22. RABB PARK COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Rabb Park Community Services District (RPCSD) provides retail water delivery services.

AGENCY OVERVIEW

Background

RPCSD was formed on November 12, 1973, as an independent special district.[451] RPCSD was formed to provide domestic and irrigation water, collection, treatment or disposal of wastewater and stormwater, the collection or disposal of garbage or refuse matter, fire protection, park and recreation, street maintenance and lighting, drainage, the conversion of existing overhead electric and communication facilities to underground locations, and to contract for ambulance service to the District.[452] The District has initiated only retail domestic water delivery, but not the other services.

The principal act that governs the District is Community Services District Law.[453] CSDs may potentially provide a wide array of services, including water supply, wastewater, solid waste, police and fire protection, street lighting and landscaping, airport, recreation and parks, mosquito abatement, library services; street maintenance and drainage services, ambulance service, utility undergrounding, transportation, abate graffiti, flood protection, weed abatement, hydroelectric power, among various other services. CSDs are required to gain LAFCO approval to provide those services permitted by the principal act but not performed by the end of 2005 (i.e., latent powers).[454]

Boundary

The RPCSD boundary is located north of the community of Buckhorn, in the upper foothills of Amador County. The boundary area is located east of SR 88, just north of the Mace Meadow Golf Club, and includes properties located along Nob Hill Court, Antelope Drive, Skyview Court, Jacqueline Drive, Circle View Drive, and Meadowmont Drive. The boundary area consists almost entirely of residential properties. The District has a boundary area of approximately 118 acres (0.18 square miles).

There have been four annexations to the District's bounds since formation—the 1978 Unit 3 Annexation, the 1987 VanderMeulen Annexation (1.6 acres), the 1987 Murdy Annexation (1.2 acres), and the 1996 Meneely Annex (one acre). The Unit 3 Annexation and the Meneely Annex are documented in the Board of Equalization records, but the others are not.

[451] LAFCO Resolution 73-56. Formation date is from Board of Equalization records.

[452] Board of Supervisors Resolution 3499, Section 7.

[453] Government Code §61000-61226.5.

[454] Government Code §61106.

Sphere of Influence

LAFCO adopted RPCSD's existing zero SOI in 2008.[455]

Local Accountability and Governance

RPCSD is governed by a five-member board of directors. Directors are to be selected via elections at large; elections are held biennially in odd numbered years. In practice, however, board members are appointed by the Board of Supervisors, as the positions are generally uncontested. There have been no contested elections in memorable history, according to the District.

Figure 22-1: Rabb Park CSD Governing Body

Rabb Park Community Services District			
Governing Body			
Members	**Name**	**Position**	**Term Ends**
	Dutch Green	President	11/30/2015
	Jim Schick	Director	11/30/2015
	Cindy James	Director	11/30/2015
	Mike Miller	Director	11/30/2017
	Caroline Rohrer	Vice President	11/30/2017
Manner of Selection	Members are elected at large via biennial elections in off numbered years.		
Length of Term	4 years		
Meetings	Date: Second Thursday of each month Location: Homes of board members.		
Agenda Distribution	Posted on the community bulletin board.		
Minutes Distribution	By request.		
Contact			
Contact	Board President		
Mailing Address	19021 Circle View Dr., Pioneer, CA 95666		
Phone	(209)295-7422		
Email/Website	dutch@volcano.net		

The District informs constituents by posting agendas on the community bulletin board. Minutes are available to the public by request. The District does not maintain a website where public documents can be accessed.

With regard to customer service, the District reported that complaints most often relate to the smell and taste of the water. Complaints may be submitted to the District office or the president via mail, phone, or in person. The District reported that it receives an average of one or two complaints per year. No complaints were received in 2012.

[455] LAFCO Resolution 2008-03.

Complaints are addressed by district personnel and logged in the District's maintenance report.

The District reported that it had no Brown Act violations in recent history.

The District demonstrated accountability in its disclosure of information and cooperation with LAFCO. The agency responded to LAFCO's written questionnaires and cooperated with document requests.

Management

The principal act requires that districts appoint a general manager to implement board policies.[456] The District did not employ a general manager as of August 2013. The District's water system is managed by two part-time maintenance workers, who each work approximately 20 hours per month. One maintenance worker attends every board meeting and gives a report. District staff also includes a part-time bookkeeper.

The District's efforts to improve operational efficiency include the hiring of certified maintenance workers in 2003. Previous maintenance had been performed by a non-certified individual. Additional improvements in operational efficiency include the installation of water meters in 2003, which have reduced the amount of water used by customers. No further endeavors to improve efficiency were reported for recent years.

The District reports that it does not conduct formal employee evaluations or district-wide performance evaluations. Employee evaluations are conducted on an informal basis at monthly board meetings and district performance evaluations are conducted by the Department of Public Health via its annual inspection of the District's water system.

The District's planning efforts are limited. The District does not have a master plan for its water system but does have an emergency/disaster response plan.

District financial planning efforts include the annual preparation of budgets and auditing of financial statements. The most recent audited financial statement provided by the District is for FY 12. The auditor did not identify any reportable conditions in FY 12. The District has not prepared a capital improvement plan; instead, the District plans annually for about $4,000 in capital outlays.

Management practices include risk management. The District spent $2,899 on general liability insurance in FY 12.

Service Demand and Growth

Existing land uses in the District's boundary are primarily suburban residential (i.e., 5 acres per unit on average) with two properties zoned for commercial located along SR 88. The District reports that there is no economic activity within the District and that all 107 water connections are residential.

[456] Government Codes §61040 and 61050.

The estimated population within District bounds is 246.[457] The District's population density is 1,334 per square mile, compared to the countywide density of 64.

The District reported that service demand increased with development from 50 homes at formation in 1973 to 107 in 2008. The District reported there have been no further developments since 2008 and therefore service demand has not been affected. The District added a total of three connections between 2005 and 2007, averaging slightly less than one percent growth annually. The District has not added any additional connections between 2008 and 2013.

Future growth is expected to be limited, as there are no proposed or planned development projects within the District. There are approximately 30 undeveloped lots within the District, on which the District has the ability to add one to three additional connections annually.

The District is not a land use authority, and does not hold primary responsibility for implementing growth strategies.

Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

LAFCO is required to evaluate disadvantaged unincorporated communities as part of this service review, including the location and characteristics of any such communities. A disadvantaged unincorporated community is defined as any area with 12 or more registered voters, or as determined by commission policy, where the median household income is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual median.[458]

The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) has developed a mapping tool to assist in determining which communities meet the disadvantaged communities median household income definition.[459]DWR identified nine disadvantaged communities within Amador County—three of which are cities and are therefore not considered unincorporated.[460] None of the identified disadvantaged communities are within or adjacent to RPCSD.

However, DWR is not bound by the same law as LAFCO to define communities with a minimum threshold of 12 or more registered voters. Because income information is not available for this level of analysis, disadvantaged unincorporated communities that meet LAFCO's definition cannot be identified at this time.

Financing

The District reported that existing financing sources are sufficient to deliver adequate services, but indicated that additional financing would be needed to finance capital improvements needs.

[457] The population estimate for the District is the product of the number of water connections within the boundary area and the average household size (2.3) in Amador County in according to the California Department of Finance 2010.

[458] Government Code §56033.5.

[459] Based on census data, the median household income in the State of California in 2010 was $57,708, 80 percent of which is $46,166.

[460] DWR maps and GIS files are derived from the US Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) and are compiled for the five-year period 2006-2010.

The District tracks its finances through a single enterprise fund.

Total revenue in FY 12 was $71,359. Revenue sources were water sales (88 percent), standby fees (seven percent), refunds and reimbursements (1.5 percent) and interest income (0.5 percent).

Total expenditures for the year were $51,249. Costs were composed of two categories of expenses: program services and support services. Program services (83 percent of expenses) include Central Amador Water Project (CAWP) annual charges, CAWP operation and maintenance charges, insurance, government services, wages and water purchases among others. Support services (17 percent of expenses) include billing and bookkeeping services, depreciation, dues and subscriptions, office expenses, and professional services.

The District had no long-term debt at the end of FY 12. The District attempts to keep capital expenditures to a minimum, due to financing constraints. Capital outlays are generally financed with operating revenue and reserves.

The District does not have an adopted policy on its target level for financial reserves. At the end of FY 12, the District had unrestricted net assets of $186,525 or 364 percent of annual expenditures.

WATER SERVICES

This section describes the nature, extent and location of the water services provided as well as key infrastructure and water sources. The tables provide further information and indicators of the agency's water service supplies, demand, financing, service adequacy, and facilities.

Nature and Extent

RPCSD purchases treated water from Amador Water Agency (AWA) through the Central Amador Water Project and distributes it to residential users. The District does not provide water treatment services. The District provides necessary maintenance and operation of the water distribution system directly through its two part-time maintenance workers. Major capital improvements are completed by contractors.

The District does not produce or use recycled water, and does not practice conjunctive use.

Location

RPCSD provides services within its bounds. The District's service area does not extend beyond its boundary area. The District's water services are available to all of its boundary area, and there are no developed lots that are unserved within RPCSD's bounds.

Infrastructure

Key infrastructure includes the District's storage tank and two miles of distribution pipes.

RPCSD purchases treated surface water from Tiger Reservoir from AWA. The water is treated at AWA's Buckhorn Treatment Plant, passes through the CAWP transmission pipeline and fills the two storage tanks serving the District. The District is not aware of any constraints on the amount that AWA will supply to the District for services within its current boundaries. During times of water shortage AWA has the prerogative to ration water to the District; however, that has never occurred. The District must apply to AWA for a commitment to serve additional connections outside of bounds.

Starting in the summer of 2014, the District will begin receiving its water from AWA's Gravity Supply Line, which will greatly improve upon the existing aged and high maintenance system.

The water received from AWA is generally excellent quality, as reported by the District. However, the District exceeded the HAA5 (a disinfection by-product) maximum contaminant level (MCL) in 2011 and 2012.

Two water storage tanks serve the District totaling 105,000 gallons in storage capacity. The District is responsible for maintenance of the inside of its storage tank on Circle View Drive, and AWA is reportedly responsible for the outside of the tank. The bolted steel tank was constructed prior to 1966, with a new liner installed in 2001, and was identified as being in fair condition by the District. The interior and exterior of the tank was last inspected and cleaned in 2010. The District also receives water from an AWA storage tank

outside of District bounds. The District identified the tank as being in fair condition. Both tanks are installed with SCADA, which relays information to operators at the AWA Buckhorn Treatment Plant. The District identified a need to replace the AWA storage tank and increase storage capacity for emergency situations.

In the event of emergencies, the District would rely on reserves in the storage tanks, which would accommodate peak demand for approximately three days. There is a single intertie between the District and external water sources—the CAWP pipeline to the storage tanks. The District pumped water from two wells prior to receiving water from AWA (pre-1980). If the water supply from AWA were to be halted for any emergency situation, the District plans to use tank trucks to fill the existing tanks and ration the use of water until the emergency is resolved. The District maintains an emergency response plan and a water quality emergency notification plan for emergency events.

The distribution network consists of two miles of PVC distribution pipelines. The pipes are in good condition, according to DPH.[461] Approximately 25 percent of the system, concentrated in the southern portion of the District, is comprised of two-inch mains that provide inadequate delivery pressure and pressure at the District's hydrants. The District would like to replace all of the two-inch mains with four or six-inch mains as well as replace all the two-inch standpipes with fire hydrants. The District currently lacks financing to replace all of the two-inch mains, and consequently replaces the pipes as needed and when financing permits.

[461] California Department of Public Health, Annual Inspection Report, March 29, 2013, p.6.

Figure 22-2: Rabb Park CSD Water Profile

Water Service Configuration & Infrastructure					
Water Service	**Provider(s)**		**Water Service**	**Provider(s)**	
Retail Water	Direct		Groundwater Recharge	None	
Wholesale Water	AWA		Groundwater Extraction	None	
Water Treatment	AWA		Recycled Water	None	
Service Area Description					
Retail Water	The District's service area lies along SR 88 north of Mace Meadows. The service area includes parcels along Meadowmont Dr., Circle View Dr., Jacqueline Dr., Antelope Dr., Sky View Ct., and South Antelope Dr.				
Wholesale Water	NA				
Recycled Water	NA				
Boundary Area	0.2 sq. miles		Population (2012)	246	
System Overview					
Average Daily Demand	11,447 gal.		Peak Day Demand[2]	18,645 gal.	
Supply	The District is not aware of any limits on the amount of water that can be purchased from AWA to serve the current District bounds. The distribution capacity of the District's system was not reported.				
Major Facilities					
Facility Name	**Type**	**Capacity**		**Condition**	**Yr Built**
RPCSD Storage Tank	Storage	0.045 mg		Fair	1966
AWA Storage Tank	Storage	0.051 mg		Fair	NP
Other Infrastructure					
Reservoirs	0		Storage Capacity (mg)	0.1 mg	
Pump Stations	0		Pressure Zones	1	
Production Wells[3]	2		Pipe Miles	2	
Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies					
The District identified a need to replace the two-inch pipes to increase delivery pressure and fire flow. In addition, the District would like the AWA storage tank to be replaced and remove RPCSD's smaller tank; with enough capacity to increase the total capacity to a minimum of 100,000 to 150,000 gallons.					
Facility-Sharing and Regional Collaboration					
Current Practices: The District currently receives treated water from the AWA Buckhorn Treatment Plant through AWA pipelines, in conjunction with other CAWP members.					
Opportunities: An opportunity for further facility sharing and efficiencies may be consolidation with AWA.					
Notes: (1) NA means Not Applicable, NP means Not Provided, mg means millions of gallons, af means acre feet. (2) Based on the average daily water usage in the peak month in 2012. (3) Both district wells are inactive.					

continued

Water Demand and Supply

Service Connections	Total	Inside Bounds	Outside Bounds	
Total	107	107	0	
Irrigation/Landscape	0	0	0	
Domestic	107	107	0	
Commercial/Industrial/Institutional	0	0	0	
Recycled	0	0	0	
Other	0	0	0	

Average Annual Demand Information (Acre-Feet per Year)[1]

	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Total	23.2	17.8	11.9	13.4	14.8	16.3	17.8
Residential	23.2	17.8	11.9	13.4	14.8	16.3	17.8
Commercial/Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Irrigation/Landscape	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Water Sources		Supply (Acre-Feet/Year)		
Source	Type	Average	Maximum	Safe/Firm
Purchased water from AWA	Surface	22.0	NP	NP

Supply Information (Acre-feet per Year)

	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Total	25.2	19.4	13	NP	NP	NP	NP
Imported	25.2	19.4	13	NP	NP	NP	NP
Groundwater	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Surface	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recycled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Drought Supply and Plans			
Drought Supply (af)	Year 1: NP	Year 2: NP	Year 3: NP
Significant Droughts	1976, 1977, 1988-1994, 2005, 2009		
Storage Practices	Storage is for short-term emergencies only.		
Drought Plan	The District relies on AWA for all drought planning activities, as water is purchased from AWA. Even during multiple-year droughts, AWA has received its full water rights and has never enacted curtailments.		

Water Conservation Practices	
CUWCC Signatory	No
Metering	Yes
Conservation Pricing	Yes
Other Practices	None

Notes:
(1) The District installed meters in 2001 and was not monitoring use prior to that. Demand for 2000 was calculated based on the 2005 8 percent distribution loss rate of water purchased from AWA. Projections are based on the average of one additional connection per year.

continued

Water Rates and Financing

Domestic Water Rates-Ongoing Charges FY 12[1]			
	Rate Description	Avg. Monthly Charges	Consumption[2]
Residential	Flat Quarterly: $120 Water Use Quarterly: $6.50 per 1,000 gallons	$ 89.40	250 gal/day

Special Rates
Water rates are the same throughout the District. The District charges a standby fee of $180 per year on undeveloped lots.

Rate-Setting Procedures			
Policy Description	The rates are based on a flat fee for maintenance and a rate for water usage to cover the cost of purchasing water from AWA.		
Most Recent Rate Change	2009	Frequency of Rate Changes	As needed

Water Development Fees and Requirements	
Connection Fee Approach	The District's connection fee is relatively low in part due to standby charges paid by undeveloped properties.
Connection Fee Timing	Prior to connection to the system.
Connection Fee Amount	$500/Single Family Unit

Water Enterprise Revenues, FY 12			Expenditures, FY 12	
Source	Amount	%		Amount
Total	$71,359	100%	Total	$51,249
Water sales	$62,827	88%	Administration	$8,580
Standby fees	$5,376	8%	O & M	$14,493
Late fees and service	$1,580	2%	Capital Depreciation	$1,931
Interest income	$489	1%	Debt	$0
Connection Fees	$0	0%	Purchased Water[3]	$12,727
Refunds and reimbur	$1,087	2%	Other	$13,518

Notes:

(1) Rates include water-related service charges and usage charges.

(2) Water use assumptions were used to calculate average monthly bills. Assumed use levels are consistent countywide for comparison purposes.

(3) Purchased water includes AWA annual charges and water purchases.

continued

Water Service Adequacy, Efficiency & Planning Indicators

Water Planning	Description	Planning Horizon
Water Master Plan	None	None
UWMP	None, not required	None
Capital Improvement Plan	None	None
Emergency Response Plan	2010	NA
Water Quality Emergency Plan	2010	NA

Service Challenges

The District identified compliance with State reporting requirements as a challenge to providing service.

Service Adequacy Indicators

Connections/FTE	428	O&M Cost Ratio[1]	$912,059
MGD Delivered/FTE	0	Distribution Loss Rate[2]	6%
Distribution Breaks & Leaks	0	Distribution Break Rate[3]	0
Response Time Policy	ASAP	Response Time Actual	1-2 days
Water Pressure	20 psi to 110 psi	Total Employees (FTEs)	0.25

Water Operator Certification

The District's system was previously operated by an uncertified part-time employee. The District hired two D1 certified maintenance workers in 2003. The District is required to have a D1 certified chief operator; the District is meeting this requirement.

Drinking Water Quality Regulatory Information[4]

	#	Description
Health Violations	2	In 2006, two separate HAA5 violations.
Monitoring Violations	0	
DW Compliance Rate[5]	100%	

Notes:

(1) Operations and maintenance costs (exc. purchased water, debt, depreciation) per volume (mgd) delivered.

(2) Distribution loss rate in 2011.

(3) Distribution break rate is the number of leaks and pipeline breaks per 100 miles of distribution piping.

(4) Violations since 2000, as reported by the U.S. EPA Safe Drinking Water Information System.

(5) Drinking water compliance is percent of time in compliance with National Primary Drinking Water Regulations in 2006.

SUMMARY OF DETERMINATIONS

Growth and population projections

- There has been significant growth in the District over the last several decades; however, no growth since the 2008 MSR, with a limited number of undeveloped lots remaining in the District.
- Future growth is expected to be limited, as there are no proposed or planned developments within or adjacent to the District. Growth is possible but limited to 30 undeveloped lots within the District.

The Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities Within or Contiguous to the Agency's SOI

- There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the District's service area, based upon mapping information provided by the State of California Department of Water Resources. However, given the large size of the defined community in the census data used, it cannot be discounted that a smaller community that meets the required income definition and has 12 or more registered voters may exist within or adjacent to the District.

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

- Approximately one mile of distribution pipes are undersized, and need to be replaced to improve water pressure and fire flow.
- The District reported a continued need to replace the AWA-owned storage tank and expand storage capacity.
- As was recommended in 2008, the District should perform an evaluation of the entire distribution system to prioritize replacement.
- District planning efforts are inadequate, and do not meet recommended standards for technical, managerial and financial ability. Specifically, the District has not prepared a master plan or capital improvement plan.
- The District continues to heavily rely on volunteer board member participation to manage district operations. While this is currently an effective arrangement, the long term availability of able volunteers, which is often unpredictable, may affect the sustainability of service provision.
- The District lacks a general manager, as required by law, to implement board policies. It is recommended that the District identify a volunteer general manager in order to come into compliance with legal requirements.
- Amador Water Agency has the capability of assuming district services.

Financial ability of agencies to provide services

- Since the 2008 review, rates have been increased and are comparable to other Amador County water purveyors. The District should continue to evaluate rates and structuring inflation-triggered rate increases as needed.
- While the 2008 MSR identified rates as not adequate to cover necessary costs, over the last few years the District has been able to accumulate substantial reserves to cover some capital needs. However, the condition of the system is not fully known and the degree to which anticipated capital costs are covered is also unknown. A capital improvement plan is needed to assess these issues.

Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities

- The District relies on AWA for water, treatment and transmission of treated water through AWA facilities.
- There is an opportunity for the District to share additional resources with AWA and improve efficiency through the reorganization or consolidation of the two agencies.

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

- Accountability to local voters is constrained by a lack of contested elections. Improvements to accountability could be made by emphasizing public outreach activities and promoting interest in participation on the governing body.
- A RPCSD website or Facebook page would improve transparency and accountability to citizens and keep customers up to date on district happenings. This online presence may be a more efficient way of posting meeting notices, agendas and meeting minutes.
- The District has faced challenges in the past in providing adequate services. In 2008, the District was considering consolidation with AWA in order to enhance service levels; however, these discussions have not continued since that time. Consolidation of compatible agencies is appropriate and consistent with LAFCO's desire to provide the highest levels of service at the lowest feasible cost, and it is recommended that RPCSD and AWA continue to evaluate the feasibility of this option.