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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the first countywide Municipal Service Review (MSR) report prepared for the Yuba Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO). An MSR is a State-required comprehensive study of services within a designated geographic area, in this case, Yuba County. The MSR requirement is codified in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Government Code Section 56000 et seq.). Once MSR findings are adopted, the Commission will update the spheres of influence (SOIs) of cities and special districts in Yuba County.

SERVICE PROVIDERS

This report focuses on municipal services in Yuba County. Water, wastewater, flood control and drainage, fire, emergency medical, law enforcement, transportation, park and recreation, cemetery, library, mosquito and vector control, and resource conservation services are included. The focus of the review is service providers under LAFCO jurisdiction within Yuba County, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Local Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Levee &amp; Reclamation Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Marysville</td>
<td>Marysville Levee District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Wheatland</td>
<td>Reclamation District #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery Districts</td>
<td>Reclamation District #2103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browns Valley Cemetery District</td>
<td>Reclamation District #784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville Cemetery District</td>
<td>Reclamation District #817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camptonville Cemetery District</td>
<td>Water Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keystone Cemetery District</td>
<td>Brophy Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville Cemetery District</td>
<td>Browns Valley Irrigation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria Cemetery District</td>
<td>Camp Far West Irrigation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartville Cemetery District</td>
<td>Cordua Irrigation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Valley Cemetery District</td>
<td>Linda County WD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upham Cemetery District†</td>
<td>Nevada Irrigation District†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatland Cemetery District</td>
<td>North Yuba Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Districts</td>
<td>Olivehurst PUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camptonville CSD</td>
<td>Ramirez Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 10-Hallwood CSD</td>
<td>South Feather Water &amp; Power Agency†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Rica-Browns Valley CSD</td>
<td>South Yuba Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Highlands CSD</td>
<td>Wheatland Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobbins-Oregon House FPD</td>
<td>Yuba County Water Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothill FPD</td>
<td>Sutter-Yuba Mosquito and Vector Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda FPD</td>
<td>District†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumas/Brophy FPD</td>
<td>Yuba County Resource Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartville FPD</td>
<td>County Service Areas (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) Multi-county local agency for which the principal LAFCO is other than Yuba.

The report also includes information on private service providers and other governmental service providers to the extent necessary to establish relationships, quantify services, and provide a
comprehensive overview of services in Yuba County, recognizing that LAFCO has no authority over these types of agencies.

**GROWTH**

The countywide population has grown by 19 percent, from 60,219 to 71,929, between 2000 and 2008. Since 2000, the total acreage of prime farmland in Yuba County has decreased by nearly six percent as a result of development in the southwestern part of the County.

There are five centers of planned and proposed development in the County: Plumas Lake, City of Wheatland SOI, East Linda, North Arboga, and the Brophy/South Yuba area northwest of Wheatland along SR 65. Development has been proposed or planned on 75 percent of land in Plumas Lake, 59 percent in the Wheatland SOI, 47 percent in East Linda, 27 percent in North Arboga, and 15 percent in Brophy/South Yuba.

Proposed and planned developments would add 62,470 dwelling units and 1,040 acres of non-residential development. The population would grow to 254,483 if such potential development in the MSR area materializes, and higher if further development should occur. Transportation and water planners are anticipating substantially less growth. Increased communication between land use and infrastructure planners is needed to ensure that long-term water and transportation planning accounts for the future needs of the area.

The jobs-housing balance is relatively low in the unincorporated areas and Wheatland. By prioritizing development projects that would create local jobs, land use authorities may attempt to achieve a more desirable jobs-housing balance.

Urbanization and growth present a number of challenges to the MSR area in balancing the competing needs and preferences of agricultural and urban uses.

**WATER**

As a water-rich area, Yuba County has adequate water supplies on the whole. Yuba County Water Agency (YCWA) and Browns Valley Irrigation District (BVID) are major water rights holders whose future water supplies are affected by increased instream flow requirements of the Lower Yuba River Accord.

Certain areas with relatively low well yields need adequate water supplies and infrastructure capacity for delivery of surface water:

- BVID needs pipeline infrastructure to extend raw water service to unserved portions of its boundary area. The planned Spring Valley development needs water treatment and conveyance infrastructure, which would be developer funded.

- The North Yuba Water District (NYWD) lacks distribution and conveyance capacity to deliver adequate water to its service area. A pipeline is needed to provide adequate capacity. The distribution system is undersized and in poor condition, and needs to be replaced or rehabilitated.
• Nevada Irrigation District (NID) lacks treatment and upstream canal capacity needed to accommodate even minimal growth in the Smartville area. NID is required by a 1926 Railroad Commission Order to serve this area, but has remaining capacity for only nine domestic connections. Needs include a new water treatment plant site and facility, or alternatively a pipeline from the Lake Wildwood water treatment plant.

• As a result of groundwater overdraft in the Wheatland Water District (WWD) area, well yields are low in the area north of Dry Creek. Surface water supplies are needed and related canal infrastructure is being developed by YCWA. WWD needs to plan and develop a local distribution system to ensure that the water is put to beneficial use by 2010.

Groundwater quality is generally good in the South Yuba Groundwater Basin, but is saline in portions of the WWD and South Yuba Water District (SYWD) service areas. Groundwater contamination has occurred on Beale AFB, although the water is not used for drinking purposes and the problem is being remediated.

Emergency water supplies are provided in Wheatland, Marysville, Olivehurst Public Utilities District (OPUD) and Beale AFB service areas, but Linda County Water District (LCWD) and Smartville have no water storage facilities. The relatively isolated Challenge, Rackerby and Forbestown communities depend on water storage tanks that are leaking and in poor condition and need replacement. Camptonville and Gold Village need additional water storage to ensure adequate water supplies during periods of shortage.

As urbanization and growth occur, areas presently served by surface water would likely be served by urban water purveyors presently dependent on groundwater. Due to historic overdraft of the South Yuba Groundwater Basin, there may be inadequate groundwater supplies to serve future development in the long-term. Actual impacts on the groundwater subbasin would depend greatly on the extent of existing surface and groundwater use on land that would be urbanized in the future. To grow and plan responsibly, an evaluation should be conducted of the safe annual yield of the groundwater subbasin and the nature of current irrigation practices on land that would be urbanized in the future.

In the meantime, major water rights holders, particularly BVID and YCWA, should make best efforts to preserve water rights and extend pending deadlines for perfection of those rights to ensure availability of surface water supplies for future municipal uses. Given a potential need for treated surface water to serve future municipal needs, there are significant policy questions and challenges for agricultural and urban interests in Yuba County to resolve. The water purveyors and land use authorities need to develop a forum for ongoing discussion and resolution of these issues. To date, no agency has taken the lead in tackling this controversial policy issue.

**FLOOD**

Urban areas must achieve protection from a 200-year flood event. Levee integrity standards have increased substantially as a result of recent floods in California and New Orleans. Substantial levee investments are being made to ensure that urban areas in Yuba County receive needed flood protection.

Reclamation Districts (RDs) 10 and 817 serving rural areas have unacceptable levee maintenance records. RD 817 has not imposed assessments to fund appropriate service levels, whereas, RD 10
imposed an assessment for the first time in 2008. RD 2103 provides adequate services largely through volunteer efforts, but will need funding for paid staff as urbanization proceeds. RD 784 does not maintain levees to an urban standard due to lack of funding; its drainage responsibilities overlap with the County and drainage services are not presently adequate. Marysville Levee District provides adequate maintenance, although funding per levee mile is below the urban standard.

A regional levee maintenance program could offer reclamation districts professional staff and appropriate equipment, and enhance service levels.

Those benefiting from levees should contribute to maintenance costs. Annexation of the eastern portions of the Linda and Olivehurst communities to RD 784, and reorganization of RD 817 would better align boundaries with the areas benefited.

WASTEWATER

LCWD, Marysville and Wheatland need to upgrade wastewater facilities to meet evolving regulatory requirements. Facility sharing would help providers reap economies of scale. Marysville is operating near its permitted capacity. Conveyance of Marysville flows to the upgraded LCWD wastewater plant may be the most cost-effective solution. Another option is the conveyance of Marysville and LCWD flows to OPUD. Wheatland needs to build a new wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) to accommodate growth. Wheatland has an opportunity to collaborate with neighboring Beale Air Force Base in developing adequate facilities; the base seeks an outside party to invest in its aging WWTP.

There are as many as 35,675 housing units planned for areas not presently within any wastewater providers’ boundary area. Of these, 14,730 units are planned for areas within the City of Wheatland’s existing SOI. Although OPUD has already upgraded its WWTP, the existing site can only be expanded to accommodate build-out of its existing service area and SOI—Plumas Lake, North Arboga and Olivehurst. To serve additional flows, OPUD would have to acquire additional land for further expansion. Growth areas would most likely be served by LCWD and Wheatland. A dividing line in the vicinity of Ostrom Road may be appropriate to accommodate gravity flows and minimize infrastructure costs.

River Highlands CSD has struggled to provide appropriate service levels. The 84 homes in the Gold Village development pay relatively high sewer rates to fund replacement of a failed plant. The very small district has management, financing and regulatory compliance challenges. Accountability for community service needs is minimal.

FIRE

Marysville, Linda Fire Protection District (LFPD), OPUD and Loma Rica-Browns Valley Community Services District (LRBVCSDD) provide the highest service levels at present, offering fire stations that are staffed 24 hours a day. These providers need additional financing and efficiencies to attain standard urban service levels of four professional firefighters staffing each fire station.

Wheatland, Plumas Brophy Fire Protection District (PBFPD) and Smartville Fire Protection District (SFPD) offer stations that are staffed with paid firefighters during daytime hours, and rely on call firefighter response in the evenings and on weekends. They need additional financing and fire stations equipped with dormitory facilities to provide 24-hour service.
In the foothill areas, providers serve expansive territory with limited resources, and provide service largely through volunteer efforts. Low densities in these areas do not yield enough revenue to fund staffed fire stations.

Only within the city limits of Marysville and Wheatland do response times meet the National Fire Protection Association guideline of six minutes at least 90 percent of the time. Nonetheless, most service providers’ response times meet State guidelines. Bi-County Ambulance response times exceed standards at Beale AFB. LRBVCSD and Dobbins-Oregon House Fire Protection District did not disclose response times.

Consolidation of fire service is an option for urbanized and urbanizing territory in the Brophy, Linda, Olivehurst and Plumas Lake areas. Consolidation of LFPD and OPUD would promote efficient service areas and optimize response times in this growing urban area. Detachment of adjacent urbanizing areas from PBFPD is an option that would offer these areas the urban service levels that future residents would most likely expect. Alignment of fire providers’ boundaries with their service areas would better promote equitable financing and public safety. Annexation of the Clippermills community to Foothill Fire Protection District is an option.

**Law Enforcement**

The countywide serious crime rate has declined in the last decade, and is now comparable to neighboring Sutter and Butte counties. Within Yuba County, the unincorporated areas and Wheatland benefit from below-average crime rates. Like many urban centers, Marysville experiences greater demand for law enforcement services due to an above-average crime rate.

Law enforcement providers offer adequate service levels based on response times to high-priority incidents and staffing levels. Crime clearance rates in the unincorporated areas and Wheatland could be improved; the Sheriff has already expanded detective resources to boost clearance rates.

The Yuba County Sheriff’s Department (YCSD) and Wheatland Police Department both reported a need for new station headquarters due to deficiencies in current facilities.

**Streets**

During peak conditions, highways are congested in Marysville and Wheatland. Additional highway capacity is needed. Caltrans plans to widen State Route 20 by 2017, and SR 70 by 2013. The Wheatland area needs an SR 65 bypass to direct traffic flows around the city center and improve traffic flow to Beale AFB. The Marysville area needs increased roadway capacity to and from Yuba City, and has plans to widen the 5th Street bridge by 2018. The planned Yuha River Parkway, set to begin construction in 2008, will serve as a bypass and provide some congestion relief in Marysville. Local agencies should aggressively pursue regional traffic impact fees to ensure that growing Yuba City and other neighboring areas pay their fair share toward needed highway investments.

The unincorporated areas and Wheatland have significant street maintenance and rehabilitation needs. The City of Wheatland has established a priority list of streets for rehabilitation or major maintenance activities, and the plan will be implemented as funding becomes available. Wheatland
needs to implement a computerized pavement management system to prioritize and optimize its street investments.

There are 44 County Service Area (CSA) through which maintenance of private roads in unincorporated areas are maintained. Governance options include dissolution of six CSAs that are inactive.

**Other Services**

On the whole, park service levels are adequate. Park acreage meets standards in Marysville and OPUD, and would need to be enhanced to meet adopted standards in the growing unincorporated areas and Wheatland. Dobbins, Oregon House, Camptonville, Smartville, Gold Village, and Loma Rica lack developed local parks. There are unmet maintenance needs in Linda and Olivehurst. Existing recreation programming is inadequate. Financing mechanisms are in place to ensure that future growth contributes toward local park development needs. Regional parks and trail networks are growth-related infrastructure needs for which financing mechanisms and service providers have not yet been developed. Formation of a countywide regional park district is an option.

Public cemetery providers have sufficient capacity at present and room for expansion, but do have capital needs. Six of the 10 cemetery districts provide year-round maintenance, while four provide maintenance only one to three times per year. In several cases, cemetery districts are not compliant with legal requirements relating to fees and constraints on burial of non-residents. Camptonville Community Services District is not legally authorized to provide cemetery service, and needs to petition LAFCO for approval so that the inactive Camptonville Cemetery District may be dissolved. Governance options include adjusting Brownsville, Strawberry Valley and Upham Cemetery Districts’ boundaries to ensure that residents of the Clippermills and Rackerby communities have legal access to the cemetery preferred by the majority in these communities.
2. MSR DETERMINATIONS

This chapter sets forth recommended findings with respect to the following service-related evaluation categories based upon this review of municipal services for Yuba County:

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 governmental structure and operational efficiencies; and

6) Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy.

LAFCO is required to identify governance options; however, LAFCO is not required to initiate changes and, in many cases, is not empowered to initiate these options. LAFCO is required by the State to act on SOI updates. The Commission may choose to recommend governmental reorganizations to particular agencies in the county, using the spheres of influence as the basis for those recommendations (Government Code §56425 (g)).

GENERAL

ADEQUACY OF PUBLIC SERVICES

- While public sector management standards do vary depending on the size and scope of an organization, there are minimum standards. Well-managed organizations evaluate employees annually, prepare a budget before the beginning of the fiscal year, conduct periodic financial audits to safeguard the public trust, maintain current financial records, periodically evaluate rates and fees, plan and budget for capital replacement needs, conduct advance planning for future growth, and make best efforts to meet regulatory requirements.

- Most of the professionally managed and staffed agencies implement many of these best management practices. Many of the smaller special districts serving the area are staffed by board members or volunteers, and do not implement such practices.

- LAFCO encourages all local agencies to conduct timely financial record-keeping and make financial information available to the public.
**Growth and Population Projections**

- The County is primarily agricultural with 228,113 acres of farmland. Most of the farmland (142,729 acres) is used for grazing purposes. There were 41,993 acres of prime farmland, 32,372 acres of unique farmland and 11,019 acres of farmland of statewide importance in the County, as of 2006. Since 2000, the total acreage of prime farmland in Yuba County has decreased by nearly six percent as a result of development in the southwestern part of the County.

- Since the 2000 Census, the countywide population has grown by 19 percent, from 60,219 to 71,929 at the beginning of 2008.

- Wheatland showed rapid development from 2002 to 2004. In the unincorporated territory, the southwestern communities of Plumas Lake and Linda experienced rapid residential growth from 2003 to 2005. In spite of the housing market downturn, the unincorporated areas have continued to attract development interest and building permits.

- There are as many as 85 proposed and planned developments in the County. The developments propose a total of 62,470 dwelling units and 1,040 acres of non-residential development. The timing of potential future development is unknown due to the present housing market downturn and forthcoming land use decisions affecting the unincorporated areas.

- There are five centers of planned and proposed development in the County: Plumas Lake, City of Wheatland SOI, East Linda, North Arboga, and the Brophy/South Yuba area northwest of Wheatland along SR 65. Developments have been proposed or planned on 75 percent of land in Plumas Lake, 59 percent in the Wheatland SOI, 47 percent in East Linda, 27 percent in North Arboga, and 15 percent in Brophy/South Yuba.

- The population would grow to 254,483 if proposed and planned development in the MSR area materializes, and higher if further development should occur.

- By contrast, transportation planners at SACOG project population growth consistent with approximately one-third of planned units being developed in the area by 2035. Water planners similarly anticipate substantially less growth.

- Land use planners in high-growth areas should periodically update development plans and growth projections; this could be included in the five-year housing element updates. Increased communication between land use and infrastructure planners is needed to ensure that long-term water and transportation planning accounts for the future needs of the area.

- The jobs-housing balance is relatively low in the unincorporated areas and Wheatland. By prioritizing development projects that would create local jobs, land use authorities may attempt to achieve a more desirable jobs-housing balance.

- To achieve a more desirable jobs-housing balance, land use authorities should prioritize development projects that would create local jobs.
FINANCIAL ABILITY OF AGENCIES TO PROVIDE SERVICES

- Municipal service providers are constrained in their capacity to finance services by the inability to increase property taxes, requirements for voter approval for new or increased taxes, and requirements of voter approval for parcel taxes and assessments used to finance services. Municipalities must obtain majority voter approval to increase or impose new general taxes and two-thirds voter approval for special taxes.

- Limitations on property tax rates and increases in taxable property values are financing constraints. Property tax revenues are subject to a formulaic allocation and are vulnerable to State budget needs. Agencies formed since the adoption of Proposition 13 in 1978 often lack adequate property tax financing.

- Financing opportunities that require voter approval include special taxes such as parcel taxes, increases in general taxes such as utility taxes, sales and use taxes, business license taxes, and transient occupancy taxes. Communities may elect to form business improvement districts to finance supplemental services, or Mello-Roos districts to finance development-related infrastructure extension. Agencies may finance facilities with voter-approved (general obligation) bonded indebtedness.

- Financing opportunities that do not require voter approval include imposition of or increases in fees to more fully recover the costs of providing services, including user fees and development impact fees to recover the actual cost of services provided and infrastructure. Development impact fees and user fees must be based on reasonable costs, and may be imposed and increased without voter approval. Development impact fees may not be used to subsidize operating costs. Agencies may also finance many types of facility improvements through bond instruments that do not require voter approval.

- Water and wastewater rates and rate structures are not subject to regulation by other agencies. Utility providers may increase rates annually, and often do so. Generally, there is no voter approval requirement for rate increases, although notification of utility users is required. Water and wastewater providers must maintain an enterprise fund for the respective utility separate from other funds, and may not use revenues to finance unrelated governmental activities.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS

- Accountability is best ensured when contested elections are held for governing body seats of local agencies. With contested elections, local voters have the opportunity to ensure accountability among their elected officials.

- The County, the cities, Yuba County Water Agency (YCWA), Browns Valley Irrigation District (BVID), and the fire districts demonstrated a high degree of public participation in elections as well as other forms of citizen participation.

- Interest in governing body membership is relatively low among many of the special districts serving the MSR area, and uncontested elections are common. Cemetery and most irrigation
district board members are appointed, which limits accountability. Accountability is constrained by limited interest among citizens in serving on the governing bodies.

- County Service Area (CSA) accountability is limited, as there is no formal mechanism for local control or input. The CSAs lack a communication vehicle for constituents to inform the County on issues pertaining to services in the community. The County Public Works Department manages the CSAs, and has not developed a new communication approach after dissolving road committees in the communities. Any CSA property owner may contact the County CSA coordinator for service requests.

- Local agencies that conduct constituent outreach promote accountability and ensure that constituents are informed and not disenfranchised. The County, the cities and the larger special districts make information about their activities available to the public through a variety of sources, including Internet websites, distribution of agenda and related documents, public access to city council and board meetings, mailing information to constituents, and similar methods. Among the smaller districts, public outreach efforts were typically informal, if conducted at all.

- Public agency operations and management should be transparent to the public. Government Code §56378 requires that local and State agencies provide information requested by LAFCOs. LAFCO was unable to obtain needed information from some agencies. LAFCO encourages agencies to develop technical information so they can respond more completely to LAFCO information requests for project proposals and the 2013 MSR. Agencies are encouraged to enhance technical information, such as infrastructure capacity and growth projections, as they prepare master plans or General Plan updates.

**Governmental Structure and Operational Efficiencies**

- Elimination of unnecessary local governments or inadequate service providers should be pursued with sensitivity to retaining local accountability.

- Local agencies must obtain LAFCO approval to alter boundaries, to serve territory outside their boundaries and to provide new services.

**Water Services**

**Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Infrastructure Needs**

- Yuba County agriculture relies primarily on surface water. Historical groundwater overdraft conditions have been reversed in much of south Yuba County by YCWA surface water delivery. Irrigation providers pump groundwater in dry years to accommodate fishery needs. Groundwater substitution needs to be closely monitored to offer adequate groundwater availability for all uses.
• As a water-rich area, Yuba County has adequate water supplies on the whole. Due to relatively low well yields, certain areas lack adequate water supplies and infrastructure capacity for delivery of surface water.

• BVID needs pipeline infrastructure to extend raw water service to unserved portions of its boundary area. The planned Spring Valley development needs water treatment and conveyance infrastructure, which would be developer funded.

• North Yuba Water District (NYWD) lacks distribution and conveyance capacity to deliver adequate water to its service area. A pipeline is needed to provide adequate capacity. The distribution system is undersized and in poor condition, and needs to be replaced or rehabilitated.

• Nevada Irrigation District (NID) lacks treatment and upstream canal capacity needed to accommodate even minimal growth in the Smartville area. NID is required by a 1926 Railroad Commission Order to serve this area, but has remaining capacity for only nine domestic connections. Needs include a new water treatment plant site and facility, or alternatively a pipeline from the Lake Wildwood water treatment plant.

• In the long-term, future urban development may need access to treated surface water to ensure adequate and reliable water supply. Due to historic overdraft of the South Yuba Groundwater Basin, there may be inadequate groundwater supplies to serve planned development in the long-term. Actual impacts on the groundwater subbasin would depend greatly on the extent of existing surface and groundwater use on land that would be urbanized in the future.

• YCWA reported that it does not anticipate having water supplies to serve municipal and industrial demands. The cities, the County and the urban water districts should evaluate groundwater adequacy and irrigation practices in their SOIs and future growth areas before the next MSR cycle.

• BVID, Linda County Water District (LCWD), Olivehurst Public Utility District (OPUD) and Wheatland will need substantial infrastructure to accommodate planned development, and have conducted associated planning and developed financing mechanisms to accommodate growth needs.

• As a result of groundwater overdraft in the Wheatland Water District (WWD) area, well yields are low in the area north of Dry Creek. Surface water supplies are needed and related canal infrastructure is being developed by YCWA.

• Water storage tanks are in poor condition and need to be replaced in three communities—Challenge, Rackerby and Forbestown—to ensure public safety.

• Emergency water supplies are provided in Wheatland, Marysville, OPUD and Beale AFB service areas, but LCWD and Smartville have no emergency water storage facilities.

• Camptonville and Gold Village need additional water storage to ensure adequate water supplies during periods of shortage.
• The City of Wheatland needs additional water reserves for fire flow in the case of multiple simultaneous fire incidents. To accommodate growth, the City has planned for developer-funded water needs in the existing SOI area.

• Beale AFB is actively remediating and monitoring groundwater contamination at various sites. Beale AFB needs to remediate gasoline in the residential area and to rehabilitate or replace older water mains and corroded piping in the distribution system, and is actively rehabilitating infrastructure and housing in the residential area.

• River Highlands Community Services District (RHCSD) serves water to 84 households in the Gold Village community in the Smartville area. The District has faced water delivery challenges relating to low well yields and equipment failure, and water quality challenges related to coliform.

**Adequacy of Public Services**

• Enhanced groundwater monitoring and planning is needed to ensure adequate and reliable water supplies are available throughout the area.

• A diversified water portfolio, including both surface and groundwater for future municipal needs, would help boost drought and emergency preparedness in urban areas. Use of surface water may also benefit wastewater providers by reducing salinity, particularly in light of evolving regulatory standards.

• To ensure that urban water needs are anticipated and met, multi-jurisdictional planning and collaboration should determine how future development will be served.

• RHCSD serves a small 84-unit development, is financially constrained, has a checkered record of compliance with drinking water standards and wastewater regulations, and demonstrated a lack of accountability.

• WWD has not begun providing services or conducting financial planning. The District needs to plan and develop a local distribution system to ensure that the water is put to beneficial use and associated water rights are perfected by the 2010 deadline.

• Expanded YCWA programs, including conjunctive use, groundwater monitoring and analysis, and land subsidence monitoring, are desirable.

**Growth and Population Projections**

• Irrigation water demand makes up 91-95 percent of water demand in the MSR area.

• Urban development will tend to reduce overall water needs in southern Yuba County.

• Comprehensive analysis of demand, not only for imported water but also for local sources, is a recommended practice. Comparison of projected demand growth to both regional and local demographic and economic forecasts also helps ensure responsible planning of
adequate water for future growth. Validation of local groundwater demand projections with safe yields is another best practice.

- To grow and plan responsibly, an evaluation is needed of the safe annual yield of the groundwater subbasin and current irrigation practices on land that would be urbanized in the future. In the meantime, major water rights holders, particularly BVID and YCWA, should seek to extend permits and to retain water rights likely to be critical to serving the needs of Yuba County as it develops over the long-term.

- Reserving surface water supplies exclusively for agricultural uses and requiring urban development to rely only on groundwater could lead to groundwater overdraft under a build-out development scenario.

- Agencies are encouraged to implement conservation best management practices to promote water use efficiency. Metering water connections reduced demand in Wheatland by 30 percent. OPUD, Cal Water and RHCSD could reduce water use by expediting installation of meters. Increased use of recycled water for landscaping purposes would reduce the amount of potable water used. Requirements that installed landscaping be climate-appropriate and drought-tolerant would reduce water needs.

**Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Services**

- For the most part, the water providers demonstrated financial ability to provide adequate services.

- NYWD operates in a severely resource-constrained fashion and charges relatively high rates. The District has substantial infrastructure needs that are presently unfunded; however, the District will be receiving a very sizable increase in revenues in 2010. The District may consider borrowing on the security of those future revenues to begin addressing infrastructure needs more timely.

- There may be opportunities for NID to restructure its rates for service to the Smartville area where users are charged a premium for outside-District service. NID raw water rates are particularly high in the Smartville area.

**Status of, and Opportunities For, Shared Facilities**

- Water purveyors practice extensive facility sharing. Camp Far West Irrigation District (CFWID) relies on water production and conveyance facilities operated by South Sutter Water District. NYWD relies on water production and conveyance facilities operated by South Feather Water and Power Agency. Ramirez Water District (RWD) relies on conveyance through Hallwood Irrigation Company and Cordua Irrigation District (CID) canals for distribution, and share responsibility for the fish screen.

- Future facility sharing opportunities include use of YCWA canals by Wheatland to receive surface water for conjunctive use.
• Given a potential need for treated surface water to serve future municipal needs, there are significant policy questions and challenges for agricultural and urban interests in Yuba County to resolve. The water purveyors and land use authorities need to develop a forum for ongoing discussion and resolution of these issues. An ongoing collaborative process would identify further opportunities for shared facilities.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS

• YCWA, BVID, NYWD, LCWD, OPUD, and Wheatland demonstrated accountability based on the measures of contested elections, constituent outreach efforts and disclosure practices.

• Accountability is more limited in Camptonville Community Services District (CCSD) and smaller irrigation districts where governing body members are appointed and contested elections do not occur.

GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES

• A government structure option is for irrigation districts containing growth areas to provide urban surface water wholesale service, as BVID does. For the most part, the districts would need to gain approval from LAFCO in addition to either YCWA approval or amendment of water rights permits. An alternative is for YCWA to provide wholesale water service to urban purveyors directly; however, YCWA is skeptical that it would have adequate water supplies to wholesale to new member units.

• Detachment of urbanizing territory from irrigation districts, particularly Brophy Water District (BWD), South Yuba Water District (SYWD) and WWD is an option. The southern irrigation providers do not wish to share governance with urban water users, and are concerned about increased maintenance costs being borne by the remaining growers. However, careful consideration to impacts on groundwater resources should be given before detaching territory.

• Annexation of territory to the City of Wheatland as the City urbanizes is an option. The City is rapidly urbanizing with proposed and planned developments covering its existing sphere of influence. The City is expected to annex substantial territory in the next 20 years as adjacent areas urbanize.

• Reorganization of BVID and NYWD to eliminate the 2,821-acre area where the boundaries of the two districts presently overlap each other is an option.

• Several irrigation water providers presently serve territory outside their bounds. Annexation of such territory to BVID, CID and SYWD are options. Local agencies have been required since 2001 to gain LAFCO approval before extending services outside their boundaries.

• Dissolution of River Highlands CSD is an option. RHCSD could be dissolved, with its various funding sources and obligations transferring to a successor agency.
• Formation of a new community services district responsible for water, wastewater, fire and possibly cemetery services in the Smartville community is an option. There are service and accountability deficiencies at RHCSD and Smartville Cemetery District (SCD). It would be desirable for the successor agency to monitor NID activities in Smartville for compliance with the Railroad Commission Order, and explore assuming water service directly. Including fire service within the new district’s scope would help ensure good governance and accountability.

**Flood Control & Drainage**

**Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Infrastructure Needs**

• New Bullards Bar Dam outlet capacity needs to be increased to facilitate earlier releases of water during extreme floods and free up more reservoir capacity to regulate peak flows. New Colgate Powerhouse needs a tailwater depression project to allow for early release of flood flows and reduce peak flows downstream.

• The entire low-lying portion of the Valley may be affected by flood conditions. Existing levees protect nearly all of the urban areas in the County in addition to the rural area north of Marysville that is surrounded by levees maintained by Reclamation District 10 (RD 10).

• Marysville levees may afford 100-year flood protection. Further evaluation of underseepage is needed to determine levee capacity and infrastructure needs. The goal of the federal Yuba River Basin project is 300-year flood protection for levees protecting Marysville.

• Geotechnical evaluations have identified underseepage and other deficiencies on the Feather River levee protecting the Linda, Olivehurst, Arboga and Plumas Lake areas, and the Bear River levee protecting Wheatland. Although these levees presently lack capacity to protect the areas from 100-year flood events, levee improvements are underway to provide these areas 200-year flood protection by 2009.

• The southern Dry Creek levee protecting northern Wheatland and the area west of Wheatland is too low, too narrow, has overly steep side slopes, and does not afford 100-year flood protection. The levee will be evaluated by DWR in 2009. Financing would need to be arranged to improve the levee capacity.

• In the Wheatland SOI area, freeboard and geotechnical deficiencies on the San Joaquin Drainage canal levees also need to be addressed by RD 2103 to achieve 200-year flood protection; this project phase needs to be evaluated and funded.

• Certain levees protecting the Linda, Arboga and Plumas Lake areas were recently improved and certified for 100-year flood protection. Specifically, the south Yuba River levee downstream of Simpson Lane, the northern Bear River and western WPIC levees have been certified to date.
• Most of the Beale AFB, Smartville, Browns Valley and foothill areas are outside the flood hazard area due to elevation and topography, and do not require flood control infrastructure.

• Future state and federal efforts to evaluate levees and map flood hazard areas more comprehensively may identify additional flood control infrastructure needs.

• Design capacity of flood channels, such as the WPIC, that are part of the joint federal-state Sacramento River Flood Control Project (SRFCP), are known. The adequacy of those channels should be reviewed in the 2013 MSR cycle, and responsible state and local agencies should make reasonable efforts to develop information on flows in the interim.

• Marysville drainage needs include replacement of undersized storm drains and construction and repair of curbs and gutters.

• In Linda and Olivehurst, a master underground drainage system is needed to eliminate ponding. In Olivehurst, runoff collects in yards where home pads are too low; pad grading, street improvements and culvert upgrades are needed. Hallwood needs elevated roadways under which culverts are installed to provide adequate drainage due to impervious soils.

• Existing capacity in Wheatland’s culverts and portions of Grasshopper Slough would not contain 100-year flows for drainage. The City is implementing regional detention basins to provide capacity to convey peak drainage flows. New development must install drainage infrastructure to limit post-development flows to existing conditions.

• Beale AFB lacks a stormwater collection system, and many housing units have water infiltration problems. Beale AFB plans to replace or renovate most of its housing units and associated infrastructure by 2012.

Adequacy of Public Services

• Levee maintenance services are adequate in RD 2103, minimally adequate in RD 784 and Marysville Levee District (MLD), and unsatisfactory in RD 817 and 10, according to State inspection records.

• RD 10, 817 and 2103 operate in an extremely resource-constrained fashion with minimal management practices. RD 10 and 817 do not conduct capital planning. RD 817 financial information is not prepared in accordance with governmental accounting standards.

• Marysville Levee District provides adequate maintenance, although funding per levee mile is below the urban standard.

• The County and Marysville have not completed implementation of minimum required practices to limit negative water quality impacts of stormwater runoff.

• The County, Wheatland and RD 784 have not implemented multi-year drainage improvement planning.
• The County and the cities are encouraged to require new development to mitigate downstream drainage impacts, and to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of required mitigation measures.

GROWTH AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS

• The need for flood protection services is primarily affected by topography, precipitation, development in low-lying areas, and the integrity and capacity of levees and other flood control structures.

• Future flood control needs will increase as a result of recent legislation (SB 5) that requires 200-year flood protection in urban areas for new development after 2015 and for existing communities after 2025.

• Factors affecting drainage service needs include precipitation, pollution, urban development, and the regulatory environment. As areas urbanize, cities and counties must conduct more extensive stormwater planning and implementation of best management practices. Climate change will substantially affect flood control and hazard mitigation planning.

FINANCIAL ABILITY OF AGENCIES TO PROVIDE SERVICES

• Flood control and drainage operations are financially constrained by limited boundary areas, Proposition 218 voter approval requirements for assessments and, in RD 2103 and particularly RD 10 and 817, relatively low densities and limited property tax bases.

• RD 2103 provides acceptable service in spite of relatively low assessments due to effective community volunteerism. As urbanization proceeds, the District will require a funding source for paid staff to conduct maintenance.

• RD 817 has not imposed assessments to fund appropriate service levels. RD 10 imposed an assessment after voter approval in 2008 for the first time, which is expected to improve service levels.

• RD 784 does not maintain to an urban levee standard due to a lack of adequate funding. The District should annex its benefit area to ensure appropriate future funding. The District relies on a patchwork of funding sources, and should evaluate its funding approach comprehensively. The District appears to lack the financial ability to provide internal drainage facilities in low-lying portions of Olivehurst.

• Funding for drainage is inadequate. Funding mechanisms have been established for growth-related capital needs, but need to be developed for drainage improvements to existing development. New and evolving requirements have increased the scope of municipal responsibility for stormwater programming without additional funding.

STATUS OF, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR, SHARED FACILITIES

• All providers have collaborated on recent flood hazard and water management planning.
• Yuba County and RD 784 collaborate on planning and financing of levee capital improvements.

• Wheatland and RD 2103 collaborate on planning and financing of levee capital improvements.

• Yuba County and Marysville collaborate on stormwater management plans and implementation of required stormwater control measures.

• The reclamation districts could create a regional maintenance program to pool resources to maintain levees. This approach would offer professional staff with appropriate equipment that could be shared in levee maintenance and enhance service levels.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS

• Marysville, Wheatland, YCWA, and Yuba County demonstrated accountability based on the measures of contested elections, constituent outreach efforts and disclosure practices.

• Reclamation districts have little governing body and constituent interest as demonstrated by a lack of contested elections. RDs 10, 784 and 2103 conduct constituent outreach efforts, but RD 817 and MLD do not. Reclamation districts demonstrated accountability by disclosing information to LAFCO.

GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES

• The County and RD 784 have overlapping responsibilities for internal drainage in the RD 784 service area. Their respective roles need to be resolved to serve the public effectively.

• Annexation of the eastern portions of the Linda and Olivehurst communities to RD 784 is an option. These areas benefit from Yuba River south bank levees, but are located outside District bounds and do not presently contribute to maintenance costs.

• Detachment of territory east of the WPIC from RD 784 is an option. The protected area is agricultural and associated revenues do not presently cover the costs of maintaining levees in the area to state and federal standards. If detached, the State would bear responsibility for levee maintenance in this agricultural area. The State could then form a maintenance area whereby local landowners would bear the cost of levee maintenance or could reconsider the SRFCP (“project”) status of such levees.

• Reorganization of RD 817 through annexations and detachments could better align District boundaries with the benefit area.

• Reclamation district consolidation is a government structure option. Three districts maintain adjacent segments of levees along the Bear River and Dry Creek. Conflicting urban and rural preferences on assessments and service levels present an obstacle. Rural property owners prefer lower assessments and urban property owners need 200-year flood protection. RDs 817 and 2103 support investigating the feasibility of this option, as well as less formal
collaborations, to achieve efficiencies. A successful consolidation approach would likely need to develop assessment financing that would allow agricultural uses to pay based on need and benefit.

WASTEWATER

PRESENT AND PLANNED CAPACITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- LCWD, OPUD, Wheatland and Beale AFB wastewater flows are presently within the permitted capacity of their treatment systems. Marysville is operating near its permitted disposal capacity at its percolation ponds.

- LCWD, Marysville and Wheatland need to upgrade to tertiary treatment to comply with stricter regulatory requirements that discharge sites—presently percolation ponds—be outside 100-year flood plains. Planned levee improvements will not bring these providers into compliance. Upgrading to tertiary treatment will allow for disposal to surface water, enhance recycled water supplies and assure compliance with evolving regulatory standards.

- OPUD presently has adequate treatment capacity consistent with current regulatory standards due to recent upgrade of its plant to tertiary treatment levels. The collection system is aged and undersized in some areas in old Olivehurst and suffers from an infiltration and inflow problem that OPUD plans to evaluate.

- LCWD, OPUD and Wheatland need additional treatment capacity to serve proposed and planned developments within their spheres. Outside these providers’ spheres, there are as many as 18,151 units and 434 non-residential acres of development planned or proposed, in addition to targeted economic development areas.

- OPUD is permitted to expand its capacity; its wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) site can readily accommodate an 8 mgd WWTP plant expansion. At best, that would serve build-out of the Plumas Lake, North Arboga and Olivehurst areas within its service area and existing SOI. The site itself could be expanded with acquisition of vacant, adjacent lands to serve additional flow.

- The LCWD site is large enough to accommodate a 15 mgd tertiary WWTP. Such a plant could serve flows from the LCWD and Marysville service areas, in addition to potential development in the Marysville primary SOI area and gravity-flows from adjacent proposed development sites. Flows from future development south of Ostrom Road would not flow by gravity to the LCWD site, and would require more costly pumping and force mains.

- Wheatland’s existing plant capacity is 0.6 mgd, less than the flows generated by build-out of the existing city limits. The City plans to build a new WWTP to accommodate the existing city and anticipated growth and eliminate use of the percolation ponds. The City would require 8.2 mgd in capacity for flows generated by build-out of its existing sphere. A majority of the City’s collection system was renovated in 2007; remaining deficiencies include various needed improvements on the C Street lift station.
- The Beale AFB WWTP has excess capacity. RWQCB requires that the WWTP be upgraded to tertiary treatment levels in order to discharge to Hutchison Creek. Due to the high cost of upgrade and recent downsizing of its missions, the base expanded its land-based discharge application instead. The AFB wishes to lease the WWTP and adjacent sites to another agency or private party who will upgrade and maintain the facility.

- The Marysville percolation ponds have reached capacity and are located within a 100-year flood plain. The City’s options for addressing this issue are transferring wastewater to the LCWD WWTP, upgrading the City’s plant to directly discharge to the river, or sending effluent to OPUD’s WWTP. The City’s collection system is in good condition with the exception of several rear-lot line sewer mains and the sewer line along Twelfth and J streets that need replacement.

- The RHCSD WWTP failed in 2006, and a new facility needs to be constructed. The County was appointed as receiver, and plans to build a new plant by the end of 2008.

- If a new development proposal surfaces in the Yuba Highlands area, it would require an additional facility as RHCSD lacks capacity to serve and there are no other adjacent providers.

**Adequacy of Public Services**

- LCWD, Marysville and Wheatland must upgrade to tertiary treatment to comply with current or anticipated regulatory requirements. Marysville, RHCSD, and Beale are operating under cease and desist orders.

- RHCSD has severely limited financial and management resources, due to the small size of the service area, and has failed to meet regulatory requirements since 2002, when the 84 Gold Village homes were completed. RHCSD failed to submit required monitoring reports since 2002. A disinfection system failed in 2004, but was not replaced. When the plant failed in 2006, an RWQCB inspection found it to be poorly operated and maintained with various regulatory violations.

- Marysville, Wheatland and OPUD complied with effluent quality standards 100 percent in 2006. LCWD complied 95 percent of the time. RHCSD failed to report the number of days out of compliance with effluent quality requirements.

- Wastewater collection systems in Marysville, Wheatland and LCWD are generally in good condition. The OPUD and Beale collection systems suffer from significant infiltration and inflow problems; both agencies reported plans to rehabilitate these systems.

- LCWD had the highest rate of sewer overflows per 100 miles of collection system in 2006 compared to the other providers. The District needs to improve performance to meet new regulatory standards.
GROWTH AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS

- Demand for wastewater services is affected directly by population and economic growth, water conservation efforts, and groundwater infiltration and inflow.

- Proposed dwelling units in the planned and proposed developments outside of a designated wastewater provider’s existing SOI constitute a total projected wastewater flow of 15.4 mgd.

FINANCIAL ABILITY OF AGENCIES TO PROVIDE SERVICES

- LCWD, OPUD, Marysville and Wheatland have structured wastewater rates and connection fees to achieve adequate financing. Each has the financial ability to provide adequate wastewater services to customers.

- Wheatland, Marysville and LCWD need considerable funding to finance WWTP plants or major upgrades. Growth rates and timing will determine the availability of connection fee revenue to finance these capital needs without debt financing. The providers may access bond markets to borrow the needed capital on the security of future revenue.

- OPUD recently financed a significant treatment plant expansion. OPUD has the financial ability to provide adequate financial services presently and in the near future.

- RHCSD has drawn down its reserves as a result of the treatment plant failure in 2006. Since that time, the District has been paying high monthly payments to transport effluent to another provider or an interim facility. The District is struggling to get funding for a new facility, has significantly higher costs per account than the other providers and the highest rate among the other jurisdictions. RHCSD does not have the financial ability to provide adequate wastewater services.

STATUS OF, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR, SHARED FACILITIES

- None of the six wastewater providers in south Yuba County practice facility sharing.

- There is no opportunity at this time for all six to share wastewater facilities, due to RHCSD’s remote location. Should OPUD be able to acquire neighboring lands and expand its plant beyond the current site capacity, there is the potential for a regional plant. OPUD reported anticipating enough capacity to serve at least LCWD and Marysville projected flow. Capacity to serve Wheatland and Beale was not reported.

- There are opportunities for facility sharing among groups of the wastewater providers. Marysville and LCWD are actively exploring joint development of a new tertiary treatment plant at the LCWD site. OPUD has expressed interest in acting as a regional wastewater facility to treat flows from Marysville and LCWD.

- Wheatland is actively seeking partners in developing a new tertiary plant to accommodate growth in Wheatland’s planning area, reap economies of scale and expedite capital financing. Potential wastewater service consolidation with Wheatland could involve Beale AFB and the
proposed casino site. Challenges to consolidation among Wheatland, Beale and the casino include the complexity of negotiating among vastly different jurisdictions, the potential service area extends beyond Wheatland’s existing SOI, and the County and the City have not yet negotiated a mutually agreeable future SOI for the City.

- A potential equipment and personnel sharing opportunity may be the sharing of CCTV and trained personnel between the various providers. CCTV equipment is a significant investment. By sharing the equipment, agencies could reduce costs.

**Accountability for Community Service Needs**

- Marysville, Wheatland, LCWD and OPUD demonstrated accountability based on the measures of contested elections, constituent outreach efforts and disclosure practices.

- RHCSO has had little governing body and constituent interest as demonstrated by a lack of contested elections since the formation of the District. In regards to disclosure practices, RHCSO did not respond to LAFCO requests for information regarding wastewater flows, inspection practices, sewer overflows, and service complaints.

**Governmental Structure and Operational Efficiencies**

In addition to the previously discussed governance and facility-sharing options, the following governmental structure options were identified for wastewater services.

- Annexation of unserved planned and proposed developments in the Brophy area north of Ostrom Road to LCWD or OPUD.

- Formation of a public utilities district in the Smartville area to provide water and wastewater services to urbanized and urbanizing areas, with consolidation of RHCSO and Smartville Fire Protection District (SFPD) into such a district.

- Reorganization such that the Terra Linda development site would be entirely within either LCWD or OPUD. The site presently straddles the providers’ boundaries.

- Annexation or out-of-area service agreements for Wheatland to serve planned and proposed developments south of Ostrom Road.

**Fire & EMS Service**

**Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Infrastructure Needs**

- Marysville offers a relatively high fire service level, but its fire station needs to be rehabilitated and aged apparatus needs replacement.
• Wheatland staffs its stations during daytime hours and relies on call firefighters in the evenings and on weekends. To increase the service level, it needs a new station with dormitory facilities, which is planned. To serve anticipated growth in the City’s existing SOI, the City will need two additional stations and a training facility, for which financing will come from development impact fees. The City needs additional fire flow capacity and apparatus.

• CALFIRE staffs its stations with professional full-time staff year round, and augments with additional paid staff during the fire season. The CALFIRE stations have minimal needs; driveways need replacement at two stations and the apparatus bay and office are planned to be replaced at another station.

• Camptonville Community Services District (CCSD) relies entirely on call firefighters and stations are unstaffed. District facilities require significant electrical, dry wall and plumbing improvements. In addition, the District needs another engine to begin operation of a second station.

• While the station within District 10-Hallwood Community Services District (D10-HCSD) boundaries is not staffed, the District is able to provide professionally staffed fire service in a rural setting through a contract with Marysville. The District needs an additional fire station to improve the District’s ISO rating and would benefit from new vehicles.

• Dobbins-Oregon House Fire Protection District (DOHFPD) provides rural fire service levels with call firefighters. The District is constructing a new station to replace the current headquarters due to space constraints. Additional district needs include plumbing improvements at a station and a new rescue engine.

• Foothill Fire Protection District (FFPD) provides rural fire service levels with volunteer firefighters. Current district facilities are in need of expansion for storage purposes. The District is in the process of completing this expansion. Other station needs include a phone line and heater.

• Linda Fire Protection District (LFPD) provides continual paid-staffing of two of its three stations augmented by call firefighters. The District’s facilities currently have sufficient capacity to provide service to current residents. To accommodate new development, LFPD plans to replace one of its stations and construct an additional station in East Linda.

• Loma Rica-Browns Valley Community Services District (LRBVCSD) provides professional fire service through CALFIRE. To serve existing demand and projected growth, LRBVCSD is planning a new station to serve the northeast portion of the District. Needs at existing stations include septic and well improvements and two new vehicles.

• OPUD provides continual paid-staffing of its station and additional station staffing by call firefighters. While the station is in fair to good condition, the District plans to replace the headquarters to improve efficiency and build an additional station to reduce response times.

• Plumas Brophy Fire Protection District (PBFDPD) staffs its stations part-time during daytime hours and relies on call firefighters in the evenings and on weekends. One of the District’s
stations lacks storage capacity for modern apparatus, and is in need of replacement. In addition, 75 percent of the District’s vehicles and equipment need to be replaced due to old age.

- SFPD staffs its stations with paid staff during daytime hours and relies on call firefighters in the evenings and on weekends. SFPD reported that it needs an additional station in the western portion of the District to provide acceptable response times, and dormitory and related facilities at its existing station in order to provide 24-hour service.

- Regional infrastructure needs include an equipment upgrade for Yuba County Sheriff Dispatch and CALFIRE to identify a caller’s location when phoning from a cell phone. Such an upgrade would enhance speed and efficiency of dispatch and response.

**Adequacy of Public Services**

- In a mature urban area, the staffing configuration is typically four paid firefighters per station at all times. None of the jurisdictions has yet achieved this standard. Marysville is the only provider in Yuba County that is close to achieving this staffing level.

- OPUD, LFPD and LRBVCSD are in the process of transitioning to an urban service level with stations staffed full-time by paid staff and augmented service by call firefighters.

- Rural providers serve expansive territory with limited resources. Consequently, these providers tend to have lower firefighter staffing levels by area in comparison with urban providers.

- The professionally staffed fire providers, including LFPD, LRBVCSD, Marysville, OPUD, and Wheatland, generally demonstrate best management practices in regards to financial management, employee management, capital planning, and planning for future growth.

- Due to the expansive size of the districts, rough terrain in some areas, and reliance on call firefighters, the foothill fire departments all greatly exceeded NFPA and CPSE fire response guidelines. In fact, the only two jurisdictions that responded within the NFPA guideline 90 percent of the time were the cities of Wheatland and Marysville, due to their compact size.

- All of the fire providers (Marysville, Wheatland, D10-HCSD, FFPD, LFPD, OPUD, PBFPD, SFPD), that provided response times, reported 90th percentile response times within California EMS BLS guidelines.

- Bi-County Ambulance exceeded response time standards for portions of Beale AFB.

**Growth and Population Projections**

- Service calls for fire and emergency medical providers have been increasing and are expected to continue growing as a result of population growth.
• Growth in demand will be affected by the availability of alternative services like primary care and telephone based service, and demand management practices, such as better fire prevention training, fire code improvements, and building rehabilitation.

• The wildland interface areas—where structures and development meet or intermingle with undeveloped wildland or vegetative fuel—are expanding as more people are building homes in such areas, which will increase demand for effective fire service.

**Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Services**

• Marysville is presently financing service levels at nearly the urban standard, but needs to establish financing mechanisms to fund existing fire-related capital needs and to accommodate the growth it intends to attract to its primary SOI area.

• LFPD, OPUD and LRBVCSD have managed to finance fire stations that are manned on a 24-hour basis. Although service levels are higher than in other parts of the County, financing is not adequate to fund the urban service levels that may be expected by planned development.

• In Wheatland, PBFPD and SFPD, fire service levels have been constrained by financing. Fire stations are not staffed in the evenings, and have been staffed by only one person in the daytime. A newly imposed assessment allowed the City and PBFPD to double its paid staffing level in FY 07-08.

• In rural districts, relatively low densities do not yield adequate revenues to transition from unstaffed to staffed stations. CCSD, DOHFPD and FFDP lack resources for paid staffing of their fire stations. Service levels are minimal.

**Status of, and Opportunities For, Shared Facilities**

• Fire and EMS providers in Yuba County rely on each other for mutual and automatic aid assistance to optimize response times.

• Jurisdictions throughout the County achieve communication efficiencies by relying on the Sheriff or CALFIRE for dispatching, with the exception of Marysville Fire Department (MFD) which uses Marysville Police Department (MPD) for dispatch.

• The fire and EMS providers in Yuba County practice extensive facility sharing, including jointly operated stations, law enforcement substations in the fire stations, sharing of training facilities and specialized equipment, and sharing of space with other organizations for meetings. Wheatland and PBFPD jointly finance the Wheatland Fire Authority, a JPA that provides fire service to both agencies’ service areas.

• Future opportunities for facility sharing proposed by the providers include the transfer of MFD dispatching to the Yuba County Sheriff’s Office to enhance communication between valley fire departments, the sharing of Cordua Irrigation District facilities to house an
additional D10-HCSD station, and a joint-use facility between PBFPD and LFPD in the Woodbury development.

- CCSD, DOHFPD, LFPD, and OPUD hope to provide space to the Yuba County Sheriff’s Office for additional substations in their facilities.

- Few of the fire providers in Yuba maintain training staff and training facilities. A regionalized approach to training would reduce costs for training staff and training facilities. LFPD is interested in the development of a shared Fire and Police Academy training facility at Yuba College.

**Accountability For Community Service Needs**

- Wheatland, Marysville, LFPD, LRBVCS, OPUD and SFPD demonstrated accountability based on the measures of contested elections, constituent outreach efforts and disclosure practices.

- Each of the providers fully cooperated with the MSR process and responded to all requests for information. Notably, LRBVCS and DOHFPD were unable to provide the requested response times due to data tracking practices.

- CCSD, D10-HCSD, DOHFPD, and PBFPD have not had sufficient governing body and constituent interest to hold a contested election at least since 1995.

- All of the providers, with the exception of D10-HCSD, attempt to inform constituents through outreach activities.

**Governmental Structure and Operational Efficiencies**

In addition to the previously discussed governance options, the following governmental structure options were identified for fire and EMS services:

- Annexation of areas lacking a designated fire provider to a fire jurisdiction’s bounds to increase response efficiency and allocate revenues to the appropriate service provider.

- Annexation of the community of Clippermills in Butte County to Foothill FPD.

- Detachment of PBFPD territory outside the anticipated long-term City of Wheatland SOI is an option. The PBFPD boundary area extends into the southwest portion of the County, bisecting potential development projects that would need urban service levels. Neighboring LFPD and OPUD offer higher service levels than PBFPD, as measured by response times, proximity of existing stations and staffing levels.

- Detachment of PBFPD territory already annexed to the City of Wheatland is an option. A perceived obstacle to detachment—that property tax and Proposition 172 funding for fire services would be reduced—could potentially be surmounted through a tax sharing agreement.
• Consolidated service is an option for urbanized and urbanizing territory in the Brophy, Linda, Olivehurst and Plumas Lake areas. Consolidation of LFPD, OPUD and a portion of PBFPD’s service area would address LFPD’s inefficient fire service area and improve service levels in the urbanizing areas along SRs 70 and 65.

• Fine-tuning boundaries along SRs 70 and 65 is an option. OPUD and LFPD provide automatic aid on a regular basis to areas along these highways and have indicated interest in annexing the territories to their boundaries due to the proximity of their stations and ease of access.

• Consolidation of SFPD is an option. The District is open to considering consolidation with RHCSD after the wastewater plant failure and related problems are resolved. Due to RHCSD operational and accountability deficiencies and incompatibilities between the RHCSD and SFPD service areas, another government structure option is to create a new special district in the area to be responsible for a variety of services.

**Law Enforcement**

**Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Infrastructure Needs**

• Due to deficiencies in current facilities, both Wheatland Police Department (WPD) and Yuba County Sheriff’s Department (YCSD) report needing new station headquarters. There were no vehicle or equipment needs identified by the agencies.

• The MPD station requires renovation, and 12 patrol cars need replacement.

**Adequacy of Public Services**

• Each of the three service providers offers adequate service levels based on response times to high-priority incidents and staffing levels.

• Violent crime clearance rates could be improved in the unincorporated areas; the Sheriff reported that future clearance rates are expected to be much improved as a result of recent expansion of its detective department. Property crime clearance rates could be improved in the City of Wheatland.

**Growth and Population Projections**

• As population grows, service providers will need to hire additional officers to maintain or enhance existing service levels.

• In addition to population growth, other factors are expected to affect the need for officers, such as changes in crime rates, traffic congestion and advances in policing strategies and police management among others.
FINANCIAL ABILITY OF AGENCIES TO PROVIDE SERVICES

- The providers have managed to deliver adequate services to date in spite of unfunded infrastructure needs.

- Yuba County and Wheatland spend less than average on law enforcement operating costs per capita, compared with the state as a whole and with neighboring cities. Marysville marshals more resources than the state and regional averages, but also has a higher crime rate and higher arrest rates than in the unincorporated areas and Wheatland.

- In Wheatland, law enforcement service levels have been constrained by financing. The City had previously eliminated two police officer positions due to funding shortfalls; however, those positions were reinstated during FY 07-08.

STATUS OF, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR, SHARED FACILITIES

- The law enforcement agencies in the County are collaborating in a number of areas through contract service arrangements, mutual aid, JPAs, and regional task forces. The departments cited these regional collaboration efforts as offering services that they could not otherwise afford.

- Facility sharing practices among the three agencies include joint use of the MPD station by other city departments, community organizations, and regional task forces, the use of the YCSD headquarters by County Superior Court, the District Attorney’s Office and the Probation Department, use of the jail and other YCSD facilities by the two cities, and joint-ownership of the Mobile Incident Command Vehicle.

- WPD relies heavily on YCSD for temporary and long-term holding facilities, dispatch facilities, animal shelter facilities, and firing range facilities. MPD relies on YCSD for jail and animal shelter services. These arrangements should be encouraged and augmented where feasible.

- The police departments identified further opportunities for facility sharing. YCSD is considering additional substations in a community center in Dobbins-Oregon House, and WPD hopes to provide office space in the proposed headquarters for county, state and federal agencies that serve the area, such as YCSD and the Probation Department.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS

- All three of the providers demonstrated accountability by holding contested elections, making efforts to inform constituents and, with few exceptions, fully disclosing all requested information during the MSR process.

- MPD was not able to provide a breakdown of the response times by priority type or service calls in the unincorporated areas. WPD did not provide a breakdown of the type of service calls received.
GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES

- No government structure options were identified for law enforcement services.

STREETS

PRESENT AND PLANNED CAPACITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Caltrans maintains SR 20 and 70 through Marysville and SR 65 through Wheatland. SR 70 operates at LOS “F” from 1st Street to 10th Street and SR 20 operates at LOS “E” on the Feather River Bridge (from Sutter Street to I Street), during peak conditions. SR 65 operates between LOS “D” and LOS “F” on all roadway segments through the City of Wheatland during peak conditions.

- Additional highway capacity, particularly on SRs 65 and 70, is needed to accommodate planned development in south Yuba County. Caltrans has plans for various projects aimed to increase capacity, including widening segments of SR 20 by 2017 ($20 million) and widening and adding passing lanes to segments of SR 70 by 2013 ($200 million).

- The City of Marysville identified roadway capacity across the Feather River as being a major infrastructure need. The City of Marysville plans to widen the 5th Street bridge to six lanes by 2018 ($71 million) or add a third bridge across the Feather River to add capacity and relieve congestion. The City reports that 45 percent of traffic entering or leaving Marysville crosses the 5th or 10th Street bridges, and an additional 35 percent does so using the southern portion of SR 70.

- A long-range infrastructure need for Wheatland is the SR 65 bypass, although the project is not expected to be completed until at least 2025. An SR 65 bypass study is currently being prepared to analyze the feasibility of various highway realignments in conjunction with development in and around the City. The total cost of the bypass is estimated at $264 million, with the majority of funding coming from development impact fees collected by the City and County. The first phase of the bypass will include an interim arterial road in the location of the final bypass and improvements to the existing SR 65, estimated to cost $40 million. A time frame for the first phase of the bypass has not yet been set.

- A major infrastructure project undertaken by the County is the Yuba River Parkway, to serve as a Marysville bypass. Caltrans had originally planned to construct a Marysville bypass, but plans were discontinued due to a lack of funding. Construction of the Yuba River Parkway will be phased in over a period of at least 10 years, with the cost of construction estimated to range from $80 to $95 million. An initial phase of the Yuba River Parkway is scheduled to begin construction in 2008 to add two lanes of roadway from The Orchard development to North Beale Road, and in 2009 to extend the two lanes from North Beale Road to Hammonton Smartville Road (totaling $4 million for both segments).

- No County-maintained roads operate at less than LOS “D,” with most operating at LOS “C” or better. Nearly fifty percent of County-maintained roads need some level of
rehabilitation. Between 2007 and 2011 the County plans to conduct street capital improvement projects spanning 85 miles of roadway, at an estimated cost of nearly $86 million.

- Beale AFB reported that roads outside the base lack needed capacity and need improvements.

- There are 92 bridges maintained by Yuba County, eight of which have been identified for rehabilitation or replacement from 2007-11, at a total cost of $9 million. The Deep Ravine Bridge at Timbuctoo Road is currently scheduled for replacement by 2009, as it has been deemed structurally deficient by Caltrans.

- The City of Marysville does not have an adopted LOS policy, but reports that no City-maintained streets operate at less than LOS “D.” Over seven miles of roadway are in need of rehabilitation in the City of Marysville, representing 13 percent of all roadway maintained by the City.

- All road segments maintained by the City of Wheatland operate at LOS “A” or “B.” Three-quarters of the streets maintained by the City of Wheatland need some level of rehabilitation or major maintenance activities. As the majority of the City’s road system has not been overlaid or reconstructed since 1960, there is a significant backlog of deferred maintenance. The City has established a priority list of streets for rehabilitation or major maintenance activities, and the plan will be implemented as funding becomes available.

- Infrastructure needs identified for CSAs include maintenance of chipseal on Hokan Lane, Walsh Lane and Creek Way and maintenance of gravel on Kapaka Lane and Clyde Way in CSA 14, and the paving of roads in CSA 2 and CSA 4.

Adequacy of Public Services

- The City of Marysville reported a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score of 80 and Yuba County reported a PCI of 45. A PCI of 75 or more is considered to be very good condition, PCI of 60-74 is good condition, PCI of 45-59 is fair condition, and PCI below 45 is poor condition.

- The City of Wheatland reported that it does not have a Pavement Management System to generate a PCI score, but anticipates having one in place by the end of 2008.

- Wheatland had on average the shortest response times for street damage repair. The City of Marysville and Yuba County both report that street damage repair time is not tracked and there is no response time policy for street damage.

Growth and Population Projections

- Regional transportation planners at Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) are anticipating that only one-third of planned development in Yuba County will occur by 2035. The County and cities should coordinate with SACOG to ensure that growth projections are consistent.
• To accommodate sizable development projects in Yuba County and Yuba City, land use authorities need to ensure that appropriate highway capacity is being developed.

• Demand growth will be determined by a number of factors, including residential, commercial and industrial growth as well as vehicle ownership, labor force participation rates, growth in suburb-to-suburb commutes, parking availability, gas prices, and the efficiency and desirability of mass transit.

• The most intensive demand—based on daily vehicle miles of travel (DVMT) per street mile—is placed on state highways. Comparatively, Marysville, Wheatland and the County face relatively low traffic volumes.

• SACOG projects that total DVMT for Yuba County will continue to increase at an average annual rate of 1.9 percent until 2035. SACOG growth projections are substantially lower than planned and proposed development projects would indicate.

• Demand management strategies include carpool lanes and incentives, promotion of mass transit through increased efficiency, access and convenience of mass transit options, promotion of alternative means of travel through pedestrian and bicycle improvements, transit-oriented development, and smart growth, as well as whether land use development patterns in the County are designed to allow transportation by transit or other modes.

Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Services

• To develop freeway capacity to accommodate planned growth in Yuba County and areas accessible through Yuba County will require substantial investments. Local agencies should aggressively pursue regional traffic impact fees.

• All providers’ financial ability to provide services is constrained by available revenues and legal limitations on revenue increases. The City of Wheatland and Yuba County both have a significant backlog of deferred maintenance due to funding shortages. Both Wheatland and Yuba County reported that the most significant service challenge to the provision of street maintenance is providing adequate funding for necessary maintenance and improvements.

• Deferred maintenance may reduce costs in the short-term, but costs increase in the long-term. Local agencies can reduce street repair costs through preventative maintenance. However, local agencies’ ability to conduct preventative maintenance may be limited by financing constraints. Yuba County reports that it would take a one-time expenditure of $25 million to bring one-fifth of its roadway network up to a PCI of 70 from the current PCI of 45.

• Street maintenance expenditures per mile, including both maintenance and reconstruction, were approximately $5,600 for Yuba County, $12,000 for the City of Wheatland and approximately $29,000 for the City of Marysville in FY 05-06.
STATUS OF, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR, SHARED FACILITIES

- The City of Marysville engages in facility sharing with Yuba-Sutter Transit, as it helps the City to maintain street areas adjacent to heavily used bus stops. The City of Wheatland and Yuba County did not identify any facility sharing related to street services.

- Road maintenance CSAs share facilities by being staffed and managed by the Yuba County Public Works Department. There is one CSA coordinator and three administrative staff that handle road-related CSAs.

- Yuba County identified a potential opportunity for facility sharing with Butte County by sharing road striping equipment. In the past the County has shared chip coating equipment with Nevada County.

ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS

- All public road maintenance service providers demonstrated accountability in that voters regularly have choices among candidates for their governing body members, providers conduct constituent outreach, and providers disclose information to the public.

- The Yuba County Public Works Department did not respond fully to all of LAFCO’s questions regarding assessments and services provided by the 44 CSAs.

GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES

- Six CSAs do not provide service and should be dissolved.

- CSA 47 is a 66-acre tract of land located in the community of Oregon House that was formed in 1991 to provide maintenance for road and drainage facilities.

- CSA 49 is a 109-acre tract of land located in the community of Browns Valley that was formed in 1992 to provide maintenance for road and drainage facilities to a proposed development.

- CSA 51 is a 525-acre tract of land located approximately three miles south of the community of Smartville, along the Yuba-Nevada County line, that was formed in 1992 to provide funding for road maintenance and drainage for a proposed 13-lot subdivision.

- CSA 56 is a seven-acre tract of land located in west Linda that was formed in 1994 to provide street and drainage maintenance, and landscaping and lighting services.

- CSA 57 is a 124-acre tract of land located in the community of Challenge that was formed in 1994 to provide maintenance of road and drainage facilities, and of a water delivery system for fire suppression purposes.
CSA 58 is a 338-acre tract of land located approximately three miles east of the community of Browns Valley that was formed in 1994 to provide maintenance of road and drainage facilities and a fire suppression water distribution system.

### Parks and Recreation

#### Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Infrastructure Needs

- Existing park service levels are 3 acres per 1,000 residents in unincorporated areas, the OPUD service area and the City of Wheatland, and 21 acres per 1,000 residents in the City of Marysville.

- For the most part, existing parks are in good to excellent condition. There are unmet infrastructure needs and deferred maintenance at existing parks in the Linda and Olivehurst communities.

- Existing unincorporated communities lacking in developed parkland include Dobbins, Oregon House, Camptonville, Smartville, Gold Village, and Loma Rica.

- Future growth and development is required to finance additional park facilities at service levels of 5-10 acres per 1,000 new residents. The County reports that an additional 155 acres need to be acquired. OPUD needs an additional 133 acres. The City of Wheatland has planned 62 acres of community parks for planned growth, and will require an additional 90 acres of parkland to accommodate anticipated growth of its existing SOI through build-out.

- Regional parks and trail networks are growth-related infrastructure needs for which financing mechanisms and service providers have not yet been developed.

#### Adequacy of Public Services

- Existing park service levels are adequate on the whole. Park acreage meets standards in Marysville and OPUD, and would need to be enhanced to meet adopted standards of five acres per 1,000 residents in the growing unincorporated areas and Wheatland. There are unserved communities in the unincorporated areas, and unmet maintenance needs in Linda and Olivehurst.

- The County needs to ensure that ongoing park maintenance is funded.

- Existing recreation programming is inadequate. Recreation opportunities are important crime-reduction strategies, particularly in communities where many adults commute significant distances.

- River Highlands CSD park is undeveloped, and needs an irrigation system, lawn, trees, and recreational equipment.
GROWTH AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS

- Demand for municipal park and recreation services is affected primarily by population growth. Demand is also affected by growth among population segments with higher park visitation rates such as younger and higher-income people.

FINANCIAL ABILITY OF AGENCIES TO PROVIDE SERVICES

- General fund revenues are the primary funding stream for park and recreation services for the County, Wheatland and Marysville. Assessments imposed in new growth areas are an important revenue source for OPUD. The County and Wheatland impose assessments on new growth in their service areas, although the affected areas are relatively small.

- Financing for maintenance of existing parks, particularly in the unincorporated areas, needs to be enhanced.

- RHCSD lacks the financial ability to provide park services, as demonstrated by the agency’s decision to decline grant funds it was awarded to develop its park.

- Financing opportunities that do not require voter approval include grants, establishing service charges and user fees, increasing non-resident fees for facility rentals, development impact fees, and park in-lieu fees.

- User fees could be used to help finance recreation programming.

- Park development impact fees, in-lieu fees, mitigation fees and grants fund development of new parks and capital needs.

- There is no financing mechanism in place to develop and maintain regional parks. The County is considering a landscape and lighting district benefit assessment to do so. Such an assessment would require voter approval.

STATUS OF, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR, SHARED FACILITIES

- OPUD shares park facilities with a school, and plans to do so with three additional parks. Wheatland is developing shared facility plans with local school districts. Marysville recognizes the opportunity.

- The County identified the opportunity to form a regional park jurisdiction to develop and maintain regional parks and trails, and potentially to help enhance financing for maintenance of local parks. Possible member agencies would be OPUD, the City of Marysville and the City of Wheatland. Planning and discussion for the regional jurisdiction are in the preliminary stage.
ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS

• The County, the cities and OPUD demonstrated accountability by holding contested elections, conducting constituent outreach and disclosing information to the public.

• RHCSRD did not demonstrate accountability for community service needs, primarily due to lack of interest in governing body service and lack of financing for park services.

GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES

• Formation of a countywide regional park district is an option. Such a district could potentially finance and maintain regional parks, although related financing would require voter approval. Existing regional parks in Marysville and the unincorporated area could potentially be transferred to such a district for maintenance. Given that existing recreation service levels are minimal, such a district may offer economies of scale in developing recreation services in Yuba County. An alternative to special district formation is a joint powers authority dedicated to the regional park mission.

Cemeteries

PRESENT AND PLANNED CAPACITY OF PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

• No capacity issues were identified for any of the public cemetery providers in Yuba County. All cemetery providers have sufficient capacity at present and sufficient room for expansion as future demands necessitate.

• All cemetery providers have infrastructure needs. Browns Valley Cemetery District (BVCD) needs a storage shed, Brownsville Cemetery District (BCD) needs a new sprinkler system, Camptonville Community Services District (CCSD) needs new maintenance equipment, Keystone Cemetery District (KCD) needs a new shop building, Peoria Cemetery District (PCD) needs a road paved, Smartville Cemetery District (SCD) needs replacement of broken headstones and damaged burial sites, Strawberry Valley Cemetery District (SVCD) needs a covered pavilion area, Upham Cemetery District (UCD) needs a covered pavilion area, a drip irrigation system and a paved road, and Wheatland Cemetery District (WCD) needs a new roof for a shed. Marysville Cemetery District (MCD) has suffered from high water and vandalism and is in need of maintenance.

Adequacy of Public Services

• Of the 10 public cemetery service providers in Yuba County, BVCD, BCD, KCD, PCD, WCD and Marysville provide cemetery maintenance services on a year-round basis. Of these six, only KCD and WCD perform routine maintenance on a daily basis. CCSD, SCD, SVCD and UCD provide maintenance services only one to three times per year. Districts that provide services on a year-round basis tend to be those with larger populations and
property tax bases, whereas those that provide minimal maintenance tend to be those with smaller populations and less property tax revenue.

- CCSD has not been authorized by LAFCO to provide cemetery services pursuant to Government Code §61106, and cemetery service is not a grandfathered power of the CSD.

- CCSD does not have an endowment fee, which is required by Health and Safety Code §9065.

- CCSD and PCD do not have a non-resident fee, which is required by Health and Safety Code §9068. PCD reported that it was in the process of establishing a non-resident fee as of the drafting of this report.

- SVCD’s endowment fee of $50 is not sufficient per Health and Safety Code §9065, which requires an endowment care fee of $2.25 per plot square foot.

- SVCD and UCD may be non-compliant with legal constraints on the burial of non-residents from Clippermills (SVCD) and Rackerby (UCD). Both districts can legally provide service to these areas if the deceased satisfies the eligibility requirements of a non-district resident per Health and Safety Code §9061, and the non-resident fee is paid.

**GROWTH AND POPULATION PROJECTIONS**

- Demand for burial services is dependent upon size of population served, the death rate in the community and the availability of alternatives to publicly operated cemeteries.

- A lack of alternatives to public cemetery districts results in broad demand for public cemetery services. Alternatives are Sierra View Memorial Park, cemeteries with religious affiliation or private cemeteries in the surrounding counties.

**FINANCIAL ABILITY OF AGENCIES TO PROVIDE SERVICES**

- All cemetery service providers face significant financing constraints, and report having infrastructure needs that have not been addressed due to a lack of available financing.

- CCSD, SCD and SVCD have severely limited financial resources to improve existing infrastructure, as a result of a small service area. Insufficient financing has lead to deficient reserves for significant repairs, as well as inadequate equipment and staff to ensure ongoing maintenance. All three districts rely primarily on community volunteers to provide services.

- For the City of Marysville, the only available financing source to address cemetery needs is the general fund, and additional financing is needed. The City’s public works staff mows and weeds the cemetery and provides irrigation and lighting maintenance as needed; however, the cemetery has suffered from high water and vandalism and is in need of significant maintenance.

- As a financing source, districts may choose to update their fees for plots. Plot fees for district residents are offered at no charge by SVCD and for $10 by PCD. The highest fee
charged for a burial plot for a district resident is $800 by SCD, with an average fee of $218 across all providers. Plot fees for non-residents range from $175 at UCD to $1,200 at SCD, with an average fee of $489.

- Securing an affordable accountant for the auditing of financial statements is a major difficulty, and many agencies have not had their financial statements audited in a number of years as a result.

**STATUS OF, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR, SHARED FACILITIES**

- No cemetery districts reported engaging in facility sharing, and no facility sharing opportunities were identified.

**ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS**

- Cemetery service providers lack accountability in that governing bodies are appointed, voters do not have opportunities to choose among candidates for their governing body members, and most providers do not conduct constituent outreach. However, most of the providers disclose information to the public.

- The only cemetery provider that conducts constituent outreach activities is CCSD by posting articles in *The Camptonville Community Courier* two to three times per year.

- Most cemetery service providers cooperated with LAFCO during the MSR process. BVCD and BCD were the only agencies not to respond to follow-up questions sent by LAFCO.

**GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCIES**

The following government structure options were identified during the MSR process:

- There are two possible government structure options for the Smartville area, becoming a community services district (CSD) or becoming a public utilities district (PUD). If a CSD were formed in the Smartville area, the Smartville Cemetery District could be consolidated into it. In the case of forming a PUD, cemetery services could not be consolidated as it is not an authorized service for a PUD.

- In order to legally provide cemetery service, Camptonville CSD must first obtain LAFCO approval. CCSD has not been authorized by LAFCO to provide cemetery services pursuant to Government Code §61106, and cemetery service is not a grandfathered power of the CSD.

- SVCD may wish to consider annexation of the Clippermills area in Butte County in order to more fully serve residents of that community. As it is now, SVCD can provide burial services to a resident of Clippermills provided that the non-district resident eligibility requirements of Health and Safety Code §9061 are satisfied and a non-resident fee is paid. With annexation of the Clippermills area into SVCD, Clippermills residents would no longer be subject to non-resident restrictions and fees for burial at SVCD.
• UCD and BCD have an overlapping SOI in the vicinity of the community of Rackerby. UCD reports that the community of Rackerby has historically been served by the Upham Cemetery, and many Rackerby residents have family buried there, although the area is within BCD bounds. The community of Rackerby should be consulted as to which district it would like to belong to, and district boundaries and SOIs should be adjusted accordingly.

• BCD identified that many residents of Forbestown in Butte County inquire about services at Brownville Cemetery because they are not located within a public cemetery district in Butte County. BCD identified annexation of the Forbestown area as a possibility.

**Miscellaneous**

**Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities and Infrastructure Needs**

• For library service, Yuba County maintains and operates one library and one bookmobile. The County reported the condition of the library building as fair, and the condition of the vehicle as good. The main library is in need of new carpet, paint, more landscaping, and irrigation repair or replacement to accommodate ground care.

• The County identified a need for a library facility in the City of Wheatland and a greater level of service through an additional facility or bookmobile hours. The County has received a grant to install a book dispenser in the Wheatland Community Center to provide extended access to area residents with limited overhead costs as part of federally funded trial program.

• Sutter-Yuba Mosquito and Vector Control District (SYMVCD) facilities are orderly, clean and well-maintained. No infrastructure needs or deficiencies were identified.

• Yuba County Resource Conservation District (YCRCD) does not own or maintain any infrastructure. The District expressed a desire to move into an office in Yuba County.

• The Norcal Waste Systems Ostrom Road Landfill was opened in 1995 and is the only active solid waste landfill in Yuba County. The landfill has ample capacity; its estimated closure date is December 31, 2066.

**Adequacy of Public Services**

• The Yuba County library’s hours of operation are the longest on average compared to surrounding county library systems.

• Yuba County had the most book volumes per capita in comparison to surrounding counties.

• Twenty percent of Yuba County residents over age five reported speaking English “not very well;” however, only one percent of the library materials are in languages other than English. Given the high demand for non-English material, there is a lack of material in other languages.
There have been several documented areas of concern and violations at active solid waste facilities in Yuba County from 2006-8, but no enforcement actions have been taken against any of the facilities.

Regional Waste Management Authority member agencies are in compliance with landfill diversion requirements for recycling.

Growth and Population Projections

Demand for library services is affected primarily by population, English literacy, level of education, and the quality and breadth of library materials.

Growth in demand is expected to be greatest in areas with rapid population growth.

Approximately 28 percent of Yuba County residents and 20 percent of Wheatland residents over age 25 did not complete high school.

A major factor influencing the demand for mosquito and vector control services is the rapid population growth within the County. The use of irrigation in agriculture and the preservation of wetlands provide the main breeding ground for mosquitoes—stagnant water. As household populations move closer to natural mosquito habitats, the demand for mosquito control increases.

As development continues in the rural areas of the County the amount of farm land declines, resulting in reduced service demand from agricultural service recipients for resource conservation services.

Given the urban benefits of water quality education, erosion prevention, proper disposal of manure, and watershed restoration services, urban demand for resource conservation services may expand as a result of countywide growth.

Population and business growth, the success of recycling programs, and progress in diverting trash from landfills are expected to affect the need for disposal space and facilities as well as other service demands.

Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Services

The County has generally managed to provide adequate library service levels within its resource constraints. The County’s financial ability to provide library services is constrained by limited operational and capital financing resources. There are particular challenges to providing adequate service levels in outlying areas.

Areas of the County that lack library facilities may be efficiently served in the future by unstaffed e-branches such as the machine currently in beta testing at the Wheatland Community Center.
• SYMVCID provides adequate service funded primarily through property taxes. Additional
district revenue comes from special assessments, charges for service, rental income, state in-
lieu funds, and interest.

• The most significant funding constraint for YCRCD is the availability of grant funding for
resource conservation services. YCRCD’s primary revenue source is a grant from the
CALFED watershed program.

• The Regional Waste Management Authority (RWMA) member jurisdictions are financed
through franchise fees from Yuba-Sutter Disposals, Inc. (YSDI). The franchise fee is
constrained by garbage collection charges collected by YSDI. The RWMA is financed
through an AB 939 fee and a hazardous waste surcharge.

**STATUS OF, AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR, SHARED FACILITIES**

• The Yuba County Library uses a database application in conjunction with Yuba College to
track and maintain library resource inventory. The County library is a member of the
Mountain-Valley Library System that provides inter-library sharing.

• There are facility sharing opportunities for library services related to development of new
facilities jointly with school districts. There are also possibilities of using space for library
services in local community centers.

• YCRCD shares facilities by renting office space through the Natural Resources Conservation
Service (NRCS).

• SYMVCID has few opportunities to share facilities with other agencies due to the specialized
nature of the District, and the unique health and safety concerns that exist. The District
does regionally collaborate in that it serves both Sutter and Yuba Counties.

• For solid waste, shared facilities and regional collaboration occur through the RWMA joint
powers agreement, formed in 1990. The Authority is an agreement between Yuba City, Live
Oak, Marysville, and Wheatland along with Yuba and Sutter Counties to jointly address the
provision of waste management services in the area.

**ACCOUNTABILITY FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS**

• Miscellaneous service providers demonstrate accountability by conducting constituent
outreach activities, and disclosing information to the public. A notable exception is that
YCRCD did not provide recent financial documents to LAFCO.

• Miscellaneous service providers’ accountability is constrained by limited interest among
citizens in serving on the governing bodies. Service providers lack accountability in that
governing bodies are appointed; voters do not have opportunities to choose among
candidates for their governing body members.
**Governmental Structure and Operational Efficiencies**

- Consolidation of Yuba County Resource Conservation District with Sutter County Resource Conservation District is an option. The District is interested in consolidating with Sutter County RCD as consolidation may provide economies of scale. Another benefit of consolidation is that it would allow for greater regional collaboration and planning, and also provide efficiency for funding projects at a regional level.