16.3.2 Determination: Needs are determined in consultation with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.16.3.3 Determination: The maintenance operations of the District are funded primarily through assessments.

4.16.4 Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District consults with the Suisun Resource Conservation District to develop a work plan for the coming year. In addition, the District works cooperatively with the California Waterfowl Organization to obtain funding for wetlands and habitat.

4.16.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District and other conservation agencies.

4.16.5 Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board who are appointed by the Board of Supervisors to 4-year staggered terms. Trustees must be landowners or representatives of the landowner. Trustees are not compensated and meet on an as-needed basis. Meetings are posted in accordance with the Brown Act.

The District has no staff. Labor requirements are met by contracting for services.

4.16.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a 3-member board appointed to 4-year terms.

4.16.5.2 Determination: The Board of Trustees meets at least annually to determine a work plan and on an as-needed basis during the rest of the year

4.16.5.3 Determination: The District has no staff. All projects are completed by contractors.

4.16.6 Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.16.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.16.7 Summary of Determinations

4.16.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.16.2.1 Determination: The Districts maintain the levees and the roads on top of the levees. The District plans to continue those functions at the current level of service.

4.16.3.1 Determination: The District does not have a formal budget process, but it does submit a report of anticipated revenues and expenses to the County.

4.16.3.2 Determination: Needs are determined in consultation with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.16.3.3 Determination: The maintenance operations of the District are funded primarily through assessments.

4.16.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District and other conservation agencies.

4.16.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a 3-member board appointed to 4-year terms.

4.16.5.2 Determination: The Board of Trustees meets at least annually to determine a work plan and on an as-needed basis during the rest of the year

4.16.5.3 Determination: The District has no staff. All projects are completed by contractors.

4.16.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.17 Reclamation District No. 2135 (Sunrise Island)

Formed in accordance with California Water Code Section 50000 in 2006, the District provides irrigation and drainage for habitat maintenance and enhancement. There is only one landowner in the District, the Sunrise Island Duck Club. The District consists of approximately 325 acres. There are no residents other than the caretaker and his family.

4.17.2 Growth and Population Projections

The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.17.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.17.3 Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District maintains the road and levee associated with the needs for water control, drainage, and irrigation to provide upkeep of the habitat within the District. There is no anticipated growth and no changes in the capacity of services.

4.17.2.1 Determination: The District maintains the road, levee, and provides irrigation and drainage for upkeep of the habitat.

4.17.4 Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 41: Reclamation District No. 2135 Revenues and Expenditures

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Note: No data available					

Since the District is a single landowner, all fees and expenses are contributed by the landowner. The District does not have a budget and needs are determined in conjunction with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.17.3.1 Determination: The District does not have a formal budget process, but needs are determined though consultation with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

4.17.3.2 Determination: The single landowner funds the required maintenance operations of the District.

4.17.5 Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District representatives attend the annual workshop hosted by the Suisun Resource Conservation District. At the meeting, reclamation districts and property owners determine what is needed to maintain the habitat.

4.17.4.1 Determination: The District works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District to outline needs in order to maintain the habitat.

4.17.6 Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a five-member board who are appointed to 4-year terms. Trustees must be landowners or representatives of the landowner. Trustees are not compensated and meet once a year or whenever necessary at the Sunrise Island Duck Club facility, usually in November to determine a work plan for the following year.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by contracted services.

4.17.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member board appointed to 4-year terms.

4.17.5.2 Determination: The Board of Trustees meets annually to determine a work plan.

4.17.5.3 Determination: The District has no paid staff. All projects are completed by contractors.

4.17.7 Other Matters affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.17.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.17.8 Summary of Determinations

4.17.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.17.2.1 Determination: The Districts maintain the road, levee, and provides irrigation and drainage for upkeep of the habitat.

4.17.3.1 Determination: The District does not have a formal budget, but needs are determined through consultation with the Suisun Resource Conservation District.

- 4.17.3.2 Determination:** The single landowner funds the required maintenance operations of the District.
- 4.17.4.1 Determination:** The District works cooperatively with the Suisun Resource Conservation District to outline needs in order to maintain the habitat.
- 4.17.5.1 Determination:** The District is governed by a five-member board appointed to 4-year terms.
- 4.17.5.2 Determination:** The Board of Trustees meets annually to determine a work plan.
- 4.17.5.3 Determination:** The District has no paid staff. All projects are completed by contractors.
- 4.17.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.18 Reclamation District No. 2136 (Grizzly West)

The Solano LAFCO approved the formation of District 2136 on September 16, 2002 to provide maintenance for the levee, the road, and flood control. The District includes approximately 2,798 acres and eight landowners: California Farms, Tip End Gun Club, Island Club, Grizzly Duck Club, Montezuma Gun Club, Gum Tree Farms, West Wino Duck Club, and Merganser Farms. The District operates under the authority of the California Water Code Division 15.

4.18.2 Growth and Population Projections

There are fewer than 12 registered voters in the District, and by Government Code Section 56046, the District is considered uninhabited. The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.18.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.18.3 Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District provides levee maintenance and flood control services to maintain the habitat. There are no plans for expansion.

4.18.2.1 Determination: The District is currently providing an adequate level of levee maintenance and flood control services. No additional expansion is anticipated.

4.18.4 Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 42: Reclamation District No. 2136 Revenues and Expenditure

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$	\$	\$2,969	\$10,570	\$89,583
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$1,361	\$10,814	\$89,025
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

Source: State Controller Reports for Special Districts.

Revenues have three sources: assessments, grants, and State funds. Typically, landowners make additional contributions for levee repairs on an as-needed basis.

An audit report for the fiscal year ending 2004/05 stated the net assets totaled \$3,340, which were undesignated. That meant that amount could be used to meet the District's ongoing obligations.

4.18.3.1 Determination: The District has been able to fund services through a combination of assessments, grants, and state funding.

4.18.3.2 Determination: Typically, landowners make additional contributions for levee repairs on an as-needed basis.

4.18.5 Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District boundary consists of water on three sides . There are no shared facilities with other districts or opportunity to share facilities.

4.18.4.1 Determination: Because of its location, the District does not share facilities, nor does it have an opportunity to do so.

4.18.6 Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a seven-member board who are serving 4-year terms. The Trustees are appointed by the Board of Supervisors, must be landowners or their representatives, and receive no compensation.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by contractors.

4.18.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Board of Supervisors.

4.18.5.2 Determination: The Board of Trustees meets at least once a year or on an as-needed basis.

4.18.5.3 Determination: The District has no employees. Labor needs are met by contract.

4.18.7 Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.18.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.18.8 Summary of Determinations

4.18.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.18.2.1 Determination: The District is currently providing an adequate level of levee maintenance and flood control services. No additional expansion is anticipated.

4.18.3.1 Determination: The District has been able to fund services through a combination of assessment, grants, state funding.

- 4.18.3.2 Determination:** Typically, landowners make additional contributions for levee repairs on an as-needed basis.
- 4.18.4.1 Determination:** Because of its location, the District does not share facilities, nor does it have an opportunity to share facilities.
- 4.18.5.1 Determination:** The District is governed by a seven-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Board of Supervisors
- 4.18.5.2 Determination:** The Board of Trustees meets at least once a year or on an as-needed basis.
- 4.18.5.3 Determination:** The District has no paid employees. Labor needs are met by contract.
- 4.18.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.19 Reclamation District No. 2138 (Morrow Island)

Formed on May 3, 2004 to provide flood control for Morrow Island, the District maintains levees that protect a single parcel of 694 acres. The district formation was in accordance with California Water Code Section 50000. The District contains no residents and consists of a hunting club with eight owners.

4.19.2 Growth and Population Projections

The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.19.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.19.3 Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District’s purpose is to maintain existing flood control and tidal levees that surround the island to maintain its use as a hunting club. Very little information is available regarding the ability of the District to provide services, however since no growth is anticipated no additional capacity is required.

4.19.2.1 Determination: There is insufficient information available to determine whether the District has sufficient capacity to maintain the levee system.

4.19.4 Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 43: Reclamation District No. 2138 Revenues and Expenditure

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Note: No data available.					

4.19.3.1 Determination: There is insufficient information on the District’s budget to determine whether the District has the financial ability to provide services.

4.19.5 Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District has no capital assets. No facilities are available for sharing with other agencies. The District is a hunt club.

4.19.4.1 Determination: There are no facilities within the District, nor does the District share facilities with neighboring districts. There are no other opportunities for shared facilities.

4.19.6 Accountability and Government Structure

The District consists of a single parcel of 694 acres and that is owned by the eight members of the hunt club. One member serves as its president. Often a reclamation district is formed to allow the landowners to apply for grants to maintain the levees and the habitat. Accountability would not be an issue since the eight members of the hunt club are represented. The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by District landowners and by contracted services.

4.19.5.1 Determination: The landowners include all eight members of the hunting club with a designated president. With only one parcel in the District, accountability is not a concern.

4.19.7 Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.19.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.19.8 Summary of Determinations

4.19.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.19.2.1 Determination: There is insufficient information available to determine whether the District has sufficient capacity to maintain the levee system.

4.19.3.1 Determination: There is insufficient information on the District's budget to determine whether the District has the financial ability to provide services.

4.19.4.1 Determination: There are no facilities within the District, nor does the District share facilities with neighboring districts. There are no other opportunities for shared facilities.

4.19.5.1 Determination: The landowners include all eight members of the hunting club with a designated president. With only one parcel in the District, accountability is not a concern.

4.19.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.20 Reclamation District No. 2139 (Can Can/Greenhead)

Formed on November 14, 2005, under California Water Code Section 50000, to provide flood control and maintain the levees for the Can Can/Greenhead area, Reclamation District No. 2139 maintains levees that protect 1699 acres. There are three landowners and no residents in the District.

4.20.2 Growth and Population Projections

The District contains fewer than 12 registered voters and is considered uninhabited, according to Government Code 56046. The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District.

Upon formation it was determined that the Sphere of Influence be coterminous with District boundaries. The District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.20.1.1 Determination: The District contains fewer than 12 registered voters and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.20.3 Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District was formed by landowners in order to maintain existing flood control and tidal levees that surround the District. The District was formed in 2005 and at that time, no new reclamation activities or facilities were anticipated.

4.20.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide levee maintenance and flood control. Since there is no planned expansion of the District, there is no planned expansion of the capacity to provide services.

4.20.4 Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 44: Reclamation District No. 2139 Revenues and Expenditure

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Revenues	\$	\$	\$
Expenditures	\$33,003	\$63,432	\$13,545
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$
Source: Bohanan, August 20, 2008.			

Revenues are generated through a self-assessment and by application for grants and subvention funds. The first budget for 2006 included the \$88,000 FEMA grant for levee repair.

4.20.3.1 Determination: The District funds its activities through assessment of landowners and available grant funding. The landowners ensure there is adequate funding.

4.20.5 Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District provides levee maintenance for a system of levees that only protects the District. The levee system is not connected to the levee system of the neighboring districts, nor is the District near enough to any of the cities to be able to share facilities with another agency.

4.20.4.1 Determination: There are no opportunities for shared facilities.

4.20.6 Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board who are elected to 4-year terms. The Trustees are the landowners or their representatives. Trustees receive no compensation and meet once a year or whenever necessary. The meeting takes place at the offices of one of the landowners, to prepare the budget and discuss any upcoming needs and issues the District will be facing in the upcoming fiscal year.

The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by contracted services.

4.20.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees and each landowner has a seat on the board.

4.20.5.2 Determination: The District meets once a year to adopt a budget and discuss relevant issues for the upcoming year.

4.20.5.3 Determination: The District has no paid staff and relies on contractors for levee repairs.

4.20.7 Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.20.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.20.8 Summary of Determinations

4.20.1.1 Determination: The District contains fewer than 12 registered voters and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.20.2.1 Determination: The District has the capacity to provide levee maintenance and flood control. Since there is no planned expansion of the District, there is no planned expansion of the capacity to provide services.

4.20.3.1 Determination: The District funds its activities through assessment of landowners and available grant funding. The landowners ensure there is adequate funding.

- 4.20.4.1 Determination:** There are no opportunities for shared facilities.

- 4.20.5.1 Determination:** The District is governed by a three member Board of Trustees and each landowner has a seat on the board.

- 4.20.5.2 Determination:** The District meets once a year to adopt a budget and discuss relevant issues for the upcoming year.

- 4.20.5.3 Determination:** The District has no paid staff and relies on contractors for levee repairs.

- 4.20.6.1 Determination:** There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.21 Reclamation District No. 2141 (Joice Island)

Formed on August 13, 2007 for the purposes of operating and maintaining the water delivery and drainage systems for Joice Island, the District includes approximately 901 acres, serving three landowners. The District operates in accordance with California Water Code Section 50000.

4.21.2 Growth and Population Projections

There are fewer than 12 registered voters in the District and by Government Code Section 56046 the District is considered uninhabited. The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.21.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.21.3 Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District operates and maintains the water delivery and drainage systems within the District boundaries. The District also maintains the portion of exterior levees and road that contain the flood and drain gates necessary for water delivery and drainage for habitat management. There are no plans for additional capacity.

4.21.2.1 Determination: The District has the ability to provide services and no planned additional services or capacity requirements.

4.21.4 Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 45: Reclamation District No. 2141 Revenues and Expenditure

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Note: No data available.					

The District has only been in existence for one year and no financial data are available. When considering an application for formation LAFCO must consider the financial ability to provide services. Since the application was processed last year, it is likely the District has the financial ability to provide services through assessments, contributions, special owner contributions, or grants.

4.21.3.1 Determination: Financial data were not available. Since the District was only formed within the last year, LAFCO is required to consider whether the District has sufficient funding before authorizing formation.

4.21.5 Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District is fairly isolated with limited opportunities for shared facilities.

4.21.4.1 Determination: Opportunities for shared facilities are limited.

4.21.6 Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board who are elected to 4-year terms, which are not staggered. The Trustees must be landowners or representatives of the landowners. Since there are only three landowners, each one has a seat on the Board. Trustees are not compensated and meet once a year on the first Tuesday in November.

There is no information on the management of the District at this time.

4.21.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees one member for each of the landowners. Trustees meet annually and are not compensated.

4.21.7 Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.21.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.21.8 Summary of Determinations

4.21.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.21.2.1 Determination: The District has the ability to provide services and no planned additional services or capacity requirements.

4.21.3.1 Determination: Financial data were not available. Since the District was only formed within the last year, LAFCO is required to consider whether the District has sufficient funding before authorizing formation.

4.21.4.1 Determination: Opportunities for shared facilities are limited.

4.21.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees one member for each of the landowners. Trustees meet annually and are not compensated.

4.21.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.22 Reclamation District No. 2142 (Suisun Slough West)

Formed on August 13, 2007 for the purposes of operating and maintaining the water delivery and drainage systems within its bounds, Reclamation District No. 2142 includes approximately 1658 acres, and serves six landowners. The District operates in accordance with California Water Code Section 50000.

4.22.2 Growth and Population Projections

There are fewer than 12 registered voters in the District and by Government Code Section 56046 the District is considered uninhabited. The District is presently zoned as marshland and in the newly approved General Plan will be included in the Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. As a result, the District does not anticipate the need to update or expand the Sphere of Influence.

4.22.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.22.3 Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District operates and maintains the water delivery and drainage systems within the District boundaries. The District also maintains the portion of exterior levees and road that contain the flood and drain gates necessary for water deliver and drainage for habitat management. There is no planned additional capacity.

4.22.2.1 Determination: The District has the capability to provide services and no planned additional services or capacity requirements.

4.22.4 Financial Ability to Provide Services

Table 46: Reclamation District No. 2142 Revenues and Expenditure

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Revenues	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Expenditures	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance Beg	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Fund Balance End	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Note: No data available.					

The District has only been in existence for one year and no financial data are available. When considering an application for formation LAFCO must consider the financial ability to provide services. Since the application was processed last year, it is likely the District has the financial ability to provide services through assessments, contributions, special owner contributions, or grants.

4.22.3.1 Determination: Financial data were not available. Since the District was only formed within the last year, LAFCO is required to consider whether the District has sufficient funding before authorizing formation.

4.22.5 Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District is fairly isolated with limited opportunities for shared facilities.

4.22.4.1 Determination: Opportunities for shared facilities are limited.

4.22.6 Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a five-member board who are elected to 4-year terms, which are not staggered. The Trustees must be landowners or representatives of the landowners. Trustees are not compensated and meet once a year on the first Tuesday in November.

There is no information on the management of the District at this time.

4.22.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees who must be landowners or their representative. Trustees meet annually and are not compensated.

4.22.7 Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.22.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.22.8 Summary of Determinations

4.22.1.1 Determination: The district is designated as part of the Resource Conservation Overlay. There is no anticipated growth in the future.

4.22.2.1 Determination: The District has the capability to provide services and no planned additional services or capacity requirements.

4.22.3.1 Determination: Financial data were not available. Since the District was only formed within the last year, LAFCO is required to consider whether the District has sufficient funding before authorizing formation.

4.22.4.1 Determination: Opportunities for shared facilities are limited.

4.22.5.1 Determination: The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees who must be landowners or their representative. Trustees meet annually and are not compensated.

4.22.6.1 Determination: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

5 REFERENCES

- Association of Bay Area Governments. 2005. Projections 2005. ABAG, Oakland, CA.
- Association of California Water Agencies. Website: <http://www.acwa.com>. Accessed July 22, 2008.
- Bohannon, Scott. Secretary Reclamation District 2139. August 19, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Bohannon, Scott. Secretary Reclamation District 2139. August 20, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Boman, Marc and Doug Kolmer. Trustees Reclamation District 2134. January 23, 2009. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- California Central Valley Flood Control Association. Website: <http://cvflood.org>. Accessed July 22, 2008.
- California State Controller, Special Districts Annual Report FY 2005-06. March 20, 2008.
- California State Controller, Special Districts Annual Report FY 2004-05. May 10, 2007.
- California State Controller, Special Districts Annual Report FY 2003-04. May 31, 2006.
- California State Controller, Special Districts Annual Report FY 2002-03. May 18, 2005.
- California State Controller, Special Districts Annual Report FY 2001-02. June 30, 2004.
- Connolly, Terry. Secretary-Treasurer, Board of Trustees, Reclamation District 2129. May 20, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Cunningham, Deborah. Secretary, Reclamation District 2060. August 12, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force. 2008. Delta Vision Strategic Plan. Volume 1 and Volume 2. October 9.
- Eandi, Loretta, Landowner Reclamation District 2138. August 21, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation. Floodplain Management Association. Website: <http://www.floodplain.org>. Accessed July 22, 2008).
- Gall, Don. Internal Auditor. Solano County Auditor-Controller's Office. August 27, 2007. Personal communication: email.
- Geary, Stanley. Trustee, Reclamation District 2130. August 21, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Geary, Stanley. Trustee, Reclamation District 2130. May 20, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.

- Governor's Office of Planning and Research. 2003. Local Agency Formation Commission Municipal Service Review Guidelines Volume 1 and Volume 2. August.
- Hardesty, Mike. General Manager Reclamation District 2068 and Reclamation District 2098. May 16, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Hardesty, Mike. General Manager Reclamation District 2068 and Reclamation District 2098. June 2, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Hardesty, Mike. General Manager Reclamation District 2068 and Reclamation District 2098. August 4, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Keuchler, Henry. President, Reclamation District 2060. August 12, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Lenk, Arnold. President, Board of Trustees Reclamation District 2127. June 9, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Lenk, Arnold. Secretary, Board of Trustees Reclamation District 2135. May 29, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Murphy, Sue. Water Quality Specialist Solano Irrigation District. October 27, 2008. Personal communication : telephone conversation.
- Northern California Salinity Coalition. <http://www.avilaassociates.com> (Site accessed July 21, 2008).
- Perazzo, Cindy. Administration Department Solano Irrigation District. October 27, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Perry, Bunch, Battaglia & Johnson, Inc. 2006. Independent Auditors Report Reclamation District 501 FY 2004 and FY 2005. July 19, 2006.
- Perry, Bunch, Battaglia & Johnson, Inc. 2007. Independent Auditors Report Reclamation District 2060 for calendar years 2005 and 2006. December 11, 2007.
- Rural North Vacaville Water District. 2007. Bylaws. December 11, 2007.
- Rural North Vacaville Water District. 2008. Newsletter. Issue 19. February.
- Rural North Vacaville Water District. 2008. Newsletter. Issue 20. July.
- Shafer, Jack. Chair, Reclamation District 2112. 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation. August 19, 2008.
- Shafer, Jack. Chair, Reclamation District 2112. May 19, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.
- Solano County Boards, Committees and Commissions Detail List Collinsville Levee Maintenance District. Website: <http://bccweb.solanocounty.com/Open/Reports/boardDetail.asp>. Accessed 8/21/08.

- Solano County Boards, Committees and Commissions Detail List Reclamation District No. 2141. Website: <http://bccweb.solanocounty.com/Open/Reports/boardDetail.asp>. Accessed August 21, 2008.
- Solano County Boards, Committees and Commissions Detail List Reclamation District No. 2142. Website: <http://bccweb.solanocounty.com/Open/Reports/boardDetail.asp>. Accessed August 21, 2008.
- Solano County Budget. Fiscal Year 2003/04 Proposed Budget.
- Solano County Budget. Fiscal Year 2004/05 Proposed Budget.
- Solano County Budget. Fiscal Year 2004/06 Proposed Budget.
- Solano County Office of the Auditor-Controller. 2006. An Audit of the Reclamation District No. 2136 of Solano County. June 23, 2006.
- Solano County Water Agency (SCWA) 2006. Policy on Directors' Compensation and Expense Reimbursement. Website: <http://www.scwa2.com/agendas/BOD/2006/jul/A13.SCWA%20Policy%20on%20Directors.doc>. Accessed June 17, 2008.
- Solano County Water Agency (SCWA). 2008. Supply and Demand Study. January 31.
- Solano County Water Agency's Urban Water Management Plan (SCWA's UWMP) 2005. Website: <http://www.scwa2.com/UWMP/UWMP%20FINAL.pdf>. Accessed June 30, 2008.
- Solano County. 2004. Solano County Water Agency Integrated Regional Water Resources Plan, January 8.
- Solano County. 2005. "An Audit of the Reclamation District No. 2084 of Solano County," Office of the Auditor-Controller. April 5, 2005.
- Solano County. 2008 Draft General Plan. <http://www.solanocountygeneralplan.net>. Accessed 8/21/08.
- Solano County. 2008. Draft Environmental Impact Report Solano County 2008 Draft General Plan. April 18, 2008.
- Solano County. General Plan Population and Housing Background Report. Website: <http://www.solanocountygeneralplan.net/documents.htm#2008DGP>. Accessed June 30, 2008.
- Solano Irrigation District (SID). 2003. Resolution 03-63 Establishing Annexation Policy and Criteria.
- Solano Irrigation District (SID). Website <http://www.sidwater.org/>. Accessed July 28, 2008.
- Solano LAFCO. 2002. Staff report Agenda Item 5b. September 16, 2002.
- Solano LAFCO. 2003. Water Service Review Part I and II.

Taylor, Stacey. Assistant Superintendent, Reclamation District 501. August 7, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.

The Reed Group. 2006. Cost of Service Analysis and Water Rate Recommendations, Final Report. November 21, 2006.

The Reporter. June 6, 2008 "Rural water customers told of increased costs."

The Reporter.Com. Salary Survey 2007. Website: <http://fromthereporter.com/specials/slaary/2007/index2.html>. Accessed August 20, 2008.

Vink, Erik. Board of Trustees Secretary Reclamation District 2093. May 13, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.

Vink, Erik. Board of Trustees Secretary Reclamation District 2093. August 8, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.

Vink, Erik. Board of Trustees Secretary Reclamation District 2093. January 26, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.

Willsie, John. Attorney for landowner Reclamation District 2034. May 30, 2008. Personal Communication: telephone conversation.

Willsie, John. Attorney for landowner Reclamation District 2034. August 8, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.

Zaragoza, Fred. Administrative Assistant County Supervisorial District 5. August 22, 2008. Personal communication: telephone conversation.