



SOLANO COUNTY
RECLAMATION/LEVEE DISTRICTS
MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

Final

PREPARED BY
MILANI & ASSOCIATES
IN COLLABORATION WITH
CRAFT CONSULTING GROUP AND
MMS DESIGN

FOR
SOLANO LAFCO
675 TEXAS STREET, SUITE 6700
FAIRFIELD, CA 94533
707-439-3898

February 10, 2020

SOLANO COUNTY RECLAMATION DISTRICTS
MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

PREPARED BY
MILANI & ASSOCIATES
IN COLLABORATION WITH
CRAFT CONSULTING GROUP AND
MMS DESIGN

FOR
SOLANO LAFCO
675 TEXAS STREET, SUITE 6700
FAIRFIELD, CA 94533
707-439-3898

February 10, 2020

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SOLANO LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Commission Members

James Spring, Chair, Solano County Supervisor

Nancy Shopay, Vice-Chair, Public Member

Harry Price, Mayor of Fairfield

Ron Rowlett, Mayor of Vacaville

John Vasquez, Solano County Supervisor

Ron Kott, Mayor of Rio Vista (Alternate)

Shawn Smith, Public Member (Alternate)

Skip Thomson, Solano County Supervisor (Alternate)

Staff

Rich Seithel, Executive Officer

Michelle McIntyre, Senior Analyst

CONSULTANT TEAM

Mike Milani, Milani & Associates, Civil Engineers & Surveyors

Gary W. Craft, Craft Consulting Group, Economics & Planning

Kevin Stichter, Craft Consulting Group, Economics & Planning

Mike McGill, MMS Design, Civil Engineering & Land Planning

This Municipal Service Review was produced under the direction of Solano LAFCO staff with assistance from Solano County GIS staff and Solano County Counsel Bernadette Curry. We would also like to thank Arnold Lenk, Board Member, Suisun Resource Conservation District; Terry Connolly, Board of Trustees RD 2129; Steve Chappell, Executive Director, Suisun Resource Conservation District; and John Currey, District Manager, Dixon Resource Conservation District for their advice and insight.

Executive Summary

Introduction

This Municipal Service Review (MSR) focuses on the provision of flood protection services provided by reclamation and levee maintenance districts located in Solano County. Under the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act (CKH Act), Solano LAFCO is responsible for conducting a comprehensive periodic review of the capacity and adequacy of the services offered by local agencies under its jurisdiction. The districts being reviewed include twenty-three (23) reclamation districts and one levee maintenance district.¹ These special districts were last evaluated as part of a multi-district MSR in 2009.² It has been determined by Solano LAFCO that preparation of an MSR is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under a Class 6 categorical exemption. This MSR addresses the CKH Act required determinations and is divided into seven sections:

1. Introduction (LAFCO's role & responsibilities regarding MSRs);
2. Reclamation District Overview (principal acts, governance, & regulatory setting);
3. Reclamation/Levee Districts Reviewed (regional context, population growth, & disadvantaged communities);
4. Suisun Marsh Districts (district profiles, & MSR determinations);
5. Collinsville Levee Maintenance District (district profile, & MSR determinations);
6. Sacramento Delta Districts (district profiles & MSR determinations); and
7. Key Findings & Recommendations.

Methodology

In order to evaluate the reclamation/levee districts, the consultant team requisitioned and reviewed available district documents, participated in an informational meeting at Rush Ranch for the districts located within the Suisun Marsh³, met with district representatives, and conducted site visits. In addition, the team researched and analyzed relevant information regarding each of the districts, including formation documents and financial reports, relevant background studies, and talked with LAFCO staff, County Counsel, Suisun Resource Conservation District, and Dixon Resource Conservation District. A questionnaire was distributed to each reclamation/levee district to obtain current information about district governance, service delivery, and financial capacity. Additional research was required for non-responsive districts including review of studies conducted by state and federal agencies. District profiles and statutorily required determinations were prepared for each of the 24 districts reviewed as prescribed by the CKH Act. Based on the report's findings, recommendations were made for improving service delivery and governance.

Reclamation/Levee District Overview

Reclamation and levee districts are special districts organized under separate sections of the State Water Code to protect land that is subject to flooding.⁴ According to the State Water Code **1) Reclamation**

¹ Reclamation District 2034 was not reviewed as part of this MSR given that it was recently evaluated under a separate MSR in November 2018. The North Rio Vista Levee Maintenance District was determined to be an assessment district and not a special district.

² Michael Brandman Associates, "Municipal Service Review Solano County Water, Irrigation, Reclamation, and Flood Management Agencies", April 13, 2009

³ Suisun Marsh Reclamation Districts Workshop, February 22, 2019

⁴ Reclamation Districts are organized under Division 15, Section 50000 and Levee Districts are organized under Division 19, Section 70000 of the California Water Code

Districts (RDs) are authorized to reclaim swamp land subject to flooding by the “construction of levees, drainage, and water control facilities for the unwatering, watering, and irrigation of district lands, and to provide for the operation and maintenance of such facilities and levees” **2) Levee Districts** can be established in order to “protect lands from overflow due to flooding and for conserving or adding water to the sloughs and drains in the district.” The primary function of both reclamation and levee districts is to operate and maintain levee and drainage systems to protect adjoining land from flooding.

Level of Service/Levee Standards

Solano County reclamation/levee districts maintain over 400 miles of levees located in Suisun Marsh, Collinsville, and the Sacramento Delta.^{5 6} The flood management system is generally divided into two broad categories: 1) **Project levees** that were built, rebuilt, or adopted as part of the State-Federal Sacramento River Flood Control System are maintained to the highest standards that comply with U.S. Army Corps of Engineer guidelines, and 2) **Non-project levees** which includes all other levees built and maintained by private landowners or local reclamation districts. Only about a third of the levees are project levees that are regularly inspected by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR).

There is no single levee maintenance standard. Instead, one of four standards are commonly used to provide guidance about the level of levee design and maintenance, along with other factors including the levee’s purpose, type and level of risk, and state/federal funding requirements. Levee standards include:

Public Law 84-99: Project levees that are part of the State Plan for Flood Control and Federal Flood Protection System are maintained to higher standards that comply with USACE guidelines. Project levees that meet the federal PL 84-99 standard are eligible for federal assistance if they participate in and are certified under the USACE Rehabilitation and Inspection Program.

Bulletin 192-82: Concern about the integrity of non-project levees led to the State’s adoption of a plan for improvement of Delta levees and issuance of levee guidelines as part of DWR Bulletin 192-82. The Delta Flood Protection Act requires that Delta Levee Subventions projects be compatible.

Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP): Various agencies negotiated the HMP standard for non-project levees to reduce the likelihood of repetitive flood damage to Delta levees and islands, so that FEMA disaster assistance would not be requested repetitively for the same islands after minor flooding. DWR is committed to improving most levee facilities to a uniform standard at the HMP configuration while working to raise the level of protection to the standards described in DWR Bulletin 192-82 or PL 84-99.

Suisun Marsh Protection Plan: The Suisun Marsh levee system provides flood protection for managed wetlands, public lands, infrastructure, residences, and wildlife habitat. Exterior levees were built up progressively over the years using dredged materials typically from adjacent waterways generally with little, or no, effort to design them to meet specific engineering standards.⁷ Levee configurations vary considerably in material composition, cross-sectional geometry, shape, strength, stability, and integrity.⁸ Standards for levee configuration in Suisun Marsh were established in 1977 as a result of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The specifications were developed to guide the design, construction, and maintenance of levees in the primary management area of the Marsh. While the goal is to “maintain and improve the integrity of the Suisun Marsh levee system”⁹, meeting these standards can be constrained by regulatory, environmental, or structural limitations and restrictions.

⁵ URS Corporation, Phase 2 Risk Reduction Report, June 2011

⁶ DWR and CDFW, “Cache Slough Complex Conservation Assessment: Volume 1 Characterization Report”, November 2015

⁷ Suisun Marsh Protection Plan, www.bcdc.ca.gov/plans/Suisun-marsh.html

⁸ Suisun Marsh Charter Group, “Suisun Marsh Levee Conceptual Model” 2005; Bay Delta Oversight Council, 1993

⁹ Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan, Goal 3: Levee System Integrity, May 2013

Reclamation/Levee District Financing

Reclamation/levee districts have several funding mechanisms. Under the California Water Code reclamation/levee districts the authority to levy assessments and fees on property owners within the district to pay for district operations, services, and facilities. Districts may also charge service fees for the provision of water and other services, including drainage. In addition, districts may issue bonds and warrants to finance improvements. Delta districts (and a portion of Suisun Marsh) may also be eligible for levee maintenance and improvement assistance under the Delta Levees Program and Delta Levee Maintenance Program (commonly called Subventions Program)¹⁰. About 10% of the levees in Suisun Marsh along Suisun, Grizzly, and Honker Bays are included in a state funded levee Special Projects maintenance program and only 2.5 miles of exterior levees on Van Sickle Island (RD 1607) are eligible to participate in Subventions and Special Projects levee programs. Reclamation/levee districts that meet FEMA requirements may apply for disaster relief funding, if the State of California issues a Declaration of Emergency, to repair levees damaged by major storm events. The State’s interest and investment in flood protection addresses “the need for improvement and ongoing maintenance of the levee system as a matter of continuing urgency to protect farmlands, population centers, the state's water quality, and significant natural resource and habitat areas” (Public Resources Code Section 29704).¹¹ Landowners within Suisun Marsh districts are eligible for Preservation Agreement Implementation (PAI) grant funding¹² administered by the Suisun Resource Conservation District for activities needed to improve managed wetland facilities, operational efficiency, and water management capabilities within the primary management area of Suisun Marsh. Exterior levee maintenance, however, is not an eligible activity for funding under the PAI grant program.

Governance

Reclamation/Levee Districts are independent special districts governed by a Board of Trustees whose members are elected by district landowners or appointed by the County Board of Supervisors. A board of trustees can consist of three, five, or seven members and have the power to do all things necessary or convenient for accomplishing the purposes for which they were formed. District Boards have complete supervision and control over the construction, maintenance and operation of flood protection facilities and the general affairs of the district. Since reclamation/levee districts are special districts, they are held to the same standards that apply to local governments including requirements for public notice of meetings and transparency under the Brown Act, submission of annual Financial Transaction Reports to the State Controller’s Office, preparation of independent audits, and maintenance of district websites.

Required MSR Determinations

1. Growth and Population

Land use and development of reclamation/levee district lands is controlled by the Solano County General Plan. All properties within the reclamation/levee districts are zoned as either agricultural or marsh land, except for part of Collinsville, which has a Residential Traditional Communities designation. Future growth and development within the districts would require County development approval. Other factors limiting population growth and development include:

- SB 5 (flood hazard zones 2007), which requires development within the FEMA 500-year and 100-year flood plains be protected from a 200-year flood event before development approval can be

¹⁰ California Department of Water Resources website: <https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/Delta-Levees-Maintenance-Subventions>

¹¹ Delta Stewardship Council, “State Investment in Delta Levees: Key Issues for Updating Priorities”, January 2015

¹² Suisun Resource Conservation District website: <https://suisunrcd.org/programs/>

granted. This would require most levees in Suisun Marsh and the Sacramento Delta to be substantially upgraded, and

- Williamson Act contracts, which limit a landowner's ability to develop or subdivide any parcel under an existing contract.

Given these development constraints the reclamation/levee districts in Solano County are not expected to experience any significant population growth or development over the next 5-10 years.

2. Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Most districts in Solano County are uninhabited with the surrounding areas having a median household income well above the threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community (DUC).¹³ The only district with a MHI of less than 80% of the State's annual MHI is the Collinsville Levee Maintenance District. The Collinsville Levee Maintenance District, however, does not meet the threshold for a DUC since it has less than 12 registered voters. None of the districts, including Collinsville, provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. Therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244, which requires LAFCO to consider the needs of unincorporated communities when considering district expansions, do not apply to any of the reclamation and levee maintenance districts in Solano County.

3. Service Configuration & Capacity

The level and type of services provided by reclamation/levee districts in Solano County varies greatly. Some districts provide services directly via full or part-time staff, while other districts perform work using private contractors or volunteer labor provided by individual landowners. Seven Delta districts have project levees that are inspected at least once annually by DWR. Four districts (RDs 501, 999, 2060, and 2068) were inspected by DWR in the Fall 2018 and found to have levees maintained at an acceptable or minimally acceptable level. Three districts (RDs 536, 2098, and 2104) had project levees with unacceptable levels of maintenance. The majority of the levees in Suisun Marsh are self-inspected by property owners or district personnel with no consistent standard of maintenance. Uninhabited agriculture and marsh land does not require the same level of protection as that where loss of life is a concern if there is a levee failure.

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Based on the current level of services provided, most reclamation/levee districts in Solano County have the financial capacity to provide the basic services needed to maintain their levees, except in the event of a major weather event, in which case they can apply for federal disaster assistance when the State has issued a Declaration of Emergency. After reviewing district financial documents, including annual budgets, financial transaction reports, and audited financial statements, most districts have generally maintained a positive fund balance over the past 5-years. Four districts (RDs 501, 2130, 2135, and Collinsville) had a negative fund balance at the end of FY 2018. Four districts did not submit sufficient information to Solano LAFCO to accurately assess their FY 2018 fund balance. Only the Collinsville Levee Maintenance District and RD 2098 are receiving ad valorem property tax as revenue. RD 501 receives revenue from special benefit assessments against property as permitted by the California Water Code. Eight (8) districts assess their members fees and service charges for benefits and services rendered in lieu of ad valorem property tax. Fourteen (14) districts receive state/federal funding support for levee maintenance. None of the districts currently have outstanding warrants that were issued to fund revenue shortfalls. Expenditures for

¹³ Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community, is defined as an inhabited community (consisting of at least 10 dwelling units with 12 or more registered voters) within an unincorporated area of the county in which the annual median household income is less than 80% of the statewide annual median household income.

levee maintenance and repairs varies greatly with costs per levee mile ranging from less than \$10,000 to more than \$50,000 per mile of levee. Small districts are more heavily impacted by rising administrative costs needed to comply with state governance requirements.

5. Status & Opportunity for Shared Facilities

Opportunities exist for adjacent districts to engage in various forms of collaboration with their neighboring districts, as well as larger governmental agencies such as DWR, USACE, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and resource conservation districts. Many districts already engage with state/federal agencies for levee inspections and financial assistance. Suisun Resource Conservation District has a water manager program in which Suisun Marsh districts participate. Reclamation districts could benefit from collaborative arrangements with neighboring districts or alternative service providers. These agreements could provide for a uniform level of operation and maintenance to improve service delivery, transparency, and flood-fighting capabilities. Governance solutions could take a variety of forms including district consolidation, contracts for shared services, MOUs, or JPAs.

6. Government Structure & Accountability

The districts reviewed for this study generally demonstrated basic levels of accountability and transparency by maintaining financial records, holding annual meetings, and complying with the Brown Act. All the districts, with the exception of RD 2043, have submitted a fiscal year 2018 financial transaction report to the State Controller's Office. Only two districts maintain an online presence through a district website as required by SB 929 and post information online.

Most districts are governed by an elected three-member Board of Trustees with the exception of four districts, which have a five-member board of trustees. However, many districts often do not have enough candidates to hold an election, in which case trustees are appointed by the County Board of Supervisors per Section 50741 of the California Water Code. Five (5) districts (RDs 2134, 2135, 2138, 1667, and 2093) are single property owner districts with legal representatives appointed to the Board of Trustees by the landowner. None of the districts reviewed provide compensation to their trustees. Twelve districts hold regular Board meetings, while the rest of the Boards meet on an as needed basis at least annually.

Adoption of an annual budget is an issue for some districts. The Special District Leadership Foundation considers the adoption of annual operating budgets as one of the most essential accountability practices of a public agency. Most importantly, Government Code §53901 states that within 60 days after the beginning of the fiscal year each local agency must submit its budget to the county auditor and make it available to the public on request. If a local agency does not have a formal budget, it shall file a listing of its anticipated revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year in progress.

7. Other Matters

No other issues or local commission policies were identified that may affect the efficient delivery of services by local reclamation/levee districts in Solano County.

Conclusions & Recommendations

Most of the reclamation/levee districts could improve their governance practices by adopting policies pertaining to district operations and financial management.¹⁴ Actions that Solano LAFCO could take to promote efficiencies in service delivery and governance include:

¹⁴ Policies such as Board compensation, expense reimbursement, purchasing and contracting, employee policies, and an annual budget to comply with State requirements help improve transparency and accountability. Only two districts have websites and post meeting agendas and minutes. The California Special Districts Association offers a website template through www.getstreamline.com for a nominal monthly fee, which includes technical support and hosting services.

1. Dissolution of Inactive Districts

LAFCO has responsibility for dissolution of special districts that have been identified by the State Controller's Office as being inactive per Government Code §56042. Once identified as being inactive by the State Controller's Office, local LAFCOs are required to initiate dissolution, unless it is determined following a public hearing, that the special district does not meet the criteria for qualifying as an inactive district. RD 2043 appears to be inactive since the District has not reported revenues and expenditures for more than five years.

2. Consolidation of Contiguous Districts

While each of the RDs is unique to some extent, consideration should be given to consolidating some districts into a larger entity to improve service delivery and efficiency and reduce administrative costs. Solano LAFCO should consider conducting a governance study to determine the feasibility, district interest, and potential benefits of consolidation where it is appropriate and supported by individual districts. While consolidation would not improve the governance and service delivery for all districts, eleven districts are considered potential candidates based on their adjacency, minimal size, and/or similar operational characteristics. Small underfunded districts should be encouraged to consolidate or collaborate on operation and/or administrative functions to reduce operating costs.

3. Formation of an Umbrella Administrative District to Improve Administrative Efficiency

Consideration should be given to the establishment of an umbrella agency that would serve as the lead agency to improve operational efficiency and service delivery while lowering administrative burdens in a cost-effective manner. An existing organization or district could serve as the umbrella organization to provide management and administrative services that many small districts find costly to maintain. This change in governance structure would maintain legal separation of the individual districts, while providing greater efficiency by reducing staff costs and overhead, improving transparency and publishing notices of agency meetings, filing financial audits and reporting, website maintenance, and other compliance requirements.

District Evaluation Summary

District Summary Table

	District Status			District Profile			Governance, Accountability, & Transparency		Financial Condition					Levee Maintenance / Level of Service ⁸	
	District #	District Name	Status	Acres	Exterior Levee Miles	Williamson Act Parcels Included	Website (\$B 929) ¹	FY2018 Financial Transaction Report	5-Yr Avg. Revenue	5-Yr Avg. Expenses	FY2018 Fund Balance	Ad Valorem / Special Assmt	State / Federal Assistance ²	Levee Standard	Inspection Responsibility
Suisun Marsh	1607	Van Sickle Island	Active	2,512.41	9 ⁶	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 324,185	\$ 333,048	\$ 184,917	-	\$157,901 (5-Yr Avg.) \$789,506 (5-Yr Total) \$603,124 (FY2018)	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
	2032	N/A	Inactive	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2034	N/A	Active	1,478.00	N/A	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	Landowners / District
	2043	N/A	Inactive	472.65	N/A	Yes	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2112	Schafer Pintal	Active	1,163.33	1.45 ⁶	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 25,421	\$ 24,840	\$ 10,543	-	\$8,549 (2-Yr Avg.) \$3,420 (5-Yr Avg.) \$17,068 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
	2127	Simmons-Wheeler	Active	3,600.00	7.50 ⁶	Yes	No	No	\$ 104,945	\$ 105,203	\$ 36,159	-	\$71,361 (4-Yr Avg.) \$82,429 (5-Yr Avg.) \$412,143 (5-Yr Total) \$101,654 (FY2018)	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
	2129	Frost Lake	Active	1,077.98	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 9,191	\$ 9,034	\$ 4,552	-	\$0 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	N/A	Landowners / District
	2130	Honker Bay	Active	630.83	2 ⁶	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 19,853	\$ 22,512	\$ (7,559)	-	\$30,052 (3-Yr Avg.) \$18,031 (5-Yr Avg.) \$90,155 (5-Yr Total) \$15,494 (FY2018)	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
	2134	Deverton	Active	852.00	7 ⁶	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 10,001	\$ 10,001	\$ -	-	\$0 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
	2135	Sunrise Island	Active	200.20	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 26,145	\$ 25,561	\$ (5,701)	-	\$73,503 (FY2018) \$73,503 (5-Yr Total) \$14,701 (5-Yr Avg.)	N/A	Landowners / District
	2136	Grizzly West	Active	2,769.61	8 ⁶	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 64,618	\$ 37,185	\$ 144,774	-	\$117,983 (2-Yr Avg.) \$47,190 (5-Yr Avg.) \$235,965 (5-Yr Total) \$234,062 (FY2018)	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
	2138	Morrow Island	Active	694.00	N/A	No	No	Yes	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 1,829	-	\$ -	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
	2139	Can-Can/Greenhead	Active	1,668.70	5.81 ⁶	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 30,933	\$ 30,801	\$ 681	-	N/A (5-Yr Avg.) N/A (5-Yr Total) \$16,871 (FY2018)	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
	2141	Joice Island	Active	939.67	4.5 ⁶	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 87,150	\$ 60,361	\$ 9,584	-	\$171,968 (FY2018) \$171,968 (5-Yr Total) \$34,388 (5-Yr Avg.)	Suisun Marsh Plan	Landowners / District
2142	Suisun Slough West	Active	1,668.46	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 6,540	\$ 6,540	\$ 4,727	-	\$ -	N/A	Landowners / District	
CLD	-	Collinsville LD	Active	233.83	0.96 ⁷	No	No	Yes	\$ 36,850	\$ 41,415	\$ (8,411)	ad valorem	\$25,342 (5-Yr Avg.) \$126,710 (5-Yr Total) \$58,909 (FY2018)	Non-Project Levee	DWR
Delta	501	Reyer Island	Active	11,838.59	20.26 ¹	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 489,049	\$ 450,731	\$ (325,039)	Special Assessment	\$65,343 (2-Yr Avg.) \$26,067 (5-Yr Avg.) \$130,485 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	FL 84-00	DWR
	535	Egbert	Active	6,700.51	10.59 ^{1, 4, 1}	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 92,094	\$ 82,921	\$ 24,860	-	\$29,468 (FY2018) \$29,468 (5-Yr Total) \$5,900 (5-Yr Avg.)	FL 84-00	DWR
	999	Netherlands*	Active	26,000.00** 2,490.87***	32.17 ^{1, 1}	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$ 867,558	\$ 853,878	\$ 565,583	-	\$119,368 (4-Yr Avg.) \$65,494 (5-Yr Avg.) \$477,471 (5-Yr Total) \$247,274 (FY2018)	FL 84-00	DWR
	1567	Prospect Island	Active	1,538.84****	14.7 ¹	No	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	\$ 48,920	-	N/A (5-Yr Avg.) N/A (5-Yr Total) \$18,493 (FY2018)	FL 84-00	N/A

District Summary Table (continued)

	District Status			District Profile			Governance, Accountability, & Transparency		Financial Condition					Levee Maintenance / Level of Service ⁷	
	District #	District Name	Status	Acres	Exterior Levee Miles	Williamson Act Parcels Included	Website (SB 929) ¹	FY2018 Financial Transaction Report	5-Yr Avg. Revenue	5-Yr Avg. Expenses	FY2018 Fund Balance	Ad Valorem / Special Assmnt	State / Federal Assistance ²	Levee Standard	Inspection Responsibility
Delta	2060	Hastings Tract	Active	6,936.80	15.66 ^{4,1}	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 67,993	\$ 69,931	\$ 141,099	-	\$95,190 (2-Yr Avg.) \$38,078 (5-Yr Avg.) \$190,392 (5-Yr Total) \$40,976 (FY2018)	PL 94-99	DWR
	2066	Yolano Tract*	Active	15,261.18	8.71 ^{1,4}	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 1,590,052	\$ 1,630,977	\$ 2,030,570	-	\$0 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	PL 94-99	DWR
	2064	Little Egbert Tract	Active	3,153.24	5.4 ⁴	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 56,000	\$ 55,256	\$ 4,175	-	\$0 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	Non-Project Levee	N/A
	2063	Liberty Island*	Active	4,280.33 ^{***}	20.5 ⁷	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 7,500	\$ 3,461	\$ 364	-	\$0 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	Non-Project Levee	N/A
	2068	Cache-Haes Slough	Active	6,373.09	10.91 ^{4,5}	Yes	No	Yes	\$ 43,074	\$ 35,484	\$ 141,975	ad valorem	\$0 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	PL 94-99	DWR
	2104	Peters Pocket	Active	1,542.28	6.65 ^{1,4,1}	Yes	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	\$ 1,500	-	\$0 (5-Yr Total) \$0 (FY2018)	PL 94-99	DWR

¹ SB 929 requires special districts to have a website containing contact information; the most recent agenda; Financial Transaction Report submitted to the State Controller's Office; Board & Staff Compensation Report, & the District's Enterprise System Catalog.

² Most Districts do not receive state or federal assistance every year.

³ CalFed Delta Program Levee System Integrity Program EIR, July 2000.

⁴ Cache Slough Complex Conservation assessment, November 2015.

⁵ DWR Annual Inspection Report, 2019.

⁶ District response to MSR Survey Questionnaire.

⁷ National Levee Database.

⁸ The level of service standards for monitoring and maintenance of levees varies depending on the level of protection and the assets being protected. Compliance with levee standards may vary depending on the resources of the District. State/Federal funding often depends on compliance with applicable levee standards. Common levee standards used in Suisun Marsh and the Sacramento Delta include:

* Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP)

* PL 94-99

* DWR Bulletin 193-82

* Suisun Marsh Protection Plan Levee Standards

These standards provide a base level of flood protection from significant storm events. Project levees that are part of the Federal Flood Control Project are generally built to higher standards that comply with USACE guidelines. Non-project levees are typically built to agriculture standards for the protection of agricultural lands and wildlife habitat. All of Suisun Marsh levees are non-project, local levees maintained by local reclamation districts and landowners.

N/A = Not Available

* Multicounty District (Solano & Yolo Counties)

** Total acres for all parcels in Multicounty District

*** Total acres of District parcels in Solano County

**** Total acres is based on revised boundary provided in detachment documents from 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1: Role & Responsibility of LAFCO	1
1.2: Purpose of this Municipal Service Review.....	1
1.3: Organization of Report	1
1.4: CEQA Exemption.....	2
SECTION 2: RECLAMATION/LEVEE DISTRICT OVERVIEW	3
2.1 Principal Acts Governing District Formation & Operation.....	3
2.2 Primary Purpose	3
2.3 Governance	3
2.4 Compliance with State Laws	4
2.5 Non-Complying Districts	5
2.6: Active/Inactive Status.....	5
2.7: Regulatory Setting	5
2.8: Service Levels & Levee Standards	6
2.9: Funding Sources	8
SECTION 3: RECLAMATION/LEVEE DISTRICTS REVIEWED.....	10
3.1: Solano County Reclamation/Levee Districts.....	10
3.2 Location of Districts by Geographic Subareas	11
3.3: Population Growth & Land Use	13
3.4: Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities.....	14
SECTION 4: SUISUN MARSH RECLAMATION DISTRICTS	15
4.0: Regional Context	15
4.1: Reclamation District 1607	20
4.2: Reclamation District 2043	29
4.3: Reclamation District 2112.....	34
4.4: Reclamation District 2127	42
4.5: Reclamation District 2129.....	50
4.6: Reclamation District 2130	57
4.7: Reclamation District 2134.....	64
4.8: Reclamation District 2135	71
4.9: Reclamation District 2136.....	78
4.10: Reclamation District 2138	85
4.11: Reclamation District 2139.....	92
4.12: Reclamation District 2141	99
4.13: Reclamation District 2142.....	106
SECTION 5: COLLINSVILLE LEVEE DISTRICT	113
5.0: Regional Context.....	113
5.1: District Profile.....	113
5.2: MSR Findings and Determinations.....	119

SECTION 6: SACRAMENTO DELTA RECLAMATION DISTRICTS	123
6.0: Regional Context	123
6.1: Reclamation District 501	126
6.2: Reclamation District 536	135
6.3: Reclamation District 999	143
6.4: Reclamation District 1667	151
6.5: Reclamation District 2060	158
6.6: Reclamation District 2068	165
6.7: Reclamation District 2084	177
6.8: Reclamation District 2093	184
6.9: Reclamation District 2098	190
6.10: Reclamation District 2104	198
SECTION 7: KEY FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS	205
7.0: Summary of Key Findings	205
7.1: Recommendations for Improved Governance and Service Delivery	206
APPENDICES	208
A: Acronyms.....	209
B: References	210
C: Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities Qualifications	211
D: Origin of Reclamation Districts.....	213
E: Project and Non-Project Levees	214
F: Levee Design Standards	215
G: Levee Maintenance.....	219
H: Reclamation District Funding Sources	221
I: Suisun Marsh & Sacramento Delta Reclamation Districts	224
J: Comment & Response Log.....	226

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Solano County Reclamation/Levee Districts	10
Table 4.1: RD 1607 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	22
Table 4.2: RD 1607 District Profile	23
Table 4.3: RD 1607 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	25
Table 4.4: RD 1607 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	27
Table 4.5: RD 2043 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	31
Table 4.6: RD 2043 District Profile	31
Table 4.7: RD 2112 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	36
Table 4.8: RD 2112 District Profile	37
Table 4.9: RD 2112 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	39
Table 4.10: RD 2112 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	40
Table 4.11: RD 2127 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	44
Table 4.12: RD 2127 District Profile	45
Table 4.13: RD 2127 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	47
Table 4.14: RD 2127 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	48
Table 4.15: RD 2129 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	50
Table 4.16: RD 2129 District Profile	52
Table 4.17: RD 2129 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	54
Table 4.18: RD 2129 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	55
Table 4.19: RD 2130 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	57
Table 4.20: RD 2130 District Profile	59
Table 4.21: RD 2130 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	61
Table 4.22: RD 2130 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	62
Table 4.23: RD 2134 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	64
Table 4.24: RD 2134 District Profile	66
Table 4.25: RD 2134 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	68
Table 4.26: RD 2134 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	69
Table 4.27: RD 2135 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	71
Table 4.28: RD 2135 District Profile	73
Table 4.29: RD 2135 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	75
Table 4.30: RD 2135 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	76
Table 4.31: RD 2136 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	78
Table 4.32: RD 2136 District Profile	80
Table 4.33: RD 2136 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	82
Table 4.34: RD 2136 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	83
Table 4.35: RD 2138 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	85
Table 4.36: RD 2138 District Profile	87
Table 4.37: RD 2138 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	89

Table 4.38: RD 2138 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	90
Table 4.39: RD 2139 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	92
Table 4.40: RD 2139 District Profile	94
Table 4.41: RD 2139 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	96
Table 4.42: RD 2139 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	97
Table 4.43: RD 2141 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	99
Table 4.44: RD 2141 District Profile	101
Table 4.45: RD 2141 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	103
Table 4.46: RD 2141 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	104
Table 4.47: RD 2142 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	106
Table 4.48: RD 2142 District Profile	108
Table 4.49: RD 2142 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	110
Table 4.50: RD 2142 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	111
Table 5.1: Collinsville Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	115
Table 5.2: Collinsville District Profile	118
Table 5.3: Collinsville Facilities, Services & Maintenance	120
Table 5.4: Collinsville Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	121
Table 6.1: RD 501 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	128
Table 6.2: RD 501 District Profile	130
Table 6.3: RD 501 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	132
Table 6.4: RD 501 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018	132
Table 6.5: RD 501 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	133
Table 6.6: RD 536 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	135
Table 6.7: RD 536 District Profile	138
Table 6.8: RD 536 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	140
Table 6.9: RD 536 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018	140
Table 6.10: RD 536 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	141
Table 6.11: RD 999 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	145
Table 6.12: RD 999 District Profile	146
Table 6.13: RD 999 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	148
Table 6.14: RD 999 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018	148
Table 6.15: RD 999 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	149
Table 6.16: RD 1667 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	153
Table 6.17: RD 1667 District Profile	154
Table 6.18: RD 1667 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	156
Table 6.19: RD 1667 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	157
Table 6.20: RD 2060 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	158
Table 6.21: RD 2060 District Profile	160
Table 6.22: RD 2060 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018	162

Table 6.23: RD 2060 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	162
Table 6.24: RD 2060 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	163
Table 6.25: RD 2068 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	167
Table 6.26: RD 2068 District Profile	171
Table 6.27: RD 2068 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	173
Table 6.28: RD 2068 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018	174
Table 6.29: RD 2068 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	175
Table 6.30: RD 2084 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	177
Table 6.31: RD 2084 District Profile	179
Table 6.32: RD 2084 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	181
Table 6.33: RD 2084 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	182
Table 6.34: RD 2093 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	184
Table 6.35: RD 2093 District Profile	186
Table 6.36: RD 2093 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	188
Table 6.37: RD 2093 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	189
Table 6.38: RD 2098 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	192
Table 6.39: RD 2098 District Profile	193
Table 6.40: RD 2098 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	195
Table 6.41: RD 2098 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018	195
Table 6.42: RD 2098 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	196
Table 6.43: RD 2104 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel	198
Table 6.44: RD 2104 District Profile	200
Table 6.45: RD 2104 Facilities, Services & Maintenance	202
Table 6.46: RD 2104 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018	202
Table 6.47: RD 2104 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance	203

List of Figures

Figure 3.1: Overview Map of Solano County Reclamation/Levee Districts.....	12
Figure 3.2: Map of Delta Primary & Secondary Zones & Suisun Marsh.....	13
Figure 4.1: Suisun Marsh Boundary Map	15
Figure 4.2: Suisun Marsh Reclamation Districts.....	19
Figure 4.3: Boundary Map of RD 1607.....	21
Figure 4.4: Boundary Map of RD 2043.....	30
Figure 4.5: Boundary Map of RD 2112.....	35
Figure 4.6: Boundary Map of RD 2127.....	43
Figure 4.7: Boundary Map of RD 2129.....	51
Figure 4.8: Boundary Map of RD 2130.....	58
Figure 4.9: Boundary Map of RD 2134.....	65

Figure 4.10: Boundary Map of RD 2135.....	72
Figure 4.11: Boundary Map of RD 2136.....	79
Figure 4.12: Boundary Map of RD 2138.....	86
Figure 4.13: Boundary Map of RD 2139.....	93
Figure 4.14: Boundary Map of RD 2141.....	100
Figure 4.15: Boundary Map of RD 2142.....	107
Figure 5.1: Boundary Map of Collinsville Levee District.....	114
Figure 6.1: Yolo Bypass/Cache Slough Complex Levees.....	124
Figure 6.2: Sacramento Delta Reclamation Districts	125
Figure 6.3: Boundary Map of RD 501.....	127
Figure 6.4: Boundary Map of RD 536.....	137
Figure 6.5: Boundary Map of RD 999.....	144
Figure 6.6: Boundary Map of RD 1667.....	152
Figure 6.7: Boundary Map of RD 2060.....	159
Figure 6.8: Boundary Map of RD 2068.....	166
Figure 6.9: Boundary Map of RD 2084.....	178
Figure 6.10: Boundary Map of RD 2093.....	185
Figure 6.11: Boundary Map of RD 2098.....	191
Figure 6.12: Boundary Map of RD 2104.....	199

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1: ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF LAFCO

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCO) are charged under the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act) with overseeing the formation, consolidation, changes of organization, and dissolution of cities and special districts, including reclamation districts (RD) and levee maintenance districts (LD). The primary role of LAFCO in reviewing local government entities is to ensure the efficient and orderly provision of governmental services. Under the CKH Act, LAFCOs must conduct a municipal service review (MSR) of all local agencies every five years, as “*a means of identifying and evaluating public services*” (GC §56076). In conducting an MSR, LAFCO shall consider and adopt written findings of its determinations with respect to each of the following seven factors as defined by GC §56430¹⁵:

- (1) Growth and population projections for the affected area;
- (2) The location and characteristics of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence;
- (3) Present and planned capacity of public facilities, adequacy of public services, and infrastructure needs or deficiencies including needs or deficiencies related to sewers, municipal and industrial water, and structural fire protection in any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence;
- (4) The financial ability of agencies to provide services;
- (5) Status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities;
- (6) Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies; and
- (7) Any other matter related to effective or efficient service delivery, as required by commission policy.

1.2: PURPOSE OF THIS MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW

The purpose of this MSR is to provide a comprehensive update of the service needs, operational efficiency, governance, and service delivery capacity of reclamation and levee maintenance districts in Solano County since the last evaluation in 2009. The MSR process does not require LAFCO to initiate changes of organization based on the determinations. However, LAFCO may subsequently use the determinations and related analysis to consider whether to pursue changes to service delivery, government organization, or district boundaries.

1.3: ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

This report is organized into six sections that focus on key issues relevant to reclamation districts while addressing the required MSR determinations for each agency. The first two sections address LAFCO’s role and reclamation district responsibilities under State law. Individual reclamation districts are grouped into three sections according to geographic subregion that discuss the 1) regional context, 2) district profiles; and 3) required MSR determinations for each district. The final section summarizes the key findings and provides recommendations for improving the efficient delivery of services and governance of the reclamation/levee districts.

¹⁵ Guide to the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, December 2017

1.4: CEQA EXEMPTION

Solano LAFCO has determined that this MSR update will have no significant effect on the environment. Public Resources Code §21000 states that “*where there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment, the activity is not subject to CEQA.*” According to CEQA Guidelines, an MSR update qualifies for a Class 6 categorical exemption since it involves “basic data collection, research, experimental management, and resource evaluation activities that do not result in a serious or major disturbance to an environmental resource” (California Code of Regulations §15306). MSR updates **do not** allow landowners to apply for changes in the sphere of influence and district boundaries, nor does it permit land-use or land subdivision beyond what is already allowed for under Solano County’s General Plan. As the lead agency, pursuant to CCR§15061(b)(3), Solano LAFCO finds this MSR update does not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment and is exempt from CEQA.

SECTION 2: RECLAMATION/LEVEE DISTRICT OVERVIEW

2.1: PRINCIPAL ACTS GOVERNING DISTRICT FORMATION & OPERATION

Reclamation and levee maintenance districts are types of special districts authorized to reclaim and protect adjoining land subject to flooding. The Principal Acts governing the formation and operation of reclamation and levee maintenance districts in California is authorized by the following sections of the State Water Code:

Reclamation Districts (RD) were initially formed under Section 3452 of the California Political Code, which was incorporated into the State Water Code in 1951. Today, RD's operate in accordance with Division 15, Section 50000-53901 of the California Water Code.

Levee Maintenance Districts (LMD) are similar to reclamation districts, but are regulated and operate in accordance with Division 19, Section 70000-70272, which was added to the California Water Code in 1959.

2.2: PRIMARY PURPOSE

Reclamation Districts are formed for the primary purpose of reclaiming swamp, overflowed salt-marsh, tidelands, or other lands subject to flood or overflow. RDs may engage in any lawful activity for the maintenance, protection, or repair of the reclamation works "necessary for the unwatering, watering, or irrigation of district lands" (WC §50013). They are responsible for reclaiming and maintaining land for beneficial use that is threatened by permanent or temporary flooding by removing and/or preventing water from returning by managing and maintaining a system of levees, dikes, drainage ditches, channels, canals, pumps and other flood protection and drainage structures. Permissible activities include the construction, maintenance, and operation of infrastructure such as "drains, canals, sluices, bulkheads, water gates, levees, embankments, pumping plants, dams, diversion works, or irrigation works", as well as any roads or bridges needed to access these facilities and do all things reasonably necessary or convenient for accomplishing the purpose for which the district was formed (WC §50932 - 50933).

Levee Maintenance Districts may be formed for the protection of lands "from overflow and for the purpose of conserving or adding water to the sloughs and drains in the district and may acquire by purchase, condemnation, gift or other action, drains, canals, sluices, bulkheads, water gates, levees, embankments, pumping plants and pipelines and to purchase, construct or otherwise acquire, maintain and keep in repair all things reasonable or convenient" (WC §70150).

The reclamation and levee maintenance districts reviewed in this document have the basic objective of managing the movement of surface water to facilitate beneficial uses of land within the district and preventing or minimizing erosion and flooding. This objective is achieved through the construction and/or maintenance of surface conveyance features such as levees, ditches, laterals, natural stream courses, weirs, and other infrastructure. Flood protection and habitat enhancement are the primary services provided by most of the reclamation/levee districts reviewed in this document.

2.3: GOVERNANCE

Reclamation districts are independent special districts as defined by Government Code §56044 and governed by a Board of Trustees whose members are elected by district landowners or appointed by the County Board of Supervisors (WC §50650). The board of trustees can consist of three, five or seven members and have the power to do all things necessary or convenient for accomplishing the purposes for which the reclamation district was formed. Owners of the majority of acreage in the district may vote to adopt governing bylaws (WC §50370). A district may, by resolution of the board of trustees, provide for

the collection of charges and fees, by way of the tax bills of the county or counties in which such district is located (WC §50904). The board of trustees has “general supervision and complete control over the construction, maintenance and operation of the reclamation works, and generally over the affairs of the district” (WC §50652.). In 1876, a California court case (*Dean v. Davis*) held that reclamation districts are essentially “public” entities, which operate in a governmental fashion and exercise certain governmental functions within their boundaries. Since then reclamation and levee maintenance districts have been held to the same standards that apply to local governments, including requirements for public hearings, fair bidding practices, and transparency in their dealings.

2.4: COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LAWS¹⁶

In addition to operating according to the Principal Act under which they were established, reclamation and levee maintenance districts must also comply with applicable state laws affecting the governance and operation of special districts in general. Relevant acts pertinent to special districts include:

1. **Ralph M. Brown Act** – As public agencies, special districts must comply with the Brown Act, which requires meetings of governing boards to be publicly announced and open to the public. Agencies must post agendas containing a brief general description of each item to be discussed at the meeting in a location that is accessible to members of the public at least 72 hours before a regular meeting.
2. **Public Records Act** – GC §6250 through §6270.5 requires inspection or disclosure of governmental records to the public upon request, unless exempted by law. Public agencies must also create a catalog of “enterprise systems” and post the list on their website or make it publicly available upon request.
3. **Financial Transaction Reports** - Local agencies must submit an annual financial transaction report within seven months after the close of each fiscal year to the State Controller’s Office (SCO). Special districts are also required to either post the financial report on its website or provide copies of the report upon request. Agencies who do not submit financial transaction reports are subject to financial and legal penalties pursuant to GC §53895.
4. **Independent Financial Audit** – All special districts must conduct an annual independent financial audit or request permission from the County Auditor-Controller and be approved by the Board of Supervisors for a biennial audit or a five-year audit period if the district’s annual revenues do not exceed \$60,000 in each year being reported.
5. **District Website** – Special districts must establish and maintain an Internet Website beginning January 2020 in accordance with SB 929, unless the district’s governing board has adopted a resolution declaring that to do so would constitute a hardship due to inadequate broadband access, significantly limited financial resources, and/or insufficient staff resources. The website must contain information on annual compensation of officers and employees and the posting of meeting agendas as required by the Brown Act. In addition, Senate Bill 272 (2015) requires local agencies to create a catalog of enterprise systems listing the vendors and product (or system name and brief title) and make it publicly available by posting the list on the agency’s website.
6. **Compensation Report Filing** – Special districts are required to submit the annual compensation of its elected officials, officers, and employees to the State Controller’s Office by April 30 of each year.

¹⁶ State Controller’s Office, “*Special District Uniform Accounting and Reporting Procedures*”, December 2018, https://www.sco.ca.gov/pubs_guides.html

7. **Annual Disclosure** –Special districts are required to annually disclose payments made to its employees or board members for reimbursement of individual charges in excess of \$100 made in the immediately preceding fiscal year and to publish or print reimbursement information in a document which is made available for public inspection. Reports must be posted annually by the district for the previous fiscal year no later than December 31st (GC §53065.5).
8. **Ethics Policy** - Local elected officials and other key officials designated by the local board (typically management) are required to take an ethics training course if the official receives compensation or reimbursement in their position with a local government agency. This applies even if the official does not actually receive compensation or reimbursement, but the district’s enabling act simply allows for such compensation or reimbursement. Affected officials must take the course once every two years and the district must establish a written policy on reimbursements (GC §53234, et seq. GC §53232.1-5323.2).

2.5: NON-COMPLYING DISTRICTS

Non-compliance with applicable state laws can lead to invalidation of a special district’s actions, financial penalties, and in some cases criminal prosecution. Special districts that fail or refuse to make and file statutorily required annual financial transaction reports within 20 days after receipt of a written notice from the State Controller’s Office (SCO) of the failure, shall be subject to penalties in accordance with GC 53895. Penalties may be imposed on districts who fail or refuse to file the required reports in a timely manner by the State Attorney General ranging from \$1,000 to \$5,000 depending on the size of the district’s annual budget. When a special district has failed to comply with statutorily required reporting, the SCO will provide technical assistance and may waive the penalties for late filing based upon the satisfactory showing of good cause.

2.6: ACTIVE/INACTIVE STATUS

Senate Bill 448, which passed in 2017, created a streamlined process for LAFCOs to dissolve special districts that are inactive. The new law specifies that the State Controller’s Office (SCO) is required to create a list of inactive districts, post the list on their website, and notify LAFCOs of the list. LAFCOs are then required to initiate dissolution of inactive districts by resolution within 90 days of receiving the notification from the SCO, unless the commission determines the special district(s) does not meet the criteria set forth in the inactive district definition. An "inactive special district" is defined as a district that meets all of the following criteria (GC §56042):

- Meet the definition set forth in GC §56036 as a special district formed “for the performance of governmental or proprietary functions within limited boundaries and in areas outside the boundaries when authorized by LAFCO pursuant to GC §56133”;
- Have no financial transactions in the previous fiscal year; and
- Have no assets, liabilities, outstanding debts, judgments, litigation, contracts, liens, or claims.

2.7: REGULATORY SETTING

Reclamation and levee districts in Solano County are part of a flood management system that is overseen by a complex framework of local, state, and federal agencies. Reclamation districts are also affected by laws and regulations related to water rights, water quality, endangered species, habitat management, and land development. The following federal, state and local agencies play a significant role related to reclamation/levee districts in the Delta and Suisun Marsh:

Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) is the State regulatory agency responsible for ensuring that appropriate standards are met for the construction, maintenance, and protection of the flood control system that protects life, property, and wildlife habitat in the Central Valley and Delta from the effects of flooding. Pursuant to the California Water Code, the CVFPB is required to enforce the erection, maintenance and protection of levees, embankments, and channel rectification that best serve the interests of the State. CVFPB is authorized to issue a Notice of Violation and take other enforcement action, as needed, to any person or public agency responsible for an encroachment, flood system improvement, or activity that is in violation of the California Water Code or Title 23 of the California Code of Regulations.

California Department of Water Resources (DWR) acting through the Division of Flood Management is responsible for state-level flood management, including cooperating with the US Army Corps of Engineers in project planning, design, and funding; providing flood fight assistance; and maintaining portions of the flood management system.

US Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) is primarily responsible for planning, designing, and constructing federally authorized flood management facilities. It also develops the operational rules for federally funded flood control reservoirs. The Corps is also responsible for environmental permitting under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of River and Harbors Act if wetland or water of the United States are effected by levee maintenance activities.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) plays a multitude of flood management roles, including managing the National Flood Insurance Program, which includes mapping and classification of flood hazards. FEMA also provides federal disaster recovery assistance in the event of federal emergency declarations or disaster declarations.

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has the primary State responsibility for the implementation of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan as part of its mission to protect the Bay, maximize public access to the Bay, and encourage appropriate development along the Bay shoreline by regulating filling, dredging, and changes of use in the Bay. BCDC's jurisdiction includes the shoreline within 100 feet of the Bay, and salt ponds and managed wetlands.¹⁷

Solano County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) oversees the formation, changes of organization and dissolution of special districts in Solano County, including reclamation and levee districts and the establishment of service boundaries and spheres of influence.

2.8: SERVICE LEVELS AND LEVEE STANDARDS

Solano County reclamation/levee districts maintain over 400 miles of levees located in Suisun Marsh, Collinsville, and the Sacramento Delta.^{18 19}

Local reclamation/levee districts are responsible for protecting low-lying lands and property within their districts from water intrusion from adjacent rivers and sloughs. Levee systems are one of the primary methods used for flood control. Levee maintenance, therefore, is an important criterion for evaluating district performance. Service levels for reclamation/levee districts are defined, in part, by the levee

¹⁷ Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) requires authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the construction of any structure in or over any navigable waters of the United States, the excavation and dredging or deposition of material, or any obstruction or alteration to a navigable water. Work outside the limits of navigable waters may require a Section 10 permit if the structure or work affects the course, location, condition, or capacity of the water body. There is some overlap between Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Permits for activities requiring approval under both Section 10 and Section 404 are processed simultaneously by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

¹⁸ URS Corporation, Phase 2 Risk Reduction Report, June 2011

¹⁹ DWR and CDFW, "Cache Slough Complex Conservation Assessment: Volume 1 Characterization Report", November 2015

standards they operate under. There is no single levee maintenance standard for local districts. Instead, one of four standards are commonly used to provide guidance about the level of levee maintenance, along with other factors including the district's purpose, type and level of risk involved, and state/federal funding requirements. The levee systems are generally divided into two broad categories: 1) **Project levees** that are built, rebuilt, or adopted as part of the State-Federal Sacramento River Flood Control System and maintained to standards that comply with U.S. Army Corps of Engineer guidelines, and 2) **Non-project levees** which includes all other levees, typically built and maintained by local reclamation districts or private landowners. Only about a third of the Delta levees are part of the federal flood management project and regularly inspected by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) on an annual basis. Non-project levees maintained by local reclamation districts are generally built and maintained to an agricultural standard and are typically less stable than project levees (see levee standards in the Appendix). Most levee systems in Solano County were built and are maintained at a minimal level of configuration with no defined engineering standard. Common levee standards include:

Public Law 84-99: Project levees that are part of the State Plan for Flood Control and Federal Flood Protection System are maintained to higher standards that comply with USACE guidelines. Project levees that meet the federal PL 84-99 standard are eligible for federal assistance if they participate in and are certified under the USACE Rehabilitation and Inspection Program.

Bulletin 192-82: Concern about the integrity of non-project levees led to the State's adoption of a plan for improvement of Delta levees. A State Plan for Non-Project levees was developed in 1975 and updated in 1982 by DWR Bulletin 192-82 to guide the formulation of projects to preserve the integrity of the levee system. Local agency plans for improving non-project levees must be compatible with DWR Bulletin 192-82 to be eligible for funding under the Delta Flood Protection Act.²⁰

Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP): Various agencies negotiated the HMP standard for non-project levees to reduce the likelihood of repetitive flood damage to Delta levees and islands, so that FEMA disaster assistance would not be requested repetitively for the same islands after minor flooding. DWR is committed to improving most levee facilities to a uniform standard at the HMP configuration while working to raise the level of protection to the standards described in DWR Bulletin 192-82 or PL 84-99.

Suisun Marsh Protection Plan: The Suisun Marsh levee system provides flood protection for managed wetlands, public lands, infrastructure, residences, and wildlife habitat. Exterior levees were built up progressively over the years using dredged materials typically from adjacent waterways generally with little, or no, effort to design them to meet specific engineering standards.²¹ Levee configurations vary considerably in material composition, cross-sectional geometry, shape, strength, stability, and integrity.²² Standards for levee configuration in Suisun Marsh were established in 1977 as a result of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The specifications were developed to guide the design, construction, and maintenance of levees in the primary management area of the Marsh. While the goal is to "maintain and improve the integrity of the Suisun Marsh levee system"²³, meeting these standards can be constrained by regulatory, environmental, or structural limitations and restrictions. While local reclamation districts are responsible for levee maintenance, they do not receive assistance under the State Subventions Program for levee maintenance or flood fighting.

²⁰ Delta Stewardship Council, "State Investment in Delta Levees", January 2015

²¹ Suisun Marsh Protection Plan, www.bcdc.ca.gov/plans/Suisun-marsh.html

²² Suisun Marsh Charter Group, "Suisun Marsh Levee Conceptual Model" 2005; Bay Delta Oversight Council, 1993

²³ Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan, Goal 3: Levee System Integrity, May 2013

2.9: FUNDING SOURCES

Reclamation and levee districts have multiple sources for financing district operations including flood control facilities and levee maintenance services necessary and convenient to reclaim the land for beneficial use or to prevent overflow from flood waters. Financing tools authorized under the State Water Code include property taxes, special assessments, user fees, service charges, warrants, and state and federal grants (see Appendix). In general, levee maintenance and improvements have been financed by district landowners. The California Water Code grants reclamation and levee maintenance districts the authority to levy assessments and fees on property owners within the district to pay for district operations, services, and facilities. Districts may also charge service fees for the provision of water and other services, including drainage. In addition, districts may issue bonds and warrants to finance improvements. Reclamation/levee districts may also be eligible for state and federal grant programs that will reimburse the district for their maintenance and improvement costs of their levee systems, including annual routine maintenance.

Project levees in the Delta that are part of the State Plan for flood control (and Federal Flood Control Project) are built to higher standards that comply with USACE guidelines. Project levees that meet the federal PL 84-99 standard may, if the levees are damaged, be able to qualify for federal rehabilitation assistance if they participate in and are certified under the USACE program. Only about a third of the Delta levees are part of the federal flood control project.

Over the past 30 years, the State of California has provided supplemental financing for levee maintenance and emergency response for qualified project and non-project levees in the Delta. For non-project levees, DWR administers two key programs: 1) the **Delta Levee Maintenance Subvention Program**, which provides funding on a cost-share basis to local agencies for rehabilitation and maintenance of non-project and eligible project levees in the Delta, and 2) the **Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects Program**, which funds improvements to levees and levee-related wildlife and fish habitats.

The Delta Levee Special Flood Control Projects program administered by DWR was established in 1988 and continues to operate under subsequent legislation that extended and provided funding for the program. In 1996, the Program was expanded to the entire Delta and to portions of Suisun Marsh (approximately 12 miles of levees on islands bordering the Northern Suisun Bay from Van Sickle Island westerly to Montezuma Slough). Each year, this funding has been dedicated to maintain and improve the aging Delta Levees, and a modest amount has been put into improving habitat and flood infrastructure. Passage of Proposition 1E and Proposition 84 in November 2006, significantly increased the amount of money available for levee projects in the Delta. This increase in funding carries with it a commensurate responsibility to be transparent and practical about how Special Projects are funded. Only about 10% of the levees in Suisun Marsh along Suisun, Grizzly, and Honker Bays are included in a state funded levee Special Projects maintenance program. The Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan (U.S. Bureau of Reclamation 2012) recommends that public funding for Suisun Marsh levees needs to be expanded beyond its current limit to address maintenance and improvement activities for exterior levees that are exposed to tidal action. Delta districts (and a portion of Suisun Marsh) may be eligible for levee maintenance and improvement assistance under the Delta Levees Program and Delta Levee Maintenance Program (commonly called Subventions Program).²⁴ The State's interest and investment in flood protection addresses "the need for improvement and ongoing maintenance of the levee system as a matter of continuing urgency to protect farmlands, population centers, the state's water quality, and significant natural resource and habitat areas" (Public Resources Code Section 29704). For

²⁴ California Department of Water Resources website: <https://water.ca.gov/Work-With-Us/Grants-And-Loans/Delta-Levees-Maintenance-Subventions>

some levee systems, the HMP levee standard may provide the appropriate level of flood management to receive State funding).²⁵

Federal disaster assistance funding from FEMA may be available after a State Declaration of Emergency to repair levees damaged by major storm events. Reclamation/levee districts meeting FEMA requirements whose levees have been damaged may be eligible for disaster relief funding.

The Suisun Marsh Preservation Agreement Implementation (PAI) Program provides funds for managed wetland infrastructure improvements in Suisun Marsh necessary to meet flood and drain cycle objectives to better manage wetlands and maintain wildlife habitat conditions.²⁶ Administered by the Suisun Resource Conservation District funding for the PAI program is provided by DWR and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Reclamation districts in Suisun Marsh may also be eligible for PAI grant funding²⁷ to “improve managed wetland facilities, operational efficiency, and water management capabilities”. Exterior levee maintenance, however, is not an ineligible activity under this grant program.

²⁵ Delta Stewardship Council, “*State Investment in Delta Levees: Key Issues for Updating Priorities*”, January 2015

²⁶ U.S Bureau of Reclamation, et al, “*Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan*” (SMP), May 2013

²⁷ Suisun Resource Conservation District website: <https://suisunrcd.org/programs/>

SECTION 3: RECLAMATION/LEVEE DISTRICTS REVIEWED

3.1: SOLANO COUNTY RECLAMATION/LEVEE DISTRICTS

Solano County has a total of 25 reclamation and levee maintenance districts. References to a 26th district, RD 2032, were identified, but its existence is suspect since no information or formation documents for the district were found. This MSR covers 23 reclamation districts and one levee maintenance district (see Table 3.1). A separate MSR for RD 2034 was recently completed in 2018 and an update is not required at this time. The North Rio Vista Levee Maintenance District, initially considered to be inactive, has been determined after a review of its formation documents not to be a special district as defined by California Government Code Section 56036, but rather an assessment district.²⁸ Three districts (RD 999, RD 2068, and RD 2093) located in the Sacramento Delta are multi-county districts with a portion of each district lying within both Solano and Yolo counties. Since the majority of the assessed property value for RD 2068 and RD 2093 is located within Solano County, Solano LAFCO is considered the principal LAFCO for these two districts, while Yolo LAFCO is the principal agency for RD 999 since the majority of the assessed valuation for that district is located in Yolo County. Yolo LAFCO completed an MSR for its reclamation districts in 2018, including RD 999, which is also reviewed in this MSR.²⁹ According to California Government Code §56388 a proposal that involves a district which is located in more than one county, jurisdiction for that proposal rests with the principal county unless all of the following occur:

- (a) The commission of the principal county agrees to having the exclusive jurisdiction vested in the commission of another county;
- (b) The commission of the principal county designates the commission of another county which shall assume exclusive jurisdiction;
- (c) The commission of the county so designated agrees to assume exclusive jurisdiction.

Table 3.1: Solano County Reclamation/Levee Districts

Districts Reviewed in this MSR			
Suisun Marsh		Secondary Zone	
1	Reclamation District 1607	14	Collinsville Levee Maintenance District
2	Reclamation District 2043		
3	Reclamation District 2112	Primary Zone	
4	Reclamation District 2127	15	Reclamation District 501
5	Reclamation District 2129	16	Reclamation District 536
6	Reclamation District 2130	17	Reclamation District 999
7	Reclamation District 2134	18	Reclamation District 1667
8	Reclamation District 2135	19	Reclamation District 2060
9	Reclamation District 2136	20	Reclamation District 2068
10	Reclamation District 2138	21	Reclamation District 2084
11	Reclamation District 2139	22	Reclamation District 2093
12	Reclamation District 2141	23	Reclamation District 2098
13	Reclamation District 2142	24	Reclamation District 2104
Districts NOT Included in this MSR			
25	Reclamation District 2034 was not reviewed as part of this MSR given that it was recently evaluated under a separate MSR in 2018		
26	North Rio Vista Levee Maintenance District was determined by LAFCO staff to be an assessment district.		

²⁸ Solano County LAFCO staff report dated December 10, 2018, Inactive Special District List

²⁹ Yolo County LAFCO, "MSR/SOI for Yolo County Reclamation Districts/Local Maintaining Agencies", February 2018

3.2: LOCATION OF DISTRICTS BY GEOGRAPHIC SUBAREA

All of the reclamation districts in Solano County are located within the broadly defined “Delta” along the Sacramento River and Deep Water Ship Channel, or the tidal channels of Suisun and Grizzly Bays (see Figure 3.1). This area of eastern and southern Solano County is an important part of the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta estuarine eco-system. The Delta, as defined by the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (AB X7-12), includes the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as defined in Water Code Section 12220 and Suisun Marsh as defined in Public Resources Code Section 29101. Geographically, the Delta is composed of three zones recognized in California law (see Figure 3.2).^{30, 31} The Primary Zone (core area) of the Delta is defined in the Public Resources Code (PRC §29728) as comprising “delta land and water area of primary state concern and statewide significance”. The primary zone includes 490,050 acres and makes up the largest area of the Delta covering five counties. Approximately 42 percent of the reclamation districts in Solano County are located in the primary zone north of Rio Vista in the Yolo Bypass/Cache Slough Complex. The Secondary Zone (around the periphery of the Delta), defined in PRC §29731 as that part of the Delta where development can occur, includes 247,320 acres surrounding the Primary Zone. The Collinsville Levee Maintenance District, situated just east of Suisun Marsh is the only Solano County reclamation/levee district located in the secondary zone of the Delta. Development projects in the secondary zone are subject to local land use decisions. The third zone includes Suisun Marsh, which is contiguous to and overlaps the Primary/Secondary Zones around Collinsville, and encompasses 106,570 acres consisting primarily of managed wetlands and upland areas. Approximately 4,300 acres of Suisun Marsh lies within the primary zone of the Delta. Suisun Marsh is an integral part of the Delta eco-system.

³⁰ California Department of Water Resources website: http://atlas-dwr.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/57b02f8a5e77465f902376dbd9522585_0?geometry=-121.945%2C38.045%2C-121.815%2C38.068

³¹ Delta Stewardship Council, “Delta Plan as amended January 2019”, <https://deltacouncil.ca.gov/delta-plan/>

Figure 3.1: Overview Map of Solano County Reclamation/Levee Districts





Figure 3.2: Delta Primary & Secondary Zones & Suisun Marsh



3.3: POPULATION GROWTH AND LAND USE

As of 2017, there were approximately 14,252 people living in census tracts covering Solano County RDs located in the Suisun Marsh and Sacramento Delta. Most of the RDs have little or no existing resident population. Future development and growth over the next five years is not anticipated due to land use regulations. According to the Solano County Planning Department there are no development proposals or zoning changes for any of the parcels within the Suisun Marsh or Delta Districts.³²

Most of the districts in the Sacramento Delta and Suisun Marsh are predominantly agriculture and marshland with no inhabitants. The Collinsville area has a small number of approximately 25 residences. District lands that are marsh land or in agriculture use are expected to remain as such with little to no population growth. The population for census tracts in which the reclamation districts are located is shown in Appendix C, Table C2.

County Land Use & Development Policies: The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for the Suisun Marsh as mostly marsh and a small amount of agriculture with a resource conservation overlay (see Appendix). Delta RDs have an agriculture land use designation with a resource conservation overlay. The resource conservation overlay identifies and protects areas of the county with special resource management needs, while maintaining the validity of underlying land use designations. The Collinsville Levee District has a mix of land use designations including agriculture, marsh, industrial, and traditional residential community. Land use designations, zoning, and Williamson Act contracts are identified for all parcels in each District.

³² Email correspondence with Solano County Planning Department staff, Matthew Walsh, Principal Planner, October 16, 2019

Williamson Act: The California Land Conservation Act (commonly known as the Williamson Act) aims to preserve agricultural land and related open space uses by discouraging premature and unnecessary conversion to urban uses. In exchange for agreeing to maintain Williamson Act compatible land uses, landowners receive the benefit of reduced property tax rates from the County. Williamson Act contracts are voluntary agreements between a landowner and the County and are automatically renewed annually for 10 years, unless a notice of non-renewal is filed by the landowner. A Williamson Act contract restricts a landowner's ability to use or subdivide a parcel of land. Compatible uses under the Williamson Act generally consist of agricultural (i.e. farming, ranching, grazing, timber) and compatible land uses such as open space and agriculturally- related processing facilities.

Solano County rules governing Williamson Act Contracts³³ permits compatible land uses devoted to open space and recreational uses such as wildlife habitat areas, managed wetland areas, and submerged areas that meet the eligibility standards including being designated on the County General Plan as agriculture, watershed, or marsh and located in one of the following zoning districts: Exclusive Agriculture, Limited Agriculture, Watershed and Conservation, Marsh Preservation, or Suisun Valley Agriculture.

3.4: DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES

Senate Bill 244, which became effective in January 2012, requires LAFCOs to consider the location and characteristics of disadvantaged unincorporated communities (DUC) within or contiguous to a local agency's sphere of influence and to ensure that the needs of these unincorporated communities are met when considering district expansions and service extensions, in particular, water, wastewater, and structural fire protection services.

A DUC is defined by Government Code §56033.5 as an inhabited community (consisting of at least 10 dwelling units with 12 or more registered voters) in a fringe, island, or legacy community (see Appendix) within an unincorporated area of a county in which the annual median household income (MHI) is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual MHI. According to the most recent figures (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, the MHI for the State was \$67,739. Eighty percent of the state MHI yields a threshold of \$54,191 for defining a DUC.

Examination of census tract data shows that five census tracts encompass the reclamation districts located in Suisun Marsh and the Sacramento Delta (see Appendix C, Table C2). The only census tract meeting the definition of a disadvantaged unincorporated community is census tract 2535, block group 4, which has a MHI of \$39,327. This census tract has several unincorporated communities including Bird's Landing, Montezuma, and the historic legacy town of Collinsville. Except for Collinsville there are no DUCs within or contiguous to any of the reclamation districts. Most of the districts are uninhabited or the area's MHI exceeds the threshold. In addition, none of the reclamation/levee districts provide water, wastewater, or structural fire protection services. Therefore, SB 244 does not apply to any of the reclamation/levee districts in Solano County. Several districts do provide irrigation water for agricultural purposes.

To confirm our analysis, we checked the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) website³⁴, which includes a mapping tool to assist in identifying disadvantaged communities. No disadvantaged communities were identified by DWR's mapping tool.

³³ Solano County Uniform Rules and Procedures Governing Agricultural Preserves and Land Conservation Contracts revised May 22, 2012.

³⁴ California Department of Water Resources website: <https://gis.water.ca.gov/app/dacs/>


SECTION 4: SUISUN MARSH RECLAMATION DISTRICTS

4.0: Regional Context ³⁵

Suisun Marsh is one of the largest contiguous estuarine marshes in the United States, encompassing more than 10 percent of California’s remaining natural wetlands and serving as a resting and feeding ground for thousands of birds migrating on the Pacific Flyway along with resident waterfowl. Suisun Marsh covers over 115,000 acres and contains approximately 52,000 acres of managed seasonal wetlands, 6,300 acres of tidal wetlands, 30,000 acres of bays and sloughs, and 27,000 acres of upland grasslands (see Figure 4.1). Because of its size and estuarine location, Suisun Marsh supports a diversity of plant communities, which provide important habitats for a variety of fish and wildlife, including more than 221 bird species, 45 mammalian species, 16 different reptile and amphibian species, and more than 40 fish species. Suisun Marsh also supports the state’s commercial salmon fishery by providing important tidal rearing areas for juvenile fish, and several rare and endangered species. The Marsh’s large open space and proximity to urban areas make it ideally suited for wildlife viewing, hiking, canoeing, and other recreational opportunities.

The majority of Suisun Marsh is situated at or below the mean tide elevation. Located along the Sacramento River, Suisun Bay, Grizzly Bay, and Honker Bay, lands within Suisun Marsh are protected from tidal action and high-water events by approximately 230 miles of exterior levees. A number of sloughs traverse the marsh including Suisun, Nurse, Volanti, Boynton, and Montezuma Sloughs.

Figure 4.1: Boundary of Suisun Marsh



³⁵ California Department of Water Resources, “Suisun Marsh Monitoring Program Reference Guide”, June 2000, Version 2
Delta Stewardship Council, “Delta Levees Investment Strategy Final Report”, July 2017
USACE, “Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Study”, April 2014
USACE, “Reissuance of Regional General Permit 3 for Suisun Marsh Managed Wetlands Operations and Maintenance”, September 18, 2017
U.S. Department of the Interior, “Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan, Draft EIS/EIR” October 2010

Land reclamation began in the 1850s with levee construction to convert tidal marsh to farmland. Wetland areas within Suisun Marsh were gradually converted to agriculture use, made possible by the construction of levees and dikes to hold back the water. By isolating the soils from daily tidal inundation, the land eventually became more saline. Increasing salinities from the development of the State and Federal Water Project and other upstream diversions caused soil salinity to increase and made cultivation and even cattle grazing less profitable. As agricultural and cattle grazing activities became unprofitable, portions of the land were subsequently converted to permanent and seasonally flooded managed wetlands as habitat for resident and migratory wildlife species, mainly to support waterfowl hunting activities. Today, most of the diked wetlands are managed specifically for habitat restoration and maintenance, while acreage devoted to grazing and agriculture is very small. Between mid-October and mid-January, managed seasonal wetlands are flooded to a depth of 8 to 12 inches to attract waterfowl.

Flood Protection and Drainage

Exterior levees serve as the primary flood protection for Suisun Marsh lands, infrastructure, and natural resources. Exterior levees provide flood protection and vehicle access. They also play a role in maintaining channels and have the potential to influence salinity levels in the Marsh. A majority of the RDs in Suisun Marsh are ringed with large exterior levees that are typically 12 feet wide at the crown with a 2:1 side slope. The exterior levees are used in conjunction with interior levees, ditches, and water control structures to retain, exclude, and direct water.

In the managed wetlands, landward of the exterior levees, are usually a series of interior levees, 2 to 4 feet in height, often topped with an unpaved gravel or dirt road. Interior levees are maintained to separate land with differing uses and management practices. The interior of most of the islands also contain a series of primary and secondary ditches, which are connected to the tidal sloughs by exterior water control structures. The primary ditches are typically 3 to 3.5 feet deep and 12 to 20 feet wide with a 2:1 side slope. Secondary ditches are typically 2 to 2.5 feet deep, 6 to 10 feet wide, also with a side slope of 2:1. Often there are smaller spreader ditches up to 18 inches deep. Water is diverted from sloughs or bays through exterior water control structures into the ditches and used to seasonally flood the managed wetlands. At other times, water is passively drained by gravity through water control structures or actively pumped off the island into the adjacent sloughs or bays. Water control structures consist of culverts, which run through levees and a mechanism (such as a screw or flap gate) to control the direction and amount of flow through the pipe. The water control structures and channels allow the landowners to control the amount and duration of water on their property.³⁶

Levee configurations throughout the Marsh vary considerably in material composition, cross-sectional geometry, strength, and stability (DWR 2005).³⁷ Levees were constructed primarily with dredged material removed from the adjacent channels on existing channel berms to take advantage of the existing natural topography. Subsidence requires additional placement of material to raise and reinforce the levees. As levees have been maintained, some of the longstanding levees have increased in size as additional dredged material has been placed on the crown, seaward side, and landside. Due to regulatory constraints, options for maintaining levees are limited to the use of materials from within the managed wetlands or by limited dredging and importation. Levee failures can result in flooding that can affect the regional salinity of the adjacent waterways, tidally restored sites, and managed wetlands. Therefore, it is important to inspect levees and adequately maintain them to prevent failure.

³⁶ Reissuance of Regional General Permit 3 for Suisun Marsh Managed Wetlands Operations and Maintenance, <https://www.spn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/Public-Notices/Article/1315367/spn-2012-00258-reissuance-of-regional-general-permit-3-for-suisun-marsh-managed/>

³⁷ Suisun Marsh Levee Conceptual Model, 2005

Levee System Integrity

Suisun Marsh levees are generally smaller than Delta levees in part because the magnitude of regional subsidence in the Suisun Marsh has not been as great as that of the Delta. In general, exterior levees in Suisun Marsh have been built up progressively over the years, with little or no effort to design them to meet specific engineering standards.³⁸ The standard Suisun Marsh levee configuration was designed over 20 years ago and is approximately four feet narrower at the levee crown than the standards used by the US Army Corps of Engineers for levees on federal flood control project levees and standards recommended by the Department of Water Resources for agricultural lands in the Delta. Although most of Suisun Marsh land surface elevations are below sea level, levees in the Marsh range in height from 4 to 8 feet above ground level.

Levee Maintenance

Maintenance and improvement of levee systems in the Suisun Marsh, including interior levees, is the responsibility of local RDs and private landowners. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Water Resources have responsibility for maintenance of several project facilities on public lands in the marsh. Of the more than 230 miles of exterior levees in Suisun Marsh, only about 20 miles (10%) along Suisun, Grizzly, and Honker Bays are included in some type of state funded levee maintenance program. Four miles of levee are within the legal boundary of the Delta and thus eligible to participate in the Delta Levee Maintenance Subventions Program. An additional 12 miles of levee from Van Sickle Island to Montezuma Slough are eligible to participate in the Special Projects portion of the Delta Levee Program. The remaining 210 miles of exterior levees in the Suisun Marsh are not eligible to receive assistance under the State Subventions Program for levee maintenance or flood fighting activities. Private landowners are solely responsible for levee maintenance and emergency repairs unless the state and federal governments intervene as they did following the flooding in 1998, and to a lesser extent in 2006. Maintenance of levees by private landowners is further constrained by the difficulty in obtaining permits for dredging and importation of materials. As restoration actions are implemented, some interior levees will be converted to exterior levees and will require reinforcement and more maintenance, and in some instances significant upgrades. Because of restrictions preventing dredging from sloughs and constraints on importing materials, landowners in the Marsh have maintained their exterior levees using material primarily from ditch cleaning or pond bottom grading, a practice that increases subsidence and potentially weakens the existing levee foundations. Combined, these factors have exhausted the supply of levee maintenance material in the managed wetlands and have forced maintenance to be deferred on some exterior levees, increasing the risk of catastrophic flooding.³⁹ From 1994 to 2014 this was the only cost-effective method of obtaining material for levee repairs. With the Completion of the Suisun Marsh Plan EIR/EIS in July 2014, a 10-year dredging permit for exterior levee maintenance was issued to SRCD for the Suisun Marsh.

Land Ownership

Landownership in Suisun Marsh include the State of California, non-profit organizations, private hunting clubs, and private landowners. Suisun Marsh is home to public waterfowl hunting areas and 158 private duck clubs. There are over 150 privately owned managed wetlands and state-owned DFW properties in the Suisun Marsh. RDs typically comprise a group of private landowners with the primary responsibility for maintenance and repair of exterior levees, water control structures (pipes, fish screens, and pumps), water conveyance facilities, and access roads. These maintenance and repair activities are usually funded

³⁸ BDOC 1993

³⁹ Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan Final EIR/EIS Report 2011

by the RD through fees or assessments on participating landowners. Landowners in the Suisun Marsh who are not members of an RD maintain their levees independently.

Suisun Marsh Preservation Act

The Nejedly-Bagley-Z'berg Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1974 directed the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) and the Department of Fish and Game (DF&G) to prepare a *Suisun Marsh Protection Plan* "to preserve the integrity and assure continued wildlife use" of the Suisun Marsh. The objectives of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan (SMP) are to preserve and enhance the quality and diversity of the Suisun Marsh aquatic and wildlife habitats and to assure retention of upland areas adjacent to the Marsh in uses compatible with its protection. In 1977, the California State legislature incorporated the findings and policies contained in the Plan into state law and enacted the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act (*California Public Resources Code 29000-29612*). The State Lands Commission has the primary responsibility for carrying out the management recommendations in the protection plan on lands owned by the state and under the jurisdiction, control, or supervision of the State Lands Commission, including tidelands, submerged lands, swamp and overflowed lands, and beds of navigable rivers and streams.

The Suisun Marsh Protection Plan includes a primary management area encompassing 89,000 acres of tidal marsh, managed wetlands, adjacent grasslands, and waterways. A secondary management area includes approximately 22,500 acres of significant buffer lands. The San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission represents the State's interest, serving as the land use permitting agency for projects in the primary management area and as an appellate body in the secondary management area.

Solano LAFCO Policy

The primary responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act was assigned to local government. Solano LAFCO has adopted policies as their component to the Local Plan to "*encourage continued long-term agriculture and wildlife use of lands within the Marsh and to limit urban assessments against lands within the Marsh*", which is consistent with the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act. RDs located in the Suisun Marsh are subject to the policies of the Suisun Marsh Local Protection Program adopted by Solano LAFCO on February 4, 1980.

Suisun Resource Conservation District


The Suisun Resource Conservation District (SRCD) covers over 115,000 acres, which includes 52,000 acres of managed wetlands, 6,300 acres of unmanaged tidal wetlands, 30,000 acres of bays and sloughs, and 27,000 acres of upland grasslands within Suisun Marsh. In 1977, the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act defined SRCD responsibilities over water management practices on privately owned lands within Suisun Marsh. Today, SRCD provides landowners with technical assistance in permitting, water control, and habitat management to ensure the wetland and wildlife values of the Suisun Marsh are sustained and enhanced. In 1980, SRCD adopted the Suisun Marsh Local Protection Plan, a management program designed to preserve, protect, and enhance the plant and wildlife communities within the primary management area of the marsh. The management program includes, among other things, standards for diking, flooding, draining, filling, and dredging of sloughs, managed wetlands, and marshes (see Suisun Marsh levee standards in the Appendix). Goal 3 Levee System Integrity is to "provide long-term protection for multiple Suisun Marsh resources by maintaining and improving the integrity of the Suisun Marsh levee system."⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Goals of the Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan for the Suisun Marsh

Reclamation Districts Located in Suisun Marsh

There are 14 reclamation districts located in Suisun Marsh (see Figure 4.2). Thirteen of these districts are analyzed as part of this MSR as to their governance, services delivery, financial capacity, and other factors necessary for Solano LAFCO to make its statutorily required findings and determinations. One district, RD 2034 was evaluated in a separate MSR in 2018.

Figure 4.2: Suisun Marsh Reclamation Districts



4.1: Reclamation District No. 1607 (Van Sickle Island)

4.1.1 District Profile

Reclamation District 1607 is located in the southeast corner of Suisun Marsh approximately 12-miles south of the City of Fairfield at the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and the terminus of Montezuma Slough. The District consists of forty-one parcels (see Figure 4.3) totaling approximately 2,512.41 acres (see Table 4.1). The District was formed as of November 25, 1914 under Section 50000 et seq. of the California Water Code to provide drainage, irrigation, and land reclamation on Van Sickle Island (see Table 4.2). The District maintains nine miles of levees surrounding the island; the most critical sections of the exterior levees are those that lie along the southern boundary of the island adjacent to the Sacramento River. This section of levees is subject to extreme wind and waves during high tide periods. In the past, heavy storm events have been able to breach the levees on Van Sickle Island causing heavy damage.⁴¹

Historically, beginning in the mid-1800's, farmers dredged the surrounding sloughs and built earthen levees to reclaim land for raising cattle and growing beans. Today, land within the District is part of a highly managed marsh adjacent to the Grizzly Island Wildlife Area that is primarily used for duck hunting. The predominant land use includes marsh land, five private duck clubs, and several small residences. In 1977, when the California legislature passed the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act, Van Sickle Island was dedicated as one of many islands committed to preserving critical wetlands. The site's location, topography, and easily breached levee system make it ideal for restoration of tidal marsh habitat to benefit listed fish species, such as Delta smelt and Central Valley steelhead. Van Sickle Island is also considered an environmentally significant location in the Suisun Marsh due to its importance to water quality, acting as a barrier to salinity intrusion in the Delta. In 1996, Van Sickle Island was included in the State funded Delta Levee Special Flood Control maintenance program.

⁴¹ East Bay Times, found at: <https://www.eastbaytimes.com/2017/01/13/delta-islanders-repair-after-floods-look-towards-next-forecast/>
Damage assessment report from February 2019 on District's website.

Figure 4.3: Boundary Map of RD 1607




Table 4.1: RD 1607 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0090050070	242.60	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
2	0090050080	194.75	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
3	0090050090	1.03	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
4	0090050120	22.38	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
5	0090050170	3.18	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
6	0090050200	332.53	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1269
7	0090050210	34.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1269
8	0090050240	3.18	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
9	0090060110	26.41	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
10	0090060150	306.75	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1239
11	0090060160	47.87	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
12	0090060170	68.55	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	989
13	0090060180	42.65	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
14	0090060190	65.19	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
15	0090060200	94.26	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
16	0090060210	0.11	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
17	0090060220	0.06	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
18	0090060230	0.23	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
19	0090060240	0.21	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
20	0090060250	0.17	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
21	0090060260	0.04	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
22	0090060270	11.72	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
23	0090060320	299.15	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
24	0090060330	22.20	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1269
25	0090060390	7.12	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
26	0090060400	7.12	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
27	0090060420	40.22	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
28	0090060430	0.46	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
29	0090060440	27.28	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
30	0090060450	79.34	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1208
31	0090120030	1.03	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
32	0090120100	399.95	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
33	0090120110	0.23	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
34	0090120130	0.19	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
35	0090120160	1.15	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
36	0090120170	1.14	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
37	0090120180	1.20	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
38	0090120190	1.20	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
39	0090120200	0.92	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
40	0090120210	3.52	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
41	0090050190	121.12	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	566
Total Acres		2,512.41				

Source: Solano County GIS

Table 4.2: RD 1607 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	P.O. Box 350 711 Railroad Avenue Pittsburg, CA 94565 Phone: (925) 698-9252
Website	https://rd1607.specialdistrict.org/
Formation Date	November 25, 1914)
Principal Act	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of five members elected by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers are elected by landowners President: Gerald Dinelli Secretary/Treasurer: Chris Lanzafame Vice President: Edmund Linschied
Compensation	None
Meetings	The Board of Trustees meets periodically. Last meeting held 11/22/19. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	Chris Lanzafame, District Secretary and Manager
Facilities/Assets	Road easement; drainage ditches; misc. supplies for flood protection; financial assets
Services Provided	Services provided by in-house personnel, outside contractors/engineers, landowners
Shared Facilities/Services	Section of western levee shared with RD 2130
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$208,385 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (FY 2019)	Revenue: \$379,570; Expenses: \$477,750
Primary Revenue Sources	State subvention funding, federal assistance, assessments
Assets	\$295,337 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	\$184,527 (June 30, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$110,810 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	A Joint Powers Agreement with the Special Districts Risk Management Authority to insure against loss.
Most Recent Financial Audit	Audited Financial Statement for FY 2016 dated June 30, 2016
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report filed with State Controller's Office

Source: Solano LAFCO's RD 1607 formation documents, 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 1607, RD 1607's audited financial statements for 2016; FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report; District website

4.1.2 MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for property within the District as marshland with a Resource Conservation Overlay, which is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. Property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. Any plan for development would require development approval from the County.

The most recent American Community Survey (2017) from the U.S. Census Bureau shows no population residing in the District. Review of aerial photos found the District to be largely uninhabited except for several buildings for duck/pheasant clubs and caretaker's residences. The District is not looking to expand its boundaries.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District is uninhabited except for several buildings for duck/pheasant clubs and caretakers on the property.
- 1.2: There are no expectations for growth or expansion of Reclamation District 1607.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available data from the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 1607. The District is uninhabited and the surrounding area has a median household income (MHI) of \$84,141, which is well above the MHI threshold \$53,735 (80% of State MHI) for defining a DUC. RD 1607 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. The District only provides drainage and levee maintenance services. Therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to RD 1607.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. Therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 1607.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 1607 is responsible for maintaining nine miles of exterior levees surrounding Van Sickle Island, which are in a constant state of repair. The District performs a variety of services utilizing outside contractors, district personnel, and volunteer labor by landowners (see Table 4.3). The District maintains a drainage system with water gates, pipes and three 30- to 50-horsepower pumps to control flooding and regulate water levels on the island. The district manager makes weekly inspections of the levees. During periods of threatening tides, inspections may be done daily. The District has prepared a 5-year levee plan and has received funding from DWR to conduct an assessment of the District's existing levee system and develop a strategic plan for flood protection.⁴² The project is to be completed by December 31, 2020.

⁴² California Natural Resources Agency, Delta Levees System Integrity Program, <http://bondaccountability.resources.ca.gov/Program.aspx?ProgramPK=96&Program=Delta%20Levees%20System%20Integrity%20Program&PropositionPK=5>

DWR maintains Roaring River Road with gravel work done by California Resources Corporation (CRC), an independent oil and natural gas producer, which provides access to their wells.

District Assets: Physical assets include facilities and equipment such as drainage ditches on the north and south sides of the District, road easements, three water pumps, and a storage container with flood fighting supplies including sandbags, plastic sheeting, pipe plugs, and 25-foot lengths of sheet piles. The District also owns an 80-foot strip of land which includes the exterior levees of the district.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District performs a variety of services utilizing outside contractors, District personnel, and volunteer labor by landowners.
- 3.2: The District has the capacity and the resources to maintain the levees for flood control.

Table 4.3: RD 1607 Services, Facilities, & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Outside Contractor
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Outside Contractor
Vector/Rodent Control	Solano County Mosquito Abatement as needed
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	DWR maintains Roaring River Road
Flood Control	In-house Levee Manager with volunteer labor by landowners
Levee Patrol	In-house Levee Manager
Pump Maintenance & Repair	Outside Contractor as needed
Drainage	As needed by landowners
Engineering	Outside Engineering Firm
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	Road easement
Drainage System/Ditches	Drainage ditches
Levee Maintenance	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	9.0 miles
Levee Maintenance Standards	
No Standard:	9.0 miles
Suisun Marsh Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	District Manager does a weekly inspection. During periods of threatening tides inspections may be done daily. Five year plan currently under review by DWR.
Most Recent Inspection Report	February 2019
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	A section of western levee shared with RD 2130
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Notes: NP = Not Provided
 Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 1607

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: An annual budget is adopted each year by the District, which sets forth anticipated revenues and expenditures for the coming fiscal year. A 5-year trend analysis indicates that the District is generally operating within its available resources (see Table 4.4). Damage from major storm events place a strain on District resources.⁴³

Revenue Sources: Landowner assessments are the primary source of revenue, which accounts for approximately 47 percent of the District's total annual revenue. The District has had difficulty raising assessments, since most landowners are restricted in their ability to generate increased revenue from their property. In the past the District has issued time warrants, which are interest bearing loans that generate funds to make up for budget shortfalls. State assistance and subvention funds account for the second largest source of revenue, followed by entry permits, and interest on investments.

The District is participating in the California Delta Levee Subventions Program, which provides state financial assistance to local agencies responsible for rehabilitation and maintenance of non-project levees in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. The District also receives a 75 percent matching grant from the DWR for repair costs under a work assistance agreement. As a result of a high water and flood event in 2017 the District received funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the California Office of Emergency Services (CalOES) for emergency protective measures, levee repairs, and flood fighting. In 2008, the District negotiated access to the island with Venoco, Inc., which operates several gas wells on Van Sickle Island. The agreement generates approximately \$50,000 per year for the right to drive on the levees with large equipment to service its wells.

Expenditures: Levee repairs and habitat mitigation account for 85 percent of the District's expenditures. The split between habitat mitigation and levee repairs varies from year to year. Utility fees and equipment maintenance costs to operate the pumps and other equipment account for the second highest level of expenditures, followed by payroll expenses and engineering. Between 2017 and 2018, the District's annual operating expenses increased significantly due to repair work.

Fund Balance: The District has maintained a positive fund balance over the past five years, which includes cash assets in an account with Solano County (Fund 205) and a bank checking account. Liabilities include outstanding time warrants from the 2017 flood with payments on the debt in 2018 of \$27,464.

Fiscal Policies: The District conducts an annual audit of its financial statements using an outside independent auditor. The District does not maintain a reserve account, but has had a net surplus of revenue for the past five years.

Determinations:

4.1: The District operates within its financial means with assistance from the State and federal governments. In the past, when there were shortfalls, the District addressed them by issuing time warrants.

⁴³ RD 1607 Landowner Letter dated December 12, 2017

Table 4.4: RD 1607 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 90,941	\$ 96,431	\$108,941	\$ 98,779	\$ 98,698
Service Charges	50,480	50,480	50,480	50,480	51,161
State/Federal Assistance	12,743	76,756	73,699	23,184	603,124
Other	\$ 1,653	\$ 1,128	\$ 904	\$ 80,740	\$ 125
Total	\$155,817	\$224,795	\$234,024	\$253,183	\$753,108
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 15,234	\$ 18,421	\$ 20,625	\$ 21,110	\$ 16,782
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	146,673	105,372	128,015	360,706	596,855
Engineering	21,848	7,658	9,158	52,595	0
Utilities	18,076	14,206	21,909	5,896	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	8,953	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	27,464
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 19,919	\$ 9,928	\$ 9,928	\$ 7,907	\$ 0
Total	\$221,750	\$155,585	\$198,588	\$448,214	\$641,101
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(65,933)	69,210	35,436	(195,031)	112,007
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	120,000	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(65,933)	69,210	35,436	(75,031)	112,007
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	89,228	23,295	92,505	127,941	52,910
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 23,295	\$ 92,505	\$127,941	\$ 52,910	\$164,917

Source: RD 1607 Audited Financial Statements for FY 2011-2015 and FY 2018, 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 1607

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 1607 does not share facilities with or provide services to other districts, except for a section of the District’s western levee south of Roaring River, which is shared by RD 2130. Otherwise, the district boundaries are the boundary of the island with few opportunities to share facilities. The District’s sphere of influence is coterminous with its existing boundary.

Determinations:

- 5.1: The District boundaries are circumscribed by Van Sickle Island with few opportunities to share facilities with another District.
- 5.2: A section of RD 1607’s western levee south of Roaring River is shared by RD 2130.

6. Accountability and Government Structure

The District is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees elected by the landowners to 4-year terms. The Board meets periodically on an as-needed basis, generally three to four times per year. The last meeting was held in November 22, 2019. The District has an adopted set of Bylaws and distributes written agendas and meeting minutes prior to Board meetings. The District maintains a website as required by SB 929 and posts agendas, minutes, Board policies, and other relevant information. The District has adopted a conflict of interest policy. Board members are not compensated for their time and information about reimbursement of expenses is filed with the State Controller’s Office and posted on the District’s website.

The District employs a secretary/manager with volunteer labor provided by landowners. The secretary/manager serves makes levee inspections and opens gates for contractors. Levee maintenance

and repairs are performed by outside independent contractors. The District also retains the services of an outside engineering firm.

Determinations:

- 6.1: The District Board meets 3-4 times annually and distributes written agendas and meeting meetings prior to board meetings. Board members are not compensated for their time.
- 6.2: The District has a website as required by SB 929 and posts agendas, minutes, Board policies, and other relevant information.
- 6.3: Current business practices and staffing are adequate to manage the affairs of the District and there are no plans to expand the level of services provided.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.2: Reclamation District No. 2043

4.2.1: District Profile

RD 2043 is located in Suisun Marsh between the Southern Pacific Railroad lines and Suisun Slough (see Figure 4.4) and contains 472.65 acres (see Table 4.5). RD 2043 was formed August 4, 1919, under the California reclamation district laws (see Table 4.6). The property is in a single ownership and privately reclaimed. Formation documents were found in the County offices, but the District appears to be inactive and has not filed a financial transaction report with the State Controller's Office for the past five years. It is anticipated that the SCO will declare RD 2043 inactive. Property within RD 2043 is currently included in and being served by Reclamation District 2142.

The property located in RD 2043 consists of reclaimed marsh land that is diked to a sufficient height to prevent overflow of the lands. A single levee surrounds the District. Tidal action does permit the entry of fresh water to the lands during the spring and early summer. Interior drainage canals lead to two floodgates connected to each other through the drainage system.

Figure 4.4: Boundary Map of RD 2043




Table 4.5: RD 2043 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046080030	472.65	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	457
Total Acres		472.65				

Source: Solano County GIS

Table 4.6: RD 2043 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	N/A
Website	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date	August 4, 1919
Principal Act	N/A
Purpose	N/A
Sphere of Influence	N/A
District Status	Considered to be inactive due to not having filed financial transaction reports with the State Controller's Office for the past several years.
Governance	
Governing Body	N/A
Officers	N/A
Compensation	N/A
Meetings	N/A
Adopted Bylaws	N/A
Operations	
Employees	N/A
Facilities/Assets	N/A
Services Provided	N/A
Shared Facilities/Services	N/A
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	N/A
Cash on Hand	N/A
Current Budget (FY 2019)	N/A
Primary Revenue Sources	N/A
Assets	N/A
Liabilities	N/A
Fund Balance	N/A
Risk Management	N/A
Most Recent Financial Audit	N/A
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	N/A

N/A – Not Available

Note: There is little to no existing information available for RD 2043

Source: Solano LAFCO's RD 2043 District formation documents

4.2.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for property within the District as marshland with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. Any plan for development would require development approval from the County. The District is uninhabited.

Determinations:

1.1: The District is uninhabited and there are no expectations for growth or expansion.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2043. The District is uninhabited and the surrounding area has a median household income (MHI) of \$84,141, which is well above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC. RD 2043 appears to be inactive and does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. Therefore, Senate Bill 244 does not apply to this District.

Determinations:

2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to RD 2043.

2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. Therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2043.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

Information about the district is severely limited. Attempts to contact the District have been unsuccessful. Services to property within the district are being provided by RD 2142.

Determinations:

3.1: RD 2043 appears to be inactive.

3.2: Property within the District is also located in and being served by RD 2142.

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

The District has not filed the required annual Financial Transaction Reports with the State Controller's Office for the past several years. The SCO's website shows no record of RD 2043 having filed any financial report within the past 15 years. Since RD 2043 appears to be inactive, consideration should be given to dissolving the District when the SCO declares RD 2043 inactive.

Determinations:

4.1: The financial ability of RD 2043 to provide services is unknown since the District has not filed financial transaction reports with the SCO for the past several years.

4.2: The District appears to be inactive and consideration should be given to dissolving the District when it is declared inactive by the SCO.

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

Property located in RD 2043 is also located in and receives services from RD 2142.

Determinations:

5.1: Property within RD 2043 lies within and receives services from RD 2142, creating the potential for redundant services.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

Formation documents for RD 2043 shows the District having been formed, but there are no incorporation documents or bylaws showing the government structure, including governing board, District offices, or annual meetings. The District does not maintain a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

6.1: There are no records showing that the District was ever active. In fact, it appears that the District is inactive and should be dissolved. Landowners within the District would not be impacted since they are currently part of RD 2142 and receiving services from that district.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.3: Reclamation District No. 2112 (Schafer-Pintail)

4.3.1: District Profile

RD 2112 (aka Shafer Pintail Reclamation District) is located on Grizzly Island within the Suisun Marsh approximately 15-miles south of the City of Fairfield (see Figure 4.5). The District is accessed via County Road 456 from Grizzly Island Road. The District is comprised of six small duck clubs with no employees. The service area of the District includes twelve parcels totaling 1,163.33 acres (see Table 4.7).

Formed out of landowner concerns, the District was organized in 1979 under California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq. for multiple purposes including 1) operating and maintaining the water delivery and drainage systems common to properties within the District, 2) maintaining exterior levees behind bulkheads, which contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems, and 3) maintaining and enhancing the water fowl habit of properties within the District (see Table 4.8). Drainage and water levels of land within the District are maintained as required for habitat maintenance per Suisun Resource Conservation District Guidelines.

Figure 4.5: Boundary Map of RD 2112




Table 4.7: RD 2112 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046220070	41.30	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	150
2	0046220180	10.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	150
3	0046220280	117.33	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	189
4	0046220290	63.77	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	189
5	0046220320	4.01	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	150
6	0046220330	75.98	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	150
7	0046220340	4.02	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	150
8	0046220350	86.06	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	150
9	0046220360	366.13	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	189
10	0046220370	255.10	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	189
11	0046220380	137.91	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	189
12	0046220390	1.72	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	189
Total Acres		1,163.33				

Source: Solano County GIS

Table 4.8: RD 2112 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	2109 Quebec Court Modesto, CA 95350 Phone: (209) 525-8453
Website	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date	1979
Principal Act	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Maintain tidal levees and provide flood control for habitat management.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of seven members appointed by the County Board of Supervisors.
Officers	Officers are elected by Board members President: Mark Morange Secretary/Treasurer: Shon Kelley
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets annually at Pintail Ranch Headquarters on Grizzly Island. Last meeting held 5/17/18. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	RD 2112 has not adopted a set of bylaws
Operations	
Employees	None
Facilities/Assets	The District maintains a checking, but does not own any facilities or equipment.
Services Provided	Levees are inspected by members. Limited services provided by outside contractors.
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$2,032 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (FY 2018)	Revenue: \$54,773; Expenses: \$59,450
Primary Revenue Sources	Service charges to landowners and PAI grant funding
Assets	\$10,543 (June 30, 2018),
Liabilities	No outstanding liabilities as of June 30, 2018
Fund Balance	\$10,543 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	The District does not maintain liability insurance.
Most Recent Financial Audit	Audited Financial Statements are prepared every 5-years. Most recent dated June 30, 2015
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report filed with State Controller's Office

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2112; FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report; Audited Financial Statements FY 2011-2015; Solano County Board website: <http://bccweb.solanocounty.com/Open/Reports/boardDetail.asp>

4.3.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The District is uninhabited except for several buildings for duck/pheasant clubs and caretakers on the property. The Solano County General Plan shows the current land use designation for all property within the District as marshland with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. Any plan for development would have to be consistent with the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan and obtain development approval from the County. There are no expectations for growth.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District is uninhabited except for several buildings for duck/pheasant clubs on the property.
- 1.2: There are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2112.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2112. The District is uninhabited and the area's median household income (MHI) of \$84,141 is well above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC. RD 2112 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2112.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. Therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2112.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District's primary duties are drainage and flooding as required for habitat maintenance per Suisun Resource Conservation District Guidelines. The District performs a limited number of services including levee inspection and maintenance (see Table 4.9). Monthly visual inspections are conducted by a district member who walks the 1.45 miles of flood control and tidal levees that surround the District. Outside contractors are used for weed abatement and vector control. The District prepares and funds an annual project plan. There are no plans to expand capacity.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District has the capacity and the resources to provide levee maintenance and seasonal flood control for habitat management.

Table 4.9: RD 2112 Facilities, Services, & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Levees are maintained consistent with Suisun Marsh RCD Levee Protection Policy Exterior Levee Standards
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Outside contractor
Vector/Rodent Control	Solano County Mosquito Abatement District
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	None
Flood Control	None
Levee Patrol	Monthly visual inspection by landowners
Pump Maintenance & Repair	None
Drainage	None
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	1.45 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
Suisun Marsh Standard:	1.45 miles
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Inspection of levee on a monthly basis by a District Member walking the levee.
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2112

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: The District adopts an annual budget, which sets forth anticipated revenues and expenditures for the coming fiscal year.

Revenue Sources: District operations are funded by revenues consisting of service charges, repair reimbursements, and grants (see Table 4.10). Wetland construction and habitat maintenance projects are supported on a cost sharing basis by grant funding from the Suisun Marsh Preservation Agreement Improvement Fund (PAI). FEMA grant funding has been received in the past to repair levees damaged by storm floods. Service charges account for the majority of the District’s annual revenue. The duck clubs are charged based on their pro rata share of the District’s total acreage. Levee and habitat maintenance account for the majority of the District’s expenditures. Wetland construction includes both PAI and non-PAI funded projects.

Fund Balance: Fund balances have fluctuated over the past five years depending on the level of expenditures for major wetland projects to maintain and enhance the waterfowl habitat. The District typically increases member assessments to resolve the deficit. The District has maintained a positive fund balance annually over the past five years with unrestricted net assets available to meet the

District’s ongoing obligations. District assets include a commercial bank checking account used to satisfy the District’s day-to-day obligations. There are no outstanding liabilities. The District conducts an annual audit of its financial statements using an outside independent auditor.

Determinations:

4.1: The District has been able to provide services with periodic assistance from grant funding. When there are shortfalls, the District increases members assessment to satisfy the deficit.

Table 4.10: RD 2112 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Service Charges	16,000	16,000	20,000	18,008	40,000
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
PAI Reimbursement	0	2,325	0	0	14,773
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	0
Total	\$16,000	\$18,325	\$20,000	\$18,008	\$ 54,773
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 3,214	\$ 2,729	\$ 3,572	\$ 24	\$ 3,403
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	10,041	7,359	4,906	4,783	5,380
Wetland Projects	7,718	1,755	18,649	0	50,667
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$20,973	\$11,843	\$27,127	\$ 4,807	\$59,450
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(4,973)	6,482	(7,127)	13,202	(4,677)
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(4,973)	6,482	(7,127)	13,202	(4,677)
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	7,635	2,662	9,145	2,018	15,219
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 2,662	\$ 9,145	\$ 2,018	\$15,219	\$10,543

Source: Audited Financial Statements for FY 2011-2015; Operating History Budget FY 2011-2019; Response to MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2112

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 2112 currently does not provide any services nor shares any facilities with other agencies. The District is adjacent to RD 2129, which may present an opportunity to share services or administrative functions with that district.

Determinations:

5.1: RD 2112 does not provide services to other agencies and facilities are designed to manage drainage and flood waters on District lands.

5.2: RD 2112 is adjacent to RD 2129, which may present an opportunity to share services or administrative functions with that district.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

RD 2112 is governed by a seven-member board of Trustees that are appointed by District landowners. The Solano County Board of Supervisors approves the appointment of each board member. The District has no paid staff and labor requirements are met by District landowners and outside contractors. The District holds an annual meeting in May at Pintail Ranch Headquarters on Grizzly Island.

Determinations:

6.1: Current business practices are adequate to manage the affairs of the District and there are no plans to expand the level of services provided.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.4: Reclamation District No. 2127 (Simmons-Wheeler)

4.4.1: District Profile

RD 2127 is located south of Roaring River Slough approximately 15 miles southeasterly of the city of Fairfield (see Figure 4.6). The District is comprised of thirteen parcels totaling 3,600 acres (see Table 4.11). Property within the district is protected by exterior levees, which were constructed at the time the land was originally reclaimed. Currently each duck club maintains the shoreline levees within its property boundaries. The length of levee maintained varies between duck clubs and not all of the duck clubs have levees to maintain. Since there are no interior levees a break in any of the shoreline levees would subject all properties to flooding. Formation of the District allowed property owners to share equally in the cost of maintaining the shoreline levees and to be eligible for Federal Emergency funds in case of a levee failure and major flooding. Formation of Simmons-Wheeler Reclamation District was approved by the Solano County Board of Supervisors on September 22, 1992 (Board Resolution No. 92-238) in accordance with Section 50000 of the California Water Code and is governed by a five-member board of trustees (see Table 4.12).

Figure 4.6: Boundary Map of RD 2127




Table 4.11: RD 2127 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	Parcel Number	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0090020020	60.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	870
2	0090020030	635.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	870
3	0090020040	431.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	845
4	0090020050	537.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	835
5	0090020060	330.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	870
6	0090030010	416.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	845
7	0090030020	562.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	881
8	0090030030	328.85	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	881
9	0090030070	99.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1044
10	0090030160	84.87	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	881
11	0090030170	65.28	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	881
12	0090030180	48.50	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
13	0090030190	2.50	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
Total Acres		3,600.00				

Source: Solano County GIS; District Formation Documents

Table 4.12: RD 2127 District Profile

Organization Requirements	
District Office	P.O. Box 6782 Moraga, CA 94570-6782 Phone: (925) 768-2983
Website	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date	September 22, 1992 (Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 92-238)
Principal Act	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system to provide waterfowl habitat and protect duck hunting clubs.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of five members serving four-year terms.
Officers	Officers elected by the Board of Trustees President: James Waters Secretary/Treasurer: Vince Malfitano Vice President: Tad Bowers
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets quarterly. Last meeting held 2/22/19. Written agenda provided in advance of meeting, but not written minutes of prior meetings.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	MerryLee Landau, Office Manager; Bruce Wickland, Designated Agent
Facilities/Assets	The District maintains commercial bank accounts, but does not own any facilities or equipment.
Services Provided	Levees inspected by landowners and reviewed by engineer. Limited services provided by outside contractors.
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$36,160 (June 30, 2018)
Budget (Jan-Dec 2018)	Revenue: \$202,730; Expenses: \$212,705
Primary Revenue Sources	Property assessments; state/federal grant revenue; charges for services
Assets	\$53,462 (December 31, 2018)
Liabilities	\$46,711 (December 31, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$6,751 (December 31, 2018)
Risk Management	The District maintains liability insurance.
Most Recent Financial Audit	Audited Financial Statements prepared every 5-years. Most recent dated June 30, 2015
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report filed with State Controller's Office

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2127, RD 2127 formation documents, RD 2127 audited financial statements report, RD 2127's FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report

4.4.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The District is uninhabited except for duck clubs located on the property. The Solano County General Plan shows the current land use designation for all property within the District to be marshland with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned as a Marsh Preservation District (MP) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. Any plan for development would have to be consistent with the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan and obtain development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District is uninhabited except for duck clubs located on the property.
- 1.2: There are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2127.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2127. The District is uninhabited and the area's median household income (MHI) of \$84,141 is well above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC. RD 2127 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2127.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. Therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2127.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2127's primary purpose is to operate and maintain the exterior levee system. The levees are inspected by individual property owners and reviewed by an outside independent engineering firm to ensure that they are being adequately maintained by the individual duck clubs in a consistent and comprehensive manner (see Table 4.13). The District also maintains the road and levees associated with the needs for water control, drainage, and irrigation to provide upkeep of the habitat within the district.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District performs levee and habitat maintenance services utilizing landowners and engineering firms to inspect and maintain the levees.
- 3.2: The District has the capacity and resources to maintain the levees for flood control.

Table 4.13: RD 2127 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	N/A
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	N/A
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	7.5 miles
Suisun Marsh Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Inspected by property owners and reviewed by outside engineer
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2127

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Financial records submitted by RD 2127 show the District has current liabilities of \$46,711 as of December 31, 2018. Levee maintenance accounts for the majority of the District’s expenditures. The District receives state and federal assistance for levee maintenance and repair of damage related to storms. Financial information for the District is shown on Table 4.14.

Budget: Although the California Water Code does not require reclamation districts to adopt formal budgetary procedures, RD 2127 has elected to prepare an annual budget, which sets forth anticipated revenues and expenditures for the forth coming year.

Revenue: District revenues consist of assessments, charges for services, state reimbursements for levee maintenance, and grants. FEMA grant funding has been received in the past to repair levees damaged by storm floods. Landowner assessments account for the majority of the District’s total annual revenue.

Fund Balance: The District has maintained a positive fund balance over the past five years. District assets include a bank checking account. The District conducts an audit of its financial statements every five years using an outside independent auditor.

Determinations:

4.1: The District has been able to maintain a positive fund balance for the past five years with fluctuations in net operating revenue depending on the need for levee repairs and maintenance with financial assistance from the State.

Table 4.14: RD 2127 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$17,500	\$ 17,500	\$ 18,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 27,000
Service Charges	13,919	25,936	90,100	42,770	117,931
State/Federal Assistance	0	140,723	69,560	100,006	101,854
Other	\$ 0	\$ 11,500	\$ 0	\$ 8,260	\$ 2,065
Total	\$31,419	\$195,659	\$177,760	\$171,036	\$248,850
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$18,390	\$ 30,419	\$ 19,646	\$ 19,701	\$ 18,822
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	13,919	163,562	,	42,770	115,618
Engineering	1,692	4,420	11,966	21,251	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	35,547	0	2,313
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$148,542	\$ 99,789
Total	\$34,001	\$198,401	\$124,806	\$232,264	\$236,542
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(2,582)	(2,742)	52,954	(61,228)	12,308
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(2,582)	(2,742)	52,954	(61,228)	12,308
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	37,449	34,867	32,125	85,079	23,851
Fund Balance End of Year	\$34,867	\$ 32,125	\$ 85,079	\$ 23,851	\$ 36,159

Source: RD 2127 Audited Financial Statements for FY 2011-2015 and RD 2127 P&L FY 2015-2018

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 2127 provides levee maintenance for a system of levees that only protects the District. The levee system is not connected to the levee system of the neighboring districts. RD 2127 does abut RD 2130 on the south, but is not connected to the levee system of the neighboring district nor does it share facilities.

Determinations:

- 5.1: RD 2127 does not provide services to other agencies and facilities are designed to manage drainage and flood waters on District lands.
- 5.2: Given that RD 2127 abuts another district on its southern border (RD 2130) consideration should be given for consolidation of RD 2127 with RD 2130 due to their adjacency.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

The governing board for RD 2127 is a five-member Board of Trustees who are appointed by the Solano County Board of Supervisors to four-year terms and serve until their successors are appointed and qualified. Board Trustees must be property owners in the district or their designated representatives. RD 2127 has three officers who were elected in February 2018. The Board of Trustees meets on a regular quarterly basis and maintains an annual operating budget and financial statements. The District has two paid staff members.

Determinations:

6.1: Current business practices and staffing are adequate to manage the affairs of the District.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.5: Reclamation District No. 2129 (Frost Lake)

4.5.1: District Profile

Reclamation District 2129 is a small district located at the center of Grizzly Island (see Figure 4.7). Formation of the District was approved by the Solano County Board of Supervisors on April 28, 1998 (Resolution No. 98-107). The District consists of eight parcels totaling 1,077.96 acres (see Table 4.15). The District was formed for the purpose of operating and maintaining water delivery and drain systems common to properties within the District, including floodgates, electronically operated fish screens, and drain gates, as well as maintaining portions of the exterior levees behind bulkheads, which contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems (see Table 4.16). These facilities were installed to improve the wetland habitat of Suisun Marsh by providing better water quality for use in leach cycles and in the irrigation of indigenous marsh plants. Funding for construction of the new water delivery system, for most of the properties in the District, as well as other properties located on Grizzly Island, came from the Suisun Resource Conservation District (SRCD) using federal funding received under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA). As a precondition for installation of the new water control system constructed with NAWCA grant monies, the SRCD required that a reclamation district be formed.⁴⁴

Formation of the district allowed for a single entity to maintain the ditches, levees, irrigation pipes, and water control structures. The District provides maintenance and operational services for both the new facilities as well as the existing water control structures and ditches, which have traditionally been maintained by the individual property owners in the District. In addition, the District provides limited services to another parcel of approximately 180 acres.

Table 4.15: RD 2129 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046210230	100.03	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	90
2	0046210220	168.53	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	90
3	0046220010	157.50	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	94
4	0046220220	93.81	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	90
5	0046220240	108.09	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	90
6	0046220260	98.54	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	90
7	0046220270	101.46	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	90
8	0046220300	250.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	868
Total Acres		1,077.96				

Source: Solano County GIS

⁴⁴ Purpose and Function of the Frost Lake Reclamation District, Exhibit G to Board of Supervisors Resolution 98-107 approving formation of the District.

Figure 4.7: Boundary Map of RD 2129



Table 4.16: RD 2129 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	39 Twin Creeks Drive Fairfield, CA 94534 Phone: (707) 864-1105
Website	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date	April 28, 1998 (Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 98-107)
Principal Act	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Formed for the purpose of operating and maintaining drainage ditches, levees, and water control structures.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of seven members elected by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by Board of Trustees President: Jim Kidder Secretary: Dan Whitely Treasurer: Terrence Connolly
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees holds an annual meeting in May
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	None
Facilities/Assets	Water delivery system incl drains, flood gates, and fish screens
Services Provided	Operation and maintenance of water delivery and drainage system common to all properties.
Shared Facilities/Services	Section of southern boundary shared with RD 2112
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$4,552 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (FY 2018)	Revenue \$13,250; Expenditures \$12,412
Primary Revenue Sources	Service charges
Assets	Cash \$4,552 plus facilities
Liabilities	None
Fund Balance	\$4,552 (FY 2018)
Risk Management	The District carries commercial general and Director's liability insurance
Most Recent Financial Audit	FY 2011-2015 dated October 2, 2015
Most Recent Financial Transactions Report	FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report filed with State Controller's Office

N/A = Not Available.

Note: The District did not provide a FY 2019 budget with the completed questionnaire

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2129; FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report to SCO; Financial Audit for FY 2011-2015 dated October 2, 2015; and district bylaws,

4.5.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The District is uninhabited except for duck clubs and caretakers on the property. The area is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP) and designated as marsh (M) on the Solano County General Plan within the Suisun Marsh Resource Conservation Overlay. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. Any plan for development would have to be consistent with the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan and obtain development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: There are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2129.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2129. The District is uninhabited and the area's median household income (MHI) of \$84,141 is well above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC. RD 2129 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2129.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. Therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2129.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District's Plan of Reclamation includes assuming responsibility for the maintenance of all structures and improvements, which is funded by charges for services to District property owners.⁴⁵ RD 2129 infrastructure consists of two fish screens and related sheet pile bulkhead walls; approximately two miles of ditching; pipes and screw gates. Water is taken from Montezuma Slough through the fish screens and then enters the Solano Cut, which is maintained by the District. Each property has a privately maintained turnout or floodgate. During flooding of the parcels for hunting season, the turnouts are open. After that, they are closed to approximately 10 percent of their capacity. This provides circulation to avoid stagnant water problems. Two 48-inch gates allow Frost Lake to drain into Montezuma Slough. The District also has an auxiliary drainage gate, which is rarely used, that empties into a drainage ditch operated by the Department of Fish and Wildlife. Each property that drains into Frost Lake is responsible for maintaining its own drainage infrastructure. The District maintains only those ditches, levees, and water control structures that are not the responsibility of individual landowners (see Table 4.17). The District maintains only the exterior levees that protect the fish screens and drain gates using brackish water from Montezuma Slough to maintain the habitat for the duck clubs. RD 2129 has an agreement with the Suisun Resource Conservation District to use the services of

⁴⁵ Frost Lake Reclamation District 2129 Reclamation Plan

SRCD’s water management program to manage the infrastructure of RD 2129 for the purpose of watering and de-watering district properties.

Determinations:

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

Table 4.17: RD 2129 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	N/A
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	N/A
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	Drains, Flood gates, Fish Screens
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	N/A
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	N/A
HMP Standard:	N/A
PL 84-99 Standard:	N/A
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	N/A
FEMA Standard:	N/A
Levee Inspection Practices	N/A
Most Recent Inspection Report	N/A
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None; The District does provided some services on a fee basis to several properties not located in the District
Services shared with other agencies	None

N/A – Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2129

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

RD 2129 struggles financially due to increasing administrative costs. Over the last ten years the District has spent \$51,508 on maintenance and operations and \$30,639 on administrative costs (insurance, accounting and auditing, elections, etc.).

Budget: District revenues consist primarily of informal charges for services (see Table 4.18) under provisions of section 50902 of the California Water Code rather than utilizing a formal assessment process in accordance with District Resolution 99-1. This resolution charges for yearly maintenance operations based on acreage within the District. Property owners are assessed based on their pro rata share of the District’s total acreage. Wetland construction and improvements were funded and supported on a cost sharing basis by grant funding from the Suisun Marsh Preservation Agreement Improvement Fund

(PAI) and other sources including the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. Levee and habitat maintenance account for the majority of the District’s expenditures.

Fund Balance: The District has maintained a positive fund balance over the past five years with no outstanding liabilities. Cash assets include a bank checking account. The District conducts an audit of its financial statements every five years using an outside independent auditor.

- Determinations:**
- 4.1: The District collects sufficient funds from the duck clubs to meet its current obligations. Increasing administrative costs place a financial strain on the District.
 - 4.2: The District applies for and receives grants for capital improvement projects.

Table 4.18: RD 2129 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Service Charges	6,358	3,510	3,210	19,625	13,250
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$6,358	\$3,510	\$3,210	\$19,625	\$13,250
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$2,226	\$2,068	\$4,915	\$ 2,121	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	3,268	746	749	16,666	12,412
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$5,494	\$2,814	\$5,664	\$18,787	\$12,412
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	864	696	(2,454)	838	838
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	864	696	(2,454)	838	838
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	3,769	4,633	5,329	2,875	3,714
Fund Balance End of Year	\$4,633	\$5,329	\$2,875	\$3,713	\$ 4,552

Source: RD 2129 Audited Financial Statements for FY 2011-2015; RD 2129 P&L 2015-2018, FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report to SCO, and 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2129

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District provides maintenance and operational services for water control, drainage, and irrigation to provide upkeep and enhancement of the habitat within the district and to several properties on a fee basis not located within the district. RD 2129 abuts RD 2112 on its southerly boundary, which may present a potential opportunity for shared management and operational services.

- Determinations:**
- 5.1: The District’s does not provide services to other agencies and facilities are designed to manage drainage and flood waters on District lands.
 - 5.2: The District abuts RD 2112 on its southerly border, which may present an opportunity for consolidation or shared services.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

Governance of RD 2129 consists of a seven-member Board of Trustees appointed to four-year terms, which meets annually in May prior to the start of the next fiscal year. The District has an adopted set of bylaws, but no website as required by AB 929. The District has no paid staff and Board members are not compensated for their time. District services are performed by individual landowners or by agreement with SRCD under its Water Management Program.

Determinations:

- 6.1: The District is in compliance with the State law requirement to submit an annual financial report to the State Controller's Office.
- 6.2: Current business practices and staffing are adequate to manage the affairs of the District, but administrative costs for compliance with state requirements represent an increasing percentage of maintenance and operational expenses.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.6: Reclamation District No. 2130 (Honker Bay)

4.6.1: District Profile

The District is located in the center of Wheeler Island, bounded by Champion Slough, Roaring River, Wreck Slough, and the Sacramento River (see Figure 4.8). The District includes nine properties totaling 830.83 acres in the Suisun Marsh, bordered on the west by RD 2127 and on the east by RD 1607 (see Table 4.19). Formation of Honker Bay Reclamation District was approved on November 10, 1998 by the Solano County Board of Supervisors (Resolution 98-269A) to permit existing duck clubs to share in the cost of constructing, operating, and maintaining flood control and tidal levees surrounding the District (see Table 4.20).

Table 4.19: RD 2130 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0090030150	129.08	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1149
2	0090030200	119.08	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
3	0090030210	10.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
4	0090040100	12.43	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	547
5	0090040110	18.04	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	547
6	0090050230	61.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	547
7	0090050260	93.58	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	547
8	0090050270	250.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	547
9	0090050280	137.60	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	547
Total Acres		830.83				

Source: Solano County GIS; District Formation Documents

Figure 4.8: Boundary Map of RD 2130



Table 4.20: RD 2130 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	1547 Gibbons Drive Alameda, CA 94501 Phone: (510) 522-5765
Website	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date	November 10, 1998 (Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 98-269A)
Principal Act	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control, tidal levees, and drainage system.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of five-members elected by District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by Board of Trustees President: Dave Cavanaugh Secretary: Peter Muriau Treasurer: Mel Springs Vice President: John Newell
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets periodically. Last meeting held 11/17/18. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	None
Facilities/Assets	No District owned facilities. Levees are located on private property
Services Provided	Misc. services provided by outside contractors/engineers and landowners
Shared Facilities/Services	None. Roaring River Levee maintained by DWR
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$101,054 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (FY 2018)	Revenue: \$17,029; Expenses: \$25,560
Primary Revenue Sources	State and federal assistance, assessments
Assets	\$101,054 (June 30, 2018),
Liabilities	\$108,613 (June 30, 2018)
Fund Balance	(\$7,559); Accounts Receivable from Federal Government \$97,256 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	District does not maintain liability insurance
Most Recent Financial Audit	Bi-annual. Audited Financial Statements dated June 30, 2018
Most Recent Financial Transactions Report	FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report filed with State Controller's Office

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2130, FY 2018 FTR; Audited Financial Statements (FY 2017-2018); Solano LAFCO's RD 2130 formation documents

4.6.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The area is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP) by the County. The property within the District is designated in the Solano County General Plan as Marsh (M) with a Resource Conservation Overlay. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. Any plan for development would have to be consistent with the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan and obtain development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: There are no expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2130 and the District does not seek to expand.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2130. Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) the District is uninhabited and the area's median household income (MHI) is above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC. RD 2130 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2130.
- 2.2: RD 2130 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District's primary purpose is to operate and maintain the water delivery and drainage systems common to properties within the District. Services provided by the District are performed by independent contractors (see Table 4.21). Individual property owners inspect the levees several times per year by vehicle, boat, and on foot. The level of inspection and maintenance of the levees is adequately provided for by the individual duck clubs in a consistent and comprehensive manner.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District performs a variety of services utilizing outside contractors and volunteer labor by landowners.
- 3.2: The District has the capacity and the resources to maintain the levees for flood control.

Table 4.21: RD 2130 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Outside Contractor
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Outside Contractor
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	Outside Contractor
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	Landowners
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	2+ miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	2+ miles
Suisun Marsh Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Levees inspected by vehicle, boat, & walking several times a year
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	No shared facilities; Roaring River easement maintained by DWR
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2130

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: District revenues consist of assessments and state/federal grants (see Table 4.22). The duck clubs are assessed based on their pro rata share of the District’s total acreage. Landowner assessments account for a small portion of the District’s total annual revenue. Levee and habitat maintenance account for the majority of the District’s expenditures.

Fund Balance: The District has maintained a positive fund balance three out of the past five years. The District showed a negative fund balance of (\$7,559) as of June 30, 2018. District assets include cash and investments totaling \$101,054 held by the Solano County Treasurer. Outstanding liabilities for accounts payable and unearned revenue totaled \$108,613. The District conducts a bi-annual audit of its financial statements using an outside independent auditor.

Determinations:

4.1: RD 2130 is a small District with limited financial capacity whose revenue fluctuates based on state/federal assistance for levee maintenance and repair.

Table 4.22: RD 2130 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 0	\$3,750	\$ 2,339	\$2,401	\$ 0
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	71,805	1,886	16,464
Other	\$ 8	\$ 9	\$ 24	\$ 12	\$ 565
Total	\$ 8	\$3,759	\$74,168	\$4,299	\$17,029
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$6,646	\$ 830	\$4,278	\$ 107
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	4,052	0	71,195	0	25,453
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$4,052	\$6,646	\$72,025	\$4,278	\$25,560
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(4,044)	(2,887)	2,143	21	(8,531)
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(4,044)	(2,887)	2,143	21	(8,531)
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	97,912	1,695	(1,192)	951	972
Fund Balance End of Year	\$1,695*	(\$1,192)	\$ 951	\$ 972	(\$7,559)

* Prior Period Adjustments made based on difference between audited and unaudited financial statements.

Source: RD 2130 Audited Financial Statements for FY 2015-2016 & FY 2017-2018, RD 2030 FY 2014 FTR submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 2130 is bordered on the west by RD 2127 and on the east by RD 1607. Except for the California Department of Water Resources maintaining the Roaring River Levee easement, the District does not share any facilities with other agencies. Opportunities may exist to consolidate the three districts (RD 2130; RD 2127; RD 1607) or to share administrative services.

Determinations:

- 5.1: The District does not provide services to other agencies and facilities are designed to manage drainage and flood waters on District lands.
- 5.2: Opportunities may exist to consolidate three districts (RD 2130; RD 2127; RD 1607) or to share administrative services.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

Five trustees, elected by district landowners to four-year terms, constitute the District's Board of Trustees, which meets periodically on an as-needed basis. The last meeting was held in November 2018. The District has an adopted set of Bylaws and written agendas and meeting minutes are distributed prior to Board meetings. The District does not have a website as required by SB 929 to post agendas, minutes, Board policies, and other relevant information.

Determinations:

- 6.1: Current business practices are adequate to manage the affairs of the District and conduct routine levee inspections.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.7: Reclamation District No. 2134 (Denverton)

4.7.1: District Profile

Reclamation District 2134 is located within the Suisun Marsh bounded by Nurse and Luco Sloughs (see Figure 4.9). The District exterior is diked with a network of slough channels and drainages feeding the interior. The District is comprised of three parcels totaling 852 acres with a single property owner - CWA Denverton LLC, which is the local arm of the California Waterfowl Association (see Table 4.23). The property is used primarily for hunting purposes RD 2134 was formed in 2000 as an independent public agency under the terms of the Reclamation District Law (WC §50000) for the purpose of sharing the cost of operating, maintaining, and repairing drainage facilities, roads, and levees within the boundaries of the District (see Table 4.24). The District was also formed to help manage and protect the unique marsh habitat found in the marsh and to qualify for state and federal funding opportunities available to public agencies.

Table 4.23: RD 2134 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046120120	228.58	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	781
2	0048020040	473.42	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	781
3	0048040210	150.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
Total Acres		852.00				

Source: Solano County GIS

Figure 4.9: Boundary Map of RD 2134




Table 4.24: RD 2134 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	1346 Blue Oaks Blvd Roseville, CA 95678 Phone: (916) 648-1406
Website	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date	September 11, 2000 (approved by Solano County LAFCO Resolution No. 00-21)
Principal Act	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control, tidal levees, and drainage system.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three members appointed by District landowner.
Officers	Officers elected by landowner President: Robert Eddings Vice President: Jake Messerli Secretary/Treasurer: Colby Heaton
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets annually. Last meeting held 9/20/18. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	None
Facilities/Assets	None
Services Provided	Minor misc. services provided by landowner. Major services by outside contractors as needed
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	
Current Budget (FY 2019)	
Primary Revenue Sources	Assessments
Assets	
Liabilities	
Fund Balance	
Risk Management	
Most Recent Financial Audit	CWA consolidated financial statement (FY 2013-2014)
Most Recent Financial Transactions Report	FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report filed with State Controller's Office

N/P = Not Provided by District, N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2134, Solano LAFCO's RD 2134 formation documents, RD 2134's FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report

4.7.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

There are no residents within District boundaries. A caretaker lives just across the road that forms one of the District boundaries. There are no anticipated changes in population. Parcels within the District are zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP) by the County. The land is designated as marshland and included within the Suisun Marsh Resource Conservation Overlay in the Solano County General Plan. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: There are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2134.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2134. While the Denverton area used to be a shipping terminal in the 19th century when goods were loaded onto barges to be transported to market, newer and more efficient transport means emerged and Denverton lost its prominence. Today, it is considered a ghost town. The District is uninhabited and the area's median household income (MHI) is above the threshold to qualify as a DUC. The District does not provide water, sewer, or fire protection services. Therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2134.
- 2.2 RD 2134 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District maintains the roads and levees associated with the needs for water control, drainage, irrigation, and upkeep of the habitat within the District (see Table 4.25). Staff of the sole owner drive and inspect levees regularly (several times a week) from a vehicle. Minor repairs are done by the landowner with major repairs contracted out on an as needed basis. There is no anticipated growth and no changes in the capacity of services.

Determinations:

- 3.1: RD 2134 performs a variety of services utilizing outside contractors and District landowners.
- 3.2: The District has the capacity and the resources to maintain the levees for flood control.

Table 4.25: RD 2134 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Minor repairs are done by landowner, major repairs are contracted on an as needed basis.
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Minor repairs are done by landowner, major repairs are contracted on an as needed basis.
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	Minor repairs are done by landowner, major repairs are contracted on an as needed basis.
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	7 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
Suisun Marsh Standard:	7 miles
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Staff of the sole owner drive and inspect levees regularly (several times a week) from a vehicle.
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2134

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: The California Waterfowl Association – Denverton LLC (CWA) is the sole owner of the property within the District. Consolidated financial statements submitted by CWA show significant revenue and net assets. CWA is a not-for-profit organization whose purpose is to preserve and enhance California’s waterfowl, wetlands and outdoor heritage. The Association receives funds to further its mission primarily through membership dues, grants, donations and fundraising events. In addition, the Association contracts with governmental agencies and private parties to perform services for the benefit of California’s waterfowl and wetlands. CWA-Denverton is a wholly owned subsidiary of the California Waterfowl Association, and was organized to hold and manage the Denverton property. District revenues consist of member assessments (see Table 4.26).

Fund Balance: The District receives revenues from member assessments equal to its expenditures annually resulting in a net zero fund balance over the past five years.

Determinations:

4.1: Financial information for the District is included in CWA consolidated financial statements. Separate financial statements for the District would provide improved transparency regarding district revenues and expenditures.

Table 4.26: RD 2134 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$3,389	\$34,765	\$ 700	\$ 7,626	\$3,525
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$3,389	\$34,765	\$ 700	\$ 7,626	\$3,525
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	3,389	34,765	700	7,626	3,525
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$3,389	\$34,765	\$ 700	\$7,626	\$3,525
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	0	0	0	0	0
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	0	0	0	0	0
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	0	0	0	0	0
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0

Source: RD 2134 FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report to SCO; and 2019 MSR Survey Questionnaire

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District does not share or provide any facilities or services with other agencies.

Determinations:

5.1: The District does not provide services to other agencies and facilities are designed to manage drainage and flood waters on District lands. There are few opportunities to share facilities with other agencies.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

Three trustees appointed by the landowner in the District constitute the Board of Trustees, which meets annually. The last meeting was held on September 20, 2018. The District has an adopted set of bylaws and provides written agendas and meeting minutes prior to Board meetings. The District does not have a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

6.1: Current business practices are adequate to manage District affairs and conduct routine levee inspections to make sure that the levees are properly maintained.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.8: Reclamation District 2135 (Sunrise Island)

4.8.1: District Profile

Reclamation District 2135, otherwise known as Sunrise Island Reclamation District, is located on the westerly side of Suisun Marsh at the south end of Chadbourne Road and North of the Teal and Cordelia Sloughs (see Figure 4.10). The District consists of four parcels totaling approximately 290.2 acres with a single property owner (see Table 4.27). Two small parcels are not reflected on map due to noncontiguous boundaries. The property was sold to the current owner in 2017. Solano LAFCO approved the formation of the District on September 10, 2001 under Division 15, Section 50000 et. seq. of the California Water Code to operate and maintain the water delivery and drain systems common to the property, as well as maintain that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for Habitat Management (see Table 4.28). The property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation (MP-250) and designated as Marsh (M) within the Suisun Marsh Resource Conservation Overlay District in the Solano County General Plan. The property suffered much damage from a major storm event in January 2017.

Table 4.27: RD 2135 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046060090	19.15	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	872
2	0046060100	270.70	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	872
	0046090020*	0.09	N/A	Marsh Preservation (MP)	N/A	N/A
	0046100090*	0.26	N/A	Marsh Preservation (MP)	N/A	N/A
Total Acres		290.20				

* Not reflected on map due to noncontiguous boundaries

N/A = Not available

Source: Solano County GIS

Figure 4.10: Boundary Map of RD 2135




Table 4.28: RD 2135 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	Steve Ciari, property owner Phone: (408) 296-6010 Email: steve@ciariplumbing.com
Website	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date	September 10, 2001 (LAFCO RESOLUTION NO. 01-08)
Principal Act	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Operate and maintain the water delivery and drain systems common to the property within the District, as well as maintaining that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for Habitat Management.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries (LAFCO RESOLUTION NO. 01-09)
District Status	Indeterminate due to the lack of information and documentation from the District
Governance	
Governing Body	N/P
Officers	N/P
Compensation	N/P
Meetings	N/P
Adopted Bylaws	N/P
Operations	
Employees	N/P
Facilities/Assets	N/P
Services Provided	N/P
Shared Facilities/Services	N/P
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	N/P
Current Budget (FY 2019)	N/P
Primary Revenue Sources	N/P
Assets	N/P
Liabilities	N/P
Fund Balance	N/P
Risk Management	N/P
Most Recent Financial Audit	FY 2011
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	FY 2016 Financial Transactions Report filed with the State Controller's Office

N/P = Not provided by District. RD 2135 opted not to fill out a questionnaire distributed by the consultant team.

Source: Solano LAFCO's RD 2135 formation documents, California State Controller's Office-Special District Financial Data, RD 2135 FY 2011 Independent Financial Audit Report.

4.8.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for all property within the District as marsh with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP-250) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District.

The most recent available U.S. Census Bureau data (2017) at the block level shows no population currently residing in the District. The District is not looking to expand its boundaries. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District is uninhabited and there are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2135.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2135. Census data shows the surrounding area has a median household income (MHI) of \$105,000 as of 2017. Given that the median household income is well above the MHI threshold (\$53,735) for defining a DUC, the area does not qualify as a DUC based on its MHI. In addition, RD 2135 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2135.
- 2.2: RD 2135 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The current and planned capacity of public services provided by RD 2135 is undetermined due to the lack of information and documentation from RD 2135 as a result of the change in ownership (see Table 4.29).

Determinations:

- 3.1: The current and planned capacity of public services is undetermined due to the lack of information and documentation from RD 2135.

Table 4.29: RD 2135 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	
Easements	
Drainage System/Ditches	
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
Suisun Marsh Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	
Services provided to other agencies	
Services shared with other agencies	

N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2134

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Since the formation of RD 2135 in 2001, submission of the District’s independent financial audits and reporting of financial transactions to the California State Controller’s Office has been irregular. According to the State Controller’s Office Special District database financial transaction reports were filed for fiscal years 2014 through 2016, but not 2017. The property within the District was sold to the current owner in 2017 and the property was transferred on May 31, 2017. The report period ending June 30, 2017, represented only one month and no RD funds were transferred with the transfer of ownership. A new RD bank account was established in August of 2017 by the new board members and a fictitious business name application filed with Stephen Ciari Plumbing & Heating, Inc. doing business as RD2135 Sunrise Island. The first Board meeting was conducted on August 3, 2017. A financial transaction report was filed by the District for FY 2018 with the State Controller’s Office. The 2018 financial transaction report showed revenue of \$78,503 and expenditures of \$78,502 for a negative fund balance of \$5,701 (see Table 4.30). The RD is expected to be run on a net zero budget fiscally to maintain the expenses and income in accordance with GAAP. The owner has indicated that they will fund the RD account annually with a budget of \$500 per month. In

August 2018, the property suffered a major levee breach and was reimbursed by the State for levee repairs. The owners have significant expenses and damages from ingressing and egressing tides and have filed for necessary permits and work allowances for ongoing as well as emergency work as necessary. Materials and labor, at prevailing wage, are paid by the owner and billed to the RD without markup as the work projects are approved for funding. The agent fee is considered a cost of the on-going projects.

Determinations:

4.1: Recent financial history with the new ownership and District management is limited. While it appears that the new ownership has the financial ability to provide basic services, no budget and financing plan for the current fiscal year has been submitted. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether the District has adequate financial capacity to provide services.

Table 4.30: RD 2135 Revenue, Expenses, & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$1,160	\$ 1,160	\$16,272	\$ 0	\$ 5,000
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	73,503
Other	<u>\$2,850</u>	<u>\$ 4,634</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>
Total	\$4,010	\$ 5,794	\$16,272	\$ 0	\$ 78,503
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	6,000	6,000	6,000	0	78,502
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 5,702</u>
Total	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 0	\$ 84,204
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(1,990)	(206)	10,272	0	(5,701)
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(1,990)	(206)	10,272	0	(5,701)
Fund Balance Beginning of Year		(1,990)	(2,196)	0	0
Fund Balance End of Year	(\$1,990)	(\$2,196)	\$ 8,076	\$ 0	\$ (5,701)

N/A = Not Available

Note: No financial data for FY 2017 due to non-filing by new ownership

Source: California State Controller's Office Special District Financial Data 2014-2016, and 2018

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

There is one property owner within the boundaries of RD 2135, who purchased the property in 2017. RD 2135 is adjacent to and shares a boundary with RD 2034, which may present a potential opportunity for consolidation.

Determinations:

5.1: RD 2135 shares its northern boundary with RD 2034, which may present an opportunity for consolidation or shared services. The two Districts currently do not share any facilities.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

There has been a change in property ownership twice since the formation of the District in 2001. The current and only property owner within the District purchased the property in 2017. When the District was formed there was an adopted set of bylaws. These are the last known available bylaws for the District and indicate the District governance structure at that time included a five-member Board of Trustees with each member serving a 4-year term. The Board of Trustees contains two officers, a president and secretary.

Prior to the change in ownership in 2017, the District was submitting its annual financial transactions report to the State Controller's Office, but this stopped after the sale of the property. The District has submitted the most recent financial report for 2018. The last independent financial audit report available for the District is for the FY 2011.

Determinations:

- 6.1: The District is comprised of a single ownership. There is a lack of current information about District operations and governance resulting from a change in ownership in 2017.
- 6.2: There is no current information available to determine what the District's governmental structure is and whether the District is in compliance due to a change in ownership. The current property owner is expected to comply with state requirements governing RDs.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other matters or local commission policies affecting efficient service delivery

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no known other matters or local commission policies affecting efficient service delivery.

4.9: Reclamation District 2136 (Grizzly West)

4.9.1: District Profile

Reclamation District 2136, otherwise known as Grizzly West Reclamation District, is southwest of Fairfield bordered on the south by Grizzly Bay and on the north and west by Montezuma Slough (see Figure 4.11). The District consists of eight parcels totaling approximately 2,769.61 acres (see Table 4.31). Solano LAFCO approved the formation of the District on September 16, 2002 under Division 15, Section 50000 of the California Water Code to maintain the water delivery and drainage system common to the property, as well as maintain the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drainage systems for Habitat Management (see Table 4.32). The District is governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of seven members, who each serve four-year terms.

Table 4.31: RD 2136 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046200010	184.20	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1037
2	0046200020	634.54	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1090
3	0046200030	172.76	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1020
4	0046200040	491.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1039
5	0046200070	502.32	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1038
6	0046200080	502.34	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1038
7	0046270040	225.80	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1037
8	0046210110	56.65	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	684
Total Acres		2,769.61				

Note: Parcel 7 is partially located in the District

Source: Solano County GIS; District Formation Documents

Figure 4.11: Boundary Map of RD 2136




Table 4.32: RD 2136 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	<p>Physical Address: 3400 Gum Tree Road Suisun, CA 94585 Phone: (707) 631-9292</p> <p>Mailing Address: P.O. Box 33 Suisun City, CA 94585</p>
Website	Currently does not have a website as required by SB 929
Formation Date	September 16, 2002 (LAFCO Resolution No. 02-07)
Principal Act	California Water Code Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Maintaining the water delivery and drainage system common to the property within the District, as well as maintaining the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drainage systems for Habitat Management.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries (LAFCO Resolution No. 02-08)
District Status	Active
Governance	
Governing Body	7-member Board of Trustees serving 4-year terms. The Solano County Board of Supervisors approves the appointment of each Trustee and officers are elected by the Trustees.
Officers	Officers are elected by the Board of Trustees and include: President: Jim Edgar (elected 11/17) Vice President: Mike Temps (elected 11/17) Treasurer: Doug Bartman (acting) upon death of Frank Johnson (elected 11/15) in early 2019
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets annually on the first Friday of December. Last meeting held on 12/07/18. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes (last revised on May 11, 2013)
Operations	
Employees	No paid staff, but the District does have a Secretary
Facilities/Assets	No district owned facilities. District assets include a checking account and a public assistance (FEMA/CA OES grant) account at First Republic Bank
Services Provided	Levee Maintenance, Upkeep of Levee Access Roads, Pump Maintenance & Repair
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$144,774 (June 30, 2018), \$133,553 is from a FEMA/CA OES grant
Current Budget (FY 2019)	Revenue: \$270,542; Expenses: \$409,100
Primary Revenue Sources	Property Assessments; Landowner Contributions; Federal/State Grants
Assets	\$149,774 (June 30, 2018), \$133,553 is from a FEMA/CA OES grant
Liabilities	\$5,000 (June 30, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$144,774 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	The District is insured through the Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA).
Most Recent Financial Audit	2018 Financial Audit Report including fiscal years ended June 30, 2017-2013
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report filed with the State Controller's Office

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2136, Solano LAFCO's RD 2136 formation documents, RD 2136 Bylaws, RD 2136 Financial Audit Report for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2013-2017, and RD 2136 FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report submitted to the California State Controller's Office.

4.9.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

Property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP-250) and designated as Marsh (M) with a Resource Conservation Overlay District in the Solano County General Plan. The most recent available U.S. Census Bureau data at the block level shows a population of four currently residing in the District. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District is largely uninhabited and there are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2136.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2136. The surrounding area has a median household income (MHI) of \$84,141 as of 2017, which is well above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC. In addition, RD 2136 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2136.
- 2.2: RD 2136 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2136 maintains eight miles of levees by contracting with various vendors when needed to provide levee maintenance, upkeep of levee access roads, and pump maintenance and repairs (see Table 4.33). In May or June of each year, the District performs a levee tour with landowners, which enables physical assessment of levee conditions, creation of an overall work plan, and assignment of priorities for each landowner. Oversight of the work plan's progress is provided by the officers of the Board. The District does not have any paid employees, but does have a secretary. The District does not have any plans to expand.

The District's exterior levees are maintained to the Suisun Marsh Local Protection Program standards. The District has a 5-year Strategic Plan prepared by MBK Engineers. The current Strategic Plan is outdated and the updated plan is currently being prepared.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District currently provides levee maintenance, upkeep of levee access roads, and pump maintenance and repair through service contracts with various contractors on an as needed or project basis.
- 3.2: The District has the capacity and the resources to provide the current level of services and there are no plans to expand the District boundaries.

Table 4.33: RD 2136 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	By contract by project (various vendors)
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	None
Vector/Rodent Control	None
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	By contract by project (various vendors)
Flood Control	None
Levee Patrol	None
Pump Maintenance & Repair	By contract by project (various vendors)
Drainage	None
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	8 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
Suisun Marsh Standard:	8 miles
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	The District performs an annual levee tour with landowner representatives to physically inspect all of the District's levees and propose necessary repairs for each landowner.
Most Recent Inspection Report	N/A
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2136

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: The District prepares an annual budget, which sets forth anticipated revenues and expenditures for the year. The District's fiscal year 2019 budget anticipates total revenues of \$270,542 from member assessments and the remaining balance (\$265,000) from a FEMA/CA OES grant. The budget also anticipates total expenditures of \$409,100 including FEMA/CA OES repairs, an independent financial audit, and insurance. With an initial fund balance of \$144,775 and an anticipated net operating loss of \$138,558, the District's budgeted fund balance at the end of fiscal year 2019 is \$6,217. The District is

covered by insurance through the Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA), a non-profit public agency, which provides risk management programs for California local governments.

Revenue: RD 2136 generates revenue from member assessments (see Table 4.34). Between fiscal years 2014 and 2018, member contributions fluctuated based on weather-related damages and the cost of repairs and maintenance incurred through normal operations. Periodically, the District also receives federal or state grant funding for weather-related damage to District property and levees. In 2018, the District received \$234,062 from a FEMA/CA OES grant for levee and road repairs. Grant funds used as of June 30, 2018 totaled \$105,509.

Fund Balance: RD 2136 has maintained a positive fund balance over the past 5-years. The District's cash is maintained in two commercial bank accounts. The primary source of revenue is from assessments levied against the District's property owners. The Special Revenue Fund account is funded by proceeds from grants and is used to pay grant-related expenses/expenditures.

The District's financial statements are independently audited every 5-years, with the last financial audit report being produced in 2018 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2013-2017. The District does report its annual financial transactions to the California State Controller's Office and has submitted its current report for fiscal year 2018.

Determinations:

- 4.1: The District has been able to adequately provide services through a combination of member assessments, member contributions, and occasional federal and/or state grants.
- 4.2: The District has maintained a positive fund balance over the past 5-years and its FY 2019 budget also anticipates a positive fund balance.

Table 4.34: RD 2136 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 5,542	\$ 5,428	\$ 5,656	\$ 5,542	\$ 0
Member Contributions	4,289	14,695	11,902	0	33,869
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	1,903	0	234,062
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$10,033	\$20,123	\$19,461	\$ 5,542	\$267,931
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 3,602	\$ 3,660	\$ 3,546	\$ 3,552	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	4,847	14,695	13,805	0	137,960
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 143	\$ 0	\$ 114	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$ 8,592	\$18,355	\$17,465	\$ 3,552	\$137,960
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	1,441	1,768	1,996	1,990	129,971
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	1,441	1,768	1,996	1,990	129,971
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	7,608	9,049	10,817	12,813	14,803
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 9,049	\$10,817	\$12,813	\$14,803	\$144,774

Source: RD 2136 Financial Audit Report for the fiscal years ending June, 30 2013-2017, RD 2136 FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report to the California State Controller's Office, and 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2136.

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 2136 is bordered on three sides by water and does not share a border with another reclamation district. The District does not share any facilities or services and there are no opportunities for shared services or facilities.

Determinations:

5.1: RD 2136 does not share any facilities or services with another district. The District is bordered on three sides by water and does not share a border with another reclamation district. There are no opportunities to share facilities with other districts.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

RD 2136 has an adopted set of Bylaws, which were last revised on December 4, 2009. A 7-member Board of Trustees governs the District. Trustees are appointed by the Solano County Board of Supervisors and serve 4-year terms. Officers of the Board are elected by the Trustees and include a President, Vice President, and Secretary/Treasurer. The District has no paid employees, but does have a secretary.

The Board of Trustees meets annually on the first Friday in December. The last meeting was held on December 7, 2018. A written agenda and meeting minutes are distributed prior to Board meetings. The District does not currently have a website. In May or June of each year, the District performs a levee tour with landowners, which enables physical assessment of levee conditions, creation of an overall annual work plan, and assignment of priorities for each landowner. Oversight of the work plan's progress is provided by the Officers of the Board of Trustees.

Determinations:

6.1: The District's Bylaws provide an adequate governance structure to manage the District.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other matters or local commission policies affecting efficient service delivery.

Determinations:

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

4.10: Reclamation District 2138 (Morrow Island)

4.10.1: District Profile

Reclamation District 2138 is located on the north end of Morrow Island east of I-680 and west of Grizzly Bay (see Figure 4.12). Formation of the district was approved by Solano LAFCO on May 3, 2004 under Division 15, Section 50000 of the California Water Code to maintain the water delivery and drainage system common to the property, as well as maintain only that portion of the exterior levees behind bulkheads which contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drainage systems. The service area of the district consist of a single parcel totaling 694 acres, which is utilized by a duck club (Morrow Island Land Company) with 17 members (see Table 4.35 and www.morrowisland.com). The District is governed by an appointed Board of Directors consisting of five members each serving 4-year terms (see Table 4.36). All members of the District Board of Directors are members and/or directors of the company. The County Board of Supervisors approves the appointment of each director. The Morrow Island Land Company owns the land that is surrounded by the levee managed by the District.

Table 4.35: RD 2138 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0090250010	694.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-

Total Acres 694.00

Source: Solano County GIS; District Formation Documents

Table 4.36: RD 2138 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	4500 California Court Benicia, CA 94510 Phone: (707) 746-1990
Website	None
Formation Date	May 3, 2004 (LAFCO Resolution No: 04-02)
Principal Act	California Water Code Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Operate and maintain the water delivery and drain systems common to the property within the District, as well as maintain that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for Habitat Management.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries (LAFCO Resolution No: 04-03)
District Status	Active
Governance	
Governing Body	7-member Board of Directors serving 4-year terms. Trustees are elected by the Morrow Island Land Company shareholders
Officers	President: Brian Boero Vice-President: Ted Toland Secretary: Roger Boero Treasurer: David McEuen
Compensation	None
Meetings	The Board of Directors meets annually. Last meeting held on 1/26/19. Written meeting minutes provided in advance of annual meeting, but no agenda.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	None
Facilities/Assets	No District owned facilities. The District has a bank account.
Services Provided	There are no services provided by the District. Morrow Island Land Company, at no cost, provides the District with levee maintenance, weed abatement/vegetation removal, vector/rodent control, upkeep of levee access roads, levee patrol, pump maintenance and repair, and drainage.
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$1,828 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (FY 2019)	Not Provided
Primary Revenue Sources	None
Assets	\$1,828 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	None
Fund Balance	\$1,828 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	N/A
Most Recent Financial Audit	Financial Audit Report for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2011-2007
Most Recent Financial Transactions Report	FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report filed with the State Controller's Office

N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2138, Solano LAFCO's RD 2138 formation documents, and RD 2138 FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report submitted to the California State Controller's Office.

4.10.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for the property as marsh (M) with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. The most recent available U.S. Census Bureau data at the block level shows no population currently residing in the District and the District is not looking to expand its boundaries. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

1.1: The District is uninhabited and there are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2138.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2138. The surrounding area has a median household income (MHI) of \$54,825 as of 2017, which is above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC. Based on having no population and the MHI, the area does not qualify as a DUC. In addition, RD 2138 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2138.
- 2.2: RD 2138 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2138 does not provide any services to the District landowners. Instead, Morrow Island Land Company, which owns the land, provides services to the District at no charge including levee maintenance, weed abatement/vegetation removal, vector/rodent control, upkeep of levee access roads, levee patrol, pump maintenance and repair, and drainage (see Table 4.37). The District keeps a list of approved vendors that can be contacted in case of an emergency, such as a levee breach. The District performs weekly levee inspections during the winter months and monthly inspections during the summer months. The District does not have any paid employees.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District does not directly provide any services. The sole property owner, Morrow Island Land Company provides a variety of services to the District at no cost.
- 3.2: Morrow Island Land Company has been able to meet the current needs of the District and there are no plans to expand District boundaries.

Table 4.37: RD 2138 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Morrow Island Land Company
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Morrow Island Land Company
Vector/Rodent Control	Morrow Island Land Company
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	Morrow Island Land Company
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	Morrow Island Land Company
Pump Maintenance & Repair	Morrow Island Land Company
Drainage	Morrow Island Land Company
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	Not provided
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	District indicated no standard, but omitted the number of levee miles maintained.
Suisun Marsh Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Weekly inspections during winter months and monthly inspections during the summer months.
Most Recent Inspection Report	N/A
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

N/A – Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2138

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: RD 2138 had no financial transactions for FY 2018 as reported in the District’s FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report to the California State Controller’s Office. The District reported in the MSR Questionnaire that over the past 5-years it has had no financial transactions including any state or federal assistance (see Table 4.38). The property owner, Morrow Island Land Company, provides services to the District at no charge. The District is funded from charges for services levied against the property owner, member contributions, and grant funding from state and federal agencies.

Fund Balance: The District has maintained a minimal positive fund balance each year over the past 5-years of about \$1,800. The District did not provide a FY 2019 budget with its completed 2019 MSR Questionnaire. Under Government Code Section 53901, the District is required to file its annual budget with the County, or lacking a formal budget, a listing of its anticipated revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year.

The only asset the District owns is a commercial bank account. Cash on hand at the end of FY 2018 was \$1,828. The District does not have any liabilities. It does not appear that the District is covered by commercial liability insurance.

While RD 2138 has its financial statements independently audited every five years, the last independent financial audit report available for RD 2138 was for the years ended June 30, 2007-2011. The District does report its annual financial transactions to the California State Controller's Office and has reported its financial transactions for fiscal year 2018. The annual financial transaction reports reflect no revenue or expenses given that the sole property owner covers the District's expenses.

Determinations:

- 4.1: The District is composed of one property owner and does not directly provide any services. All services the District receives are provided by the property owner, Morrow Island Land Company, at no cost to the District. Financial information for Morrow Island Land Company was not provided.
- 4.2: RD 2138 has not had any revenue or expenses over the past 5-years, but has maintain a minimal positive fund balance.

Table 4.38: RD 2138 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Member Contributions	0	0	0	0	0
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ 1
Total	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ 1
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	0	0	0	1	1
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	0	0	0	1	1
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	(3,315)	1,829	1,829	1,829	1,830
Fund Balance End of Year	\$1,829*	\$1,829	\$1,829	\$1,830	\$1,831

* Prior Period Adjustments made based on difference between audited and unaudited financial statements.

Source: RD 2138 FY 2014-2018 FTR submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 2138 does not share any facilities or services with another district. The District is located on Morrow Island, which does not contain another reclamation district. At the very northern tip of the District, Cordelia and Goodyear Sloughs separate a small portion of the District from District 2142.

Determinations:

5.1: RD 2138 does not currently share any facilities with another District. The District is located on Morrow Island, which is bordered on three sides by water.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

Formation documents for RD 2138 show the District had a set of Bylaws at the time of formation. A 7-member Board of Trustees governs the District. Trustees are elected by the shareholders of the Morrow Island Land Company, which is the sole property owner within the District, and serve 4-year terms. Officers of the Board are elected by the Trustees and include a President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer. The District has no employees. The Board of Trustees meets annually. The last meeting was held on January 26, 2019. Written meeting minutes are distributed prior to Board meetings, but not an agenda. The District does not currently have a website. None of the Board of Directors receives compensation from the District. The last District audit was conducted in August 2012 by the Solano County Auditor-Controller's Office.

Determinations:

6.1: The District's has an adequate governance structure to manage the District.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other matters or local commission policies affecting efficient service delivery.

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.11: Reclamation District 2139 (Can-Can/Green Head)

4.11.1 District Profile

Reclamation District 2139 (Can-Can/Green Head) is located on the eastern side of the Suisun Marsh, north of the Montezuma Slough and west of Luco Slough (see Figure 4.13). Solano LAFCO approved the formation of the District on November 14, 2005 under Division 15 of the California Water Code to operate and maintain the water delivery and drain systems common to the property within the District, as well as maintain that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for habitat management. The District was formed in order to maintain existing reclamation facilities within an area that has already been reclaimed and no new reclamation activities or facilities were proposed or contemplated. The service area of the District includes six parcels totaling 1,698.70 acres (see Table 4.39). The District is governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of three trustees who are elected by property owners and each serve 4-year terms (see Table 4.40).

Table 4.39: RD 2139 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046170090	426.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	738
2	0046170100	42.83	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1086
3	0046170110	222.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1086
4	0046170200	442.83	Water Bodies & Courses	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
5	0046170210	283.04	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
6	0046170220	282.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	738
Total Acres		1,698.70				

Source: Solano County GIS; District Formation Documents

Figure 4.13: Boundary Map of RD 2139




Table 4.40: RD 2139 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	114 Pierce Street Santa Rosa, CA 95404 Phone: (707) 542-1921
Website	None
Formation Date	November 14, 2005 (LAFCO Resolution No. 05-12)
Principal Act	California Water Code Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Operating and maintaining the water delivery and drain systems common to the property within the District, as well as maintaining that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for Habitat Management.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries (LAFCO RESOLUTION NO. 05-12)
District Status	Active
Governance	
Governing Body	3-member Board of Trustees with 4-year terms. Trustees are elected by district landowners
Officers	President: William W. Hatcher Vice-President: Scott Bohannon Secretary: Scott Bohannon Treasurer: Mark Wilson
Compensation	None.
Meetings	The Board of Trustees meets annually. Last meeting was held on 10/15/18. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of annual meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes. Dated 7/14/05.
Operations	
Employees	None.
Facilities/Assets	No District owned facilities. The District has a bank account
Services Provided	Levee Maintenance and Flood Control
Shared Facilities/Services	None.
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending December 31
Cash on Hand	N/A
Current Budget (FY 2019)	Not provided
Primary Revenue Sources	Property owner contributions and governmental grants
Assets	\$0 (December 31, 2018)
Liabilities	\$0 (December 31, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$0 (December 31, 2018)
Risk Management	District does <u>not</u> maintain liability insurance
Most Recent Financial Audit	Financial Audit Report for the fiscal years ended December 31, 2009-2013
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report filed with the State Controller's Office

N/A = Not Available, N/P = Not Provided

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2139, RD 2139 Bylaws, Solano LAFCO's RD 2139 formation documents, and RD 2139 FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report submitted to the California State Controller's Office.

4.11.2; MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for property within the District as marsh (M) with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP-250) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District.

The most recent available U.S. Census Bureau data at the block level shows a population of six currently residing within the district boundaries. The District's primary purpose is to protect the property within the District from flooding. In that capacity, the District is not looking to expand its boundaries. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

1.1: The District is largely uninhabited and there are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of RD 2139.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available data from the U.S. Census Bureau there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2139. The surrounding area has a median household income (MHI) of \$84,141 as of 2017. Given that the MHI is well above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC, the area does not qualify as a DUC. In addition, RD 2139 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2139.

2.2: RD 2139 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection, therefore the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2139 maintains 5.81 miles of levees by contracting with Wetlands Construction and the California Waterfowl Association to provide levee maintenance and flood control (see Table 4.41). The levees within the District are maintained according to the Suisun Marsh Local Protection Program exterior levee standards and inspections are performed monthly. The District does not have any employees. The services provided by the District are only provided within the District's sphere of influence and the District does not receive any services from another District.

Determinations:

- 3.1: Reclamation District 2139 currently provides minimal services to the property owners within the District’s sphere of influence, including levee maintenance and flood control. The District provides the services through contractors.
- 3.2: The District conducts monthly inspections of the levees, which are maintained in compliance with the Suisun Marsh Local Protection Plan.

Table 4.41: RD 2139 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Wetlands Construction
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	N/A
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	Wetlands Construction/California Waterfowl Association
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	5.81 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
Suisun Marsh Standard:	5.81 miles
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Levees are inspected on a monthly basis.
Most Recent Inspection Report	N/A
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2139

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: RD 2139 primarily receives its revenue from member contributions, but will also apply for and receive state/federal assistance for weather related damage when necessary (see Table 4.42).

Fund Balance: According to the District’s 2018 Financial Transaction Report and 2009-2013 Financial Audit, the District has maintained little to no fund balance over the past 5-years. The District has also indicated that it does not own any assets and does not have any liabilities. The District’s financial statements are audited by an independent auditor every 5-years with the next audit due in 2019 for fiscal years 2014-2018. The last available independent audit of the District’s financial statements was

conducted in 2014 and included the fiscal years ended December 31, 2009-2013. The District began submitting a financial transaction reports to the State Controller’s Office in 2015, and has continued to do so every year since.

Determinations:

4.1: RD 2139’s major source of revenue comes from property owner contributions and periodic state/federal grant funding for weather related damage. Revenues appear to be adequate to cover normal maintenance and operating expenses.

Table 4.42: RD 2139 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$N/A	\$ N/A	\$ 0
Member Contributions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20,480
Service Charges	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
State/Federal Assistance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	16,871
Other	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$N/A	\$ N/A	\$ 0
Total	\$47,669	\$4,450	\$ 660	\$64,534	\$37,351
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$N/A	\$ N/A	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	36,691
Engineering	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Utilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Equipment Maintenance	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Debt Service	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ N/A	\$ N/A	\$N/A	\$ N/A	\$ 0
Total	\$47,669	\$4,450	\$ 660	\$64,534	\$36,691
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	0	0	0	0	660
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	0	0	0	0	660
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	\$ 21	\$ 21	\$ 21	\$ 21	21
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 21	\$ 21	\$ 21	\$ 21	\$ 681

N/A = Not Available

Source: RD 2139 FY 2009-2013 Audited Financial Statements, 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2139, RD 2139 FY 2018 FTR submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 2139 does not share any facilities or services with another district. The District is surrounded on three sides by sloughs and does not border another reclamation district. There are no opportunities to share facilities with other districts.

Determinations:

5.1: Reclamation District 2139 does not currently share any facilities with another district and is bordered on three sides by water. There are no opportunities to share facilities with another district.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

The District has a 3-member Board of Trustees with each member serving 4-year terms. The Trustees are elected by district landowners. Officers of the Board include a President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer. Currently, one Trustee fills the position of Vice President and Secretary. The District has an adopted set of bylaws dated 7/14/05. The District is owner managed and does not have any employees. The Board of Trustees meets annually with the last meeting being held on October 15, 2018. A written agenda and meeting minutes are provided in advance of the annual meeting. The District does not currently have a website.

Determinations:

6.1: The District has an adopted set of bylaws and provides written agendas and meeting minutes prior to its annual Board meeting.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other matters or local commission policies affecting efficient service delivery.

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

4.12: Reclamation District 2141 (Joice Island)

4.12.1: District Profile

Reclamation District 2141 is located on Joice Island north of Montezuma Slough (see Figure 4.14). Solano LAFCO approved the formation of the District on August 13, 2007 under Division 15 of the California Water Code to operate and maintain the water delivery and drain systems common to the property within the District, as well as maintain that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for habitat management. The District includes three parcels totaling 939.67 acres, in which two duck clubs (Volanti Duck Club & Joice Island Mallard Farm) operate (see Table 4.43). The District is governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of five trustees who serve staggered two and four-year terms (see Table 4.44).

Table 4.43: RD 2141 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046070010	244.70	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1143
2	0046070030	265.65	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1143
3	0046070040	429.32	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1172
Total Acres		939.67				

Source: Solano County GIS; District Formation Documents

Figure 4.14: Boundary Map of RD 2141




Table 4.44: RD 2141 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	650 Alvarado Road Berkeley, CA 94705 Phone: (510) 849-9415
Website	None
Formation Date	August 13, 2007 (LAFCO RESOLUTION NO. 07-15)
Principal Act	California Water Code Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Operate and maintain water delivery and drain system common to property within the District, as well as maintaining that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for Habitat Management.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries (LAFCO Resolution No: 07-15)
District Status	Active
Governance	
Governing Body	5-member Board of Trustees serving 2 and 4-year staggered terms. Officers are recommended to the District by the property owners and elected by the Trustees. As of December 2019, the County Board of Supervisors will appoint the Trustees.
Officers	President: Larry Newhall (elected 3/17) Vice-President: John Paulsen (elected 3/17) Secretary/Treasurer: Dennis DeDomenico (elected 3/17)
Compensation	None
Meetings	The Board of Trustees meets annually. Last meeting was held on 3/9/19. Written agenda and meeting minutes from previous meeting provided in advance of annual meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes. Dated 7/12/07
Operations	
Employees	None
Facilities/Assets	48" drain gate on California State Fish and Wildlife property, a checking/savings account, and an Epson color printer.
Services Provided	Levee Maintenance
Shared Facilities/Services	None.
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending December 31
Cash on Hand	\$9,584.28 (December 31, 2018)
Current Budget (FY 2019)	In excess of \$55,720
Primary Revenue Sources	Assessments and occasional grants
Assets	\$33,075.89 (December 31, 2018)
Liabilities	\$9,157.18 (Prepaid expenses by the two sub-entities and unspent CalOES reimbursements.)
Fund Balance	\$9,584.28 (December 31, 2018)
Risk Management	N/A
Most Recent Financial Audit	Audited Financial Statements for FY 2018 dated December 31, 2018.
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report filed with the State Controller's Office

N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2141, Solano LAFCO's RD 2141 formation documents, and RD 2141 FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report submitted to the California State Controller's Office.

4.12.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP) and designated as Marsh (M) with a Resource Conservation Overlay in the Solano County General Plan. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. The most recent available U.S. Census Bureau data at the block level shows a population of one currently residing in the District. The District's primary purpose is to protect the property within the District from flooding. In that capacity, the District is not looking to expand its boundaries. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District is largely uninhabited and there are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of RD 2141.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2141. The surrounding area has a median household income (MHI) of \$84,141 as of 2017. Given that the MHI is well above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC, the area does not qualify as a DUC. In addition, RD 2141 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2141.
- 2.2: RD 2141 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this district.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2141 maintains approximately 4.5 miles of levees through service contracts with Wetland Construction (see Table 4.45). The District reacts to requests from its two duck clubs to solicit repairs to levees and control structures located through the levees within the District. The two duck clubs that operate within the District provide various services including weed abatement/vegetation removal, upkeep of levee access roads, levee patrol, and pump maintenance and repair. The District periodically inspects the levees, while inspecting the levees more frequently during rain and high tide events. The District does not have any employees. The services provided by the District are only provided within the District's sphere of influence and the District does not receive any services from another District.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District provides levee maintenance services by contracting with Wetland Construction.
- 3.2: The two property owners within the District provide various services to the District including weed abatement/vegetation removal, upkeep of levee access roads, levee patrol, and pump maintenance and repair.

Table 4.45: RD 2141 Services, Facilities, & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Wetland Construction, Inc.
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Volanti Duck Club or Joice Island Mallard Farm (Duck Club #219 or #220)
Vector/Rodent Control	
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	Volanti Duck Club or Joice Island Mallard Farm (Duck Club #219 or #220)
Flood Control	
Levee Patrol	Volanti Duck Club or Joice Island Mallard Farm (Duck Club #219 or #220)
Pump Maintenance & Repair	Volanti Duck Club (Duck Club #219)
Drainage	
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	48" drain gate on California State Fish and Wildlife property.
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	4.5 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	4.5 miles
Suisun Marsh Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	The levees are inspected periodically, more frequently during rain and high tide events.
Most Recent Inspection Report	N/A
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None.
Services shared with other agencies	None.

N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2141

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: RD 2141 primarily receives its revenue in the form of assessments, but may apply for and receive state/federal assistance in the form of grants to cover expenses related to damage cause by weather events. The District suffered a flood emergency during the winter of FY 2017 in an area covered by a Federal Disaster Declaration. As a result of damages suffered, the District spent \$127,220 in 2018 to repair levees damaged by the flood. In addition, the District spent \$8,118 in contract services to a Designated Agent for assistance in filing the claims with Cal OES.

Fund Balance: RD 2141 has kept a positive fund balance over the past 5 years despite expenditures surpassing revenues in FYs 2014 and 2015 (see Table 4.46). District assets include a 48” drain gate, a checking/savings account with Tri Counties Bank, and an Epson color printer. Liabilities include prepaid expenses by property owners and unspent CalOES funds. Cash on hand equals \$9,584.

The District has indicated that they do produce an annual budget plan, but did not provide a fiscal year 2019 budget plan for this report. The District has had its FY 2018 financial statements independently audited by an outside accounting firm. The District has also submitted its FY 2018 financial transactions report to the California State Controller’s Office.

Determinations:

4.1: The District has been able to meet its financial obligations over the past 5 years and maintains a positive fund balance through property assessments and state/federal assistance when needed for weather related storm damages.

Table 4.46: RD 2141 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$2,500	\$36,688	\$2,000	\$105,863	\$ 116,709
Member Contributions	0	0	0	0	0
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	171,988
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$2,500	\$36,688	\$2,000	\$105,863	\$ 288,697
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 17,210
Repairs & Maintenance	1,681	35,088	266	97,482	181,447
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	460
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	1,293	2,341	1,698	6,574	0
Debt Services	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,262
Total	\$2,974	\$37,430	\$1,965	\$104,056	\$ 200,379
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(474)	(741)	34	1,806	88,318
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(474)	(741)	34	1,806	88,318
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	1,906	1,431	689	723	2,530
Fund Balance End of Year	\$1,431	\$ 689	\$ 723	\$ 2,530	\$110,206*

* Prior Period Adjustments made based on difference between audited and unaudited financial statements.

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2141, RD 2141 FY 2014-2018 Profit & Loss Statements, RD 2141 FY 2018 Audited Financial Statements

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

Although RD 2141 does not share any facilities or services with another reclamation district they do own a 48” drain gate on California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) property. The District does not border another reclamation district nor is it in proximity to another district. The Volanti Slough separates the District to the south from the Joice Island Unit of the Grizzly Island Wildlife Area, owned by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

Determinations:

- 5.1: RD 2141 does not share any facilities with another reclamation district and is not located adjacent to or near any other district. There are no opportunities to share facilities with another reclamation district.
- 5.2: RD 2141 owns a 48” drain gate on a State agency’s property.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

RD 2141 bylaws dated July 12, 2007, were amended in 2018 to provide for a 5-member Board of Trustees serving staggered terms with 2 members serving a two-year term and 3 members serving a four-year term expiring on a date two and four years after their respective appointments. Officers are recommended to the District by the property owners and elected by the Trustees. Officers of the Board include a President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer. One Trustee serves as both Secretary and Treasurer. The District does not have any employees.

The Board of Trustees meets annually. The last meeting was held on March 9, 2019. A written agenda and meeting minutes are provided in advance of the annual meeting. The District does not currently have a website. According to the meeting minutes from a District meeting held March 9, 2019, the Board of Trustees approved Resolution Number 1 declaring a hardship preventing the establishment or maintenance of a District website and Resolution Number 2 adopting a District Conflict of Interest Policy. A Reimbursement Policy was also discussed and a draft policy is being considered. Adoption of the reimbursement policy by the Board will be done via email.

Determinations:

- 6.1: RD 2141 has an adopted set of bylaws, with a 5-member Board of Trustees.
- 6.2: The District does not have a website, but the RD 2141 Board of Trustees has approved a resolution declaring a hardship preventing the establishment of a District website.
- 6.3: The District has an adopted Conflict of Interest Policy and will be adopting a Reimbursement Policy.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other matters or local commission policies affecting efficient service delivery.

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect the efficient delivery of services.

4.13: Reclamation District 2142 (Suisun Slough West)

4.13.1: District Profile

Reclamation District 2142, otherwise known as Suisun Slough West Reclamation District, is located in the western portion of the Suisun Marsh, North of Grizzly Bay and southwesterly of Fairfield. The east boundary of the District is bordered by the Suisun Slough and on the west boundary by the Union Pacific Railroad (see Figure 4.15). Solano LAFCO approved the formation of the District on August 13, 2007 under Division 15 of the California Water Code to operate and maintain the water delivery and drain systems common to the property within the District, as well as maintain that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for habitat management. Properties in the District at the time of formation had individual management plans certified by Suisun Resource Conservation District, the California Bay Conservation and Development Commission and the California Department of Fish and Game. The service area of the District includes nine parcels totaling 1,668.46 acres (see Table 4.47). The District is governed by a Board of Trustees consisting of three trustees who serve 4-year terms (see Table 4.48). The property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation (MP-250) and designated as Marsh (M) within a Resource Conservation Overlay District (RC-O) in the Solano County General Plan.

Table 4.47: RD 2142 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0046080030	472.65	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	457
2	0046080070	164.19	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	860
3	0046080130	0.01	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
4	0046080160	290.42	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1334
5	0046080170	325.10	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	1335
6	0046080180	0.08	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
7	0046090050	1.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	860
8	0046080040	220.51	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
9	0046080050	194.50	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	Active	919
Total Acres		1,668.46				

Source: Solano County GIS; District Formation Documents

Figure 4.15: Boundary Map of RD 2142




Table 4.48: RD 2142 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	P.O. Box 2602 Suisun City, CA 94585 Phone: (209) 487-4980
Website	None
Formation Date	August 13, 2007 (LAFCO RESOLUTION NO. 07-14)
Principal Act	California Water Code Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose	Operate and maintain the water delivery and drain systems common to the property within the District, as well as maintaining that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for Habitat Management.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries (LAFCO RESOLUTION NO. 07-14)
District Status	Active.
Governance	
Governing Body	3-member Board of Trustees serving 4-year terms. Trustees are currently elected by the District landowners but in the future will be appointed by the Board of Supervisors.
Officers	President: Ted Jonat Vice President: Mike Lenzi Secretary/Treasurer: Bob Bozek
Compensation	None
Meetings	The Board of Trustees meets annually. Last meeting was held on 3/3/19. Written agenda and meeting minutes from previous meeting provided in advance of annual meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes. Dated 6/29/07
Operations	
Employees	None
Facilities/Assets	No district owned facilities. The District has a checking account.
Services Provided	None
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$4,727 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (FY 2019)	N/P
Primary Revenue Sources	Service charges
Assets	\$4,727 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	None
Fund Balance	\$4,727 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	N/A
Most Recent Financial Audit	Financial Audit Report for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2013-2009
Most Recent Financial Transactions Report	FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report filed with the State Controller's Office

N/P = Not Provided by District, N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2142, Solano LAFCO District formation documents, and RD 2142 FY 2018 Financial Transactions Report submitted to the California State Controller's Office.

4.13.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for all property within the District as marsh (M) with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned Marsh Preservation District (MP-250) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District.

Formation documents for RD 2142, indicate that the District was uninhabited at the time of formation in 2007. The most recent available U.S. Census Bureau data at the block level shows no population currently residing in the District. The District's primary purpose is to protect the property within the District from flooding. In that capacity, the District is not looking to expand its boundaries. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

1.1: The District is uninhabited and there are no development plans or expectations for growth.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau there are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2142. The surrounding area has a median household income (MHI) of \$84,141 as of 2017. Given that the MHI is well above the MHI threshold for defining a DUC, the area does not qualify as a DUC. In addition, RD 2142 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2142.

2.2: RD 2142 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this district.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2142 is responsible for operating and maintaining the water delivery and drain systems common to the property within the District, as well as maintaining that portion of the exterior levees and roads that contain the flood and drain gates necessary to the water delivery and drain systems for habitat management. The District has indicated that it does not have any employees and does not directly perform work, but contracts for services (see Table 4.49).

Determinations:

3.1: RD 2142 provides basic services for operating and maintain the levee and water delivery systems common to property within the District.

Table 4.49: RD 2142 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	N/A
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	N/A
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	N/P
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
Suisun Marsh Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	N/P
Most Recent Inspection Report	N/P
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None.
Services provided to other agencies	None.
Services shared with other agencies	None.

N/P = Not Provided by District, N/A = Not Available
 Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2142

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: The District’s sole source of revenue over the past 5 years was from service charges to property owners (see Table 4.50). Revenues and expenditures have been equal with the primary expense for levee maintenance. The District did not provide a FY 2019 budget.

Fund Balance:

The District has maintained a positive fund balance over the past five years. As of the end of FY 2018, RD 2142 had a positive fund balance of \$4,737 with no liabilities.

Determinations:
 4.1: RD 2142 has the ability to meet its minimal financial obligations at its current level of service.

Table 4.50: RD 2142 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Member Contributions	0	0	0	0	0
Service Charges	6,540	6,540	6,540	6,540	6,540
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Other	<u>\$ 0</u>				
Total	\$6,540	\$6,540	\$6,540	\$6,540	\$ 6,540
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Services & Supplies	6,538	6,542	6,540	6,540	6,540
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Services	0	0	0	0	0
Other	<u>\$ 0</u>				
Total	\$6,538	\$6,542	\$6,540	\$6,540	\$ 6,540
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	2	(2)	0	0	0
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	2	(2)	0	0	0
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	3,349	3,351	3,349	3,349	3,349
Fund Balance End of Year	\$3,351	\$3,349	\$3,349	\$3,349	\$4,727*

* Adjustment made due to account balancing

Source: RD 2142 FY 2009-2013 Audited Financial Statements, 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by RD 2142, RD 2142 FY 2018 FTR submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 2142 does not currently share any facilities or services with another district. A very small portion of the District is just north of and directly across the confluence of Cordelia and Goodyear Sloughs from RD 2138, which may present opportunities for shared services.

Determinations:

5.1: RD 2142 does not currently share any facilities or services with another District. The District is located in proximity to RD 2138.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

RD 2142 has a set of bylaws dated June 29, 2007. The District has a 3-member Board of Trustees with each trustee serving a 4-year term. Trustees are elected by District landowners. Officers of the Board include a President, Vice President, and Secretary/Treasurer. Currently, one Trustee serves as both the Secretary and Treasurer. Trustees are not compensated. The District does not have any employees. The Board of Trustees meets annually. The last meeting was held on March 3, 2019. A written agenda and meeting minutes are provided in advance of the annual meeting. The District does not have a website.

The District has its financial statements independently audited every 5 years, with the last audit report being produced in 2014 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2009-2013. The District has submitted a financial transaction report to the California State Controller's Office for the past 4 years including their latest report for FY 2018.

Determinations:

- 6.1: RD 2142 is governed by a 3-member Board of Trustees serving 4-year terms who are not compensated. Officers include a President, Vice President, and Secretary/Treasurer. The District has no employees.
- 6.2: The District meets annually and provides a written agenda and meeting minutes prior to the meeting.
- 6.3: The District does report its financial transactions to the State Controller's Office on an annual basis and has its financial statements independently audited every 5 years.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other matters or local commission policies affecting efficient service delivery.

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

SECTION 5: COLLINSVILLE LEVEE DISTRICT OF SOLANO COUNTY

5.0: Regional Context

Collinsville is a rural unincorporated community situated east of the Suisun Marsh in the southeastern portion of Solano County, approximately 10 miles southwest of Rio Vista and 15 miles southeast of Fairfield. The community is bordered on the south and southwest by the Sacramento River and on the west by Montezuma Slough. The Solano County General Plan shows Collinsville as a Special Study Area (SSA) covering approximately 8,500 acres. The land use plan for the Collinsville area is intended to 1) maintain the residential character of Collinsville and Birds Landing, 2) retain the possibility for future industrial development outside of the existing community, and 3) protect the condition of Suisun Marsh and other natural resource areas. Property in the district is designated as Traditional Community in the County General Plan, which allows for infill residential, mixed-use development, and limited industrial uses that rely on the Collinsville area's unique access to the Sacramento River and wind resources. According to the General Plan EIR, the area lacks infrastructure including the provision of septic tanks for existing homes. As such, substantial residential growth is not expected to occur in the near future within Collinsville.

5.1: District Profile

The Collinsville Levee District lies within the Collinsville Special Study Area along the Sacramento River (see Figure 5.1). District lands consist of 65 parcels totaling approximately 233.83 acres (see Table 5.1). Formed on September 2, 1924 under the California Levee District Act of 1905, the District now operates under Section 70070 of the Water Code and Section 1780 of the Government Code (see Table 5.2). The District was formed to provide for the erection of levees, dikes, and other works necessary to protect the lands within the district from overflow and to levy assessments to erect, construct, and maintain such levees, dikes, and other flood control works. The service area of the district is defined by the physical barriers of the levees and the upland hill areas. Land uses include single family homes, agricultural and marsh land. The District maintains approximately 1.375-miles of levee that protects the historic town of Collinsville from flooding. The most recent flood event occurred in the winter of 2008 when water topped the levee.

Figure 5.1: Boundary Map of Collinsville Levee District




Table 5.1: Collinsville Levee District Parcels, Acreage & Land Use

Map ID	Parcel Number	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0090130010	7.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
2	0090130100	1.36	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
3	0090130110	41.91	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
4	0090130130	1.43	Marsh (M)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
5	0090130140	1.60	Marsh (M)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
6	0090130170	2.94	Marsh (M)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
7	0090130180	12.70	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
8	0090130190	1.90	Marsh (M)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
9	0090130200	2.40	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
10	0090130220	2.10	Marsh (M)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
11	0090130240	1.60	Marsh (M)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
12	0090130250	6.80	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
13	0090130270	51.80	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
14	0090130310	4.70	General Industrial (GI)	Commercial Recreation – Limited (CRL)	-	-
15	0090130320	1.26	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
16	0090130330	20.04	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
17	0090130340	1.57	General Industrial (GI)	Commercial Recreation – Limited (CRL)	-	-
18	0090130360	13.73	General Industrial (GI)	Commercial Recreation – Limited (CRL)	-	-
19	0090130370	6.22	Marsh (M)	Suisun Marsh Agriculture (ASM160)	-	-
20	0090130380	28.08	Marsh (M)	Suisun Marsh Agriculture (ASM160)	-	-
21	0090140110	4.75	Marsh (M)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
22	0090150010	0.63	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
23	0090150020	0.25	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
24	0090150030	0.12	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
25	0090150040	0.14	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
26	0090150050	0.17	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-

27	0090150060	0.18	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
28	0090150070	0.10	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
29	0090150080	0.20	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
30	0090150090	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
31	0090150100	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
32	0090150110	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
33	0090150120	0.14	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
34	0090150140	0.13	General Industrial (GI)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
35	0090150150	0.13	General Industrial (GI)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
36	0090150160	0.19	General Industrial (GI)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
37	0090150170	0.13	General Industrial (GI)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
38	0090150180	0.19	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Commercial Recreation - Limited (CRL)	-	-
39	0090150190	0.88	Marsh (M)	Commercial Recreation - Limited (CRL)	-	-
40	0090150200	0.23	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
41	0090160010	0.44	Marsh (M)	Commercial Recreation - Limited (CRL)	-	-
42	0090160020	0.08	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
43	0090160030	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
44	0090160040	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
45	0090160050	0.14	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
46	0090160060	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
47	0090160070	6.00	Marsh (M)	Marsh Preservation (MP)	-	-
48	0090170010	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
49	0090170020	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
50	0090170040	0.16	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
51	0090170060	0.08	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
52	0090170070	5.00	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-

53	0090170080	0.11	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
54	0090170090	0.14	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
55	0090170100	0.13	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
56	0090170110	0.14	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
57	0090170120	0.14	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
58	0090170130	0.18	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
59	0090170140	0.13	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
60	0090170160	0.13	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
61	0090170180	0.15	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
62	0090170240	0.02	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
63	0090170280	0.09	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
64	0090170290	0.07	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-
65	0090170300	0.08	Traditional Community - Residential (TC-R)	Residential Traditional Community (RTC4)	-	-

Total Acres 233.83

Source: Solano County GIS

Table 5.2: Collinsville Levee District Profile

District Organization	
District Office	2550 Hilborn Road, #215 Fairfield, CA 94534 Phone: (707) 419-4383
Website	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date	July 7, 1924
Principal Act	California Levee District Act of 1905
Purpose	Provide for the erection of levees, dikes, and other works necessary to protect the lands within the district from overflow and to levy assessments to erect, construct, and maintain such levees, dikes, and other flood control works.
Sphere of Influence	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status	Active.
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three members serving four-year terms, appointed by the Solano County Board of Supervisors.
Officers	Elected by Board of Trustees President: Sam Liberati Secretary: Marilyn Vitali Treasurer: Judi Booe Vice President: Sue Rodway
Compensation	None
Meetings	The Board of Trustees meets periodically. Last meeting was held on 3/28/19. Written agenda and meeting minutes from previous meeting provided in advance of annual meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes. Dated 6/29/07
Operations	
Employees	Administrative Staff position
Facilities/Assets	No district owned facilities. The District has a checking account.
Services Provided	None
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	Ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$4,727 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (FY 2019)	Not provided
Primary Revenue Sources	Service charges
Assets	\$4,727 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	None
Fund Balance	\$4,727 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	
Most Recent Financial Audit	Conducted by Solano County Auditor/Controller
Most Recent Financial Transaction Report	FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report filed with the State Controller's Office

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by Collinsville Levee District, Solano LAFCO's Collinsville Levee Maintenance District formation documents, Collinsville Levee District's FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report submitted to the California State Controller's Office.

5.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Collinsville Levee District is located within the Collinsville Special Study Area. Current land uses in the area include natural resources land, utility operations, publicly owned open space, residences, wind farms, and agricultural lands used primarily for grain and grazing sheep. Much of the land is used for dry farming and the production of wind energy. A cluster of approximately 25 homes is located along the southern end of Collinsville Road. Another cluster of homes and businesses is located in Birds Landing, at the northern edge where Collinsville and Birds Landing Roads intersect. The Solano County General Plan shows a mix of land use designations within the Collinsville SSA as Traditional Community-Residential, Commercial Recreation, Water Dependent Industrial, marsh, and agriculture. Property within the District is zoned Residential Traditional Community (RTC-4), Commercial Recreation (CR) and Marsh Preservation (MP) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. According to the General Plan EIR, the area currently lacks the necessary sewer and water infrastructure, including the provision of septic tanks for existing homes to support residential and commercial development. As such, substantial population growth is not expected to occur in the near future within Collinsville.

Determinations:

- 1.1: There are no current development proposals or expectations for substantial population growth within the Collinsville Levee District.
- 1.2: The County General Plan does permit development of the Collinsville area consistent with its historical character, natural resources, and zoning including water dependent industrial. If future development is approved, the District should re-evaluate and upgrade the levee system and other flood protection infrastructure.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

GC §56033.5 defines a disadvantaged unincorporated community (DUC) as an inhabited community (containing 12 or more registered voters) where the annual median household income (MHI) is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual MHI. Based on the number of street addresses there is a cluster of approximately 25 homes in the district. According to the Solano County Register of Voters there are eight registered voters living within the district. Collinsville lies within Block Group 4 of Census Tract 2735.02, which has an MHI of less than 80 percent of the statewide MHI. Based on the number of registered voters Collinsville would not qualify as a DUC. The Collinsville Levee District also does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this district.

Determinations:

- 2.1: Collinsville is not considered a disadvantaged unincorporated community given that the number of registered voters does not meet the threshold requirements for a DUC.
- 2.2: The Collinsville Levee District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this district.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District performs a limited range of services, primarily levee maintenance and inspection (see Table 5.3). The District maintains approximately one mile of levee. District assets include prescriptive easements, a small pump, miscellaneous equipment, and shed. District services are performed by individual landowners or contracted services. Except in extreme flood conditions, the District has the capacity to provide basic services.

Determinations:

- 3.1: Except in extreme flood conditions the District has the capacity to provide services.
- 3.2: District assets include miscellaneous equipment to maintain the levee system and fight floods.

Table 5.3: Collinsville Levee District Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Provided by outside contractor
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Provided by Board members and local residents
Vector/Rodent Control	Provided by Board members
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	Provided by outside contractor
Levee Patrol	Provided by Board members
Pump Maintenance & Repair	Provided by outside contractor
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	Prescriptive Easements
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	0.99 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Local residents and Board members inspect levees weekly. District contracts with an engineering company to inspect the levee on an annual basis and certify the results with DWR.
Most Recent Inspection Report	Annual review and certification to DWR
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire submitted by Collinsville Levee Maintenance District; USACE National Levee Database

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Collinsville Levee District is a small district with limited financial capacity. Levee maintenance and inspection services are funded primarily through ad valorem property taxes and state subvention funds (see Table 5.4). The District receives approximately \$10,000 annually in property taxes. Since 2015, the District has also secured grants from DWR totaling over \$350,000. The Solano County General Plan recommends the exploration of additional funding mechanisms for levees and other flood control mechanisms to protect the Collinsville town site (Implementation Measure SS.I-8). In 2015 the District received a three-year loan from Solano County, which was repaid in 2017 from a DWR grant for qualified work under the State’s Delta Levee Maintenance Subvention Program. Financial records submitted by the District show the District received reimbursements from FEMA and Cal OES/DWR in 2017 for flood fighting and operating expenses. The major expense was the replacement of a water pump. In 2018, the District received \$58,809 in federal/state assistance. According to the California State Controller’s Office, the district had a negative fund balance of \$8,411 at the end of FY 2018 with financial assets of \$4,911 and liabilities of \$13,322. District assets include bank accounts with Solano County, a pump, prescriptive easements, and miscellaneous small equipment.

Determinations:	
4.1:	The District is funded primarily through ad valorem property taxes. In the event of damage from a major storm event, the District relies on reserves and state subvention funds to partially cover flood fighting services and levee repairs.
4.2:	Collinsville is a small District with limited financial capacity whose revenue fluctuates based on state/federal assistance for levee maintenance and repair.
4.3:	The District reports its financial transactions to the State Controller’s Office on an annual basis.

Table 5.4: Collinsville Levee District Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$10,158	\$10,487	\$10,777	\$10,415	\$10,420
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	86	82	24,281	43,452	58,809
Other	77	90	0	11	105
Total	\$10,321	\$10,659	\$35,058	\$53,878	\$69,334
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Services & Supplies	7,720	43,725	55,069	18,797	39,375
Capital Outlay	0	12,080	0	0	30,165
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Services	0	0	0	0	0
Other	51	21	61	36	37
Total	\$ 7,771	\$55,826	\$55,130	\$18,833	\$69,517
Net Operating Revenue/ (Loss)	2,550	(45,167)	(20,072)	35,045	(183)
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	2,550	(45,167)	(20,072)	35,045	(183)
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	19,416	21,966	(23,201)	(43,273)	(8,228)
Fund Balance End of Year	\$21,966	(\$23,201)	(\$43,273)	(\$8,228)	(\$8,411)

Source: Collinsville Levee District FY 2014-2018 FTRs submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District operates under a separate section of the California Water Code than reclamation districts and provides flood protection for District residents and property. The District's levee and drainage systems are unique to Collinsville and are not connected to the levee system of another district. There is no overlap in service delivery with another agency that provides similar services.

Determinations:

- 5.1: Unlike the reclamation districts in Solano County, the Collinsville Levee District was formed under a different act and is somewhat isolated from the reclamation districts. There is no current opportunity for the Collinsville Levee District to share facilities with a neighboring reclamation district.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

The governing board for Collinsville is a three-member Board of Trustees who are appointed by the Solano County Board of Supervisors for four-year terms. Vacancies on the Board are filled pursuant to Section 1780 of the Government Code. When no election is held, the County Board of Supervisors appoint those nominated for the positions of trustee, and if no person has been nominated, the Board of Supervisors appoints a qualified person or persons. The current Board of Trustees was appointed by the Solano County Board of Supervisors in January 2014 with terms expiring in 2019 and 2021. To be eligible to serve on the Board of Trustees qualified candidates must be property owners in the district or their designated representatives. The District has an administrative staff of one.

Determinations:

- 6.1: The District has an adopted set of bylaws and is governed by a five-member Board of Trustees serving 4-year terms who are not compensated. Officers include a President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer. The District has one administrative employee.
- 6.2: The District meets periodically and provides a written agenda and meeting minutes prior to the meeting.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

SECTION 6: SACRAMENTO DELTA RECLAMATION DISTRICTS

6.0: Regional Context

The boundaries of the statutorily defined Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta were established in 1959 under the Delta Protection Act (CWC §12220). In 1992, the Delta was divided into two zones. The Primary Zone includes approximately 500,000 acres of waterways, levees and farmed lands extending over portions of five counties: Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano and Yolo. The Secondary Zone consisting of approximately 238,000 acres is all the area within the legal boundaries of the Delta not included in the primary zone subject to the land use authority of local governments.

The Delta is part of a flood-prone area that is defined geographically and hydraulically by levees (see Figure 6.1).

The **Yolo Bypass** is a seasonal flood plain located west of the Sacramento River in Yolo and Solano Counties that floods regularly during the winter and spring. The Bypass begins in Yolo County and ends just north of the City of Rio Vista in the Liberty Farms area, where the Bypass joins Prospect Slough and Cache Slough. The Yolo Bypass was designed in the early 1930's by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers as part of the Sacramento Flood Control Project. The flood control project is a system of levees, bypasses, dams, and weirs along the main river channels that were incorporated into a single flood control system to protect Delta cities from seasonal floods.

The **Cache Slough Complex** is located at the intersection of the Yolo Bypass and the Delta. The CSC is in a pivotal location for flood management in the region. The CSC has been identified as an area with potential for tidal restoration as a result of its connectivity with the Yolo Bypass floodplain, suitable elevations, high turbidity, high primary and secondary productivity, and use by Delta smelt, Chinook salmon, and other native fishes. Both federal and state wildlife agencies consider the CSC as a prime area to advance habitat conservation to benefit endangered species in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and incorporate improvements to the regional flood management system.⁴⁶

Habitat Restoration Projects: The Yolo Bypass/Cache Slough region is a key public focus by state/federal agencies and environmental organizations for habitat restoration projects. There are also other restoration projects in the region that are in various forms of development. Legislation passed in 1988 significantly increased funding for Delta levees while mandating no net loss of fish or wildlife habitat in the Delta and providing funds to mitigate past losses. Habitat restoration has occurred as mitigation for many large and small development projects throughout the Delta. In recent years large tracts of property have been acquired by both government and private interests in anticipation of future mitigation needs.⁴⁷

Reclamation Districts Located in the Sacramento Delta: There are ten Solano County reclamation districts located within the Sacramento Delta (see Figure 6.2). These districts patrol, inspect, maintain, and repair over 146 miles of levees to protect property within their jurisdiction from flood waters. Most Delta levees were built by private landowners or reclamation districts and maintained by local reclamation districts. Levees built by the federal government as part of a federally authorized flood control project are known as project levees and are built to standards that comply with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers guidelines. These levees have been turned over to the State for maintenance as part of the state plan for flood control. Project Levees are defined under the State Water Resources law (Chapter 1 (commencing with §12570) and Chapter 2 (commencing with §12639 of Part 6) and are shown on the Department of Water Resources "Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Atlas" dated 1993.

⁴⁶ Cache Slough Complex

⁴⁷ <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=83617fa1873a4cd781a15b54e14312c7>
<https://www.sacbee.com/opinion/op-ed/soapbox/article75622122.html>

Figure 6.1: Yolo Bypass/Cache Slough Complex Levees





Figure FI-1: Flood Management Overlay



Figure 6.2: Sacramento Delta Reclamation Districts



6.1: Reclamation District No. 501 (Ryer Island)

6.1.1: District Profile

Reclamation District No. 501 is located on Ryer Island in the Sacramento Delta bounded by Miner Slough on the north and west, Steamboat Slough on the east and south, and Cache Slough on the southwest (see Figure 6.3). The District was formed on June 16, 1887 under the California Political Code (Section 3452) to maintain levees and provide drainage services to some 11,877 acres of land that is mostly devoted to agricultural uses (see Table 6.1). The District is responsible for maintaining 20.6 miles of project levees surrounding the island, 34.4 miles of interior drainage canals, and three drainage pump stations strategically located along Cache Slough and Steamboat Slough to remove excess water from district lands. Activities and services provided by the District are outlined in a communication to landowners dated February 4, 1926, which was adopted by the District. RD 501 is an independent district governed by an elected three-member board of trustees that holds annual board meetings in September (see Table 6.2).

Figure 6.3: Boundary Map of RD 501




Table 6.1: RD 501 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	Parcel Number	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042220020	416.83	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1169
2	0042220030	145.86	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1281
3	0042220040	76.83	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
4	0042220070	125.28	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	604
5	0042220080	139.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	212
6	0042220100	61.68	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	75
7	0042220110	85.25	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	356
8	0042220120	0.40	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
9	0042220130	73.14	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	75
10	0042220140	166.61	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	472
11	0042220160	150.13	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1140
12	0042220190	329.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1169
13	0042220210	329.50	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
14	0042230020	1.44	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
15	0042230040	414.14	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
16	0042230090	22.01	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1152
17	0042230110	220.73	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
18	0042230130	3.17	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
19	0042230140	255.09	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	356
20	0042230190	510.72	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
21	0042230210	47.81	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1152
22	0042230220	0.01	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
23	0042230230	63.15	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	356
24	0042230240	261.10	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	248
25	0042230250	197.27	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1139
26	0042240110	328.08	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1167
27	0042240120	267.73	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
28	0042240190	227.67	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
29	0042250010	239.98	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	206
30	0042250030	314.86	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	248
31	0042250040	216.54	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	315
32	0042250050	187.26	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1166
33	0042250070	153.87	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	248
34	0042250100	3.21	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	206
35	0042250110	289.76	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	206

36	0042250180	493.78	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	248
37	0042250190	52.99	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1344
38	0042250200	13.81	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1342
39	0042260020	2.88	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
40	0042260030	45.62	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
41	0042260040	3.78	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
42	0042260060	0.29	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
43	0042260070	0.13	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
44	0042260080	216.60	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	248
45	0042260090	4.32	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	248
46	0042320010	1.01	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	472
47	0042330010	1.41	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
48	0042340010	0.95	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1140
49	0042350010	2.55	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1140
50	0042360010	0.35	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1169
51	0042360020	1.23	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
52	0042370010	1.93	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
53	0042400010	4.32	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
54	0042400020	0.83	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
55	0042410010	2.84	Water Bodies & Courses (WB)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1165
56	0177040010	320.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	886
57	0177040020	266.04	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1167
58	0177040030	222.32	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	233
59	0177040040	336.30	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1167
60	0177050010	115.01	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1167
61	0177050020	200.27	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1167
62	0177050030	280.23	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1166
63	0177050040	242.51	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1166
64	0177050050	256.05	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1166
65	0177050060	164.95	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	248
66	0177050120	123.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	686
67	0177050130	141.14	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	687
68	0177050140	43.86	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1343
69	0177050150	59.50	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1345
70	0177060010	252.16	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1167
71	0177060020	396.46	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1168
72	0177060030	420.96	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	357
73	0177060040	37.40	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	688
74	0177060050	16.38	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1154

75	0177060070	190.74	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1153
76	0177060080	266.90	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1168
77	0177060090	309.14	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1168
Total Acres		11,838.59				

Source: Solano County GIS

Table 6.2: RD 501 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office:	Stacey Boyd, Superintendent 3554 State Highway 84 Walnut Grove, CA 95690 Phone: (916) 775-1996
Website:	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date:	June 16, 1887
Principal Act:	California Political Code, Section 3452
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system.
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three-members elected by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by landowners President: Neil Hamilton Secretary/Treasurer: Grace Nixon Vice President: Tom Hester
Compensation	None
Meetings	Scheduled as required. Annual budget meeting held in September.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	Grace Nixon, Secretary; Dick Taylor, Manager
Facilities/Assets	
Services Provided	Levee maintenance and repair
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending Oct 31st
Cash on Hand	\$591,045 (October 31, 2018)
Current Budget (2018-2019)	Revenue: \$526,063; Expenses: \$475,783
Primary Revenue Sources	State subvention funding, property assessments
Assets	\$680,188 (October 31, 2018)
Liabilities	\$1,005,227 (October 31, 2018)
Fund Balance	(\$325,039) (October 31, 2018)
Risk Management	The District purchases business liability, E&O, auto, and property insurance
Most Recent Audit	Audited Financial Statements for FY 2015-2016 dated July 21, 2017
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: Reclamation District survey submitted by RD 501, FTR to State Controller's Office, Solano County Boards, Committees, & Commissions website

6.1.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

RD 501 serves a population of approximately 30 residents. The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for all property within the District as agriculture with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Most of the land is used for agriculture purposes and is under Williamson Act contracts. There are no expectations for growth or development of the District. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

1.1: There are no expectations for growth or development.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no DUC's located within or contiguous to RD 501. The median household income for the area is well above the threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community and RD 501 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection. Therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to RD 501.

2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 501.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

According to the Delta Stewardship Council RD 501 levees meet PL 84-99 rural standards for project levees.⁴⁸ The District focuses primarily on levee maintenance and flood protection in order to comply with levee maintenance standards and address inspection infractions (see Table 6.3). Routine maintenance activities are performed using district employees. For major levee repairs the District relies on assistance from DWR and the USACE. The latest DWR Maintenance inspection report (2018) gave the district an overall rating of minimally acceptable (see Table 6.4). According to DWR, the district needs to focus on controlling vegetation along the levees to maintain visibility and access.

Determinations:

3.1: District levees meet PL 84-99 rural standards, although levee maintenance is minimally acceptable. The District has the capacity and is working with State and Federal Agencies to improve levee maintenance and flood protection.

⁴⁸ Delta Stewardship Council, Delta islands and tracts protected by levees meeting Bulletin 192-82/PL 84-99 standards, located at <https://viewperformance.deltacouncil.ca.gov/pm/delta-levees>

Table 6.3: RD 501 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Minimally acceptable based on DWR report
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	N/A
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	
Easements	
Drainage System/Ditches	
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	20.6 miles of project levees
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	20.6 miles
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: Audited Financial Statements for FY 2015-2016

Table 6.4: RD 501 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018

District	Overall Rating					Total Levee Miles
	A= Acceptable; M = Minimally Acceptable; U = Unacceptable					
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
RD 501	U	U	U	M	M	20.26

Source: DWR Maintenance Inspection Report

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: The District’s most recent Financial Transaction Report (2018) shows revenue of \$526,063 mostly from property tax assessments (see Table 6.5). The amount of the assessment is determined annually by the Board of Trustees and is charged to landowners on a pro-rata basis based on assessed value. RD 501 participates in the State’s Delta Levee Subvention Program, which provides funding to help the District maintain its levee system. The District also has interest income and other revenue. In 2018, District expenditures totaled \$475,783, primarily for salaries and levee maintenance services. Long-term warrants were issued in 2013, with a maturity date of October 16, 2018, to fund the replacement of pumping pipes. Regular monthly payments of principal and interest have been made with a final balloon payment due at the end of the term. Annual cash flow for 2018 was positive.

Fund Balance: As of June 30, 2018, RD 501 had a negative fund balance of (\$325,039) due to a carryover from 2017. The fund balance represents assets totaling \$680,188 minus liabilities consisting primarily of outstanding warrants and accrued expenses of approximately \$1,005,227.

Assets: The District owns a number of capital assets including cash and investments, receivables, land, facilities and equipment including pumping plants and pumps.

Determinations:

- 4.1: The District has adequate funding from several sources to maintain the levee system, including revenue from a special property assessment and the State Delta Levee Subvention Program.
- 4.2: The District is able to issue warrants and long-term notes to cover revenue shortfalls and pay for capital improvements.

Table 6.5: RD 501 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$360,504	\$435,528	\$440,704	\$ 459,703	\$ 475,709
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	78,079	52,406	0	0
Other	\$ 40,474	\$ 9	\$ 23	\$ 51,752	\$ 50,354
Total	\$400,978	\$513,616	\$493,133	\$ 511,455	\$ 526,063
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 54,807	\$ 44,793	\$ 0	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	282,273	18,007	112,420	351,835	341,395
Capital Outlay/Depreciation	0	21,580	24,501	0	0
Labor Costs (salaries & benefits)	120,899	134,119	142,795	135,408	134,388
Engineering	0	76,436	65,687	0	0
Utilities	0	7,475	12,590	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	13,161	33,329	0	0
Debt Service	0	27,206	19,200	0	0
Other (permits, misc.)	\$ 0	\$ 71,876	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$403,172	\$432,142	\$455,315	\$ 487,243	\$ 475,783
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(2,194)	81,474	37,818	24,212	50,280
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(2,194)	81,474	37,818	24,212	50,280
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	(419,447)	(430,278)	165,713	203,531	(339,098)
Fund Balance End of Year	(\$430,278)*	\$165,713*	\$203,531	(\$339,098)*	(\$325,039)*

* Prior Period Adjustments made based on difference between audited and unaudited financial statements.

Source: RD 501 FY 2015-2016 Audited Financial Statements; RD 501 FY 2014, 2017, & 2018 FTRs submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District maintains the project levees surrounding Ryer Island and operates six pumping stations that provide flood protection and drainage services to District properties. RD 501 does not share facilities with or provide services to other districts. The District works cooperatively with the Department of Fish and Game to refrain from any maintenance activities that will disturb sensitive wildlife habitat and works with the Department of Water Resources and USACE to maintain the levees.

Determinations:

- 5.1: The District does not share facilities with or provide services to other districts.
- 5.2: The District works cooperatively with the Department of Fish and Game to preserve sensitive wildlife habitat.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

The Board of Trustees consists of three members who are elected to serve 4-year terms. They receive no compensation. Public meetings are held annually in September at the District office on Ryer Island. Financial statements are independently audited with the most recent report being produced in 2017. The District also submits annual financial transaction reports to the California State Controller's Office, including FY 2018. The District does not currently have a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

- 6.1: The Board of Trustees holds public meetings on an annual basis to set a budget and transact District business. District personnel and outside labor are sufficient to provide the current level of services.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.2: Reclamation District No. 536 (Egbert Tract)

6.2.1: District Profile

RD 536 is primarily agricultural land, bordered by Little Egbert Tract to the east, the City of Rio Vista on the south and Lindsey Slough to the North (see Figure 6.4). The District encompasses approximately 6,700.51 acres of agricultural land (see Table 6.6). The District maintains 10.6 miles of project levees and 15 miles of canals that serves a population of five. RD 536 was established on September 4, 1891 to protect Egbert Tract from flooding by operating and maintaining the levees, flood control, and drainage systems within the district (see Table 6.7).

Table 6.6: RD 536 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042170050	551.32	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
2	0042170130	160.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	Active	23
3	0042170140	320.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	Active	23
4	0042170210	320.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	-	-
5	0042180060	3.11	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1247
6	0042180090	267.26	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
7	0042180100	16.99	Water Bodies & Courses (WB)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	777
8	0042180110	401.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	777
9	0042180150	480.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1164
10	0042180210	320.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
11	0042180220	615.07	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
12	0042180270	80.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	Active	23
13	0042180280	160.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
14	0042180290	160.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	Active	23
15	0042180300	111.75	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	777
16	0042180310	260.14	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	777
17	0042180330	161.41	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1164
18	0042270010	1.31	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1164
19	0042270030	3.56	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	777
20	0042270050	1.75	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
21	0042270080	5.16	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1164
22	0042270090	94.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
23	0042270100	38.04	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
24	0042270110	0.20	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
25	0042270120	0.10	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	23
26	0042270130	13.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1164
27	0048080010	323.37	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	Active	23
28	0048080130	642.58	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	Active	1164
29	0048080140	16.92	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A160)	Active	1164
30	0177010010	491.39	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
31	0177030050	151.50	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-

32	0177030060	230.30	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
33	0177030070	292.61	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
34	0177100070	5.77	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
Total Acres		6,700.51				

Source: Solano County GIS

Figure 6.4: Map of RD 536 Boundaries




Table 6.7: RD 536 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office:	P.O. Box 785 Rio Vista, CA 94571 Phone: (209) 481-6213
Website:	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date:	September 4, 1891
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system within the district.
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three members appointed by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by landowners President: Warren Gomes, Jr. Secretary/Treasurer: Vice President:
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets periodically. Last meeting held 10/17/18. Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act and held locally in Rio Vista.
Adopted Bylaws	
Operations	
Employees	David Hearn, Manager
Facilities/Assets	3 water pumps; capital assets
Services Provided	
Shared Facilities/Services	Eastern boundary shared with RD 2084; southern shared with the city of Rio Vista.
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$23,310 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (2018-2019)	Revenue: \$60,116; Expenses: \$58,565
Primary Revenue Sources	Property assessments, state subvention funding, federal assistance
Assets	\$83,425 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	\$58,565 (June 30, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$24,860 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	
Most Recent Audit	
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Transaction Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: Annual Financial Transaction Report (2018), Solano County Boards, Committees, & Commissions website

6.2.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

RD 536 serves a population of five. Property within the District is zoned for exclusive agriculture use (A80 or A160) with a Resource Conservation Overlay District and an agriculture land use designation under the County General Plan. There are no plans to convert agricultural lands to residential or commercial use. The population is expected to remain constant with no expansion of the District.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District serves a population of five and there are no expectations for population growth or expansion.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no DUC's located within or contiguous to RD 536. The area's median household income of well above the MHI threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community. RD 536 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 536.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 536.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District maintains 10.6 miles of project levees, 15 miles of drainage canals, and operates three pumps. The District patrols the levees, conducts levee inspections, and contracts with an outside engineering firm for inspection and maintenance services (see Table 6.8). According to the Delta Stewardship Council the levees do not meet federal standards and are not adequately maintained based on the 2018 DWR Inspection Report, which gave the district an overall rating of unacceptable (see Table 6.9). The levees have vegetation that significantly impacts access and visibility in the area and the crown roadway may not be able to be driven on in all types of weather. The DWR report found that the District needs to focus on controlling vegetation, repairing erosion sites, and maintaining the levee crown and access roads.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District needs to improve its level of levee maintenance and address deficiencies noted in the 2018 DWR Inspection Report.

Table 6.8: RD 536 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	N/A
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	N/A
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	10.59 miles
Easements	
Drainage System/Ditches	10.59 miles
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	10.59 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	10.59 miles
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Levee Patrols and annual DWR Inspection
Most Recent Inspection Report	2018
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: DWR Inspection Report (2018); CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Levee System Integrity Program Plan, Final Programmatic EIS/EIR Technical Appendix, July 2000; DWR and DFW, Cache Slough Complex Conservation Assessment, Volume 1 Characterization Report, November 2015; MBK Engineers Comment letter dated 1/13/20

Table 6.9: RD 536 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018

District	Overall Rating A= Acceptable; M = Minimally Acceptable; U = Unacceptable					Total Levee Miles
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
RD 536	U	U	U	U	U	10.59

Source: DWR Maintenance Inspection Report

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: Most of the District’s revenues are derived from property taxes (see Table 6.10). Shortfalls are made up by use of reserves or additional assessments on property owners. Annual revenue from property assessments are determined annually by the Board of Trustees and charged to landowners on a pro-rata basis based on assessed value. The District also participates in the Delta Levee Subvention Program, which provides funding to help maintain the District’s levee system.

Fund Balance: As of June 2018, RD 536 had a positive fund balance of \$24,860 with assets of \$83,425 and liabilities of \$58,565. The majority of its assets include \$23,135 received from FEMA and \$6,362 from Cal OES for disaster assistance.

Determinations:

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

Table 6.10: RD 536 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$10,5877	\$84,465	\$89,213	\$120,301	\$30,270
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	29,498
Other	\$ 75	\$ 92	\$ 131	\$ 198	\$ 349
Total	\$105,952	\$84,557	\$89,344	\$120,499	\$60,116
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Services & Supplies	89,606	91,939	76,400	98,094	58,565
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Services	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$ 89,606	\$91,939	\$76,400	\$ 98,094	\$58,565
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	16,346	(7,382)	12,944	\$ 22,405	\$ 1,551
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	16,346	(7,382)	12,944	22,405	\$ 1,551
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	(26,776)	(6,149)	(12,039)	905	\$23,309
Fund Balance End of Year	(\$6,149)	(\$12,039)	\$ 905	\$ 23,309	\$24,860

Source: RD 536 FY 2014-2018 FTRs submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District shares its eastern boundary with RD 2084 and its southern boundary with the City of Rio Vista. The District also works with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to preserve sensitive habitat. Although the District operates its own flood control and drainage facilities, there may be opportunities to explore partnerships or assistance with other agencies, particularly during major flood events.

Determinations:

- 5.1: The District shares part of its eastern boundary with RD 2084 and its southern boundary with the City of Rio Vista, but does not share facilities or services. Opportunities for shared services should be explored.
- 5.2: The District works cooperatively with the Department of Fish and Game to preserve sensitive habitat.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board who are appointed by the Board of Supervisors to four-year terms. Trustees must be landowners or agents of landowners. Trustees are not compensated and meet at least twice a year for the purpose of voting on landowner assessments, discussion and voting on District business. Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act and held locally in Rio Vista. The District has no paid staff. Labor requirements are met by District landowners, tenant farmers, and by contract services. The District does not currently have a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

6.1: The Board of Trustees meets annually to set a budget and meetings are noticed in accordance with the Brown Act.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.3: Reclamation District No. 999 (Netherlands)

6.3.1: District Profile

RD 999 is a multi-county agency located in the northeastern corner of Solano County situated north of Miner Slough. The majority of the land area and assessed value lies within Yolo County. Therefore, Yolo LAFCO has jurisdiction as the principal county. Only the southern-most portion of the District is located in Solano County south of the Yolo County line (see Figure 6.5). The District consist of approximately 26,000 acres, of which 2,491 acres are located in Solano County (see Table 6.11). Formed on August 10, 1913, under the California Reclamation Act of 1868 the District provides levee maintenance, drainage, and irrigation services to District property owners (see Table 6.12). The District maintains 32.4 miles of exterior levees that are part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project, 260 miles of ditches and canals, and 15 water discharge pumps. Localized flooding is common throughout the District during significant storm events. It is not expected that the drainage facilities will prevent localized flooding, but rather, will moderate the depth and duration of such flooding and facilitate the removal of storm and flood waters from District lands. RD 999 also holds riparian water rights, as well as Pre- and Post-1914 appropriate water rights and provides irrigation water for farming through five inlet stations which draw water from the Sacramento River, Sutter Slough, and Elk Slough. Yolo County LAFCO completed a multi-district MSR in 2018, which covered RD 999.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Yolo County LAFCO, *"Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Study for the Reclamation Districts and Local Maintaining Agencies"*, February 2018

Table 6.11: RD 999 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042200010	198.74	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1162
2	0042200020	3.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
3	0042200030	52.96	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
4	0042200040	96.12	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	436
5	0042200050	122.33	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1026
6	0042200060	52.77	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	949
7	0042200070	148.81	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1138
8	0042200080	3.44	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
9	0042200100	12.60	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
10	0042200120	26.75	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
11	0042200130	45.42	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	306
12	0042200140	272.48	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
13	0042200150	238.75	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	327
14	0042200170	142.61	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1030
15	0042200200	85.56	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	579
16	0042200220	100.65	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	307
17	0042200230	55.34	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
18	0042200240	103.39	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	632
19	0042200270	1.43	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
20	0042200280	230.91	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	308
21	0042200330	76.52	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
22	0042200340	4.92	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
23	0042200350	9.04	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
24	0042200360	91.81	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	632
25	0042200390	13.76	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
26	0042200400	7.78	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
27	0042200410	111.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1155
28	0042200420	101.46	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1155
29	0042200430	80.26	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1155
Total Acres		2,490.97				

Source: Solano County GIS

Table 6.12: Reclamation District 999 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office:	38563 Netherlands Road Clarksburg, CA 95612-5003 Phone: (916) 240-5610
Website:	www.rd999.org
Formation Date:	1913 (by act of the State legislature)
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of reclaiming Delta swampland. Levees finished in 1921.
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of five members appointed 4-year terms by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by landowners President: Tom Slater Secretary/Treasurer: Vice President:
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets periodically. Last meeting held 9/12/19. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of meeting to comply with Brown Act.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	Vanessa Schmoker, District Bookkeeper, Secretary to the Board
Facilities/Assets	
Services Provided	Services performed by in-house personnel and outside contractors/engineers
Shared Facilities/Services	
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending December 31st
Cash on Hand	\$208,385 (2018)
Current Budget (2018-2019)	Revenue: \$379,570; Expenses: \$477,750
Primary Revenue Sources	State subvention funding, federal assistance, property assessments, entry permits
Assets	\$295,337 (2018)
Liabilities	\$184,527 (2018)
Fund Balance	\$110,810 (2018)
Risk Management	Joint Powers Agreement with Special Districts Risk Management Authority to insure against loss.
Most Recent Audit	
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: Annual Financial Transaction Report (2018); District website

6.3.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

RD 999 is a multi-county district with approximately 90% of its land area located in Yolo County. The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for the district as agriculture with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned A-80 (Exclusive Agriculture) under the County's Zoning Ordinance with most of the land under a Williamson Act contract. The District serves a relatively stable population of approximately 30 residents and there are no expectations for growth or development. Any plan for development of parcels within Solano County would require a change in land use and development approval from Solano County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: RD 999 is a multi-county district with approximately 90% of its land area located in Yolo County.
- 1.2: The District population is relatively stable and there are no expectations for growth that would impact the District's ability to provide services.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

Based on the most recent available information from the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) there are no DUC's located within or contiguous to RD 999. While Clarksburg, which is located in Yolo County, is defined as an unincorporated census designated place with a population of approximately 420 residents, it does not qualify as a DUC based on the area's MHI. RD 999 also does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to RD 999.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to this district.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District is protected from flooding by a system of substantial levees constructed well above floodplain and is drained by a system of natural and artificial drainage channels and pumping plants. Localized flooding is common throughout the District during significant storm events. While the drainage facilities do not prevent localized flooding, they do moderate the depth and duration of such flooding and facilitate the removal of storm and flood waters from District lands. The District provides a variety of levee maintenance services including mowing levee slopes, tree trimming, weed control, rodent abatement, crown road maintenance, erosion repair, spraying, goat grazing, routine levee inspection, ditch maintenance, and engineering services (see Table 6.13). Ditch maintenance requires vegetation control, cleaning, deepening of the waterways and the maintenance of pipes, gates, risers and pumps which connect them.

The California Department of Water Resources performs annual inspection of the levees and reports the status of levee maintenance to the USACE. The Fall 2018 DWR inspection report gave the District a minimally acceptable level overall rating (see Table 6.14), which was an improvement

over prior years. According to the DWR report, there is woody vegetation along the levees that significantly impacts access and visibility. In addition, the crown roadway may not be able to be driven on in all types of weather. The District also reported seepage, saturated areas, and sand boils on all levee units. The 2018 DWR Inspection Report recommended that the District focus on controlling vegetation, repairing erosion sites, and maintaining the levee crown and access roads.

Determinations:

3.1: The District should address the repair of erosion sites and other items identified in DWR’s 2018 Inspection Report.

Table 6.13: RD 999 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	N/A
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	N/A
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	32.17 miles of Project levees
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	32.17 miles
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Annual inspection by DWR
Most Recent Inspection Report	2018
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: District website; DWR Inspection Report (2018)

Table 6.14: RD 999 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018

District	Overall Maintenance Rating					Total Levee Miles
	A= Acceptable; M = Minimally Acceptable; U = Unacceptable					
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
RD 999	U	U	U	U	M	32.17

Source: DWR Maintenance Inspection Report

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Although the District reportedly adopts an annual budget, it has not provided either Solano or Yolo LAFCOs with a copy of their budget for the current or previous fiscal years as requested. Therefore, the following analysis relies primarily on the District’s annual financial transaction reports to the State Controller’s Office, Yolo LAFCO MSR, and 2016 Assessment Engineer’s report. According to the Assessment Engineer’s report, the District appears to generally operate within its financial means. However, according to the Yolo County MSR, the District does not appear to have adequate reserves for improvements detailed in the Regional Flood Management Plan.

The District’s financial transaction report to the SCO for FY 2018 shows a positive fund balance with an annual operating budget of \$1,268,405 generated primarily from property assessments and funding from the State Subvention Program (see Table 6.15). The District gets financial assistance from the Delta Levees Maintenance Subvention Program, which provides cost-share assistance for levee maintenance and rehabilitation. The major operating expenses for the District are for labor costs and levee maintenance. The District has four full-time employees including a manger, board secretary, watermaster, and mechanic. The District contracts out for legal and engineering services.

Fund Balance: As of FY 2018, RD 999 had a positive fund balance of \$595,563 with assets of \$609,074 and current liabilities of \$13,511. The majority of its assets include \$23,135 received from FEMA and \$6,362 from Cal OES for disaster assistance.

Table 6.15: RD 999 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$647,399	\$647,881	\$687,377	\$966,832	\$ 992,762
Service Charges	0	0	0	4,853	16,247
State/Federal Assistance	92,964	67,097	70,136	0	247,274
Other	\$ 27,841	\$ 24,801	\$ 5,216	\$ 2,300	\$ 12,122
Total	\$768,204	\$739,779	\$737,415	\$973,985	\$1,268,405
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Services & Supplies	370,522	352,370	391,124	386,678	505,322
Capital Outlay	17,440	40,136	0	0	155,545
Labor Costs (salaries & benefits)	353,204	350,425	320,413	357,813	368,920
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Services	68,155	68,155	68,155	69,698	25,314
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$809,321	\$811,086	\$779,692	\$814,189	\$1,055,101
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(41,117)	(71,307)	(42,277)	159,796	213,304
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(41,117)	(71,307)	(42,277)	159,796	213,304
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	377,164	336,047	264,740	222,463	382,259
Fund Balance End of Year	\$336,047	\$264,740	\$222,463	\$382,259	\$ 595,563

Source: RD 999 FY 2014-2018 FTRs submitted to SCO

Determinations:

- 4.1: According to the 2016 Assessment Engineer’s report, the District appears to generally operate within its financial means and has recently adopted a new assessment to begin retiring debt, operation and maintenance, construction of reclamation and irrigation works, replacement of equipment and operating facilities, and establishing a reserve fund to address large unplanned expenses.
- 4.2: According to the Yolo County MSR “the District is lacking adopted financial policies and should consider adopting policies for District operations and financial management.”

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 999 currently does not share any services or facilities with another district. A 2014 Yolo County Flood Governance Study found that for the Clarksburg hydrologic basin the property owners and residents would be better served if RD 999 and two other districts provided a consistent level of levee maintenance and flood response capability, either as one entity or in a coordinated manner.

Determinations:

- 5.1: Potential governance alternatives should be evaluated as recommended in the Yolo County MSR to determine whether there could be operational efficiencies from coordinated services.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

Reclamation District 999 is an independent special district with a five-member board of trustees elected by the landowners within the District. The district maintains a website and regularly posts board agendas and meeting minutes in compliance with State requirements and the Brown Act.

Determinations:

- 6.1: The District Board meets on a regular basis, maintains a website, and posts agendas and meeting minutes in compliance with State requirements.
- 6.2: RD 999 is a multi-county district with the majority of its assessed valuation located in Yolo County.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.4: Reclamation District No. 1667 (Prospect Island)

6.4.1: District Profile

Prospect Island lies within the Yolo Bypass and is bounded by Miners Slough on the east and the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel (DWSC) on the west (see Figure 6.6). Levees surrounding the island were first constructed in the late 19th century to create farmland. The levees are non-project lower (restricted) height levees designed to allow overtopping in large flood events as part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. A cross levee divides the island into a northern and southern section hydrologically.

The entire island was acquired in the early 1950's by the Sacramento-Yolo Port District for the construction of the Deep-Water Ship Channel. In 1963, the majority of the property (approximately 1,329 acres) was sold to a private farming interest. RD 1667 was formed at that time to protect the farmland and was active from 1963 to 1994. A portion of the District (approximately 954.05 acres), which lies west of the Ship Channel, was detached in 1983 since the District's levees no longer encompassed those lands.⁵⁰ Today, the revised exterior boundary of the District encompasses approximately 1,538.84 acres of land inside the district (see Table 6.16). The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation purchased the privately-owned portion of the island in 1994 as part of the proposed North Delta National Wildlife Refuge and RD 1667 was allowed to languish. Legislation and funding for the proposed wildlife refuge was never authorized and the northern portion of Prospect Island was eventually acquired by DWR in 2010. The District was reactivated in January 2014 by DWR to facilitate land management activities.⁵¹ Prospect Island is currently owned by several governmental entities that make up the District.

While RD 1667 provides drainage and levee maintenance services for lands within the district's boundaries (see Table 6.17), the levee along the Miner Slough side of the property is not actively maintained and a previously repaired levee breach is subjected to regular tidal action. The levees, however, serve an important function protecting other islands including Ryer Island from significant wind-wave action. The western levee along the DWSC is a federal navigation levee. By design, the lands on both the northern and southern portion of the island are uncultivated and subject to seasonal flooding. The south property levee has a very "porous" breach repair consisting of large boulders with little to no soils in between. The interior of the south property is largely shallow aquatic habitat with portions invaded by aquatic weeds and emergent marsh and riparian vegetation. During the winter waterfowl season, the Port leases out its property for waterfowl hunting.

⁵⁰ Solano LAFCO RD 1667 Detachment Application Resolution approved 2/7/83

⁵¹ Prospect Island Tidal Habitat Restoration Project Draft EIR, August 2016

Figure 6.6: Map of RD 1667 Boundaries




Table 6.16: RD 1667 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042190150	354.41	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	887
2	0042190200	284.40	Water Bodies & Courses	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
3	0042210250	331.61*	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
4	0042210260	273.43*	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
5	0042210270	4.66	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
6	0042210280	19.09*	Water Bodies & Courses	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
7	0042210290	526.75*	Water Bodies & Courses	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
8	0042210300	160.95	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
9	0042210330	152.63	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
10	0042230010	9.00	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
11	0042230060	3.60	Water Bodies & Courses	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
12	0042240270	22.30	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
13	0042240310	88.27	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
14	0042240360	94.02*	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
15	0042240370	293.94*	Agriculture	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
Original Acres		2,619.06				
Detached Acres		(954.05)				
Adjustment		(126.17)				
Revised Acres*		1,538.84*				

Source: Solano County GIS, District Formation Documents

Table 6.17: RD 1667 District Profile

District Organization

District Office:	
Website:	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date:	September 22, 1914 (Solano County Board Resolution No. 92-238)
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system.
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active; Independent District

Governance

Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three members 2 from DWR and 1 from the Port of Sacramento.
Officers	Trustee: Cliff Feldheim Trustee: Erik Loboschefskey Trustee: Katherine Wadsworth
Compensation	None
Meetings	
Adopted Bylaws	

Operations

Employees	
Facilities/Assets	
Services Provided	Levee inspection and maintenance provided by DWR
Shared Facilities/Services	

Financial Position

Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$46,920 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (2018)	Revenue: \$178,223; Expenses: \$185,304
Primary Revenue Sources	State subvention funding, assessments
Assets	\$46,920 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	\$0 (June 30, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$46,920 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	
Most Recent Audit	
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: Annual Financial Report (2018)

6.4.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The service area of the district is physically defined by the Sacramento deep water ship channel and Miners Slough. RD 501 abuts RD 1667 on the eastside of Miners Slough. Land within the district is designated for agriculture in the Solano County General Plan with a resource conservation overlay. Land within the District is also part of the Prospect Island tidal habitat restoration project. Based on these limitations it is not expected that there will be any development, population growth, or physical expansion of the district.

Determinations:

1.1: The District is uninhabited and there is no anticipated growth in the future.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no DUC's located within or contiguous to RD 1667. The area's median household income of \$84,141 is well above the MHI threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community. RD 1667 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 1667.

2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 1667.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

Prospect Island was made part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project when that project was constructed in the early twentieth century. Like other lands at the southern end of the Yolo Bypass (Little Holland Tract, Liberty Island, Little Egbert Tract), all of the Prospect Island levees were constructed and maintained as "restricted height levees", designed to overtop during larger floods to provide additional flood storage capacity. By design, agricultural operations on the island were subject to interruption and damage during flood events.

Following repair of the 2006 levee breach, pumping flood water off of the north property was discontinued. During this time, the flap gate on the small drainage culvert on Miner Slough was damaged, allowing inundation and water exchange between Prospect Island and Miner Slough. Currently, the Prospect Island levee system is in relatively poor condition. A February 2013 inspection of the Miner Slough levee on the north property, the internal cross levee, and the northern levee of the north property found that significant areas of each of these levees are at risk of failure.⁵² Since District lands are part of the Prospect Island Tidal Habitat Restoration Project the District only provides a minimal level of service (see Table 6.18).

Determinations:

3.1: Habitat restoration and enhancement are the primary focus of the District with minimal need for flood protection and levee maintenance.

⁵² (MBK 2013) Prospect Island Tidal Habitat Restoration Project Draft EIR, August 2016

Table 6.18: RD 1667 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	
Vector/Rodent Control	
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	
Flood Control	
Levee Patrol	
Pump Maintenance & Repair	
Drainage	
District Facilities	
Levees	
Easements	
Drainage System/Ditches	
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	10.44 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	9.87 miles
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	0.57 miles
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	
Services provided to other agencies	
Services shared with other agencies	

Source: FRP Cache Slough Complex Conservation Assessment, November 2015

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

After being dormant for a four-year period RD 1667 was reactivated by DWR in 2014 to facilitate land management and levee maintenance activities. The most recent financial transaction report (2018) filed with the State Controller’s Office shows the District is a new district and was not required to file a report in the prior year (see Table 6.19). The District had a positive fund balance of \$46,920 at the end of FY 2018 with no liabilities. The primary source of revenue is from service charges. The District also participates in the State Subvention Program.

Determinations:

- 4.1: The District was dormant for a four-year period, then reactivated in 2014 by DWR with a focus on developing a habitat restoration project on the island with a water control system designed for that purpose.

Table 6.19: RD 1667 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 124,945
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	18,493
Other	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$ 34,785</u>
Total	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 178,223
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	185,304
Capital Outlay/Depreciation		0	0		0
Labor		0	0		0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc)	<u>\$ 0</u>				
Total	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 185,304
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	0	0	0	0	\$ (7,081)
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	0	0	0	0	\$ (7,081)
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	0	0	0	0	\$ 54,001
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 46,920

Source: Prospect Island Reclamation District No. 1667, FTR to SCO-2018

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD1667 does not share any facilities or services with another district. DWR is the major landowner and is developing a habitat restoration project on the island with a water control system designed for that purpose.

Determinations:

5.1: The primary purpose of the District is on habitat restoration and does not share any facilities or services for flood control with another district.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

DWR and the Port of Sacramento are the district's only property owners. The District does not currently have a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

6.1: RD 1667 is an independent district controlled by two governmental entities.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.5: Reclamation District No. 2060 (Hastings Tract)

6.5.1: District Profile

Hastings Tract is bordered by Wright Cut to the east, Lindsey Slough to the south, agricultural ditches to the west, and Cache Slough on the north (see Figure 6.7). Interior to Hastings Tract are several non-project levees that border both sides of Hastings Cut and an agricultural ditch connected to Hastings Cut. The Mahoney-Ulatis Tract is also diked agricultural land located within the boundaries of RD 2060 just north of Ulatis Creek and is surrounded on all sides by non-project levees.

The District maintains 16.02 miles of project levees that protect 6,938.86 acres of farm land (see Table 6.20). Agriculture activities within the district include diversified row crop agriculture (alfalfa, corn, wheat, barley, safflower, oat hay, sunflower, triticale, melons, garlic, onions, and tomatoes), permanent pasture for livestock, and a hunting preserve licensed by the State of California. The District was organized on February 15, 1922 to provide flood control and levee maintenance for Hasting Tract (see Table 6.21). The District serves a permanent population of 60. Additionally, the Hastings Island Hunting Preserve has a trailer park of 36 sites that can house a non-permanent population of between 70-100 individuals. In 2018, the preserve provided recreation for approximately 17,000 individual visits to the hunting preserve.

Table 6.20: RD 2060 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042120230	0.48	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
2	0042120440	555.57	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	534
3	0042140220	314.05	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
4	0042150030	90.01	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	6
5	0042150050	45.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	534
6	0042150070	416.50	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
7	0042150120	509.16	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
8	0042150160	1.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	132
9	0042150210	775.35	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1256
10	0042150280	621.41	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	6
11	0042160070	0.92	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
12	0042160080	0.92	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
13	0042160120	640.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
14	0042160130	647.42	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
15	0042160140	537.55	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
16	0042160150	611.29	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
17	0042160160	502.79	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
18	0042180320	557.89	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1156
19	0042310070	111.55	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	534
Total Acres		6,938.86				

Source: Solano County GIS

Figure 6.7: RD 2060




Table 6.21: RD 2060 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office:	1143 Crane Street, Suite 200 Menlo Park, CA 94025 Phone: (650) 328-0820
Website:	Currently does not have a website as required by SB 929
Formation Date:	January 3, 1922
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining levees for flood control
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three members appointed by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by landowners President: Henry N Kuechler Vice President: Mary Kuechler Secretary: Kathy Ringman Treasurer: Kathy Ringman
Compensation	None
Meetings	
Adopted Bylaws	
Operations	
Employees	District Superintendent. Hourly employees on an as needed basis.
Facilities/Assets	
Services Provided	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending December 31st
Cash on Hand	
Current Budget (2018-2019)	Revenue: \$103,344; Expenses: \$63,351
Primary Revenue Sources	State subvention funding, charges for services levied against landowners
Assets	\$141,890 (2018)
Liabilities	\$824 (2018)
Fund Balance	\$141,066 (2018)
Risk Management	Maintains business liability insurance
Most Recent Audit	Audited Financial Statements for FY 2013-2014 dated April 15, 2016
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Transaction Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: Annual Financial Transaction Report (2018), Independent Audit FY 2013-2014, District responses to draft

6.5.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for property within the District to be agriculture with a Resource Conservation Overlay. The resource conservation overlay is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. All the property within the District is zoned A-80 (Exclusive Agriculture) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. Land uses within the District include diversified row crop agriculture, pasture land for livestock, and a commercial hunting preserve. The District serves a permanent population of 60. Additionally, the Hastings Island Hunting Preserve has a trailer park of 36 sites that can house a non-permanent population of between 70-100 individuals. In 2018, the hunting preserve provided recreation for approximately 17,000 individual visits to the hunting preserve. There are no expectations for growth or development other than agriculture and hunting related uses. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District has a population consistent with its present use and there are no current development proposals or expectations for growth.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no DUC's within or contiguous to RD 2060. The area's median household income is well above the MHI threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community. RD 2060 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2060.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2060.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District provides flood control services, but also has an Appropriative Water License that falls under the North Delta Water Agency contract with DWR. Private landowners supply their own irrigation water that comes from Lindsey and Cache Sloughs.

The Delta Stewardship Council found that RD 2060s levees did not meet federal standards for rural project levees. Current levee operations and maintenance in 2018 were evaluated at the minimally acceptable level by the Department of Water Resources (see Table 6.22), down from an acceptable level in 2017. Woody vegetation significantly impacts access and visibility. The District has reported seepage, saturated areas, and sand boils on all levee units. Services performed by the District include levee patrolling, spraying, engineering services, erosion control, mowing of the waterside slope of the levee, burning of the landside slope of the levee, roadway maintenance, tree trimming, and rodent control (see Table 6.23). According to the inspection report the District needs to focus on controlling woody vegetation and repairing erosion sites. The District reports that its efforts in this area are adversely impacted by conflicting maintenance requirements of the US Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Water Resources and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The District has identified and

reported to the California Department of Water Resources approximately 56 sites of damage/erosion due to storm damage in winter 2017 that have yet to be repaired by the California Department of Water Resources.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District has sufficient capacity for the current level of services, but needs to address the inadequacies in the 2018 DWR Inspection Report.
- 3.2: The District maintenance efforts are adversely impacted by conflicting maintenance requirements between state and federal agencies.

Table 6.22: RD 2060 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018

District	Overall Rating A= Acceptable; M = Minimally Acceptable; U = Unacceptable					Total Levee Miles
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
RD 2060	U	U	U	A	M	15.65

Source: DWR Maintenance Inspection Report

Table 6.23: RD 2060 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	
Vector/Rodent Control	
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	
Flood Control	
Levee Patrol	
Pump Maintenance & Repair	
Drainage	
District Facilities	
Levees	
Easements	
Drainage System/Ditches	
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	15.65 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	15.65 miles
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	
Most Recent Inspection Report	2018
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: Annual Financial Transaction Report (2018); Independent Audit (2014)

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

The District receives revenue from several sources including assessments, levee road permit fees, interest revenues, and state subvention funds. In 2018, subvention funds accounted for approximately 40% of the revenues while landowner self-assessments made up 60% of the District's revenue. Interest income totaled less than 1% of the District's revenues (see Table 6.24).

Fund Balance: RD 2060 had a positive fund balance of \$141,066 with assets of \$141,890 and current liabilities of \$824 as of FY 2018.

Determinations:

4.1: The District has a positive current fund balance and is financially able to provide flood control and levee maintenance services to meet its current needs.

Table 6.24: RD 2060 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 15,078	\$0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Service Charges	0	0	24,940	41,708	\$ 60,313
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	149,417	40,975
Other	\$ 8,223	\$0	\$ 51	\$ 8	\$ 56
Total	\$ 22,345	\$0	\$24,991	\$191,133	\$101,344
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 11,594	\$0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Services & Supplies	69,058	0	77,113	107,135	63,351
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	0
Labor Costs (salaries & benefits)	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	19,030	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Services	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 2,376	\$0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$0
Total	\$102,058	\$0	\$77,113	\$107,135	\$ 63,351
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(79,713)	0	(52,122)	83,998	37,993
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(79,713)	0	(52,122)	83,998	37,993
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	170,693	0	90,980	19,067	103,073
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 90,980	\$0	\$38,858	\$103,065	\$141,066

Source: RD 2060 FY 2013-2014 Audited Financial Statements, RD 2060 FY 2015-2018 FTRs submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District has no capital assets and does not provide or share services or facilities with other agencies.

Determinations:

5.1: RD 2060 does not provide or share services or facilities with other agencies with no apparent opportunity for shared services/facilities.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board of landowners, elected to 4-year terms. In the past, candidates for the Board of Trustees have run unopposed in District elections and therefore no elections were held, and thus the Solano County Board of Supervisors has appointed those candidates to the District's Board of Trustees. The Board holds a regular annual meeting. In addition, the Board of Trustees holds special meetings throughout the calendar year as needed. All meetings are noticed in accordance with the Brown Act and are held at the Hastings Island Land Company offices located on Hastings Tract. The District employs a District Superintendent and part-time staff on an as-needed basis. Other labor requirements are met by contracted services. District Trustees receive no compensation. The District does not currently have a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

- 6.1: The District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees, but often has difficulty finding candidates to serve on the Board. Levee maintenance is performed by District landowners, farm operators, or outside contractors.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.6: Reclamation District No. 2068 (Yolano)

6.6.1: District Profile

Yolano Reclamation District (RD 2068) is a multi-county district, serving Solano and Yolo Counties. While a portion of the district is located in Yolo County, the majority of the assessed value lies within Solano County. Therefore, Solano LAFCO has jurisdiction as the principal county.

RD 2068 is bordered by the Yolo Bypass to the east, RD 2098 to the south, and agricultural fields on the west and north (see Figure 6.8) and includes 164 parcels and 15,261.18 acres of land (see Table 6.25). The District was formed on April 7, 1924 (see Table 6.26) to provide agricultural irrigation water, drainage, and flood protection for lands within the district and to provide regional cooperation in the management of water and drainage in the Dixon regional watershed and with the North Delta Water Agency. Levee maintenance is only a small portion of what the District does, accounting for approximately 5%-10% of the District's activities. RD 2068 was formed mainly as an irrigation district, but maintains 8.23 miles of federal project levees (including the Yolo Bypass levee and the levees to the west) for flood protection that protects 13,200 acres of active farmland. Although the District maintains the levees, the State is responsible for the adequacy of the levees and flood protection provided by the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. The levees function primarily to provide flood protection from the operation of the SRFCP and to a lesser degree from normal tide cycles in the lower lying areas.

RD 2068 operates a drainage system that is designed for limited capacity and does not provide a specified level of flood protection. The purpose of the system is to facilitate irrigation and storm drainage to remove excess water. The District also operates a water supply system for agricultural uses with appropriative water rights principally from the Sacramento River. The riparian claims and pre-1914 claims were used to document the extensive reuse the District conducts. The claims are now in an inactive state, since the SWRCB has provided a way to claim water conservation on its annual water right reporting forms. The District has one groundwater well, which can be used to supplement water supplies. District levees are currently not up to federal standards according to the USACE'S period inspection report; therefore, RD 2068 levees are currently not covered under the USACE PL 84-99 program. However, the District will be submitting a Letter of Intent to enter back into the program in 2019 and should have program coverage for the 2021 flood season.

Figure 6.8: Map of RD 2068 Boundaries




Table 6.25: RD 2068 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0111120030	158.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	378
2	0111120060	26.34	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	522
3	0111120070	49.85	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	522
4	0111120080	19.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	522
5	0111120090	88.98	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	522
6	0111120100	78.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	522
7	0111120110	240.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	744
8	0111120130	43.44	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
9	0111120140	44.08	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
10	0111120150	46.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
11	0111160020	156.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	14
12	0111160070	159.86	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	200
13	0111160080	155.12	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	200
14	0111160090	80.99	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	379
15	0111160130	39.67	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
16	0111160140	39.66	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
17	0111160150	78.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	379
18	0111160160	77.30	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	379
19	0112030020	78.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	14
20	0112030030	314.85	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	465
21	0112030040	78.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	250
22	0112030050	80.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	250
23	0112030060	318.49	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	278
24	0112030110	78.79	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	14
25	0112030120	1.21	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	14
26	0112030130	156.66	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1174
27	0112030140	41.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1183
28	0112030150	64.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1183
29	0112030160	53.77	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1183
30	0112070010	158.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	250
31	0112070020	150.67	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	156
32	0112070030	6.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	156
33	0112070040	156.38	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	157
34	0112070080	79.24	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	539
35	0112070090	79.24	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	539
36	0112070100	156.64	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	539
37	0112070110	13.08	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	NN	202
38	0112070150	158.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	157
39	0112070230	57.28	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	929

40	0112070260	0.40	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
41	0112070290	3.62	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
42	0112070320	36.74	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	929
43	0112070330	2.43	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	929
44	0112070340	1.78	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
45	0112070350	37.94	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	929
46	0112070360	1.84	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
47	0112070370	2.58	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	929
48	0112070380	48.17	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1369
49	0112090050	632.74	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
50	0112100010	78.74	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	464
51	0112100020	78.93	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	257
52	0112100030	474.86	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	765
53	0112100080	79.09	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	550
54	0112110050	158.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	581
55	0112110070	0.11	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
56	0112110080	4.23	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
57	0112110100	163.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	303
58	0112110110	151.88	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	293
59	0112110120	13.15	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	303
60	0112110130	66.35	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	204
61	0112110150	149.79	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	196
62	0112110180	3.14	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
63	0112110190	89.54	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	827
64	0112110200	4.10	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
65	0112110210	5.81	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
66	0112110220	4.28	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	827
67	0112110230	65.01	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	827
68	0112120010	1.99	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	581
69	0112120040	0.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
70	0112120050	0.28	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
71	0112120060	0.15	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
72	0112120070	2.57	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
73	0112120080	33.13	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	204
74	0112120090	1.31	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	204
75	0112120100	1.34	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
76	0112120110	1.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
77	0112120120	2.67	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
78	0112120140	4.83	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
79	0112120150	4.78	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
80	0112120160	4.78	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
81	0112120170	3.15	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
82	0112120210	7.21	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-

83	0112120220	0.58	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
84	0112120230	67.79	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	581
85	0112120240	2.98	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	581
86	0143020060	159.27	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	47
87	0143020110	158.49	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
88	0143030010	317.07	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	32
89	0143030020	311.94	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	120
90	0143030030	158.48	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	645
91	0143030050	156.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1031
92	0143030060	156.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	122
93	0143030080	77.11	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	32
94	0143030090	39.15	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	32
95	0143030100	40.09	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	32
96	0143040010	154.64	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1063
97	0143040020	30.63	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	333
98	0143040030	3.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
99	0143040040	19.58	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
100	0143040050	7.28	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
101	0143040060	65.56	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	329
102	0143040070	26.65	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	329
103	0143040080	2.85	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	329
104	0143040100	126.10	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	32
105	0143040110	24.67	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	32
106	0143040120	148.56	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	329
107	0143040130	4.03	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
108	0143040150	75.13	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1288
109	0143040160	4.54	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1288
110	0143040170	46.06	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1064
111	0143040180	33.61	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	1064
112	0143040190	73.87	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	194
113	0143040200	43.49	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
114	0143040210	36.06	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
115	0143040220	122.48	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	164
116	0143040230	38.16	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	203
117	0143040240	5.70	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
118	0143040250	1.65	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	-	-
119	0143040260	78.35	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	204
120	0143040270	76.79	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A40)	Active	204
121	0143060170	133.39	Agriculture (AG)	N/A	-	-
122	0143060180	139.63	Agriculture (AG)	N/A	-	-
123	0143060180	139.63	Agriculture (AG)	N/A	-	-
124	0143070010	633.33	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1298
125	0143070020	158.19	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1163

126	0143070030	197.36	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1163
127	0143070040	183.46	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	323
128	0143070050	9.06	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
129	0143070060	80.48	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1163
130	0143080010	25.81	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	32
131	0143080040	156.52	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1283
132	0143080050	308.97	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1283
133	0143080060	4.46	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1283
134	0143080070	157.51	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	322
135	0143080080	159.34	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	322
136	0143080090	158.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	318
137	0143080100	156.37	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	318
138	0143080110	3.76	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
139	0143080120	4.80	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
140	0143080130	13.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
141	0143080140	111.90	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	367
142	0143110030	115.03	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	323
143	0143110040	8.16	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
144	0143110050	35.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	319
145	0143110060	156.01	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	779
146	0143110110	18.87	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	319
147	0143110130	116.45	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	319
148	0143110140	80.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	728
149	0143110150	78.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	728
150	0143110180	4.76	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
151	0143110190	16.30	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
152	0143120010	37.80	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	779
153	0143120020	119.17	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	728
154	0143120030	155.76	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1282
155	0143120060	156.96	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	728
156	0143120070	155.76	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	956
157	0143120080	316.38	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	727
158	0143120090	313.89	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	727
159	0143160080	316.97	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1180
160	0143160090	155.15	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1177
161	0143160100	158.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1177
162	0143200010	314.54	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	561
163	0143200020	155.08	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	562
164	0143200030	156.97	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	562

Total Acres 15,261.18

N/A = Not Available

Source: Solano County GIS

Table 6.26: RD 2068 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office:	7178 Yolano Road Dixon, CA 95620 Phone: (707) 678-5412
Website:	Hardship exemption from website requirement (Board Resolution dated 1/9/20)
Formation Date:	September 22, 1914 (Solano County Board Resolution No. 92-238)
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of irrigation and associated drainage, but also operates and maintains flood control and tidal levees.
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of five members appointed by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by landowners President: Cliff Detar Secretary: Bryan Busch, General Manager Treasurer: Solano County Treasurer Vice President: Ross Rasmussen
Compensation	Board member stipend of \$270 per meeting
Meetings	Board of Trustees holds monthly meetings with the last meeting held on 1/9/20. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of meeting.
Adopted Bylaws	Yes
Operations	
Employees	8 employees
Facilities/Assets	80 ft wide strip of land for exterior levees; 100 miles of irrigation and drainage canals; 5 water pumps; supplies for flood protection; office buildings & shops; pickup trucks;
Services Provided	Irrigation, drainage, and flood control services provided by in-house personnel, outside contractors/engineers, volunteer labor
Shared Facilities/Services	Management and maintenance services to RD 2098; Section of western levee shared with RD 2130
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending December 31st
Cash on Hand	\$1,209,256 (December 31, 2019)
Current Budget (2019)	Revenue: \$1,682,000
Primary Revenue Sources	State subvention funding, federal assistance, property assessments, entry permits
Assets	\$295,337 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	\$184,527 (June 30, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$110,810 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	Association of California Water Agencies Joint Powers Insurance Authority
Most Recent Audit	Audited annually; most recent audited Financial Statements dated June 30, 2018
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: Reclamation District survey submitted by RD 2068

6.6.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The County General Plan identifies the zoning for the District as intensive agriculture. A portion of the agricultural area lies within the Yolo Bypass, which is used to convey floodwaters from the Sacramento River when flows exceed the river's physical capacity to move water into the Delta. The area served by the District is currently designated as a Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. The District serves a population of approximately 100. There are no plans to convert agricultural lands to residential or commercial use in the County's General Plan. The very existence of RD 2068 is dependent on the presence of an active, healthy and self-sustaining agricultural community. The District does not anticipate significant expansion of its service area or change in water use other than seasonal and crop planting variability.

Determinations:

- 1.1: The District is uninhabited and there are no current development proposals or expectations for growth.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities located within or adjacent to the boundary of RD 2068. The area's median household income is well above the MHI threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community. Therefore RD 2068 is not a DUC as defined. RD 2068 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2068
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2068.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2068 provides several types of services including flood protection through levee maintenance and drainage services, as well as water for irrigation (see Table 6.27). Project levees and water conveyance facilities service approximately 20,000 acres of agricultural land and in excess of 35,000 acres of flood and storm drainage, including the City of Dixon and several thousand acres of conservation lands for avian and terrestrial species. Other agencies utilizing these reclamation works include the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority, Dixon Resource Conservation District, the Maine Prairie Water District, and the Solano and Yolo County Transportation Departments. Alterations to the Yolo Bypass and Cache Slough areas have the possibility of affecting lands at distances beyond fifteen miles away from those geographic areas. RD 2068 along with other agencies, operate and maintain flood management and drainage facilities that drain into the Cache Slough/Lower Yolo Bypass area. The District maintains the federal Sacramento River Flood Control Project Levee, while the State has responsibility for adequacy of the levee. According to the Delta Stewardship Council, District levees

meet the federal standards for rural levees and DWR rates levee maintenance as acceptable for the past five years (see Table 6.28).

The District also provides drainage services for agricultural purposes. The system includes approximately 100 miles of irrigation and drainage canals, five pumping plants, and 25 lift pumps. The drainage system provides access to all parcels, including the provision of drainage for county roads. The drainage system is designed for limited capacity and does not provide a specified level of flood protection. The purpose of the system is to facilitate irrigation and storm drainage so as to remove excess waters over time. The District cooperates with other agencies in planning for regional drainage improvements.

In addition to providing flood protection and drainage services RD 2068 also operates a water supply system for agricultural uses that consists of four pumps that supply an open canal gravity-feed distribution system. The State Division of Water Rights has accepted twenty-one claims of riparian and pre-1914 water rights in this District. In addition, Reclamation District 2068 holds three appropriative rights. The District’s water supply is principally from the Sacramento River under appropriate licenses. The District does not use any groundwater. The District supply is under contract with the California Department of Water Resources and the North Delta Water Agency also has agreements with the Maine Prairie Water District and the Dixon Resource Conservation District for the transfer of water that reaches the District.

Table 6.27: RD 2068 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	
Vector/Rodent Control	
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	
Flood Control	
Levee Patrol	
Pump Maintenance & Repair	
Drainage	
District Facilities	
Levees	
Easements	
Drainage System/Ditches	
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	8.71 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	8.71 miles
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	
Services provided to other agencies	
Services shared with other agencies	

Source: Survey responses provided by District

Table 6.28: RD 2068 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018

District	Overall Rating A= Acceptable; M = Minimally Acceptable; U = Unacceptable					Total Levee Miles
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
RD 2068	A	A	A	M	A	8.71

Source: DWR Maintenance Inspection Report

Determinations:

3.1: The District has the capacity to provide levee maintenance and flood protection and other services to district property owners.

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: RD 2068 operates primarily on service charges to district property owners for agricultural water sales and drainage services (see Table 6.29). Total revenues from these sources amounted to \$1,505,150 in 2018. According to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan the district is wholly dependent on the presence of an active, healthy and self-sustaining agricultural community.⁵³ Conversion of large tracts of private land from agriculture to permanent habitat under State or Federal ownership resulting in the loss of local property tax and assessments will significantly impact the ability of RD 2068 to continue providing levee maintenance and flood protection services.

The District is subject to Proposition 218 passed by California voters in 1996, which requires all local governments to get majority voter approval for new or increased general taxes with stricter rules for initiating or increasing benefit assessments. The District reviews its rates annually during the budget process. The District considers anticipated agency costs, crop mix and associated water sales, anticipated fallow lands, available non-operating or reserve funds, and available funds from prior years in determining the need to change rates. The District uses the Solano County Treasurer as Treasurer of the District. Revenues are collected and held in the Maintenance and Operations Fund, the Irrigation Fund, or the General Fund. The reserves are also invested in the State Treasurer’s Local Agency Investment Fund.

Fund Balance: The District has maintained a positive fund balance for the past five years. As of FY 2018, RD 2068 had a positive fund balance of \$2,030,570 with total assets of \$2,189,093 including current assets of \$1,408,534 and capital assets of \$780,559. Current liabilities included \$158,523.

Determinations:

4.1: The District has the financial ability to provide flood protection, drainage, and agriculture irrigation water services to district lands.

⁵³ District Correspondence on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan EIR, May 14, 2009

Table 6.29: RD 2068 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 172,152	\$ 171,897	\$ 357,635	\$ 326,800	\$ 308,011
Service Charges	1,231,006	1,214,135	1,439,568	1,340,962	1,345,117
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 10,777	\$ 5,247	\$ 5,437	\$ 7,851	\$ 13,663
Total	\$1,413,935	\$1,391,279	\$1,802,640	\$1,675,613	\$1,666,791
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$662,683	\$ 740,671	\$ 674,925	\$ 807,515	\$ 733,806
Services & Supplies	752,882	768,475	832,337	856,578	801,655
Capital Outlay	120,419	87,626	101,000	109,312	105,000
Labor Costs (salaries & benefits)	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Services	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$1,535,984	\$1,596,772	\$1,608,262	\$1,773,405	\$1,640,461
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	(122,049)	(205,493)	194,378	(97,792)	26,330
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	(122,049)	(205,493)	194,378	(97,792)	26,330
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	2,699,266	2,706,721	2,296,540	2,545,274	2,143,186
Fund Balance End of Year	\$2,706,721*	\$2,296,540*	\$2,545,274*	\$2,143,186*	\$2,030,570*

* Prior Period Adjustments made based on difference between audited and unaudited financial statements.

Source: RD 2068 FY 2014-2018 FTRs submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District cooperates with other agencies in the management of water and drainage in the Dixon regional watershed and the North Delta Water Agency. The District works with various agencies including the Dixon Resource Conservation District, Maine Prairie Water District, City of Dixon, Solano County Water Agency, the Solano Water Advisory Commission, and the Solano County Water Authority. The District, in cooperation with the Dixon Regional Watershed Joint Powers Authority, is planning a regional drainage improvement project extending from the City of Dixon to Haas Slough.

RD 2068's southern boundary is contiguous with RD 2098 northern border. RD 2068 levees continue into RD 2098 and works with RD 2098 and other agencies to provide an integrated flood protection system. RD 2068 also has a contract to provide administrative services to RD 2098.

Determinations:

5.1: RD 2068 has a shared boundary with RD 2098 and some common levee segments in addition to provides administrative services. Opportunities for consolidating the two districts may exist and should be explored.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

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

to the Brown Act. The District has seven full-time employees, one executive staff, one executive support staff, and five operations staff. The General Manager also acts as Secretary to the Board. The support staff is responsible for routine office operations and financial reporting. The operations staff is responsible for general maintenance and operation of the water distribution, drainage, and levee systems. The District Board passed a resolution of hardship exempting them from establishing a website as required by SB 929. The Board recognizes the importance of transparency and clear communication in government and is committed to full compliance with the Brown Act and will revisit the question of hardship within one year and re-evaluate whether the District is able to create and maintain a website.

Determinations:

- 6.1: The District has adequate staff to manage the affairs of the District, comply with state requirements, and perform routine levee inspections and maintenance.
- 6.2: RD 2068 is a multi-county district with the majority of its assessed valuation located in Solano County.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

- 7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.7: Reclamation District No. 2084 (Little Egbert Tract)

6.7.1: District Profile

Little Egbert Tract (RD 2084) is located within the most southern portion of the Yolo Bypass and is designed to function as a flood storage basin during major storm events (see Figure 6.9). The State has flowage easements over the property through deed restrictions, so there can be no structures of any kind built on the property.

The District is bounded by Lindsey Slough on the east and north and RD 536 on the west. The eastern levees along Lindsey Slough are Non-Project restricted height levees. The district includes ten parcels totaling 3,153.24 acres of land, of which approximately 2,600 acres are in agricultural production (see Table 6.30). RD 2084 was organized on November 15, 1946 under Division 15 of the Water Code (see Table 6.31).

Table 6.30: RD 2084 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042240070	517.68	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1247
2	0042240080	105.92	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1247
3	0177030010	237.68	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1247
4	0177030020	153.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1247
5	0177030030	250.50	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1247
6	0177030040	352.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1227
7	0177090070	1,206.94	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1350
8	0177110150	269.34	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1227
9	0177110160	1.25	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
10	0177110260	59.01	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	
Total Acres		3,153.24				

Source: Solano County GIS

Figure 6.9: Map of RD 2084 Boundaries




Table 6.31: RD 2084 District Profile

District Organization		
District Office:	Reclamation District 2084 c/o Larsen Wurzel & Associates 2450 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 240 Sacramento, CA 95833 Phone: (916) 646-3644	<u>Mailing Address</u> Reclamation District 2084 P.O. Box 698 Rio Vista, CA 94571
Website:	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929	
Formation Date:	November 15, 1946	
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.	
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system.	
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries	
District Status:	Active; Independent District	
Governance		
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three members appointed by the County Board of Supervisors.	
Officers	Officers elected by Board of Trustees President: Mark Young Secretary/Treasurer: Kim Erickson Vice President:	
Compensation	None	
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets periodically. Last meeting held 1/2/20. Written agenda and meeting minutes provided in advance of meeting.	
Adopted Bylaws	Yes	
Operations		
Employees	None	
Facilities/Assets	Exterior levees; water pumps; drainage facilities	
Services Provided	Services provided by landowners	
Shared Facilities/Services		
Financial Position		
Fiscal Year	ending June 30	
Cash on Hand	\$4,175 (June 30, 2018)	
Current Budget (2018-2019)	Revenue: \$83,000; Expenses: \$81,505	
Primary Revenue Sources	Property assessments	
Assets	\$4,175 (June 30, 2018)	
Liabilities	\$0 (June 30, 2018)	
Fund Balance	\$4,175 (June 30, 2018)	
Risk Management	Maintains commercial liability insurance	
Most Recent Audit	Audited Financial Statements dated June 30, 2004	
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)	

Source: Reclamation District survey submitted by RD 2084; FTR submitted to SCO (2018); Independent Audit FY 2004

6.7.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the current land use designation for all property within the District to be agriculture with a Resource Conservation Overlay. Property within the District is zoned A-80 (Exclusive Agriculture) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. The District is planning on restoring the property to tidal action. Any restoration plan would require approval from the county. There are no plans or expectations for population growth or urban development. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: Land within the district is slated to remain in agriculture and there are no current plans for development or expansion of the District.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no DUC's located within or contiguous to RD 2084. The district is uninhabited, except for one house located within the District boundaries and the area's median household income is well above the MHI threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community. RD 2084 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2084.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2084.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

The District is responsible for maintaining the levees on the east and north sides (see Table 6.32). District facilities include pumping stations, an irrigation canal, and the levees. The pumping station on the north end of the District includes a 40 HP pump, while the pumping station on the south end includes a 125 HP pump and two 75 HP pumps. The irrigation canal, which traverses the middle of the District, runs from the east to the west boundary, then south and east to the middle of the property. The drainage canal occasionally requires cleaning. The levees have been well maintained as are the roads that service the levees. There are no planned additions to current services.

Determinations:

- 3.1: The current services are adequate to meet district needs and there are no planned expansions.

Table 6.32: RD 2084 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Landowners
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Landowners
Vector/Rodent Control	Landowners
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	Landowners
Flood Control	Landowners
Levee Patrol	Landowners
Pump Maintenance & Repair	Landowners
Drainage	Landowners
District Facilities	
Levees	
Easements	
Drainage System/Ditches	
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	5.4 miles of non-project restricted height levees
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Fall and Spring inspections for general maintenance. High water events the levees are inspected on an as needed basis.
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: Survey responses provided by District

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

Budget: RD 2084 uses a formal budgetary process in preparing an annual budget. The District collects sufficient revenues through assessments to provide service (see Table 6.33). The assessments are distributed amongst the landowners based on assessed value. The most recent financial report for FY 2018 showed positive cash flow of \$1,495 with \$81,505 in expenses and \$83,000 in revenue.

Fund Balance: The District’s general fund at the end of FY 2018 showed a positive balance with assets of 4,175 and no liabilities.

Determinations

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

Table 6.33: RD 2084 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 25,000	\$ 71,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 83,000
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$ 25,000	\$ 71,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 66,000	\$ 83,000
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	18,013	73,785	35,914	67,064	81,505
Capital Outlay/Depreciation	0	0	0	0	0
Labor	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc)	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$ 18,013	\$ 73,785	\$ 35,914	\$ 67,064	\$ 81,505
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	6,987	(2,785)	(914)	(1,064)	\$ 1,495
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	6,987	(2,785)	(914)	(1,064)	\$ 1,495
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	423	7,443	4,658	3,744	\$ 2,680
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 7,443	\$ 4,658	\$ 3,744	\$ 2,680	\$ 4,175

Source: Little Egbert Reclamation District No. 2084, Audited Financial Statements for FY 2003-2004; FTR to SCO-2014-2018

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District shares part of its southwestern boundary with the City of Rio Vista and its western boundary with RD 536. Although the District has the capacity to provide services, there may be opportunities to explore partnerships with the City particularly during flood events, or consolidation with the adjacent district. The District works together with other reclamation districts and local agencies during flood events.

Determinations:

5.1: The District should explore opportunities for partnerships with the City of Rio Vista or consolidation with RD 536.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

The District is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees. The Solano County Board of Supervisors appoints the Trustees to 4-year terms. The Trustees meet on an as-needed basis. The last Board meeting was held on January 2, 2020. The District has no employees and contracts for maintenance services. The District does not currently have a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

6.1: RD 2084 is a small district with no employees and a three-member Board appointed by the County Board of Supervisors that meets on an as-needed basis.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.8: Reclamation District No. 2093 (Liberty Island)

6.8.1: District Profile

RD 2093 is located on Liberty Island in the Sacramento Delta (see Figure 6.10). Liberty Island is part of the original Sacramento River Flood Control Project and has a long history of flooding, having flooded 27 times between 1917 and 1973.⁵⁴ In 1995, a large portion of the levee at Liberty Island’s southern end crumbled, resulting in mass flooding. The levee was repaired but failed again in 1998. Since 1998, Liberty Island has remained flooded and the levees not maintained. The levees are categorized as non-project, breached levees. Liberty Island is now a California Department of Fish & Wildlife Ecological Reserve.

RD 2093 is a multi-county agency. The District consist of seven parcels (see Figure 6.9) totaling 4,200.80 acres of land (see Table 6.34). While a portion of the District is located in Yolo County, the majority of its assessed value lies within Solano County. Therefore, Solano LAFCO has jurisdiction as the principal LAFCO.

Reclamation District 2093 was initially formed as “Liberty Reclamation #1” on March 5, 1918. The original purpose was to protect the island with a levee system to allow for agriculture. In 1959, because of the changes in landowners, the formation of the Sacramento Port District, and the Deep-Water Ship Channel, Reclamation District No. 2093 was reorganized on May 25, 1959 replacing Liberty Reclamation #1. The new District was organized to provide drainage, irrigation and reclamation of lands within the district (see Table 6.35). In 1998, The Trust for Public Land (TPL) purchased 96% of the island. The remaining 4% is owned by Wildlands, Inc, a national leader in wetland mitigation, endangered species, conservation banking, habitat management, and ecosystem restoration. Since that time there has been no agricultural activity, the levee was breached, and much of the island was flooded.

Table 6.34: RD 2093 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042190020	465.65	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
2	0042190230	157.72	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
3	0042190240	677.84	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
4	0042190250	604.85	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
5	0042210370	947.48	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
6	0042210380	949.67	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
7	0042240350	477.12	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
Total Acres		4,280.33				

Source: Solano County GIS

⁵⁴ Dickmann 1981

Figure 6.10: Map of RD 2093 Boundaries




Table 6.35: RD 2093 District Profile

District Organization

District Office:	101 Montgomery Street, Suite 900 San Francisco, CA 94104 Phone: (415) 495-5660
Website:	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date:	May 25, 1959
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system.
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active; Independent District

Governance

Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of five members appointed by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by landowners President: Dave Sutton Secretary/Treasurer: Vice President:
Compensation	None
Meetings	
Adopted Bylaws	

Operations

Employees	
Facilities/Assets	
Services Provided	
Shared Facilities/Services	

Financial Position

Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	
Current Budget (2018-2019)	Revenue: \$7,500; Expenses: \$2,243
Primary Revenue Sources	
Assets	\$41,032 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	\$40,668 (June 30, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$364 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	
Most Recent Audit	
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: FTR submitted to SCO (2018)

6.8.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

RD 2093 is uninhabited with an agriculture land use designation and Resource Conservation Overlay under the County's General Plan. There are no expectations for growth or development of the island. Hunting is allowed on the property, but no camping or dwelling of any sort.

Determinations:

1.1: The District is uninhabited with no anticipated increase in population or service expansion.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no DUC's located within or contiguous to RD 2093. The area's median household income is well above the MHI threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community. RD 2093 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2093.

2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2093.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2093 performs little or no levee maintenance activities (see Table 6.36). The four pumps on the island are inoperable. The Trust for Public Land does not plan to repair the levees or drain the island to allow renewed agricultural activities. Instead, the owners prefer to leave the island in its natural state. Other than making the island available for hunting, the District has no plans to expand services.

Determinations:

3.1: The island is being used for habitat restoration and the District has made the island available for hunting, but has no plans to expand flood protection and drainage services.

Table 6.36: RD 2093 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	N/A
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	N/A
Vector/Rodent Control	N/A
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	N/A
Flood Control	N/A
Levee Patrol	N/A
Pump Maintenance & Repair	N/A
Drainage	N/A
District Facilities	
Levees	N/A
Easements	N/A
Drainage System/Ditches	N/A
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	20.50
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	N/A
Most Recent Inspection Report	N/A
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	N/A
Services provided to other agencies	N/A
Services shared with other agencies	N/A

N/A = Not Available – District did not respond to LAFCO request for information
Source:

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services⁵⁵

Funding for operations comes from the Trust for Public Land (TPL), who owns 96% of the property, and is the primary source of the funding (see Table 6.37). TPL loans the District sufficient funds to cover expenses. The costs are divided proportionally by percent of ownership. RD 2093 intends to levy an assessment on landowners when the outstanding loan amount attributed to the other 4% of the ownership equals or exceeds the cost of a Proposition 218 election. Most of the expenses incurred are associated with the audit of the District by the County and legal expenses. That cost has been estimated at \$10,000 to \$15,000 annually. The District has no income-generating operations and has operated at deficits for the past several years. In FY 2018, the District had a positive cash flow of \$5,257 offsetting a negative fund balance from the prior fiscal year.

Fund Balance: At the end of FY 2018, the District showed a positive fund balance of \$364 with assets of \$41,032 and liabilities of \$40,668.

Determinations:

4.1: The District often operates at a deficit, which is funded by TPL, the majority property owner.

⁵⁵ Michael Brandman Associates, "Water MSR final", April 13, 2009

Table 6.37: RD 2093 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 0
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$7,500
Total	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 7,500	\$7,500
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$
Services & Supplies	0	0	0	5,644	
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	
Labor Costs (salaries & benefits)	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Services	2,549	1,883	2,538	2,001	2,130
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 228	\$ 219	\$ 113
Total	\$ 2,549	\$ 1,883	\$ 2,766	\$ 7,864	\$2,243
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	4,951	5,617	4,734	(364)	5,257
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	4,951	5,617	4,734	(364)	5,257
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	(60,864)	(55,913)	(50,296)	(45,562)	(4,894)
Fund Balance End of Year	(\$55,913)	(\$50,296)	(\$45,562)	(\$4,894)*	\$364*

* Prior Period Adjustment made.

Source: RD 2093 FY 2014-2018 FTRs submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District plans to keep the island in its natural state and has no need to share facilities or services with other agencies.

Determinations:

5.1: The District does not share facilities with neighboring districts and the majority of the island is flooded and being used for habitat restoration and mitigation banking.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

RD 2093 is governed by a three-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Meetings are held on an as-needed basis and are open to the public. An annual meeting is held in the spring at TPL offices in Sacramento to develop the budget and conduct other district business. Property owners want to maintain the governance structure to allow the District to serve as the lead agency for habitat mitigation, should it be required. The District does not maintain a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

6.1: The District provides limited services, but maintains its status as an active independent district.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.9: Reclamation District No. 2098 (Cache-Hass Slough)

6.9.1: District Profile

RD 2098 is located at the southern end of the Yolo Bypass ten miles north of the city of Rio Vista. The District covers 6,373.09 acres (see Table 6.38) and serves a population of 25. The District is surrounded by Project Levees on its east, west, and south boundaries along Cache, Haas, and Shag Sloughs, which are part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project (see Figure 6.11). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers improved these levees in the early 1960's. Upon completion, the levees were turned over to the State of California. Landowners were subsequently given responsibility for the levees and formed RD 2098 on September 26, 1963 to oversee the operation and maintenance of the levees (see Table 39). Internally, there are several Non-Project levees and drainage ditches, which provide flood protection and water management within the District. The predominant land use within RD 2098 is agriculture and managed wetlands. At the southern-most tip of the district is a small flooded island, Liberty Farms, constructed by DWR in 1991 by breaching a Project levee to create the 166-ac Cache Slough Mitigation Area.

Figure 6.11: Map of RD 2098 Boundaries




Table 6.38: RD 2098 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042140030	87.50	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	858
2	0042140050	66.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	848
3	0042140070	335.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
4	0042140110	68.37	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
5	0042140120	160.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
6	0042140140	160.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
7	0042140200	800.40	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	567
8	0042140230	334.19	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
9	0042140240	160.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
10	0042140250	160.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
11	0042160170	151.08	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
12	0042160180	161.84	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1218
13	0042160190	182.64	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	-	-
14	0143150130	346.55	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	1184
15	0143160010	80.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	369
16	0143160020	120.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	764
17	0143160030	118.18	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	856
18	0143160050	78.65	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	778
19	0143160060	78.65	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	778
20	0143160110	154.87	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	778
21	0143190070	200.66	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	368
22	0143190080	120.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	369
23	0143200040	640.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	369
24	0143200050	0.37	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	562
25	0143230070	334.20	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	858
26	0143240010	200.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	858
27	0143240020	268.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	848
28	0143240030	396.68	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	567
29	0143240040	409.26	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	567
Total Acres		6,373.09				

Source: Solano County GIS

Table 6.39: RD 2098 District Profile

District Organization	
District Office:	7178 Yolano Road Dixon, CA 95620 Phone: (707) 678-5412
Website:	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date:	September 26, 1963
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system.
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active; Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three members appointed by the District landowners.
Officers	Officers elected by Board of Trustees President: John Cain Secretary: Bryan Busch Treasurer: Solano County Treasurer Vice President:
Compensation	
Meetings	
Adopted Bylaws	
Operations	
Employees	
Facilities/Assets	
Services Provided	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Financial Position	
Fiscal Year	ending June 30
Cash on Hand	\$ (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (2018-2019)	Revenue: \$17,373; Expenses: \$18,585
Primary Revenue Sources	Property assessments
Assets	\$295,337 (June 30, 2018)
Liabilities	\$184,527 (June 30, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$141,975 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	.
Most Recent Audit	.
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: 2009 Survey Responses submitted by RD 2098; FTR submitted to SCO (2018)

6.9.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for property within the District to be agriculture with a Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. All lands within the District are zoned A-80 (Exclusive Agriculture) under the County's Zoning Ordinance with the predominant land use being agriculture. There are no current plans or expectations for population growth or development within the district. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

1.1: There is no expected population growth within District boundaries.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no DUC's located within or contiguous to RD 2098. The area's median household income is well above the MHI threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community. RD 2098 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2098.

2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2098.

3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services

RD 2098 has struggled to maintain its levee system to meet state standards for several years. The District has no full or part-time employees. Labor requirements are met by the contributions of labor by District landowners, tenant farm operators and contracted services (see Table 6.40). In 2005, MBK Engineers surveyed the District's levees and found problems in several areas that exhibited stability problems during high water events, areas of landside instability, and a number of areas showing crown subsidence.⁵⁶ During the December 2006 - January 2007 floods the District's levees experienced substantial damage. The District initiated an enhanced levee maintenance program in 2007, the levees were re-examined and received a satisfactory inspection. In 2012, the Delta Stewardship Council found that the District's levees did not meet the federal standards for rural levees⁵⁷ and DWR Fall Inspection Report rated levee maintenance as unacceptable for the past five years (see Table 6.41).

⁵⁶ MBK Engineers, "Reclamation District 2098 Engineer's Report in Regard to Status of Levee Conditions", August 2005

⁵⁷ Delta Stewardship Council, Delta islands and tracts protected by levees meeting Bulletin 192-82/PL 84-99 standards, located at <https://viewperformance.deltacouncil.ca.gov/pm/delta-levees>

Table 6.40: RD 2098 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	
Vector/Rodent Control	
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	
Flood Control	
Levee Patrol	
Pump Maintenance & Repair	
Drainage	
District Facilities	
Levees	
Easements	
Drainage System/Ditches	
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	10.91 miles
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	10.91 miles
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	
Most Recent Inspection Report	
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	
Services provided to other agencies	
Services shared with other agencies	
Source:	

Table 6.41: RD 2098 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018

District	Overall Rating A= Acceptable; M = Minimally Acceptable; U = Unacceptable					Total Levee Miles
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
RD 2098	U	U	U	U	U	10.91

Source: DWR Maintenance Inspection Report

Determinations:

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

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

RD 2098 receives revenue from ad valorem property taxes collected by the County and a maintenance fee (see Table 6.42). RD 2098 also participates in the State funded Delta Levee Maintenance Program that reimburses districts for eligible maintenance completed in the prior year. Overall, the District receives 27 percent of its revenues from property taxes, and 72 percent from maintenance fees. The Delta Levee Maintenance Program historically reimburses districts for about half of what has been spent on eligible maintenance in the prior year. The most recent Financial Transaction Report for FY 2018 showed a negative cash flow of (\$1,212) with \$17,373 in revenue and 18,585 in expenses.

Fund Balance: According to the financial report submitted to the SCO, RD 2098 had a positive fund balance of \$141,975 at the end of FY 2018 with assets of \$163,126 and liabilities of \$21,151.

Determinations:

- 4.1: The District has sufficient funding to maintain the levees during normal years. Ad valorem property taxes and maintenance fees are augmented by State subvention funds.
- 4.2: In the past the District has made use of landowner assessments to cover the costs of emergency repairs.

Table 6.42: RD 2098 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 5,233	\$ 6	\$ 9,291	\$16,722	\$17,373
Member Contributions	\$ 33,445	33,445	43,039	0	0
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	40	0	0
Other	\$ 56,527	\$ 249	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$ 95,205	\$ 33,700	\$52,370	\$16,722	\$17,373
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Services & Supplies	51,013	72,921	30,903	3,997	18,585
Capital Outlay	0	0	0	0	0
Labor Costs (salaries & benefits)	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Services	0	0	0	0	0
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Total	\$ 51,013	\$ 72,921	\$30,903	\$ 3,997	\$18,585
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	44,192	(39,221)	21,467	12,725	(1,212)
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	44,192	(39,221)	21,467	12,725	(1,212)
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	136,229	168,014	132,332	161,429	458,725
Fund Balance End of Year	\$168,014*	\$132,332*	\$161,429*	\$458,725*	\$141,975*

* Prior Period Adjustment made based on difference between audited and unaudited financial statements.

Source: RD 2098 FY 2014-2018 FTRs submitted to SCO

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

RD 2098 maintains a common levee system with an adjacent district (RD 2068) of about 20 miles. These levees are conjoined with the federal levees maintained and operated by RD 2068. Each agency is dependent on the integrity of the combined system for flood protection. Both districts depend on each other to maintain their portion of the levee system, since failure in any part of the system will result in some level of flooding in both districts. RD 2098 does not own or operate any drainage facilities, canals, pumps or other facilities not directly associated with the levees. Facilities associated with the levees such as gravity culverts, while under the jurisdiction of the District, are the financial responsibility of the benefited landowner.

Determinations:

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

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

The District is governed by a three-member board appointed to 4-year terms by the Board of Supervisors. Trustees must be landowners or an authorized representative of a landowner. Trustees are not compensated and meet once a year or whenever necessary. Meetings are noticed according to the Brown Act, however there are no locations within the District suitable and accessible to the public so meetings are held at the nearby offices of RD 2068. The District does not currently have a website as required by SB 929.

The District has no paid staff. Administrative services are provided by contract with RD 2068, which adjoins and is codependent with RD 2098 on the conjoined levee system operated by the two agencies. Because of the close relationship and interdependency with RD 2068, it seems logical to consider a consolidation of the two districts. LAFCO may want to initiate a study to determine if consolidation would be of interest to and benefit both districts.

Determinations:

6.1: Because of the close relationship of the District and RD 2068 an opportunity may exist for consolidation of RD 2098 and RD 2068 that would be beneficial to both districts.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

There are no other matters or local commission policies that will affect service delivery.

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

6.10: Reclamation District No. 2104 (Peters Pocket Tract)

6.10.1: District Profile

Peter’s Pocket is a diked agricultural island bordered by Hass Slough to the east and north, Cache Slough to the south, and agricultural fields to the west (see Figure 6.12). District lands consist of ten parcels totaling approximately 1,542.28 acres (see Table 6.43). The predominant land use is agricultural. The District was formed under §50000 of the California Water Code and approved by Solano County LAFCO on May 1, 1964, to maintain the exterior levees and water control structures (see Table 6.44). While RD 2104 is currently active, the District was considered inactive for several years according the 2009 MSR by Michael Brandman Associates.⁵⁸

Table 6.43: RD 2104 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel

Map ID	APN	Acres	County Land Use Designation	County Zoning	Williamson Act Status	Williamson Act Number
1	0042120150	119.03	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	270
2	0042120220	6.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	270
3	0042130060	6.75	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	270
4	0042130070	133.80	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	597
5	0042130080	35.39	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	271
6	0042140010	41.11	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	271
7	0042140020	133.80	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	597
8	0042140040	747.95	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	270
9	0143230080	151.00	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	271
10	0143230090	167.45	Agriculture (AG)	Exclusive Agricultural (A80)	Active	271
Total Acres		1,542.28				

Source: Solano County GIS

⁵⁸ Michael Brandman Associates, “Solano Water, Irrigation, Reclamation, and Flood Management Agencies Municipal Service Review”, April 13, 2009

Figure 6.12: Map of RD No. 2104 Boundaries




Table 6.44: RD 2104 District Profile

Organization Requirements	
District Office:	33 N. San Pedro San Jose, CA 95110 Phone: (408) 280-7577
Website:	Currently does not have a website required by SB 929
Formation Date:	May 1, 1964
Principal Act:	California Water Code, Section 50000 et. seq.
Purpose:	Formed for the primary purpose of operating and maintaining flood control and tidal levees and drainage system.
Sphere of Influence:	Coterminous with District boundaries
District Status:	Active: Independent District
Governance	
Governing Body	Board of Trustees consisting of three members serving four-year terms, appointed by the property owners.
Officers	Elected by Board of Trustees President: Ken Machado Secretary: Christine Malroney Treasurer: Chris Niederhauser Vice President: Chris Niederhauser
Compensation	None
Meetings	Board of Trustees meets bi-annually. Last meeting held _____. Written agenda and meeting minutes are not provided in advance of board meetings.
Adopted Bylaws	None
Operations	
Employees	None
Facilities/Assets	The District does not own any facilities or equipment. Stockpiles flood supplies.
Services Provided	Limited services provided by landowners.
Shared Facilities/Services	None
Financial	
Fiscal Year	ending December 31st
Cash on Hand	\$36,160 (June 30, 2018)
Current Budget (2018-2019)	Revenue: \$; Expenses: \$
Primary Revenue Sources	Property assessments; state/federal grant revenue; charges for services
Assets	\$53,462 (December 31, 2018)
Liabilities	\$46,711 (December 31, 2018)
Fund Balance	\$36,160 (June 30, 2018)
Risk Management	
Most Recent Audit	Audited Financial Statements dated June 30, 2015
Annual Financial Report	Annual Financial Transaction Report filed with State Controller's Office (FY 2018)

Source: Reclamation District survey submitted by RD 2104

6.10.2: MSR Findings and Determinations

1. Growth and Population of the District

The Solano County General Plan shows the land use designation for all property within the District to be agriculture with a Resource Conservation Overlay. That designation is used to identify and protect areas with special resource management needs. All District lands are zoned A-80 (Exclusive Agriculture) under the County's Zoning Ordinance. There are no current plans or expectations for growth of the District. Any plan for development would require a change in land use and development approval from the County.

Determinations:

- 1.1: There are no current development proposals or expectations for growth within the boundary of Reclamation District 2104.

2. Location and Characteristics of Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities

There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2104. The District is uninhabited and the area's median household income is well above the MHI threshold for defining a disadvantaged unincorporated community. RD 2104 does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection therefore, the provisions of Senate Bill 244 do not apply to this District.

Determinations:

- 2.1: There are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to the boundary of Reclamation District 2104.
- 2.2: The District does not provide public services related to water, sewer or structural fire protection and therefore, the provisions of SB 244 do not apply to RD 2104.

3. Present and planned capacity of public services

The District provides a limited scope of services with levee maintenance activities performed by district landowners (see Table 6.45). Levees surrounding the District are all Project levees, which are inspected by DWR and maintained by individual property owners. Two annual inspections are conducted by government personnel with reports reviewed by the District Board of Trustees. The most recent inspection report by DWR in the Fall of 2018 indicates that the levees have not been maintained at an acceptable level for the past five years (see Table 6.46).

Determinations:

- 3.1: The District provides a limited scope of services utilizing district landowners.
- 3.2: DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report for 2018 shows the District's levees have been maintained at an unacceptable level for the past five years.

Table 6.45: RD 2104 Facilities, Services & Maintenance

Services Provided	
Levee Maintenance	Landowners
Weed Abatement/Vegetation Removal	Landowners
Vector/Rodent Control	Landowners
Upkeep of Levee Access Roads	Landowners
Flood Control	Landowners
Levee Patrol	Landowners
Pump Maintenance & Repair	Landowners
Drainage	Landowners
District Facilities	
Levees	None
Easements	None
Drainage System/Ditches	None
Levee Maintenance Standards	
Total Levee Miles Maintained	8.4 miles of Project Levees
Levee Maintenance Standard	
No Standard:	
HMP Standard:	
PL 84-99 Standard:	8.4 miles of Project Levees
Bulletin 192-82 Standard:	
FEMA Standard:	
Levee Inspection Practices	Two levee inspections are conducted annually by government personnel and the District reviews the reports.
Most Recent Inspection Report	2018
Shared Facilities/Services	
Shared Facilities	None
Services provided to other agencies	None
Services shared with other agencies	None

Source: District Response to MSR Survey

Table 6.46: RD 2104 DWR Levee Maintenance Inspection Report, 2018

District	Overall Rating A = Acceptable; M = Minimally Acceptable; U = Unacceptable					Total Levee Miles
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
RD 2104	U	U	U	U	U	6.85

Source: DWR Maintenance Inspection Report

4. Financial Ability to Provide Services

The 2018 Financial Transaction Report submitted by RD 2104 shows \$1,500 in revenue with no expenditures (see Table 6.47). Financial information submitted by the District in response to the MSR survey shows \$1,100 in expenses and \$1,530 in revenue. Landowner assessments accounts for the District’s total annual revenue. While the District shows a positive fund balance with no outstanding liabilities it did not provide a recent audited financial statement.

Determinations:

4.1: The District has limited financial data with minimal revenue and no expenditures for the most recent fiscal year.

Table 6.47: RD 2104 Revenues, Expenditures & Fund Balance

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Revenues					
Assessments	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,500
Service Charges	0	0	0	0	0
State/Federal Assistance	0	0	0	0	0
Other	<u>\$ 0</u>				
Total	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,500
Expenditures					
General & Administrative	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Levee Repairs & Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Capital Outlay/Depreciation		0	0		0
Labor		0	0		0
Engineering	0	0	0	0	0
Utilities	0	0	0	0	0
Equipment Maintenance	0	0	0	0	0
Debt Service	0	0	0	0	0
Other (permits, misc)	<u>\$ 0</u>				
Total	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Net Operating Revenue (Loss)	0	0	0	0	\$ 1,500
Loans/Warrants	0	0	0	0	0
Net Change in Fund Balance	0	0	0	0	\$ 0
Fund Balance Beginning of Year	0	0	0	0	\$ 0
Fund Balance End of Year	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 1,500

Source: Peters Pocket Reclamation District 2104, Response to MSR Survey; FTR to SCO-2018

5. Status and Opportunity for Shared Facilities

The District owns no facilities and provides limited levee maintenance services utilizing district landowners. District levees are not connected to the levee system of neighboring districts. There is no overlap in service delivery with other reclamation districts that provide similar services.

Determinations:

5.1: The District does not provide services or share facilities with other agencies. Solano LAFCO should work with the District to determine if they would like to transfer responsibility for service delivery to a neighboring district.

6. Accountability and Governmental Structure

RD 2104 is governed by a three-member board who are appointed by the landowners. The Board meets bi-annually, but the District has no website, does not post meeting agendas and minutes prior to board meetings, and does not have an adopted set of bylaws. The District does not compensate its Board members and has no paid employees. The District does not currently have a website as required by SB 929.

Determinations:

6.1: Appropriate actions should be taken by the Board of Trustees to be in full compliance with State requirements.

7. Other Matters Affecting Efficient Service Delivery

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

Determinations:

7.1: There are no other matters or local commission policies that would affect efficient service delivery.

SECTION 7: KEY FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS

7.0: Summary of Key Findings

Key findings include:

1. Most Districts are uninhabited and none of the districts anticipates significant growth, population increases, or changes in land use. Most of the parcels are zoned for agricultural or marsh uses that would require County development approval for a change in land use;
2. According to population and household income data from the U.S. Census Bureau, there are no disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or adjacent to any reclamation district's service area or its sphere of influence, nor in the general area surrounding the District. None of the Districts provides water, sewer, or fire protection services;
3. The primary service provided by the reclamation district is levee maintenance and drainage. Most districts appear to have adequate facilities in good condition adequate to meet current levels of relative to applicable standards and the district's primary purpose, with some exceptions. Eleven of the 24 districts reviewed have project levees that are inspected at least once annually and reported to DWR. Three Delta RDs (501, 999, 2060, and 2068) were inspected by DWR in the Fall 2018 and found to be maintained at an acceptable or minimally acceptable level. Several Delta districts with project levees had unacceptable levels of maintenance;
4. The main sources of revenue for most reclamation districts include special assessments, property taxes or landowner assessments, service charges, and state and federal grant funding. These revenue streams are generally adequate for normal maintenance and repairs. However, additional funding is necessary for levee upgrades and major repairs due to storm damage. Most districts appear to be financially stable and are able to recover from periodic large infrastructure and facility expenditures. District budgets are generally balanced with little or no outstanding liabilities. Most districts utilize property owner volunteers for minor maintenance and levee inspections along with contract services to reduce costs.
5. Most district own some facilities and equipment, but do not share facilities or services with other districts. Several potential opportunities for improved shared service delivery and governance have been identified and are included in the recommendations below.
6. The reclamation districts reviewed in this report are independent special districts with elected Boards of Directors. The frequency of Board meetings varies, but at least one meeting is held annually. Except for two reclamation districts, the districts do not maintain websites or been granted a hardship exemption as prescribed by SB 292 (McGuire 2018). Improvements can be made to the overall governance and transparency of district operations.

Most of the reclamation/levee districts could take actions to improve their accountability and transparency. Districts that haven't done so already should adopt policies pertaining to district operations and financial management, such as Board compensation, expense reimbursement, purchasing and contracting, employee policies, and an annual budget to comply with State requirements. Only two districts have websites and post meeting agendas and minutes. Districts without a website should create a website in compliance with AB 292 requirements. The California Special Districts Association offers a website template for a nominal monthly fee, which includes technical support and hosting services.⁵⁹

⁵⁹ www.getstreamline.com

Districts with Project Levees which are inspected on a regular basis by DWR and/or USACE. Districts with non-project levees are typically self-inspected by property owners or district personnel with no mandatory standard for levee maintenance. Small districts may want to consider collaborative arrangements with other districts or alternative service providers that will provide for a uniform level of operation and maintenance to improve levee maintenance and flood fighting capabilities. Governance solutions could take a variety of forms including district consolidation, contracts for shared services, MOUs, or JPAs.

7.1: Recommendations for Improved Governance and Service Delivery

The following suggested recommendations are made to promote efficiencies in service delivery and governance. Potential actions that Solano LAFCO should consider include:

1. Dissolution of Districts Declared to be Inactive

LAFCO has responsibility for dissolution of special districts that have been identified by the State Controller's Office as being inactive per Government Code §56042. Senate Bill 448 (2017) created a streamlined process to dissolve special districts whose audits show that they are no longer performing. Once identified as being inactive by the California State Controller's Office (SCO), local LAFCOs are required to initiate dissolution, unless the commission determines, following a public hearing, that the special district does not meet the criteria for qualifying as an inactive district. Requirements for an "active district" include: 1) filing annual financial transaction reports with the SCO; 2) filing audits with LAFCO and SCO; 3) holding properly noticed elections (or appointments) and Board meetings including minutes; 4) meeting the requirements of the public records act; 5) filing records with the Secretary of State, and 6) following California Fair Political Practices Commission requirements.

RD 2043 appears to be inactive given that the District has not reported revenues and expenditures for more than five years. There is no evidence, other than formation documents, that the District has been active. Other districts identified as being inactive should also be considered for dissolution.

2. Consolidation of Contiguous Districts

Each of the reclamation/levee districts reviewed in this MSR has some unique character and/or configuration that may limit consolidation. While each of the districts are unique to some extent, consideration should be given to consolidating some districts into a larger entity to improve service delivery and efficiency and reduce administrative costs. Solano LAFCO should consider conducting a governance study to determine the feasibility, district interest, and potential benefits of consolidation where it is appropriate and supported by individual districts. While consolidation would not improve the governance and service delivery for all districts, eleven districts are considered potential candidates based on their adjacency, minimal size, and/or similar operational characteristics. Small underfunded districts should be encouraged to consolidate or collaborate on operation and/or administrative functions to reduce operating costs.

3. Formation of an Umbrella Administrative District to Improve Administrative Efficiency and Governance

Small underfunded districts should be encouraged to consolidate or collaborate on operation and/or administrative functions to reduce operating costs. Consideration should be given to the potential placement of reclamation districts as subsidiary districts under the umbrella of a lead agency or service provider to improve operational efficiency and service delivery while lowering administrative burdens in a cost-effective manner. An existing organization with knowledge about reclamation districts could serve as an umbrella organization to provide management and administrative services that many small

districts find costly to maintain This change in governance structure would maintain legal separation of the individual districts, while providing greater efficiency and coordination of services. This type of administrative arrangement could potentially reduce staff costs and improve transparency and accountability associated with publishing notices of agency meetings, filing financial audits and reporting, website maintenance, and other compliance requirements.

APPENDICES

APN – Assessor Parcel Number

BCDC – San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission

CDP – Census Designated Place

CEQA – California Environmental Quality Act

CKH - Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (CKH Act)

CWC – California Water Code

DUC – Disadvantaged Unincorporated Community

DWR – California Department of Water Resources

FEMA – Federal Emergency Management Agency

GC – California Government Code

LAFCO – Local Agency Formation Commission

MHI – Median Household Income

MSR – Municipal Service Review

RD – Reclamation District

SB – California Senate Bill

SCO – California State Controller’s Office

SOI – Sphere of Influence

SMP – Suisun Marsh Protection Plan

USACE – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

REFERENCES

Cache Slough Complex

Cache Slough Comprehensive Regional Planning: Draft Baseline Characterization Report, July 2017

CalFed Bay-Delta Program, “Levee System Integrity Program Plan, Final Programmatic EIS/EIR”, July 2000

California Office of Emergency Services, “California State Hazard Mitigation Plan”, September 2018

California Department of Water Resources, “Suisun Marsh Monitoring Program Reference Guide”, June 2000, Version 2

California Department of Water Resources, “Delta Levees Special Flood Control Projects: 2014 Guidelines for providing funding to local public agencies”, April 2014

Delta Protection Commission, “Delta Flood Risk Management Assessment District Feasibility Study and Delta Levee Financing Options”, May 17, 2018

Delta Stewardship Council, “State Investment in Delta Levees: Key Issues for Updating Priorities”, January 2015

Department of Water Resources and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, “Cache slough Complex Conservation Assessment, Volume 1: Characterization Report”, August 2016

FEMA, “Public Assistance Program and Policy Guide”, January 2018

Flood Protect, “Lower Sacramento River/Delta North Regional Flood Management Plan”, July 2014

Guide to the Cortese–Knox–Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, December 2017

ICF, “Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan”, May 2013

Michael Brandman Associates, “Solano County Water, Irrigation, Reclamation, and Flood Management Agencies”, April 13, 2009

USACE, “Delta Islands and Levees Feasibility Study Draft Report and EIS”, April 2014

URS Corporation, “Delta Risk Management Strategy: Phase 2 Risk Reduction Report”, June 2011

URS Corporation, “Delta Risk Management Strategy: Risk Analysis Report”, September 2008

DISADVANTAGED UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES QUALIFICATIONS

Senate Bill (SB) 244, which became effective in January 2012, requires Local Agency Formation Commissions to consider the presence of any Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities (DUCs) when preparing a Municipal Service Review for agencies that provide water, wastewater or structural fire protection services. SB 244 created several definitions related to DUCs, in both LAFCO and planning law, including:

1. “Community” is an inhabited area within a city or county that is comprised of no less than 10 dwellings adjacent to or in close proximity to one another;
2. “Unincorporated fringe community” is any inhabited and unincorporated territory that is within a city’s SOI;
3. “Unincorporated island community” is any inhabited and unincorporated territory that is surrounded or substantially surrounded by one or more cities or by one or more cities and a county boundary or the Pacific Ocean;
4. “Unincorporated legacy community” as a geographically isolated community that is inhabited and has existed for at least 50 years; and
5. **“Disadvantaged unincorporated community”** is inhabited territory of 12 or more registered voters that constitutes all or a portion of a community with an annual MHI that is less than 80 percent of the statewide annual MHI. In 2017, the statewide annual median household income (MHI) was \$67,739 (2017 American Community Survey). This yields an MHI of less than \$54,191 (80 percent of the statewide MHI) as the financial threshold for defining a DUC.

The CKH Act requires LAFCO to make a determination regarding the location and characteristics of any disadvantaged unincorporated communities within or contiguous to the sphere of influence. This state legislation is intended to ensure that the needs of these unincorporated communities are met when considering service extensions and/or annexations, in particular, water, wastewater, drainage, and structural fire protection services. Additionally, Solano LAFCO’s policy requires written determinations with respect to the location and characteristics of any DUCs within or contiguous to the Sphere of Influence.

The challenge in identifying DUCs is that census geography does not precisely match reclamation district boundaries. The smallest census geography includes census blocks and block groups. Because the census data reflects values for areas larger than the RDs, it is possible that there may be an unincorporated community within or contiguous to a RD that meets the financial threshold requirement for a DUC.

The most recent American Community Survey (2017) conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau shows four unincorporated Census Designated Places (CDP) in Solano County (see Table C1 below), none of which are located within or contiguous to a reclamation district’s boundaries. The closest unincorporated community is Elmira, which is located approximately 4.5 miles east of Vacaville and has an MHI above 80% of the State’s MHI. Green Valley located approximately four miles north of Cordelia has an MHI equal to 99% of the State’s value. Allendale, located 9-miles west of Dixon, and Hartley, located 7-miles north of Vacaville, have MHI well above the statewide average. The median household income for all CDPs in Solano County is above 80% of the MHI for California.

The California Department of Water Resources has an on-line mapping tool that is based on data from the US Census American Community Survey showing census block groups identified as

disadvantaged communities (less than 80% of the State's median household income) or severely disadvantaged communities (less than 60% of the State's median household income). Block Group data does not provide information on specific neighborhoods.

Table C1: Solano County Unincorporated Communities

Census Designated Place	Population	Median Household Income	% of State's MHI
Allendale CDP	1,349	\$ 135,161	199.9%
Elmira CDP	208	\$ 60,833	89.9%
Green Valley CDP	1,224	\$ 66,710	98.5%
Hartley CDP	2,988	\$ 89,235	131.7%
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 2017, 5-year estimate, Table B19013			

Table C2: Median Household Income (2017)

Census Tract	Block Group	2017 Population	MHI	% of State's MHI
Suisun Marsh				
2521.02	1	1,968	\$ 54,825	81.6%
2523.05	1	2,551	\$105,000	156.3%
2527.02	6	891	\$ 84,141	125.3%
Collinsville				
2535	4	1,702	\$ 39,327	58.5%
Sacramento Delta				
2533	1	2,033	\$ 94,258	140.3%
2535	1	5,108	\$ 65,456	97.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 American Community Survey, 5-year estimates, Tables B01001 and B19013

ORIGIN OF RECLAMATION DISTRICTS

Reclamation Districts in California began with passage of the federal Swamp Land Act of 1850 (aka the Arkansas Act) by the U.S. Congress, which authorized the transfer of federal swamplands to private ownership with the provision that the land be drained and made productive for a beneficial use, typically for agricultural purposes. In California, more than two million acres were transferred to the State for sale and reclamation, consisting mostly of extensive Tule marsh in the Central Valley and Sacramento–San Joaquin Delta. A series of laws were passed by the California Legislature to allow counties to sell “swamp land” for reclamation purposes (1855) and for County Board of Supervisors to apply assessments on property for improvement and maintenance (1861). The Board of Swamp Land Commissioners, established in 1861 was the first state agency involved with land reclamation. This board was abolished in 1866 and its responsibilities and powers transferred to the county boards of supervisors. From 1866 to 1911, authority for oversight of Reclamation District’s was first the responsibility of each county and then the State Board of Reclamation. Owners of reclaimed land were authorized starting in 1867 to organize special districts to acquire, build, and operate reclamation works, which included levees, drains, canals, bulkheads, sluices, water gates, embankments, pumping plants, dams, diversion works, irrigation ditches, bridges, and roads.

Reclamation districts are primarily responsible for protecting agriculture lands, development, and habitats in floodplain areas. Reclamation districts may also perform other duties including irrigation, drainage, and recharge needs.

PROJECT AND NON-PROJECT LEVEES

Project Levee: A federal flood control levee, as shown on DWR’s Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Atlas dated 1993, is a project facility under the State Water Resources Law of 1945, (Chapter 1 commencing with § 12570 and Chapter 2 commencing with § 12639 of Part 6), if not less than a majority of the acreage within the jurisdiction of the local agency that maintains the levee is within the primary zone of the Delta, as defined in § 29728 of the Public Resources Code. (CA Water Code § 12980[f])

Non-Project Levee: Non-project levees shall be compatible with the plan for improvement of the delta levees as set forth in Bulletin No. 192-82.

Both project and non-project plans shall include provisions to acquire easements along levees that allow for the control and reversal of subsidence. The easement shall (1) restrict the use of the land to open-space uses in areas where the department determines that such an easement is desirable to maintain structural stability of the levee, non-tillable crops, the propagation of wildlife habitat, and other compatible uses, (2) provide full access to the local agency for levee maintenance and improvement purposes, and (3) allow the owner to retain reasonable rights of ingress and egress as well as reasonable rights of access to the waterways for water supply and drainage (WC §12988).

Most Project and Non-Project levees are classified as agricultural levees, meaning their main function is to protect agriculture from flood impacts (Betchart 2008). These levees generally fall under one of two condition standards—the Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) standard or the Public Law 84-99 (PL 84-99) standard. The HMP standard is recognized as providing a very basic level of flood protection. It provides marginal protection by establishing an interim, short term levee design standard that lessens the likelihood of repeat flood damages, and is a precursor for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) disaster assistance. The PL 84-99 design standard is the minimum nationwide levee standard for all federal flood control project levees, but Non-Project (non-federally funded) levees may also qualify for inclusion in the PL 84-99 program. In the Delta, some Non-Project levees may achieve a “Delta-Specific” version of the PL 84-99 standard if they meet certain design criteria and pass an inspection. These levees are effective in providing basic flood protection and are eligible for USACE emergency assistance (Betchart 2008).

LEEVE DESIGN STANDARDS

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA): This standard, often called the “1 percent annual chance flood” level of protection, protects against flooding that is the basis for FEMA’s flood insurance rate maps. The standard provides crown heights 3 feet above the 100-year flood and 16 feet wide, with side slopes of 2 to 1. For property-owners, a benefit of attaining the 100-year standard is relief from the cost of purchasing flood insurance that is required for properties with federally-guaranteed mortgages. For rural areas protected by project levees, attaining this level of protection is often difficult to justify economically.

Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP): State and Federal Agencies including FEMA, DWR, the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), and levee maintaining agencies negotiated the HMP guidance to reduce the likelihood of repetitive flood damage to Delta levees and islands, so that FEMA disaster assistance would not be requested repetitively for the same islands after minor floods. This standard provides for levees with crowns 1 foot above 100-year flood heights and 16 feet wide, with 46 side slopes of 1.5 to 1. Until recently, local communities that met the HMP guidance were eligible for FEMA disaster assistance if levees fail or islands flood. FEMA’s recent cancelation of its agreement with the State about Delta levees makes this commitment uncertain. The Delta Plan’s policy on State investments in Delta levees provides that improvement of non-project levees to the HMP standard may be funded without justification, but that higher levels of protection should be provided “as befits the benefits to be provided.”

Public Law 84-99: is a minimum Delta specific levee requirement established by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for levees that participate in its Rehabilitation and Inspection Program. Delta islands that meet this standard are eligible for USACE funding for levee rehabilitation, island restoration after flooding, and emergency assistance, provided that the reclamation district is accepted and passes a rigorous initial inspection and periodic follow-up inspections. Levees accepted into the USACE program are no longer eligible for FEMA rehabilitation assistance and those which protect primarily agricultural areas will not meet the requirements for assistance. The PL 84-99 standard provides for levees 1.5 feet above the 100-year flood elevation and side slopes of 2 to 1. Delta islands or tracts that meet this standard are eligible for USACE funding for levee rehabilitation and island restoration after flooding, if the benefits exceed the cost.

Bulletin 192-82: Provides guidance for the Delta Levee Maintenance Subventions Program (Water Code section 12987) and includes standards for (1) urban level improvement based on 100 year protection roughly equivalent to the FEMA 100 year standard, and (2) levee improvements on islands used primarily for agriculture to provide 50 year protection roughly equivalent to PL 84-99 standards.

Suisun Marsh Plan:

The Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan included four interrelated and interdependent objectives that addressed habitat restoration, land use, water quality, and a levee integrity goal to “maintain and improve the Suisun Marsh levee system integrity to protect property, infrastructure, and wildlife habitats from catastrophic flooding.” Levee standards were developed as part of a Levee Conceptual Model that assumed the maximum water depth against an exterior levee is 7 feet above sea level and the maximum depth against an interior levee is 3 feet above sea level. Figure F2 shows the applicable standards for typical exterior and interior levees.

**Levee Sections:
Suisun Marsh and Delta Levee Standards**

Reclamation Districts have historically relied upon levee systems to accomplish the varied reclamation purposes. Typical levee sections vary from District to District and will also vary as to the level of flood protection the levee provides. Levee sections will vary as to:


1. Top width of levee section measured from top of water side embankment to top of land side embankment.
2. Whether the levee crest is rocked, paved in order to provide an “all weather” access/maintenance roadway
3. Water side embankment slope (i.e. 1.5:1; 2:1; 3:1; etc)
4. Land side embankment slope (i.e. 2:1, 3:1, 4:1 etc)
5. Freeboard, the distance measured from levee crest to design water side water surface elevation, i.e. 100-year flood stage or 500-year flood stage.

Delta Levee Sections

Delta Levees fall under two levee standards depending on the use of the lands that the levee system protects. These two standards are comprised of the following: 1) Agricultural Uses and 2) Urban Use. Three levee sections fall under the Agricultural Use Designation that include standards under the: 1) Hazard Mitigation Plan; 2) PL84-99; and 3) DWR Bulletin 192-82. Two additional sections fall under the Urban Land Use Designation. These include FEMA and DWR Bulletin 192-82.

Cross sections of the five Delta Levee Section Standards are shown on Figure F1. All five sections utilize a minimum levee crest width of sixteen feet (16’) with varying waterside/landside slope gradients and freeboard requirements. Maintenance of perimeter levees is typically funded by district landowners supplemented with funding available from DWR under its Subventions Programs for Districts that properly maintain levees in compliance with DWR requirements.

Figure F1: Delta Levee Standards



Suisun Marsh Levee Sections

The levee standards for Suisun Marsh districts vary from the levee standards for the Delta levee districts. Recommended standards for levees in Suisun Marsh were established in the 1980 Suisun Marsh Local Plan of Protection, and approved by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission.⁶⁰ Applicable standards for typical exterior levees include a crown width of 12 feet that is two feet above expected high water levels and side slopes of 2:1. Where wave action is expected, the freeboard must be at least three feet. Interior levees with crowns of 10 feet and freeboard of 1 foot minimum; if water depth is greater than 1 foot, freeboard should be equal to water depth and not exceed 3 feet; and side slopes of 2:1. The management program acknowledged that when these water elevation conditions are exceeded special design levee standards are required.

Exterior levees within the Primary Management Area of Suisun Marsh should have: 1) a levee crest width of twelve feet (12') in width; 2) a crown elevation set to approximately nine feet (9') above the zero tide elevation line, maintaining an approximate freeboard of two feet (2'); and 3) slope gradients no steeper than 1.5 to 1 with all levee repairs set to a minimum slope gradient of 2:1. A cross section of the Suisun Marsh standard is shown in Figure F2.

Figure F2: Suisun Marsh




Table F1: Levee Standards & Guidance

Standard	Type	Feet Above Flood (Free Board)	Flood Occurrence	Comments
HMP – Hazard Mitigation Plan	Short term	1.0	100 year	Pre-condition for receiving FEMA disaster assistance
PL 84-99	Project Levees	1.5	100 year	Eligible for USACE and Rehabilitation Funds
DWR Bulletin 192-82	Agricultural	1.5	300 year	Provides guidelines for Delta Levee Maintenance Subvention Program
Suisun Marsh Protection Plan	Habitat Protection & Water Quality	2.0		Upgraded levees and new exterior flood control levees constructed and maintained to SMPP standards

⁶⁰ Delta Stewardship Council, “State Investment in Delta Levees”, January 2015

Table F2: District Levee Standards

District No.	District Name	Exterior Levee Miles	No Standard	Suisun Marsh	HMP	PL 84-99	DWR Bulletin 192-82	FEMA
Suisun Marsh								
1607	Van Sickle Island	9.00	X					
2043								
2112	Schafer Pintail	1.45	X					
2127	Simmons-Wheeler	7.50	X					
2129	Frost Lake	7.50	X					
2130	Honker Bay	2.00	X					
2134	Denverton	7.00		X				
2135	Sunrise Island							
2136	Grizzly West	8.00		X				
2138	Morrow Island		X					
2139	Can-Can/Greenhead	5.81		X				
2141	Joice Island	4.50						
2142	Suisun Slough West							
Collinsville								
	Collinsville Levee District	1.38						
Delta								
501	Ryer Island	20.96				X		
536	Egbert	10.59				X		
999	Netherlands	32.17				X		
1667	Prospect Island	14.70				X		
2060	Hastings Tract	15.65				X		
2068	Yolano Tract	8.71				X		
2084	Little Egbert Tract	5.40						
2093	Liberty Island	20.50						
2098	Cache-Haas Slough	10.91				X		
2104	Peters Pocket	6.85				X		

Notes: Blank Cell = Data Not Available

RD Acreage from Solano County GIS

Exterior Levee Miles from multiple sources and may not represent the total length of levees within an RD

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaires submitted by the Reclamation Districts; CalFed Levee Rehabilitation Study; URS Phase 2 Risk Reduction Report; Suisun Marsh Levee Conceptual Model; Cache Slough Complex Conservation Assessment, November 2015; DWR Levee Inspection Report, 2018

Habitat Levees: The Suisun Marsh Plan⁶¹ proposed habitat levees for tidal restoration sites with low, wide, gently sloping vegetated levees, which do not serve a flood protection purpose and may be overtopped during storm surges with nominal eroding or destabilizing. Habitat levees include benches or berms that provide wind- and wave-action protection as well as opportunities for high marsh/upland transition habitat. Habitat levees may be planted and seeded with native marsh species and/or allowed to colonize naturally with native and naturalized species.

⁶¹ The Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan, May 2013

LEVEE MAINTENANCE

Levee systems require continuous monitoring and maintenance activities in order to:

1. Maintain the levee crest elevation due to short term and long-term settlement of the levee complex, consolidation of underly bay muds, or oxidation of underlying peat layers;
2. Maintain water and land side embankment slopes due to damaged caused by rodent/beaver activity, prevent development of wetlands or growth of trees along the land side toe of slope;
3. Repair and maintain levee crest access corridors and embankment slope due to age, use & weather;
4. Replace levee rock/paving due to age, use, weather and general degradation.

Table G1: Reclamation District Services

District No.	District Name	Levee Patrol	Levee Maintenance	Equipment Maintenance	Weed Abatement/ Vegetation Removal	Vector/Rodent Control	Levee Road Upkeep	Drainage	Flood Control	Engineering
Suisun Marsh										
1607	Van Sickle Island	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
2043										
2112	Schafer Pintail	√	√		√	√				
2127	Simmons-Wheeler	√								
2129	Frost Lake									
2130	Honker Bay	√	√		√		√			
2134	Denverton		√		√		√			
2135	Sunrise Island									
2136	Grizzly West		√	√			√			
2138	Morrow Island	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		
2139	Can-Can/Greenhead		√						√	
2141	Joice Island	√	√	√	√		√			
2142	Suisun Slough West									
Collinsville										
	Collinsville Levee Maintenance District	√	√	√					√	
Sacramento Delta										
501	Ryer Island									
536	Egbert									
999	Netherlands									
1667	Prospect Island									
2060	Hastings Tract									
2068	Yolano Tract									
2084	Little Egbert Tract									
2093	Liberty Island									
2098	Cache-Haas Slough									
2104	Peters Pocket									

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaire, District Financial Audits

Table G2: Exterior Levee Maintenance Costs by District (FY 2018)

District No.	District Name	Exterior Levee Miles	Acres	Maintenance Costs (\$)	Cost/Mile	Cost/Acre
Suisun Marsh						
1607	Van Sickle Island	9.00	2,512.41	\$641,101	\$71,233	\$255.17
2043			409.29			\$0.00
2112	Schafer Pintail	1.45	1,163.33	\$59,450	\$41,000	\$51.10
2127	Simmons-Wheeler	7.50	3,597.10	\$232,352	\$30,980	\$64.59
2129	Frost Lake	7.50	1,072.96	\$12,412	\$1,655	\$11.57
2130	Honker Bay	2.00	830.83	\$25,560	\$12,780	\$30.76
2134	Denverton	7.00	760	\$3,525	\$504	\$4.64
2135	Sunrise Island	5.00	290.2	\$ 78,502	\$15,700	\$270.51
2136	Grizzly West	8.00	2,675.11	\$136,960	\$17,120	\$51.20
2138	Morrow Island	8.00	688.41	\$ 25,699	\$3,212	\$37.33
2139	Can-Can/Greenhead	5.81	1,698.70	\$36,691	\$6,315	\$21.60
2141	Joice Island	4.50	939.67	\$237,643	\$52,810	\$252.90
2142	Suisun Slough West		1,661.61	\$6,540		\$3.94
Collinsville						
	Collinsville Levee District	1.38	233.98	\$69,517	\$50,375	\$297.11
Sacramento Delta						
501	Ryer Island	20.96	11,879.31	\$320,000	\$15,267	\$26.94
536	Egbert	10.59	6,782.81	\$65,000	\$6,138	\$9.58
999	Netherlands	32.17	2,490.97		\$0	\$0.00
1667	Prospect Island	14.7	954.05	\$ 185,304	\$12,606	\$194.23
2060	Hastings Tract	15.65	6,938.86	\$40,000	\$2,556	\$5.76
2068	Yolano Tract	8.71	13,200.00	\$1,163,720	\$133,607	\$88.16
2084	Little Egbert Tract	5.4	3,094.34	\$53,000	\$9,815	\$17.13
2093	Liberty Island	20.5	4,280.33	\$6,589	\$321	\$1.54
2098	Cache-Haas Slough	10.91	6,373.09	\$53,000	\$4,858	\$8.32
2104	Peters Pocket	6.85	1,488.00	\$ -	\$0	\$0.00
<p>Notes: Blank cell: Information not available RD Acreage from Solano County GIS Exterior Levee Miles are from multiple sources and may not represent the total length of levees within an RD Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaires submitted by the Reclamation Districts; CalFed Levee Rehabilitation Study; URS Phase 2 Risk Reduction Report; Suisun Marsh Levee Conceptual Model; Cache Slough Complex Conservation Assessment, November 2015; DWR Levee Inspection Report, 2018</p>						

RECLAMATION DISTRICT FUNDING SOURCES

Property Tax Assessments: based on the specific benefit each parcel receives from the improvements may be levied only if they are proportional to the benefits provided, supported by a detailed engineer's report, and approved by a majority of the landowners within the district per Proposition 218.

Special Assessments: Charges that local governments can assess against real estate parcels to pay for specific public infrastructure projects.

Warrants: The State Water Codes allows Reclamation/Levee Districts to issue warrants to pay for needed infrastructure.

Fees & Charges: As an independent special district, reclamation districts may charge for services, such as providing water or drainage.

Bonds: Reclamation districts may issue bonds to finance improvements.

State & Federal Funding Programs: Grant funding opportunities are available from the state and federal government. State programs primarily derive their funding from bond measures approved by the voters of California. The main source of funding comes from Proposition 84, Proposition 1E, and Proposition 13. Most of the grants come from three programs administered by DWR:

- **Delta Levees Maintenance Subvention Program:** The State of California through the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) provides financial assistance to local agencies cooperating in the construction of federally authorized flood control projects. The CVFPB is responsible for the State's share of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' State Plan of Flood Control projects in the Central Valley, while DWR is responsible for disbursing funds for all other projects authorized by the State. The Subventions Program is a cost share program that provides technical and financial assistance to local reclamation agencies in the Delta for the maintenance and rehabilitation of non-project and eligible project levees. In 1996, Assembly Bill 360 expanded funding program for levee maintenance to include the entire Delta and portions of the Suisun Marsh.
- **Delta Levee Special Flood Control Projects:** provides funding to local agencies in the Delta for levee maintenance and improvement, and for habitat mitigation and enhancement. Financial assistance for flood protection under this program is used for projects that safeguard public benefits, such as roads, utilities, urbanized areas, water quality, recreation, navigation and fish and wildlife from flood hazards. To be eligible for funding the local agency must submit a five-year plan that assesses the current conditions of a local agency's levees and sets out a strategy for rehabilitation, repair, and/or improvement of its facilities to meet a desired levee standard and level of protection.
- **Flood Protection Corridor Program:** DWR provides grant funding to proponents of nonstructural flood management projects throughout the state that include wildlife habitat enhancement and/or agricultural land preservation. By conserving agricultural lands, preserving wildlife habitat, acquiring flood flow easements, and restoring floodplain functions, floodwaters can safely spread over and, in some cases, move more quickly through floodplains or be detained for later release. These efforts can reduce peak flows upstream and downstream.
- **Suisun Marsh Preservation Agreement Implementation (PAI) Fund** provides grant funding for habitat improvement activities needed to improve managed wetland facilities, operational

efficiency and water management capabilities. PAI funding cannot be used for exterior levee maintenance. Funding can be used for:

- Drainage Infrastructure improvements necessary for the property to meet the 30-day flood and drain cycle objective for managed wetlands.
- Drainage Efficiency improvements necessary to improve leaching and drainage efficiency of parcels. Funding also can be used to help offset electrical and fuel costs to perform spring leach cycles.
- Joint-Use Facility improvements are water control improvements used between two or more properties. Funds from this Program may not be used for maintenance of joint use facility structures or fish screens.

The Suisun Marsh Preservation Agreement (SMP) was executed on March 2, 1987, between the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, California Department of Water Resources, California Department of Fish and Game (now California Department of Fish and Wildlife), and Suisun Resource Conservation District. The revised SMP was executed on November 24, 2015, to reflect significant events and changed conditions that had occurred since the original SMP was signed. The objective of the SMP is to assure that a dependable water supply is maintained to mitigate the adverse effects on Suisun Marsh from the CVP and State Water Project (SWP) and a portion of the adverse effects from other upstream diversions. The Bureau of Reclamation (CVP) is responsible for 40 percent of the construction and annual operation and maintenance costs associated with implementation of the SMP; the State of California (SWP) is responsible for 60 percent of the implementation costs. The updated 2015 SMP consolidated three existing agreements (the revised SMP, revised Suisun Marsh Mitigation Agreement, and revised Suisun Marsh Monitoring Agreement). The 2015 SMP also incorporates (1) the negotiated 1997 Preservation Agreement Implementation (PAI) fund for small scale infrastructure projects in lieu of the large-scale facilities described in the original Suisun Marsh Plan of Protection; and (2) actions in Suisun Marsh identified in the CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program. These latter two actions were addressed in the Suisun Marsh Plan whose Record of Decision was completed in April 2014. The 2015 SMP has been signed by the DWR, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Suisun Resource Conservation District and Reclamation. The PAI funding was negotiated in 1997 between Reclamation, DWR and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for Reclamation and DWR to provide \$3.7 million total for small scale infrastructure projects to improve managed wetland flood and drain capabilities in the marsh. The PAI fund supports Reclamation and DWR's mitigation obligations for CVP and SWP operations. The PAI fund has several program elements. The managed wetland facilities improvement element provides funds for infrastructure improvements necessary to meet the 30-day flood and drain cycle described in individual management plans. This could include purchase and installation of new, larger, lowered, or relocated discharge facilities. The improvement element for managed wetland facilities also includes a 50/50 cost share program providing funds for management and infrastructure improvements necessary to meet recommendations described in the individual management plans that improve leaching and drainage efficiency.

The PAI Fund's Joint Use Facility Improvements element provides financing on a 75/25 cost share basis for infrastructure improvement to increase efficient and cooperative use of joint use water delivery systems to managed wetlands, including construction of or improvements to: interior levees, water conveyance ditches, water control structures, and permanent pumps.


Table H1: Main Funding Sources by District (FY 2018)

District No.	District Name	Assessments	Property Taxes	Service Charges	State/Federal Assistance	Warrants	Other
Suisun Marsh							
1607	Van Sickle Island	13.1%	0.0%	6.8%	80.1%	0.0%	0.0%
2043	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2112	Schafer Pintail	0.0%	0.0%	73.0%	27.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2127	Simmons-Wheeler	10.8%	0.0%	47.4%	40.9%	0.0%	0.8%
2129	Frost Lake	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2130	Honker Bay	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	96.7%	0.0%	3.3%
2134	Denverton	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2135	Sunrise Island (FY 2011)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2136	Grizzly West	12.6%	0.0%	0.0%	87.4%	0.0%	0.0%
2138	Morrow Island (FY 2011)	34.7%	0.0%	0.0%	65.3%	0.0%	0.0%
2139	Can-Can/Greenhead	54.8%	0.0%	0.0%	45.2%	0.0%	0.0%
2141	Joice Island	66.9%	0.0%	0.0%	33.1%	0.0%	0.0%
2142	Suisun Slough West	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Collinsville							
	Collinsville Levee District	2.8%	12.3%	0.0%	84.7%	0.0%	0.2%
Delta							
501	Ryer Island	90.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%
536	Egbert	50.4%	0.0%	0.0%	49.1%	0.0%	0.6%
999	Netherlands	78.3%	0.0%	1.3%	19.5%	0.0%	1.9%
1667	Prospect Island	70.1%	0.0%	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	19.5%
2060	Hastings Tract	0.0%	0.0%	59.5%	40.4%	0.0%	0.1%
2068	Yolano Tract	0.0%	0.0%	90.3%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%
2084	Little Egbert Tract	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2093	Liberty Island	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
2098	Cache-Haas Slough	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2104	Peters Pocket	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

N/A = Not Available

Source: 2019 MSR Questionnaires submitted by Reclamation Districts, FY 2018 FTR to SCO

Figure H2: Sacramento Delta Reclamation Districts



COMMENT & RESPONSE LOG

Solano County Reclamation/Levee District Municipal Service Review Public Comment Log					
#	Commenter/Agency	Date	Page/Section	Comment	Response
1	Diane Tesene, Secretary RD 2136	12/5/2019	Page 95 of 245, Table 4.31 & Page 96 of 245, Figure 4.11	<p>The property number 8 should be corrected on map I sent to you for LAFCO:</p> <p>A very small section 2 acres of number 8 on your map is owned by a different party. This 2-acre area is within our District #2136, but when our District was formed, we were unaware of the owner of it, until 2006, when we were flooded from a storm and this 2 acre parcel had major damage. The owner at that time was different from the current owner.</p> <p>That 2-acre parcel number is: 046-260-11 Williamson Contract Number: 1339</p>	Noted. Solano LAFCO should work with the reclamation districts and Solano County GIS to update District boundary maps and associated data.
2	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 7 of 245, Paragraph titled "Level of Service/Levee Standards", 2 nd paragraph	<p>In the second paragraph of this section, the consultant alleges that districts which are part of the Suisun Marsh Preservation Plan "must comply with the Suisun Marsh Levee Specification standard." And further states that, "Any upgraded levees...within these districts would need to be designed to the Suisun Marsh Levee Specification standard."</p> <p>These standards are not mandatory. They are recommendations. In an ideal world all the levees in our District would be made of clay, not peat as many sections are; would be 3 feet above a 500 year flood, which they are not; would be 12 feet wide and surfaced with gravel, which they are not; and would have interior and exterior side slopes of 2 to 1, which they are not.</p> <p>In order to repair or raise our levees, we must rely on obtaining the material to do so from the pond bottoms inside the levee system. The majority of such material is peat. Even where there are clay lenses with the levee borders, trying transport such material for miles across peat pond bottoms to the levee being worked on is not only extremely expensive but requires filling in ditches and interior sloughs along the way, then excavating them when finished. Importing clay material is cost prohibitive and subject to extremely strict requirements regarding the potential seed content of the material.</p> <p>The USACE and BCDC will not allow the placement of any material on vegetation located on the outside (tidal side) of the levee. Therefore, it is impossible to extend or otherwise repair the exterior side slope of the levee if water plants are growing there once the slope has either eroded or subsided. It is thus impossible to keep exterior side slopes up to the ideal configuration.</p>	Noted. See modifications in final document. Standards for levee configuration in Suisun Marsh were established in 1977 as a result of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The specifications were developed to guide the design, construction, and maintenance of levees in the primary management area of the Marsh. Meeting these standards can be constrained by regulatory, environmental, or structural limitations and restrictions.

				There is no other source of funding to do this work other than from the two Duck Clubs, which formed the district. The FEMA assistance we obtained due to the 2017 Emergency Declaration was a one-off event. And we certainly can't issue bonds or impose a property tax on the Clubs because we are all the landowners. We do the work we can afford to do through self-assessment.	
3	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 9 of 245, Paragraph titled "4. Financial Ability to Provide Services"	The first sentence claims that RD's have the ability to seek and receive FEMA assistance in the "event of a major weather event." The only time our RD was able to seek FEMA assistance was when the State of California issued a Declaration of Emergency, which FEMA approved, covering the Suisun Marsh resulting from the flood event of January 2017. We had not previously been able to seek such assistance, and have not since. If there were no Emergency Declaration, we would not have been able to seek such assistance.	Consultant agrees and has clarified with the following sentence. "Reclamation/levee districts that meet FEMA requirements may apply for disaster relief funding, if the State of California issues a Declaration of Emergency, to repair levees damaged by major storm events."
4	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 10 of 245, Paragraph titled "5. Status & Opportunity for Shared Facilities"	The second sentence claims that "Many districts already engage with state/federal agencies for levee inspections and financial assistance." This statement seems to claim the majority of RD's do so. Our RD has no such engagement. We are responsible for levee and control structure repair and maintenance and, with the exception of our only application for Cal OES and FEMA financial assistance mentioned above, solely financially responsible for such work. There are no other funding sources available for levee maintenance. There is funding for converting cast iron drain gates to stainless steel drain gates, but that is a one off event. The implication that RD's have easy access to state and federal money is simply not true.	Noted.
5	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 11 of 245 & Page 227 of 245, Paragraphs titled "2. Consolidation of Contiguous Districts" & "3. Formation of an Umbrella Administrative District to Improve Administrative Efficiency"	The consultant recommends a consolidation of Districts to "improve service delivery and efficiency and reduce administrative costs" and "reducing staff costs and overhead." And further recommends the creation of an umbrella agency to oversee the individual districts. Our RD has no administrative or overhead costs other than an auditor's bill and copier paper. There is no staff, no ED, only volunteer time from the two entities that formed the District. Our response time to unusual events is immediate. Our knowledge of the issues presented by our levee system is expert in nature. There is no deficiency in our service delivery or efficiency. The creation of an umbrella entity will require the hiring of an Executive Director, paid staff and even perhaps renting office space to oversee the individual districts, creating a bureaucracy that will lay off it's cost of operating on District's that presently have no costs at all. It would also create a layer of delay and inexperience where there was none before.	Noted. See modifications in the final document.

6	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 235 of 245, Paragraph titled "Suisun Marsh"	The levee design standards developed by SRCD are not mandatory, they are recommendations.	Noted. See modifications in final document. Standards for levee configuration in Suisun Marsh were established in 1977 as a result of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The specifications were developed to guide the design, construction, and maintenance of levees in the primary management area of the Marsh. Meeting these standards can be constrained by regulatory, environmental, or structural limitations and restrictions.
7	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 237 of 245, Paragraph titled "Suisun Marsh Levee Sections"	It is not true that "All Districts within the Primary Management Area of Suisun Marsh <u>must</u> maintain exterior Levees to the following: " etc. (emphasis added). As noted above, these design standards are recommendations and entirely voluntary.	Noted. See modifications in final document. Standards for levee configuration in Suisun Marsh were established in 1977 as a result of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan. The specifications were developed to guide the design, construction, and maintenance of levees in the primary management area of the Marsh. Meeting these standards can be constrained by regulatory, environmental, or structural limitations and restrictions.
8	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 239 of 245, Appendix G, Section titled "Levee Maintenance", #2	The consultant asserts that the RD's must "prevent the development of wetlands or tree growth along the land side toe of slope." The primary purpose of the RD Member entities is just the opposite regarding development of wetlands on the land side of the levee toe. We are Duck Clubs. We manage wetlands, not prevent them, on the land side of the levees. There are miles of existing eucalyptus trees lining the land side of various levees in Suisun Marsh. To suggest that RD's prevent their growth at this point in history is absurd.	The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Levee Vegetation Removal policy seeks to require the removal of all vegetation from levees in order to allow for easier inspections and to reduce any potential weakening of or damage to levees from root growth and overturned trees. Levees that the Corps deems to be out of compliance with its vegetation policy without an approved variance will be ineligible for federal disaster assistance. The Corps' policy is sometimes in direct conflict with some federal and/or state regulations that often prohibit the removal of trees and other plants on or next to the levees, especially when they provide habitat for endangered or threatened species.
9	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 241 of 245, Appendix H, Section titled "Reclamation District Funding Sources"	There can't be any Property Tax Assessments unless a majority of landowners (i.e. duck club owners) approve such a tax, and since the landowners formed the District in the first place they would not impose a property tax on themselves. The reality is this: the Clubs that formed the district agree to the work to be done, get proposals from contractors who work in the marsh, have the work done, assess the member or members benefitting from the work, and pay the contractor through the District. The duck clubs that formed RD's in the Suisun	Noted.

				Marsh don't issue warrants and would <u>never</u> be able to issue bonds.	
10	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 241 of 245, Appendix H, Section titled "Reclamation District Funding Sources", Paragraph titled "State and Federal Funding Programs"	The Delta Levee programs mentioned in the consultant's report are not available to our RD in the Suisun Marsh. We were able to utilize the Cal OES/FEMA disaster relief funds only because of the Emergency Declaration issued after the January 2017 flood event. See our following comment on the PAI program from DWR.	Noted.
11	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 242 of 245, Paragraph titled "Suisun Marsh Preservation Agreement Implementation (PAI) Fund"	The consultant seems to think that the PAI program will help RD's pay for exterior levee maintenance. We believe that to be inaccurate at best. Our RD has been awarded several cost share grants to replace exterior cast iron drain gates with stainless steel. I have enquired of SRCD, which manages the grant application process, whether there was cost share assistance available for exterior levee maintenance and the response was that we could apply for a pond bottom grading cost share grant the purpose of which was wetland enhancement, and if granted then place the grading spoils on the levee. The message being, no there were no funds available for levee repairs.	Agreed. Exterior levee maintenance is not an eligible activity for funding under the PAI grant program.
12	Dennis T. DeDomenico, Secretary/Treasurer RD 2141	1/8/2020	Page 243 of 245, "Table H1: Main Funding Sources by District (FY 2018)"	The exhibit entitled Main Revenue Sources by District (FY 2018) is somewhat misleading in that one could mistakenly draw the conclusion that our RD #2141 regularly obtains 33.1% of it's expenses from State/Federal assistance, which is not the case. The assistance obtained was a one off event due to the Emergency Declaration related to the flood event of January 2017.	Noted. A footnote has been added to the table in the final document to clarify.
13	Judi Booe, Administrative Staff Collinsville Levee District	1/8/2020	Page 7 of 245, Paragraph titled "Level of Service/Levee Standards"	On page 7 of 245 pages, it states "The Collinsville Levee Maintenance District maintains 1.5 miles of non-project levees along the Sacramento River that meets FEMA requirements". There are two inaccuracies- first, we maintain .8 miles of non-project levees and we DO NOT MEET FEMA REQUIREMENTS .	See changes in final report.
14	Judi Booe, Administrative Staff Collinsville Levee District	1/8/2020	No page number or section provided.	There is NOT A POPULATION OF SIX. The current full-time population is more than between 12-20 people (12 which are all registered voters).	Noted.
15	Judi Booe, Administrative Staff Collinsville Levee District	1/8/2020	No page number or section provided	Since 2015, I have written grants to DWR (Department of Water Resources) that we have annually received that have totaled over \$350,000. Although it is a 75% reimbursement of expenses, the report says "the District has maintained little or no fund balance over the past 5 years. We also received property taxes in the amount of approximately \$10,000 annually.	Noted. The Collinsville Levee District FY 2015-2018 Financial Transaction Reports submitted by the District to the California State Controller's Office shows end of fiscal year negative fund balances of (\$23,201), (\$43,273), (\$8,228), and (\$8,411) respectively.

16	Judi Booe, Administrative Staff Collinsville Levee District	1/8/2020	No page number or section provided.	The report also says we have no assets or liabilities. We currently have miscellaneous equipment to maintain the levee, and because we are very fiscally conscience, we DO NOT have any liabilities at this time. The table used for Revenue, Expenditures and Fund Balance is incorrect.	Noted. The assets listed in the questionnaire submitted by Collinsville Levee District have been added to the report. The assets include, bank accounts with Solano County, a pump, prescriptive easement in gross, and miscellaneous small equipment. The Collinsville Levee Maintenance District FY 2018 Financial Transaction Report submitted by the District to the California State Controller's Office shows assets of \$4,911 and liabilities of \$13,322 giving an end of fiscal year negative fund balance of (\$8,411).																																				
17	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 197 of 245	The District is comprised of 3,153.24 acres of land (based on Solano County Assessor Parcel information), of which approximately 2,600 acres are in agricultural production (Table 6.31; not Table 6.32).	Noted. Solano LAFCO should work with the reclamation districts and Solano County GIS to update District boundary maps and associated data.																																				
18	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 197 of 245, Table 6.31	Table 6.31: RD 2084 Land Use, Ownership, & Acreage by Parcel There appears to be a mismatch between the Map ID numbers listed on the table and the Map ID numbers shown on Figure 6.8. Our understanding of the Map ID numbers and APNs within the District boundaries are as follows: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Map ID</th> <th>APN</th> <th>Acres (within District)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1</td><td>0042240070</td><td>517.68</td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td>0042240080</td><td>105.92</td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td>0177030010</td><td>237.68</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>0177030020</td><td>153.00</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>0177030030</td><td>250.50</td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td>0177030040</td><td>352.00</td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td>0177090070</td><td>1,206.94</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>0177110159</td><td>269.34</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>0177110160</td><td>1.25</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>0177110260</td><td>59.01</td></tr> <tr><td>Total Acres</td><td></td><td>3,153.24</td></tr> </tbody> </table> As a point of clarification, only a portion of the property shown as Map ID 10 is within the District boundaries.	Map ID	APN	Acres (within District)	1	0042240070	517.68	2	0042240080	105.92	3	0177030010	237.68	4	0177030020	153.00	5	0177030030	250.50	6	0177030040	352.00	7	0177090070	1,206.94	8	0177110159	269.34	9	0177110160	1.25	10	0177110260	59.01	Total Acres		3,153.24	Noted. Solano LAFCO should work with the reclamation districts and Solano County GIS to update District boundary maps and associated data.
Map ID	APN	Acres (within District)																																							
1	0042240070	517.68																																							
2	0042240080	105.92																																							
3	0177030010	237.68																																							
4	0177030020	153.00																																							
5	0177030030	250.50																																							
6	0177030040	352.00																																							
7	0177090070	1,206.94																																							
8	0177110159	269.34																																							
9	0177110160	1.25																																							
10	0177110260	59.01																																							
Total Acres		3,153.24																																							
19	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 198 of 245	Figure 6.8: Map of RD 2084 Boundaries is incorrect. The southern boundary includes a portion of Map ID 10 and follows parcel lines. We have enclosed a map of the RD 2084 boundaries for your use.	Noted. Solano LAFCO should work with the reclamation districts and Solano County GIS to update District boundary maps and associated data.																																				
20	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 198 of 245	Figure 6.8: could you please explain the double lines between Map ID 1 and 2? We don't understand. There are no public roads or major roads within the District boundaries.	Noted. Solano LAFCO should work with the reclamation districts and Solano County GIS to update District boundary maps and associated data.																																				

21	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 199 of 245	Please update the District Office address as follows: Mailing Address Reclamation District 2084 P.O. Box 698 Rio Vista, 94571 District Principal Office Reclamation District 2084 c/o Larsen Wurzel & Associates 2450 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 240 Sacramento, CA 95833	See changes in final report.
22	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 199 of 245	Governing Body: Board of Trustees consisting of three (not five) members appointed by the County Board of Supervisors: President: Mark Young Trustee: Page Baldwin Jr. Trustee: Matt Gause Secretary: Kim Erickson Vice President: None	See changes in final report.
23	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 199 of 245	Meetings. The last meeting of the Board of Trustees was held on 1/2/2020.	See changes in final report.
24	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 200 of 245, Paragraph titled "1. Growth and Population of the District"	The Solano County General Plan shows the current land use designation for all property within the District to be agriculture with a Resource Conservation Overlay . (Overlay is misspelled.)	See changes in final report.
25	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 200 of 245, Determination 1.1	The statement that "There are no plans or expectations for growth or development" Is incorrect. The District is planning on restoring the property to tidal action. Any restoration plan would require approval from the County.	Noted. There are no plans or expectations for population growth or urban development per the County Planning Department.
26	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 200 of 245, Paragraph 2	There is one house within the District boundaries.	See changes in final report.
27	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 200 of 245, Paragraph 3	The pumping station on the south end includes a 125 (not 100) HP pump and two 75 HP pumps.	See changes in final report.
28	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	Page 202 of 245, Paragraph 5	There are no opportunities to explore consolidation with the adjacent RD 536. Please remove this statement.	Noted.
29	Mark Young, President/Trustee RD 2084	1/10/2020	General Comment	Also, it should be noted that all reclamation districts and local agencies work together during flood events.	Noted.
30	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 186 & 187 of 245 Page 212 & 213 of 245	The GIS mapping of both Districts (RD 2068 & 2098) are incorrect and I assume the listing of parcels is also incorrect.	Noted. Solano LAFCO should work with the reclamation districts and Solano County GIS to update District boundary maps and associated data.
31	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 214 of 245	Attached to the submitted comments is a Resolution that exempts RD 2068 out of the website requirement.	Noted.
32	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.27	The District was formed mainly as an irrigation District and associated drainage of	Noted. See changes in final document.

				irrigation water, not a flood control agency, although we do maintain levees.	
33	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.27	Suzanne George is not the Secretary/Treasurer, I am the Secretary and Solano County Treasure is our Treasurer.	See changes in final report.
34	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.28	The Vice-President is Ross Rasmussen.	See changes in final report.
35	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.29	The board is given a Stipend of \$270 per meeting.	See changes in final report.
36	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.30	Monthly meetings with the last meeting being on January 9, 2020	See changes in final report.
37	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.31	We have a total of 8 employees	See changes in final report.
38	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.32	Facilities and Assets include: approximately 100 miles of irrigation and drainage canals, 8.2 miles of levees, 5 large pumping plants, 25 lifts pumps, office building and shops, 10 pickups, miscellaneous construction equipment, replacement pumps and water related equipment, flood supplies, inventory of pipes and water control structures, etc.	See changes in final report.
39	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.33	The Services we provide are irrigation, drainage, and flood control.	See changes in final report.
40	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.34	We provide management and maintenance services to the neighboring RD 2098.	Noted.
41	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.35	Cash on hand on 12/31/2019 = \$1,209,256 (LAIF, County, and Checking)	Noted.
42	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.36	Current 2019 Budget = \$1,682,000 Expenses = \$1,682,000	See changes in final report.
43	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.37	Risk management is with Association of California Water Agencies Joint Powers Insurance Authority.	See changes in final report.
44	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 191 of 245, Table 6.38	We are audited annually	See changes in final report.
45	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 193 of 245	The riparian claims and pre-1914 claims were used to document the extensive reuse the district conducts. The claims are now in an inactive state, since the SWRCB has since provided a way to claim water conservation on its annual water right reporting forms. The District has 1 groundwater well, which can be used to supplement water supplies.	See changes in final report.
46	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 193 of 245	District levees are currently not up to federal standards according to the USACE's 2012 periodic inspection report; therefore, RD 2068 levees are currently not covered under the USACE PL84-99 program. However, the District will be submitting a Letter of Intent to enter back into the program this year and should have PL84-99 program coverage for the 2021 flood season.	See changes in final report.

47	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2068	1/13/2020	Page 193 of 245, Table 6.28	RD 2068 is primarily an irrigation District. Levee maintenance is a small portion of what the District does, levee maintenance is only 5-10% of the Districts activities.	Noted.
48	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2098	1/13/2020	Page 214 of 245, Table 6.4	Cliff Detar is not RD 2098's President, Trustees Are John Durand, John Cain, and Katie Riley. John Cain is the President.	See changes in final report.
49	Bryan Busch, General Manager RD 2098	1/13/2020	Page 214 of 245, Table 6.4	RD 2098: Susanne George is not District Secretary/Treasurer, Bryan Busch is the Secretary and the Solano County Treasurer is the District Treasurer.	See changes in final report.
50	Michael Moncrief, PE MBK Engineers, District Engineer RD 2060	1/13/2020	Page 179 of 245, Figure 6.6	The District boundary needs to be modified to change the NW corner of the District. The west levee ties into Hastings Road to the north, then East along Hastings Road to the SE corner of Map ID 19, then north again following the District alignment from that point.	Noted. Solano LAFCO should work with the reclamation districts and Solano County GIS to update District boundary maps and associated data.
51	Michael Moncrief, PE MBK Engineers, District Engineer RD 2060	1/13/2020	181 of 245, 3rd Subsection titled "3. Present and Planned Capacity of Public Services"	Lindsey Slough Misspelled	See changes in final report.
52	Michael Moncrief, PE MBK Engineers, District Engineer RD 2060	1/13/2020	Page 182 of 245, Table 6.24	Update to remove the No Standard, HMP Standard and PL 84-99 Standard numbers, and leave the total levee-miles maintained number. The District is progressively maintaining their levees to meet the PL 84-99 United States Army Corps of Engineers Rehabilitation Inspection Program USACE RIP maintenance standard, focusing on annual routine maintenance, while addressing other repairs and maintenance.	See changes in final report.
53	Michael Moncrief, PE MBK Engineers, District Engineer RD 536	1/13/2020	Page 155 of 245, Subsection "6.2.1: District Profile"	There are 10.6 miles of Project levee maintained by the District, however page 138 states 15 miles, while the rest of the document states 10.6.	See changes in final report.
54	Michael Moncrief, PE MBK Engineers, District Engineer RD 536	1/13/2020	Page 160 of 245, Table 6.9	Table 6.9 states Levee Maintenance Standard as a combination of HMP and PL 84-99. The project levee system levee design standard is based on the Sacramento River Flood Control Project design, and the 1957 design water surface elevation and not HMP or PL 84-99. The levees need to be maintained to meet the PL 84-99 maintenance standards to be active in the United States Army Corps of Engineers Rehabilitation Inspection Program (USACE RIP). HMP maintenance standard does not apply to the Project levee system.	See changes in final report.
55	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 7 of 245, First sentence of the second paragraph under the subsection titled "Level of Service/Levee Standards"	Change "in the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan." to "in 1977 as a result of the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan."	See changes in final report.

56	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 7 of 245, Last sentence in the second paragraph under the subsection titled "Level of Service/Levee Standards"	At the end of the sentence delete "standard" and add "but meeting these standards can be constrained by regulatory, environmental, or structural limitations and restrictions."	See changes in final report.
57	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 8 of 245, First paragraph	The landowners within the districts are eligible for PAI funding. Change the eligible entity from the "districts" to "landowners within the districts".	See changes in final report.
58	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 8 of 245, First paragraph	Since exterior levee maintenance is not eligible for PAI funding, why is the PAI grant program described?	Changed. The PAI grant program is described here because all district revenues and expenditures need to be reflected on the financial statements.
59	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 9 of 245, Second paragraph titled "3. Service Configuration & Capacity"	This implies that Regulatory Agencies have a responsibility to inspect. They don't. The RD has the responsibility and they do the level of inspection they feel is necessary. If the Corps or DWR is providing funding or has easements they inspect for compliance with their program. This says RD's and Private landowners can't be trusted to look after their interest that the RD was formed to protect?	See changes in final report.
60	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 24 of 245, First paragraph	The SRCD LPP are engineered standards. All the levees in the Delta, Suisun and Sac Valley were not originally constructed with engineers.	Noted.
61	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 25 of 245, First paragraph	PAI has nothing to do with RD's exterior levee maintenance. Delete the information for PAI Funding.	Noted. See modified section in final document.
62	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 32 of 245, First paragraph under the subsection titled "Flood Protection and Drainage"	Levees in the Suisun Marsh have been maintained to the SRCD 1980 LPP Standards.	Noted.
63	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 32 of 245, Fourth paragraph, bottom of page	Please cite the first sentence of the paragraph.	Citation made.
64	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 32 of 245, Fourth paragraph, bottom of page	Please include the bold text to the following sentence. "Due to regulatory constraints, options for maintaining levees are limited to the use of materials from within the managed wetlands or by limited dredging and importation."	See changes in final report.
65	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 33 of 245, Second sentence of the first paragraph under the subsection titled "Levee System Integrity"	In reference to exterior levees in the marsh: This is a general statement for all levees in the Marsh, Publicly and Privately owned. RD's have more resources and engineering for their levees than private levees.	Noted.
66	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 34 of 245, Paragraph titled "Solano LAFCO Policy"	Delete the second sentence that reads: "The Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan was completed in 2014."	See changes in final report.

67	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 34 of 245, Paragraph titled "Suisun Resource Conservation District"	Delete the strikethrough in the following sentence. "In 1977, the California Legislature passed Assembly Bill 1717, which defined SRCD responsibilities over water management practices on privately owned lands within Suisun Marsh."	See modification in final document.
68	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 34 of 245, Paragraph titled "Suisun Resource Conservation District"	Delete the strikethroughs in the following sentence and insert the bold text. "A In 1980, SRCD adopted the Suisun Marsh Local Protection Plan , a management program was prepared by SRCD, which was designed to preserve, protect, and enhance the plant and wildlife communities within the primary management area of the marsh."	See changes in final report.
69	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 45 of 245	This RD is currently covered by 2142 and should be recommend for Dissolution.	Consultant agrees and has made the recommendation.
70	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 226 of 245, First sentence of the second paragraph under the subsection titled "7.0: Summary of Key Findings"	The RD's are the Special Districts with the responsibility to inspect. There is no regulatory Agency with this responsibility.	Noted. This is true for non- project levees.
71	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 235 of 245, last paragraph on page titled "Suisun Marsh"	Change "SRCD's Management Program" to "the Local Protection Policy Management Program"	See changes in final report.
72	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 237 of 245, First paragraph under the subsection titled "Suisun Marsh Levee Sections"	Delete the following sentences. They have nothing to do with RD levee maintenance. This was a description of a Habitat Levee for Tidal Restoration Sites. Overtopping levees are not Flood Control. "The more recent Suisun Marsh Plan (Bureau of Reclamation 2012) also proposes habitat levees -- low, wide, gently sloping vegetated levees, which may be overtopped during storm surges with nominal eroding or destabilizing. Habitat levees would include benches or berms that provide wind- and wave-action protection as well as opportunities for high marsh/upland transition habitat."	See changes in final report.
73	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 238 of 245, Table F2	Suisun Marsh Standards apply to all Suisun Marsh levees.	Noted.
74	Steve Chappell, Executive Director Suisun Resource Conservation District	1/17/2020	Page 239 of 245, Table G1	All of the Suisun Marsh RD's conduct levee patrols, levee Maintenance, weed abatement, drainage and Flood Control	Noted. Table based on district responses to questionnaire.