

****AGENDA****

AMADOR LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

**6:00 P.M. – THURSDAY FEBRUARY 15, 2018
810 COURT STREET, JACKSON
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CHAMBERS**

Please Note: All LAFCO meetings are recorded. Anyone who wishes to address the Commission must speak from the podium and should print their name on the Meeting Speaker list, which is located on the podium.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact the LAFCO staff, at (209) 418-9377, by e-mail to amador.lafco@gmail.com. Requests must be made as early as possible, and at least two business days before the start of the meeting.

Meeting Materials are available for Public Review at the LAFCO desk, located at the County Planning Department, 810 Court Street, Jackson, and posted on the Amador LAFCO website.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- 4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 18, 2018**
- 5. APPROVAL OF CLAIMS TO FEBRUARY 15, 2018**
- 6. PUBLIC FORUM –PUBLIC COMMENT**

Any person may address the Commission on any subject within the jurisdiction of LAFCO which is not on the agenda. No action may be taken at this meeting. There is a five (5) minute limit.

- 7. REPORT OF THE CITY SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING OF 11:00 AM, FEB 15, 2018 ; APPOINTMENT OF CITIES REPRESENTATIVE AND ALTERNATE**
- 8. RIVER PINES PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT, PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW (MSR), 2018 UPDATE**

Commission will receive the public review draft of the RPPUD Municipal Services Review Update, and direct staff to release the update for public comment through March 15, 2018.

- 9. OVERVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF SB 239 (2015)**

LAFCO review of fire contracts under Government Code §56134; possible contract between Lockwood FPD and CalFire.

10. POLICY DEFINING MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Adoption of policy to confirm the list of municipal services as those services or related functions listed under Government Code Section 61100.

11. SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE GRANT FUNDING TO LAFCOS

Authorize the executive officer and/or chairman to sign and send letters of support for bills establishing a state fund for grants to study and dissolve inactive districts.

12. OTHER BUSINESS, REPORTS

- a. Correspondence
- b. Commissioner Announcements
- c. Executive Officer's Report
- d. Budget Reports (in the review binder at the dais)
- e. Project Status Report

1. ADJOURNMENT

Note: The next regular LAFCO meeting is scheduled for March 15, 2018.



Roseanne Chamberlain
Executive Officer

All persons are invited to testify and submit written comments to the Commission. If you challenge a LAFCO action in court you may be limited to issues raised at the public hearing or submitted as written comments prior to the close of the public hearing. All written materials received by staff 48 hours before the hearing will be distributed to the Commission. If you wish to submit written material at the hearing, please supply 10 copies.

NOTE: State law requires that a participant in LAFCO proceedings who has a financial interest in the decision and who has made a campaign contribution to any Commissioner in the past year must disclose the contribution. If you are affected, please notify commission staff before the hearing.

**PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE POSTING BEFORE:
February 16, 2018**

AMADOR LAFCO



LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

810 COURT STREET ♦ JACKSON, CA 95642 ♦ (209) 223-6380

MINUTES

January 18, 2018

 DRAFT

This meeting was available via live audio streaming and was digitally recorded.

1. **Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance & Roll Call**

The January 18, 2018, meeting of the Amador Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), held at the County Administration Center, 810 Court Street, Jackson, California, was called to order by Chairman Crew at 6:00 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**

Members Present:

Pat Crew, Chairman
Dominic Atlan, City Member
Jim Vinciguerra, Public Member

Staff Present:

Roseanne Chamberlain, Executive Officer
Nancy Mees, Clerk to the Commission

3. **Approval of Agenda for January 18, 2018**

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Vinciguerra, seconded by Commissioner Atlan, and carried unanimously to approve the agenda as submitted.

4. **Approval of the Minutes of September 21, 2017**

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Atlan, seconded by Commissioner Vinciguerra, and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes for September 21, 2017, as submitted.

5. **Approval of Claims to January 18, 2018**

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Vinciguerra, seconded by Commissioner Atlan, and carried unanimously to approve the Approval of Claims – Meeting Final, as submitted.

6. **Public Forum – Public Comment**

Rocky Raymond introduced himself as the Vice Chairman of River Pines PUD, adding that he wants to learn about LAFCO so RPPUD and LAFCO can work together more smoothly.

7. **Meeting Schedule for 2018**

Executive Officer Chamberlain pointed out that the schedule lists the June 21 meeting as the Final Budget Hearing, but as the legal deadline for that hearing is June 15, it will actually occur at the May meeting. She explained that there is no need for a separate budget hearing between the Proposed Budget Hearing and the Final Budget Hearing. LAFCO works so closely with the cities and county at the Proposed Budget stage, that there are usually no questions that have not already been addressed and resolved by the time of the Final Budget Hearing.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Atlan, seconded by Commissioner Vinciguerra, and carried unanimously to approve the Meeting Schedule for 2018 as submitted.

8. **Election of Officers: Chairman & Vice Chairman**

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Atlan, seconded by Commissioner Crew, and carried unanimously to retain the current Chairman (Crew) and Vice Chairman (Vinciguerra).

9. **Designation of Signature Authority for 2018**

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Atlan, seconded by Commissioner Vinciguerra, and carried unanimously to retain the current designation of signature authority for 2018 (Commissioners Crew, Vinciguerra, and Oneto).

10. **Budget Update and Recommended Revised Work Plan**

Referring to the spreadsheet in the meeting packet, Executive Officer Chamberlain pointed out that very little money has been spent so far this fiscal year. Therefore, she recommended getting a jump start on the MSR that needs to be done in 2019 by starting to work on it now. She proposed that staff begin doing the work, and if it goes well, we may be able to avoid having to hire a consultant to do the MSR, which cost approximately \$40-45,000 for the 2014 MSR.

Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Atlan, seconded by Commissioner Vinciguerra, and carried unanimously to approve the revised work plan as presented and to direct staff to begin work on the MSR.

11. **Other Business, Reports**

- a. Correspondence –none.
- b. Commissioner Announcements – Commissioner Crew mentioned that there is a dispute among the fire districts as to who serves Martell, and asked whether that is something with which LAFCO would be involved. Executive Officer Chamberlain responded that none of the fire districts other than Lockwood have adopted SOIs. She is currently working with Jackson Valley FPD because they have agreed to work with LAFCO on an SOI. If two or more fire districts wanted to build fire stations in close proximity to each other, LAFCO would have to look at their SOIs, which currently are just assumed boundaries and financial areas, which are not always the same. Sutter Creek FPD is the most confusing as in the past there have been annexations into the City but not the Fire District, annexations into the Fire District but not the City, and sometimes no official annexation to either. Ms. Chamberlain will be working with all the Fire Districts.

- c. Executive Officers Report – Ms. Chamberlain stated that her report was in the meeting packet, but that she would like to particularly point out that she will be working with CalFire regarding their contract with Lockwood FPD, which will enhance service. She does not believe LAFCO will have to review the contract, but she will learn more as she communicates with them further.

She also mentioned the future annexation of land in El Dorado County to River Pines PUD. This annexation will require updating their MSR and revisions to their SOI, which LAFCO will be doing at the staff level. RPPUD is getting grant funding to upgrade their system.

- d. Budget Report – in the review binder at the dais.
- e. Legislation Report – Executive Officer Chamberlain reported that, due to SB 448, she will be coming back to the Commission with regard to dissolving some inactive districts in the county.

12. **Adjournment**

The next regular LAFCO meeting is scheduled for February 15, 2018. Ms. Chamberlain added that the February meeting may be cancelled if there is nothing regarding the Lockwood FPD agreement that needs LAFCO approval.

Chairman Crew adjourned the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Pat Crew, Presiding Officer
LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

ATTEST: _____
Nancy Mees, Clerk to the Commission

APPROVAL OF CLAIMS - PACKET DRAFT

AGENDA OF February 15, 2018

APPROVAL OF CLAIMS TO

February 15, 2018

Agenda Item 5

<u>VENDOR</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>INV.DATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
R Chamberlain 1/18/2018-2/14/2018	Consulting Services Labor	2/15/2018 estimate	\$ 5,900.00
	Expense Total, includes mileage	2/15/2018 estimate	\$ 300.00
N Mees 1/18/2018-2/14/2018	Clerical & Admin Labor	2/15/2018 estimate	\$ 498.00
	Expenses		\$ -
W Chamberlain 1/1/2018-2/15/2018	Legal Services Labor	2/15/2018 estimate	\$ 360.00
CALAFCO	Staff Workshop Registration**	2/6/2018	\$ 580.00
County of El Dorado	Maps/River Pines SOI & Annexation	2/2/2018	\$ 60.00
LAFCO Board	Meeting Stipends (Maximum of 5 @ \$50.00)		\$ 250.00
	TOTAL		\$ 7,948.00

** Note: Denotes any invoices paid prior to Commission Approval, per Policy 2.3.7

CHAIR:

Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

Nancy Mees
CLERK TO THE COMMISSION

AGENDA ITEM # 7

TO: ALL COMMISSIONERS, ALTERNATES
FROM: ROSEANNE CHAMBERLAIN, EXECUTIVE OFFICER
SUBJECT: REPORT OF THE CITY SELECTION COMMITTEE MEETING
DATE: MEETING OF FEBRUARY 15, 2018

BACKGROUND:

The City Selection Committee was unable to hold a meeting with a quorum in January 2017 when appointments to LAFCO would have been made. The mayors' meeting is set for 11:00 AM, February 15, 2018. The agenda for the mayors' selection meeting is attached.

DISCUSSION & EXPLANATION:

The City Selection Committee, composed of the mayor of each city in the County (GC §50270) appoints the City members, each of whom shall be a mayor or council member. The clerk of the county (Clerk to the Board of Supervisors) acts as permanent secretary and recording officer of the city selection committee (GC §56335 and §50276).

The mayors use a rotation plan to ensure fairness and allow each city to have representation for two years as alternate, then two years in city seat #2, followed by two years in city seat #1.

The rotation order is as follows: Amador City, Jackson, Sutter Creek, Ione, Plymouth. The biennial rotation is independent of the fixed 4-year calendar terms assigned to each city position under state law.

In January 2017, former cities representative Patrick Crew (City of Jackson) left his city position. Dominic Atlan, cities alternate, has been seated and voting on LAFCO to fill the seat vacated by Patrick Crew. Under the rotation system used by the mayor's, staff expects appointments that would have been made in January 2017 to become effective as described in the agenda for the City Selection Committee (attached).

This information is provided to address questions about the terms and rotation plan chosen by the City Selection Committee years ago.

Attachment: Agenda - City Selection Committee

**AMADOR COUNTY
CITY SELECTION COMMITTEE**

A G E N D A

DATE: Thursday, February 15, 2018

TIME: 11:00 a.m.

LOCATION: County Administration Center, Conference Room A
810 Court Street, Jackson

AGENDA: Approval of agenda for this date; any and all off-agenda items must be approved by the Committee (pursuant to §54954.2 of the Government Code).

PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA: Discussion items only, no action to be taken. Any person may address the Committee at this time upon any subject within its jurisdiction; however, any matter that requires action may be referred to staff and/or Committee for a report and recommendation for possible action at a subsequent meeting. Please note - there is a five (3) minute limit per topic.

APPOINTMENTS: Approval of appointments or reappointments to the following:

1. **2018 Chairperson:** Appointment of the 2018 Chairperson for a one (1) year term.
2. **L.A.F.C.O. (Local Area Formation Commission):** L.A.F.C.O. (Local Area Formation Commission): Mayor's will validate the City of Plymouth's appointment to the City Alternate position, effective January 2017, which will continue through 2018, to January 2019; validate the City of Ione's appointment to the first year in City Seat #2, effective January 2017, which will continue through 2018 to January 2019 for the second year of the City Seat #2 rotation; validate the City of Sutter Creek's position in City Seat #1, effective January 2017 and going forward to January 2019 for the second year of the rotation.
3. **Airport Land Use Commission:** Mayor's will validate the appointments of Mr. Keith Sweet by the City of Jackson and Mr. Robin Peters by the City of Sutter Creek to serve on the Airport Land Use Commission for a four year term.

ADJOURNMENT: Scheduling of next meeting. (If needed)

AGENDA ITEM # 8

TO: ALL COMMISSIONERS, ALTERNATES
FROM: ROSEANNE CHAMBERLAIN, EXECUTIVE OFFICER
SUBJECT: RIVER PINES PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT, PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW (MSR), 2018 UPDATE
DATE: MEETING OF FEBRUARY 15, 2018

BACKGROUND:

Government Code §56430 requires a municipal services review (MSR) to establish or update a district sphere of influence and §56425(g) provides that the commission shall, as necessary, review and update each sphere of influence.

The commission affirmed the River Pines Public Utility District (RPPUD) in 2014 without change. The sphere included three properties receiving RPPUD service outside its boundaries in Amador County. Since the late 1970s, the district also serves 15 parcels in El Dorado County. MSR and sphere determinations in 2014 identified numerous problems in both operations and administration for this district. Significant changes have occurred within the district since 2014.

The district now plans to completely renew and upgrade the water storage and distribution system and is eligible for grant funding to do so. It contracts with Amador Water Agency for operations and has secured grant funding and completed planning studies to upgrade its system. It is eligible for construction grant funding. To complete its grant application, RPPUD desires to amend its sphere of influence and annex all of the served properties.

DISCUSSION:

The attached municipal service review is the first step in the LAFCO review process toward the eventual annexation of the service area. This MSR is a draft intended to be circulated for comment and corrections. Staff will refine the document and bring the final MSR to the commission for hearing at a future meeting. A draft resolution making determinations about the services and potential service capabilities of the district will be included for the commission decision.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Receive the draft Municipal Service Review for RPPUD and direct staff to circulate the document for public review for no less than 21 days.
2. Direct staff to schedule the hearing for the Final MSR on a future commission agenda.

Attachments: Draft Municipal Service Review: River Pines PUD

RIVER PINES PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT

River Pines Public Utility District (RPPUD) provides retail water delivery, wastewater collection and wastewater treatment and disposal services.

AGENCY OVERVIEW

Background

RPPUD was formed on July 24, 1961, as an independent special district.¹ RPPUD was formed to provide water services to the River Pines community. The sewer system was completed in 1988, to address public health hazards from failing private septic systems. LAFCO authorized water and sewer related services in 2012 in conjunction with adopting a sphere of influence for the district.

The principal act that governs the District is the Public Utility District Act.² The principal act empowers the District to acquire, construct, own, operate, control, or use works for supplying light, water, power, heat, transportation, telephone service, or other means of communication, or means for the disposal of garbage, sewage, or refuse matter.³ In addition, the District may acquire, construct, own, complete, use, and operate a fire department, street lighting system, public parks and other recreation facilities, and provide for the drainage of roads, streets, and public places.⁴ Districts must apply and obtain LAFCO approval to exercise services authorized by the principal act but not already provided (i.e., latent powers) by the district at the end of 2000.⁵

Boundary

The RPPUD boundary area encompasses the community of River Pines, which is located in northern Amador County. The boundary area encompasses the portion of the community zoned for low-density residential uses, and excludes outlying parcels zoned for suburban-residential use. The boundary extends north to the South Fork of the Cosumnes River, east to Meadow View Road, south to include parcels on Spring Lane and Circle Avenue, and west to include parcels on Pigeon Trail and Emigrant Trail Roads. The District has a boundary area of approximately 84 acres. The district is known to provide service to three parcels outside its boundaries within Amador County and to approximately 13 properties in El Dorado County. There are no known records for the El Dorado County service extension in the Amador or El Dorado LAFCO files.

¹ Formation date is from Board of Equalization records.

² Public Utilities Code §15501-17501.

³ Public Utilities Code §16461.

⁴ Public Utilities Code §16463.

⁵ Government Code §56824.10.

Sphere of Influence

The District’s sphere of influence (SOI) was first adopted by LAFCO in 1976. The current SOI, which was last updated in 2012,⁶ includes all territory within district boundaries plus parcels outside the boundaries within Amador County. Parcels located within El Dorado County, which are receiving service from the District are not included in the sphere of influence and are anticipated for annexation in the near future. The District’s SOI consists of two non-contiguous areas, the western portion of which is outside of the District’s boundaries. An update and amendment of the sphere of influence is proposed by River Pines (LAFCO Project #296 and the parcels currently receiving service in El Dorado County are proposed for annexation by the district (LAFCO Project #292)

Local Accountability and Governance

RPPUD is governed by a five-member board of directors. Directors are elected, although they are occasionally appointed if necessary to fill vacancies. The most recent contested election was held in 2017.

Figure 1: RPPUD Governing Body

River Pines PUD			
Governing Body			
	Name	Position	Term Ends
<i>Members</i>	Richard Miller	Chair	December 2019
	Rocky Raymond	Vice Chair	December 2021
	Anita Ebbinghausen	Director	December 2019
	Mark Etter	Director	December 2021
	Patrick Henry	Director	December 2021
<i>Manner of Selection</i>	Members are elected at large via biennial elections in odd numbered years.		
<i>Length of Term</i>	4 years.		
<i>Meetings</i>	Center at 22900 Canyon Way		
<i>Agenda Distribution</i>	Posted at the Town Hall and Store bulletin board in town; District Website		
<i>Minutes Distribution</i>	Available upon request; posted on District Website		
Contact			
<i>Contact</i>	General Manager		
<i>Mailing Address</i>	P.O. Box 70, River Pines, CA 95675		
<i>Phone</i>	209-245-6723		
<i>Email/Website</i>	rppud@riverpinespud.org		

⁶ LAFCO Resolution 2012-03.

The District informs constituents by mail or through the District's website. District website is maintained with all of the District's documents, financials, etc. Board position vacancies are posted in the same locations as the Agendas.

Candidates for a board position typically conduct outreach by visiting constituents in person.

With regard to customer service, the District reported that complaints are most often related to water quality and fire flow. Complaints may be submitted to the General Manager via mail, phone, fax, email, or in person. The District reported that the number of complaints received in 2012 was unknown. As of this update (2018) the District notes that complaints are still somewhat related to water quality. Lack of fire hydrants have made it nearly impossible for owners to obtain insurance and/or financing to build vacant lots. Complaints may be made to the General Manager via mail, phone, fax, email or through the website.

The District reported that it had no prosecuted Brown Act violations in recent history. However, in the past, there have been decisions within the scope of the District's responsibilities made without accompanying board actions. Several board members were recalled and voted out of office in 2005. There was also a successful recall in 2011.

The District demonstrated accountability in its disclosure of information and cooperation with LAFCO. The District was cooperative with the MSR process but was unable to provide some of the requested information. The General Manager hopes to improve the District's accountability and disclosure and has made great strides in this effort .

Management

As of 2018, District staff includes a General Manager who is sub-contracted and works approximately a 40 hour week with office hours Monday - Thursday. All plant operations are sub-contracted with Amador Water Agency (AWA).

To improve operational efficiency, the District has reduced the number of its personnel. Remaining independent of AWA as a separate independent district is the District's goal to increase accountability and promote lower customer rates. The primary management challenge remains the difficulty recruiting qualified employees to a small community.

The District did not report any performance evaluation practices, such as tracking workload, monitoring productivity, or evaluating operations in 2014. As of 2018, the General Manager notes productivity is monitored and evaluated.

RPPUD conducts employee evaluations annually, and evaluates new employees after they complete their first three months.

As of 2014, the District did not have a master plan for its water or wastewater system, and did not routinely prepare a capital improvement plan. RPPUD has successfully proceeded in the process of applying for a grant to repair the water storage and delivery system. Grant funding was received for the new well (Well 03R) which was awarded by U.S.D.A. The District also received a Planning Grant for a new distribution system which includes lines, pipes, meters, fire flow, pressures, etc., which were awarded through California Development Block Grant (C.D.B.G) and Proposition 1 - Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (D.W.S.R.F). Those plans are substantially complete and the District is now in the process of submitting for a

construction grant (D.W.S.R.F and U.S.D.A)for this work, which includes work in the El Dorado County service area.

District financial planning efforts include annual preparation of budgets. Audits were performed annually for 2012 through 2017. All audit reports are now located on the District's website for review.

As of 2016, the General Manager notes that Policy and Procedures are currently being developed. An Employee Handbook has been adopted. IIPP has been updated and adopted (2016). Policy and Procedures continue to be adopted; new Bylaws are planned to be adopted within the next couple of months as well.

Management practices include risk management. The District's insurance includes liability coverage of the buildings and property and also Errors and Omissions coverage for the Board and employees.

Service Demand and Growth

Existing land uses in the District's boundary are primarily low-density residential (i.e., three units per acre on average) with four commercial properties located on Shenandoah Road, three public service properties, and vacant parcels scattered throughout the community. The Post Office was removed.

Economic activity in the District's service area includes retail and governmental services. Employers include the River Pines Market and RPPUD.

There are approximately 219 water connections within the District bounds. The estimated population within district bounds is 504.⁷ The District's population density is 3,877 per square mile, compared to the countywide density of 64.

The District reported that service demand had been stable in recent years. The number of connections has increased by 19 (10 percent) since 2008.

Future growth is expected to be limited, because there are only a few undeveloped properties within the District's bounds. There are planned construction projects and District is currently in process of submitting its grant application for the new distribution system. This project will give 275,000 gallons of water storage, all new distribution lines, new meters, fire hydrants, pressure reducer valves, isolation valves for repair work.

There were 52 standby accounts within District bounds in 2013 and no standby accounts outside bounds. The \$6,000,000 improvements will enable the district to serve all the parcels within its boundaries.

The District is not interested in expanding its service area, indicating that, absent grant funding for the new system, current facilities are probably not adequate for serving the maximum customer base, the cost to connect may be prohibitively expensive, and financial reserves are minimal. The District intends to annex those properties outside the boundaries that are currently receiving service.

⁷ The population estimate for the District is the product of the number of water connections within the boundary area and average household size (2.3) in Amador County in 2009-2011, according to the United States Census Bureau.

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.⁸

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.⁹ DWR identified nine disadvantaged communities within Amador County—three of which are cities and are therefore not considered unincorporated.¹⁰ The community of River Pines, which is also a River Pines Census Designated Place with the population of 574, is considered a severely disadvantaged unincorporated community.

In conjunction with its grant funding application, the district conducted an income survey that closed and completed the week of January 29, 2018. The median income is \$28,500 and River Pines is considered a Severely Disadvantaged Community.

Any MSR conducted by LAFCO for a city or special district that provides public facilities or services related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, or structural fire protection, shall identify any DUCs within and contiguous to the sphere of influence of that city or special district and describe the present and probable needs and deficiencies for the provision of those public facilities and services within such DUC. ¹¹

A legacy community is a geographically isolated community that meets DUC criteria, is at least 50 years old, and is beyond the adopted sphere of influence of any city..¹²

Financing

RPPUD reports that its current financing level is sufficient to deliver services, and that all capital costs are incorporated into the rate structure. The MSR earlier MSR research suggested the

⁸ Government Code §56033.5.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ LAFCO Policy 7.3 Adopted 2-16-17

¹² LAFCO Policy 7.7 Adopted 2-16-17

District has significant unmet capital needs, some of which had not been evaluated, indicating likely underfunding of capital replacement. RPPUD has secured grant funding for water storage and distribution planning. The District is currently (2018) trying to obtain a grant for construction of a new distribution system.

The District tracks its finances through two enterprise funds, one for water and the other for wastewater. Total revenue in FY 11-12 was \$289,555. \$308,352 was the total revenue for 16-17.

Main revenue sources are property taxes (two percent), water and sewer fee income (86 percent), and variable income, which consists of broken locks, door hanger fee, late fees, reconnection fees, returned check fees, service connection fees, and water usage (11 percent). Additional sources include interest income, repair labor, and town hall rental, which together constitute about one percent.. Customers may now pay their bills through the District website. In 2016 the Board voted to accept credit cards and debit card payments. Payments may be made through the District's website or to office staff. The General Manager was able to find a company that does not charge the District merchant fees. Instead the consumer is charged \$2.95 per transaction.

The District charges water fees for initiation of new service, monthly usage, late fees, door hanger fees, bank fees, returned checks, reconnection following lock-off, monthly standby assessment, monthly voluntary lock off, service calls, and connection impact. The monthly base service rate is \$60.38 for both commercial and residential properties and as last increased by 10% October 1, 2017. The District uses a tier rate fee schedule for water usage. There is no water usage included in the base rate.

Sewer rates include a monthly residential charge of \$57.75, a monthly commercial charge of \$66.70, and a connection water impact fee of \$7,500.

Standby assessment fees are "restricted" funds and may not be used in the general fund for expenses. Standby fees are used toward a customer's impact fee should they decide to develop the property.

Voluntary Lock-Off fees are for parcels with water/sewer service where the structure is no longer on the property. The voluntary lock off fees are "reserved" funds and may not be used in the general fund for expenses. Voluntary Lock-Off fees are used toward repairs or improvements to the system.

Total expenditures for FY 16-17 were \$327,458. (\$196,167 –suppliers; \$131,291 – employees) The year-end financial report is posted on the website and shows the percentages of each expense. Other expenditures include automobile expenses, bank charges, board member related expenses, contracted expenses, office expenses, property taxes, and repairs and maintenance as noted in the final financial report.

Additional information can be obtained from the 2017 year end audit which can also be found on the District's website.

RPPUD participated in a joint financing arrangement with the County. RPPUD and the County formed a JPA for purposes of water capital financing, however records of this agreement have not yet been found.

WATER SERVICES

Nature and Extent

RPPUD supplies treated water to domestic users. Water services include groundwater pumping, treatment of groundwater, distribution and billing. The District does not produce or use recycled water, and does not practice conjunctive use. As of 2016, the District also has a complete SCADA system for water and wastewater.

The District operations rely on AWA staff (via contract) for services; for example, AWA conducted repairs in 2007 of leaking distribution lines. RPPUD contracted with AWA for certain backup managerial and technical services to qualify for a State Revolving Fund loan to finance capital improvements in 1999.

As of 2017, the District contracted with AWA for all water, sewer, distribution and technical operations. AWA also provides emergency on-call services. AWA may be used if the District needs access to their heavy equipment also.

Location

RPPUD provides services within its bounds to 219 connections. The District's service area extends beyond its boundary area and in El Dorado County where RPPUD serves 15 additional connections.

There are parcels not presently receiving service within the district; including 65 standby accounts within District bounds as of 2018. There have been no new developments of vacant lots. The California drought, lack of fire hydrants and limited water storage make insurance and financing almost impossible to obtain.

Infrastructure

The District's water sources are from groundwater. The well water is chlorinated prior to distribution.

There are a total of three wells. Well No. 2, Well No. 3R and Well No. 6R). Key infrastructure includes water supplies. Well 6R runs only once a week to keep it running for emergency backup only. Well 2 and Well 3R are groundwater - these are the District's two main Wells. Well 2 yields 30gpm and Well 3R yields 35 gpm. These two main Wells are operated congruently.

The groundwater source is a shallow, fractured rock aquifer underlying the River Pines community. Well 2 was drilled 200 ft. deeper in 2015 and is still very much an active water source. It has not been replaced. Before it was drilled deeper it would dry up in late spring and would not be available through the summer. The District had to rely solely on Well 6R during this time. Well No. 6-R was drilled in 1998, and yields 60 gpm. Well 6R needs a down hole transducer to monitor the water level. The groundwater at Well No. 6-R is classified as groundwater under the direct influence of surface water. Wells 2 and 3R have transducers. Well 2's was installed when the Well was drilled deeper. Currently Well 6R does not have one. It is too narrow to install. Well

No. 6R was permitted in April 2006 for domestic use after installing treatment due to problems with microbiological contamination. In April 2006, River Pines completed the process of installing treatment for this well through the State Revolving Fund. After the treatment went online in April 2006, this well was permitted as an active source. Before 2006, Well No. 6R was being used in conjunction with a Boil Water Order for meeting the water demand. Groundwater at Well No. 6R is filtered with Rosedale filtration equipment. The drinking water in Well No. 6R is not vulnerable to contamination from gas stations, but is affected by individual septic systems according to the General Manager. There have been no “boil Water” orders since 2006.

E. coli was detected in a raw Well No. 6 sample taken in March 2012. The California Department of Health Services in Stockton was notified, and its instructions were to increase the amount of chlorine used in the treatment process. All treated water samples taken from the distribution system during the same time periods were free of E. coli. No other contaminants were detected in the water from either well. Well 6R has always been the only Well with contamination risks.

The proposed new distribution project is eliminating the water line that was used to distribute the water from the slow sand filter to the storage tank (the State will not approve financing for the filter).

Diversion from the Cosumnes River under district water rights is currently inactive due to water availability and the need for the District to purchase and install a flow measuring device required by the permit. However, the District still holds the permits for the diversion. The permit provides the District to divert surface water from the South Fork Cosumnes River, which flows through the east part of the community. The District holds water rights to divert up to 126.4 af from the South Fork Cosumnes River for municipal purposes, and may divert at a maximum rate of .204 cfs.¹³ The State will not permit the District to use its slow sand filter for surface water, and that filter is going to be demolished in conjunction with system upgrades.

The District’s water right requires it to maintain a minimum instream flow of 15 gpm, and to install a device to measure instream flow. In addition, RPPUD has rights to divert an additional three af in water from the same source for recreational use during the summer months¹⁴. The District does not presently have rights to store diverted Cosumnes River water, but could apply for such rights in the future to enhance water reliability. RPPUD has another 15 af in water rights from Slate Creek, a tributary to the south fork of the Cosumnes River, which may be used year-round for domestic purposes.¹⁵ The Slate Creek source is not presently used. The Cosumnes River surface water source is generally good quality; however, it is affected by livestock in upstream fields. All potential surface water diversions are currently inactive.

The daily average flow of the South Fork Cosumnes River varies over the course of the year. The greatest flows occur between January and April; during rainy weather, the District relies on its groundwater source due to permit requirements, turbidity in the surface water and associated treatment issues. The daily average flow exceeded the instream flow requirement of 15 gpm even in the driest months (0.6 cfs in September), based on river gage monitoring by U.S. Geological

¹³ State Water Resources Control Board, license 1748, last updated Aug. 24, 1966.

¹⁴ State Water Resources Control Board, license 1748, last updated Aug. 24, 1966.

¹⁵

Survey between 1958 and 1980.¹⁶ Since then, flows have declined, and there are times when there is no surface flow in the river. From July to November, the river is typically dry at the surface. In 2001, as the river became unusable due to extremely low flow, and RPPUD increased its reliance on groundwater sources.

The RPPUD surface water treatment system is being deactivated and dismantled. DWR no longer permits the use of district's treatment system.

The District has a total of 135,000 gallons of storage capacity. By comparison, peak day demand is 45,000 gallons. In other words, the District's stored water capacity would accommodate about one day of peak demand. One of the storage tanks (on Circle Avenue) needs to be replaced. There are no interties between the RPPUD system and neighboring water systems.

The distribution network consists of 4.8 miles of water mains. Per March 2016 Rehabilitation Study - the majority of the distribution system, which was placed in early 1927, consist of 3/4 inch to 4 inch diameter water lines with various materials (Galvanized Pipe, Polyvinyl Chloride Pipe, Polyethylene Pipe, Asbestos Cement Pipe, Copper).

The 2014 MSR noted that the largest distribution main is undersized, and needs to be upgraded to the current six-inch diameter standard. The most recent (2017) state inspection notes that most of the mains are in fair condition. Approximately 20 percent contain asbestos-cement pipelines. The PVC mains and the AC mains are in good condition. The District had approximately 22 distribution system service breaks and leaks in 2017, all of which were repaired. The 2017 Annual Inspection Report pointed out that District's emergency notification plan, which was last updated in 2016, needed to be updated due to personnel changes. As 2018, the District's emergency notification plan was up to date. Updating and replacing the system is the District's current challenge (financial) and this sometimes caused problems in consistently maintaining the system.

There are two separate pressure zones—one in the River Pines community and another in the portion of the service area in the El Dorado County area served by the District.

Fire flow is deficient, as indicated by the impact on water pressure when hydrants are opened, although the District needs to conduct modeling to determine precisely how deficient and to identify solutions and associated costs. Currently there are 18 fire hydrants. To provide adequate protection hydrants should be placed at intervals no more than about 300 feet. In 2017, the District conducted the modeling and planning to rectify these issues and these changes will be included with the new Distribution project.

The 2014 MSR noted the District does not own the equipment (e.g., backhoe, jackhammer) for performing most types of distribution system repairs. The District now contracts with AWA for operations

The District's regulatory record includes deficiencies dating to 1997-8 DPH conducted a technical, managerial and financial (TMF) assessment of the District in 1999, and concluded that RPPUD had TMF deficiencies. DPH issued a notice of violation to the District in 2007 for having served old, stagnant water that had been left in a well contact tank for more than six

¹⁶ Daily average flow was calculated by U.S. Geological Survey for a gage located just downstream of River Pines that was operational from 1958 through 1980 (State Water Resources Control Board, *Decision 1634*, 1996, p. 8).

months, and indicated that RPPUD “ran poor operations during this time and needs a good operations plan for preventing this and other situations in the future.”¹⁷ RPPUD reported that it had subsequently prepared a plan. As of 2018, AWA has implemented a schedule to comply with all State requirements .

The 2014 MSR noted the distribution system did not have the ability to shut off certain locations for repairs without affecting the majority of the customers. This has been addressed in the new distribution plans.

¹⁷ California Department of Public Health, *Notice of Violation No. 03-10-07NOV-003*, 2007, p. 5.

Figure 2: RPPUD Water Profile

River Pines PUD				
Water Service Configuration & Infrastructure				
Water Service	Provider(s)	Water Service	Provider(s)	
Retail Water	Direct	Groundwater Recharge	None	
Wholesale Water	Direct	Groundwater Extraction	Direct	
Water Treatment	Direct	Recycled Water	None	
Service Area Description				
Retail Water	RPPUD boundary area and connections outside of the boundary area in Amador and El Dorado Counties.			
Wholesale Water	River Pines			
Recycled Water	NA			
Boundary Area	0.1 sq. miles	Population	504	
System Overview				
Average Daily Demand	0.032 mgd	Peak Day Demand	0.04 mgd	
Supply	0.032 mgd			
Major Facilities				
Facility Name	Type	Capacity	Condition	Yr Built
Slow sand filter	surface treatment	None	Poor	1994
Well No. 02	well	35 gpm	Excellent	1976
Well No. 06R	well	65 gpm	Excellent	1998
Well No. 03R	well	35 gpm	Excellent	2014
Jaybird	storage tank	75,000 gal	Fair	1982
Circle Ave. contact	contact tank	20,400 gal	Poor	1954
Circle Ave. storage	storage tank	63,000 gal	Poor	1964
Well No. 06R contact	contact tank	12,000 gal	Excellent	2005
Other Infrastructure				
Reservoirs	0	Storage Capacity (mg)	0.17	
Pump Stations	4	Pressure Zones	2	
Production Wells	3	Pipe Miles	4.8 miles	
Other:	18 fire hydrants			
Infrastructure Needs and Deficiencies				
<p>Well 06R needs down hole transducer to monitor the water level. - The slow sand filter's permit has been revoked due to high operation cost and a need for a flow meter to be installed downstream of the diversion point to comply with the water rights permit. Fire flow is deficient, as indicated by the impact on water pressure when hydrants are opened. The District has completed a study and planning to identify solutions and associated costs. Generally, the District lacks certain equipment needed for water operations. The District does not own the proper equipment (e.g., backhoe, jackhammer) for performing most types of distribution system repairs.</p>				
Facility-Sharing and Regional Collaboration				
Current Practices: RPPUD contracts with AWA for all operation services.				
Opportunities: Currently has contract with AWA for all operation needs.				
Notes:				
(1) NA means Not Applicable, NP means Not Provided, mg means millions of gallons, af means acre-feet.				

continued

River Pines PUD							
Water Demand and Supply							
Service Connections	Total		Bounds		Outside Bounds		
Total	234		219		15		
Irrigation/Landscape	0		0		0		
Domestic	229		214		15		
Commercial/Industrial/Institutional	4		4		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	NP	35	35.8	35	NP	NP	NP
Residential	NP	34	34.8	34	NP	NP	NP
Commercial/Industrial	NP	1	1	1	NP	NP	NP
Irrigation/Landscape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Sources		Supply (Acre-Feet/Year)					
Source	Type	Average		Maximum		Safe/Firm	
South Fork Sosumnes River	Surface	0.0		0		NP	
Slate Creek	Surface	0.0		0		NP	
Groundwater wells	Groundwater	NP		35.8		NP	
Supply Information (Acre-feet per Year)							
	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025	2030
Total	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Imported	0.0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0
Groundwater	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Surface	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP
Recycled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drought Supply and Plans							
Drought Supply (af) ¹	Year 1: NP		Year 2: NP		Year 3: NP		
Significant Droughts	1976, 1977, 1988-94, 2007-2009, 2014-2016						
Storage Practices	District water storage capacity amounts to 60 percent of peak day demand.						
Drought Plan	None						
Water Conservation Practices							
CUWCC Signatory	No						
Metering	Yes, 100 percent of connections are metered						
Conservation Pricing	Rate schedule includes water use charges, with gradually higher rates for greater use.						
Other Practices	None.						
Notes:							
(1) Firm or safe water supply from the surface water source and aquifer is unknown. Limits of water during drought are unknown.							

River Pines PUD

Water Rates and Financing

Domestic Water Rates-Ongoing Charges FY 13¹			
	Rate Description	Charges	Consumption²
Residential	\$60.38/month base + use charge	\$ 97.01	7,600 gal/month
Special Rates			
None			
Rate-Setting Procedures			
Policy Description	The District has an increasing block rate schedule; greater water use pays higher rates. \$10/month standby charge for parcels within		
Most Recent Rate Change	2017	Frequency of Rate Changes	Every 3-5 years
Water Development Fees and Requirements			
Connection Fee Approach	Properties paying standby charges get to have those payments applied to new connection fee.		
Connection Fee Timing	Due prior to connection.		
Connection Fee Amount	\$7,500/Single Family Unit		
Land Dedication Requirements			
Development Impact Fee			
Water Enterprise Revenues, FY 17			Expenditures, FY 17
Source	Amount	%	Amount
Total	\$308,408	100%	Total \$318,431
Rates & charges	\$131,488	43%	Administration \$47,664
Property tax	\$6,883	2%	O & M \$88,172
Grants	\$132,117	43%	Capital Depreciation \$40,972
Interest	\$1,174	0%	Debt \$9,500
Connection Fees	\$395	0%	Purchased Water \$0
Variable Income	\$36,351	12%	Other \$132,123
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.			

continued

River Pines PUD

Water Service Adequacy, Efficiency & Planning Indicators

Water Planning	Description		Planning Horizon
Water Master Plan	None		N/A
UWMP	None		N/A
Capital Improvement Plan	None		N/A
Emergency Response Plan	Emergency contacts		Last Updated 2016
Other Plans			
Specs and plans for a new distribution system			
Service Challenges			
Distribution system piping is not standardized, creating challenges for distribution system maintenance. Standardized piping would simplify distribution system maintenance.			
Service Adequacy Indicators			
Connections/FTE	293	O&M Cost Ratio ¹	NP
MGD Delivered/FTE	0.04	Distribution Loss Rate	28%
Distribution Breaks & Leaks	30	Distribution Break Rate ²	625
Response Time Policy	ASAP	Response Time Actual	1-2 hours
Water Pressure	20 psi	Total Employees (FTEs)	0
Water Operator Certification			
Grade 3			
Drinking Water Quality Regulatory Information³			
	#	Description	
Health Violations	0	NA	
Monitoring Violations	5	Coliform, 2005. Failed to conduct nitrate monitoring, 2016. Failed to test all of its backflow prevention devices, 2016.	
DW Compliance Rate ⁴	100%		
Notes:			
(1) Operations and maintenance costs (exc. purchased water, debt, depreciation) per volume (mgd) delivered.			
(2) Distribution break rate is the number of leaks and pipeline breaks per 100 miles of distribution piping.			
(3) Violations for the last 10 years as reported by the U.S. EPA Safe Drinking Water Information System.			
(4) Drinking water compliance is percent of time in compliance with National Primary Drinking Water Regulations in 2018.			

WASTEWATER SERVICES

Nature and Extent

RPPUD provides wastewater collection, treatment and disposal services. The District contracts with AWA for all wastewater services.

The community relied on septic systems until FY 87-88 when the sewer system was completed by Amador County and subsequently transferred to the district. The County received grant funding to develop the system because septic systems were failing, soils and small lots made septic systems infeasible and due to public health hazards associated with septic systems.¹⁸ State and federal grants funded the costs of developing the sewer system. Amador County planned, acquired easements, developed and owned the wastewater collection system until 2008 when it was transferred to RPPUD. RPPUD now owns the collection system and bears responsibility for all aspects of the wastewater system.

Location

RPPUD offers wastewater services throughout its boundary area. As of 2018, the District had 215 residential and four commercial connections, all of which were within its bounds. In 2014, standby sewer connections and stand by charges were not reported .

Infrastructure

Key infrastructure includes the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), sewer pipes, grinders used to transfer effluent up hill to the lift stations and lift stations.

The District's WWTP has a facility design flow capacity of 0.035 mgd (ADWF), and can accommodate peak flows of 0.088 mgd. The average treatment plant daily flow in 2012 was 0.022 mgd and peak wet weather flow 0.03 mgd. The treatment system consists of a bar screen, two 1.25-af aerated ponds, a secondary clarification pond and a storage reservoir, and a 17-acre spray field.¹⁹ Treated effluence is disinfected prior to disposal. The disposal system consists of seven sprinkler circuits. Solids accumulate in the ponds are removed occasionally; sludge is hauled off-site to a landfill for disposal.

The wastewater collection system consists of an unknown number of miles of gravity sewer and approximately 1.5 miles of force main. The system is subject to infiltration and inflow, although the peaking factor of 1.8 is lower than the industry standard of 3.0. There are three major pumping stations: East Side, Horseshoe Lane and Slate Creek. In addition, there are seven small "grinder" pump stations, which are located along the Cosumnes River; these pump wastewater through a force main up to the gravity collection system.

¹⁸ An estimated 60 of 215 septic systems had failed when the wastewater collection system was developed (Baracco and Associates, *Environmental Impact Report: River Pines Wastewater Facilities Project*, June 1984, p. 3)

¹⁹ Central Valley RWQCB, *Waste Discharge Requirements for River Pines Wastewater Treatment Plant: Order No. 85-291*, 1985.