

II. AGENCY OVERVIEW

Service Providers

This report focuses on service providers in East Contra County for which LAFCO will ultimately adopt determinations and update SOIs. A service summary is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 – Service Summary

Services	City of Antioch	City of Brentwood	City of Oakley	City of Pittsburg	CSA RD-4	BIMID	Town of Knightsen CSD
Police (1)	•	•	X	•			
Fire/EMS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Hospital	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Land Use Planning	•	•	•	•			
Building/Inspection s	•	•	•	•			
Transit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Roads	• <input type="checkbox"/>	•	•	•	•		
Public Open Space	• <input type="checkbox"/>	• <input type="checkbox"/>	• <input type="checkbox"/>	• <input type="checkbox"/>			
Public Recreation	•	•	•	•		•	
Library	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Cemeteries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Airports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Solid Waste	X	• X	<input type="checkbox"/>	X			
Levee Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		•	
Drainage Maintenance	•	•	•	•		•	
Water	• <input type="checkbox"/>	• <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	• <input type="checkbox"/>			
Flood Control/Protection (2)	•	•	•				•
Water Quality (2)	•	•	•				•
Street lighting (3)	•	•	•	•			
Wastewater	• <input type="checkbox"/>	•	<input type="checkbox"/>	• <input type="checkbox"/>			
Other (4)							

Key:

- Indicates service provided by agency staff
- X Indicates service provided through a contract
- Indicates other service provider

Notes:

- (1) Brentwood police dispatch services provided by City of Antioch
- (2) Knightsen CSD is authorized to provide services but is currently not providing services
- (3) Street lighting maintained by City of Pittsburg and PG&E

- (4) All cities provide housing, economic development and/or redevelopment. In addition, Antioch funds an arts & cultural foundation and provides golf course and marina management; and Pittsburg provides geological hazard abatement, golf course and marina management, and limited power services (electrical/natural gas) to Mare Island in Vallejo through the Pittsburg Power Company.

This report may also include reference to other service providers not under LAFCO's purview, including various State agencies, regional transit providers, and private service providers.

Population and Growth

Contra Costa County is the ninth most populous county in the State with a population of 1,044,201 (State Department of Finance: 2007). Approximately 84% of the residents live in the County's 19 cities, with the remaining 16% living in the unincorporated areas. The County covers a total of 805 square miles, of which 732 square miles are land, with the remaining areas consisting of water areas.

In the 10 years between 1990 and 2000, the County added 145,100 residents. In the 10 years between 2005 and 2015, the County is expected to add 83,900 residents, and between 2015 and 2025, the County is expected to add an additional 100,900 residents. By 2035, the County's population is expected to reach 1.3 million. It is estimated that one-third of the County's population growth since the early 1990s has occurred in the East County cities of Antioch, Brentwood and Oakley. This growth trend in eastern Contra Costa County, including the unincorporated areas of Bethel Island and Discovery Bay, is expected to continue.

Contra Costa County is part of the nine county region of the San Francisco Bay Area. Growth for the County is projected by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). ABAG, as the Bay Area's land use planning agency, prepares long-term forecasts of population, households, and employment. Every two years, ABAG issues its *Projections* report, which provides an assessment of the growth in the nine-county Bay Area region. The *Projections 2007* report provides information on the individual cities in the County, as well as the various unincorporated communities and subregional study areas. The estimates below for cities rely on 2000 Census and ABAG's *Projections 2007* data.

With regard to the special districts, the methodology used to project growth applies 2000 Census data for baseline populations as modified using census tract (whole and partial) information. The 2005 data also accounts for known new development (using Assessor's parcel data). Future projections are based on a model using the County's assessment of vacant and underutilized parcels in which future development may occur as shown in Table 4.

Over the next 20 years, the County's total population is expected to increase by 184,800. Growth projections related to population, housing and jobs are shown in Table 2 below. The projections include those within the jurisdictional boundaries and within the sphere of influence (SOI).

Table 2 – Growth Projections for East County Cities and SOI Areas

	Antioch		Brentwood		Oakley		Pittsburg		Total
	Boundary	SOI	Boundary	SOI	Boundary	SOI	Boundary	SOI	County
Population									
2005	101,500	102,300	43,200	44,600	29,500	31,500	62,400	84,000	1,023,400
2015	110,400	111,300	59,600	61,600	34,050	36,200	67,900	93,400	1,107,300
2025	119,600	120,600	75,300	77,500	37,650	40,400	74,600	103,100	1,208,200
Annual Growth Rate (%)	0.89	0.89	3.72	3.69	1.38	1.41	0.98	1.14	0.90
Households									
2005	32,760	33,090	13,860	14,400	9,140	9,730	19,440	25,910	368,310
2015	36,360	36,740	19,550	20,300	10,610	11,420	21,690	29,420	405,420
2025	39,890	40,320	24,980	25,820	11,850	12,890	24,220	32,940	446,590
Annual Growth Rate (%)	1.09	1.09	4.01	3.97	1.48	1.62	1.23	1.36	1.06
Jobs									
2005	20,510	21,270	6,750	7,610	3,220	3,400	15,770	18,260	379,030
2015	25,930	26,900	9,670	10,800	4,570	5,100	21,700	24,600	436,970
2025	33,000	34,170	13,770	15,190	6,870	7,730	28,970	32,800	510,930
Annual Growth Rate (%)	3.04	3.03	5.20	4.98	5.67	6.37	4.19	3.98	1.74

The projected growth within the East County cities (corporate boundaries) ranges from a low of less than 1% annually in Antioch to a high of 3.72% annually in Brentwood. Among the four cities, the most significant increases in population in the next 20 years are expected to occur in Brentwood and Oakley. Antioch and Pittsburg will likely experience less of a population gain than projected as a result of encouraging more commercial and industrial and less residential development.

Jobs/Housing Balance

The jobs/housing balance is the relationship between the number of jobs provided by a community and the number of housing units needed to house the workers in those jobs. The measure of jobs/housing balance is the jobs/employed resident ratio. The ratio of 1.00 indicates that there is a numeric balance between the number of jobs and the number of employed residents in a community. A ratio of less than 1.00 indicates that a community is “job poor”, that is its residents commute to jobs in other areas, and that its economic development has not kept pace with its housing growth.

A jobs/housing balance can indicate a number of factors, such as whether a community’s housing costs match worker incomes, travel distances between homes and jobs are not excessive, and the environmental and quality of life are maintained at an acceptable level.

A jobs/housing imbalance can result in environmental problems such as decreased air quality and increased traffic congestion, as well as fiscal problems such as decreased revenues to fund public services.

The balances between jobs and employed residents within the cities (from 2005 to 2025) are shown in Table 3. In 2005, the County as a whole, had a ratio of 0.82 jobs per employed resident. This number is projected to remain stable through 2025. The East County cities have ratios which are below the County. In general, East County appears to be “job poor.” The land use patterns, as discussed later in this report, create a regional imbalance, as a large percent of jobs are located outside East County and a large percent of new housing is occurring in East County. This imbalance indicates that employees are commuting to other areas. The various traffic congestion problems in East County are directly attributable to the jobs/housing imbalance. As indicated in Table 3, this pattern is not expected to significantly improve within the next 20 years.

Table 3 – Jobs and Employed Resident Balance

	2005			2015			2025		
	Jobs	Employed Residents	Jobs/ Employee Ratio	Jobs	Employed Residents	Jobs/ Employee Ratio	Jobs	Employed Residents	Jobs/ Employee Ratio
Antioch	21,270	44,250	0.48	26,900	51,730	0.52	34,170	59,980	0.57
Brentwood	7,610	17,110	0.44	10,800	25,430	0.42	15,190	34,190	0.44
Oakley	3,400	14,060	0.24	5,100	17,450	0.29	7,730	20,880	0.37
Pittsburg	18,260	33,950	0.54	24,600	40,530	0.61	32,800	47,860	0.69
Total County	379,030	459,600	0.82	436,970	533,300	0.82	510,930	621,900	0.82

The special districts covered in this report are all located in the unincorporated County. The population and growth projections for these districts are shown in Table 4. These projections are based on 2000 Census data, along with County estimates relating to known new housing units and estimated housing units based on an assessment of vacant and underutilized land.

Table 4 – Growth Projections for East County Special Districts

	CSA RD-4	Bethel Island MID	Knightsen CSD	Total County
Population				
2005	57	2,343	1,415	1,023,400
2015	65	3,404	1,448	1,107,300
2025	72	3,446	1,630	1,208,200
Annual Growth Rate (%)	1.32	2.35	0.76	0.90

The projected growth within the East County districts ranges from a low growth rate of less than 1% annually for Knightsen CSD to a high of 2.35% annually for the BIMID. The BIMID increase is primarily attributable to the 495-unit Delta Coves project which is expected to begin construction in 2008 and be completed by 2010.

Land Use Trends

Contra Costa County continues to grow. The County has sought to balance the competing interests of growth and development with preserving agricultural land and open space through the General Planning process, growth management, and establishment of the County Urban Limit Line.

The County General Plan (2005-2020) presents a discussion of land use trends and projections by sub-region (Central County, East County, and West County), which is highlighted below:

- *Central County* – Significant residential growth occurred in this sub-region in the 1980's. This area is reaching "buildout" and development will level out. Some planned residential development is expected to occur in the Pleasant Hill area and in the San Ramon Valley.
- *East County* – Much of the future growth for Contra Costa County is planned for the Pittsburg-Antioch-Oakley-Brentwood areas. In addition, residential development is planned for the unincorporated areas of Bethel Island and Discovery Bay.
- *West County* – Industrial and commercial development and redevelopment is anticipated in the North Richmond and Richmond areas.

The projected increase in growth within the County, and particularly within the East County, will impact the agencies included within this review. There are a number of planning tools and strategies to help manage growth in the County, including spheres of influence, County and city urban growth boundaries, and service boundaries.

Spheres of Influence

LAFCO is required by statute to adopt sphere of influence (SOI) boundaries for all agencies within its jurisdiction, indicating the physical boundary and service area each agency is expected to serve. The SOI is a boundary, which is separate from a service boundary (e.g., City limit, district service area), although sometimes the SOI and service boundary is coterminous.

A sphere of influence is defined as "a plan for the probable physical boundaries and service area of a local agency, as determined by the Commission." Territory cannot be annexed to a local agency unless it is within that agency's SOI.

LAFCO determines an agency's SOI using a number of factors, including current and future land use, current and future need and capacity for service, and any relevant communities of interest.

The SOI for each agency covered in this review, along with recommended SOI policies and determinations, are discussed in the individual agency sections. In addition, maps showing agency boundaries and SOIs are included in the Appendix.

Growth and Boundaries in Contra Costa County

Growth and local agency boundaries in Contra Costa County have a complex history.

In 1988, the voters of Contra Costa approved a half-cent local transportation sales tax that would be in place for 20 years and would help fund local street and road and public transportation services (Measure C). In 2004, the sales tax was renewed for an additional 25 years (to 2034) and a new expenditure plan was adopted, the "Measure J Expenditure Plan."

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) was originally formed to manage the funds generated by the 1988 half-cent transportation sales tax and to oversee implementation of the Measure C Expenditure Plan. In addition, CCTA oversees the design and construction of the transportation projects and programs included in the Expenditure Plans, most notably, the County's Growth Management Program and serves as the County's Congestion Management Agency. In 1992 the Authority was designated Contra Costa's Program Manager for the return-to-source portion of the regional Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA). In this capacity, CCTA is responsible for the allocation of approximately \$1.3 million dollars annually for projects that reduce air pollution caused by motor vehicles. For more information about these various programs and projects, please visit the CCTA website at www.ccta.net.

One of the major components of transportation funding is the Growth Management Program (GPM). The GPM is intended to promote a healthy, strong economy while preserving and enhancing the quality of life for the people of Contra Costa County.

To receive its share of local transportation maintenance and improvement funds, local agencies must comply with the provisions of the GPM, including the following:

1. Adopt a growth management element
2. Adopt a development mitigation program
3. Address housing options
4. Participate in an ongoing cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning process
5. Adopt an urban limit line
6. Develop a five-year capital improvement program
7. Adopt a transportation system management ordinance or resolution

A number of the GMP components relate directly to LAFCO and local agency boundaries; in particular, the adoption of urban limit lines.

The County and the cities of Antioch, Pittsburg and San Ramon have voter-approved Urban Limit Lines (ULLs). In addition, a number of cities have adopted the countywide ULL as their own ULL. These lines serve as long-term growth boundaries and delineate areas intended for future urbanization. The ULLs are adopted either by the individual local agencies (e.g., County, city) or by their respective voters and do not require LAFCO approval.

The County and the cities define and utilize these boundaries differently, as highlighted below.

- *Contra Costa County Urban Limit Line (ULL)* - In 1990, the voters in Contra Costa County approved Measure C, the 65/35 Contra Costa County Land Preservation Ordinance. This measure limited urban development in the County to no more than 35% of the land in the County, and required that at least 65% of all land in the County be preserved for agriculture, open space, wetlands, parks and other non-urban uses.

In 2000, the Board of Supervisors approved a General Plan amendment modifying the County ULL and moving approximately 16,000 acres, which were previously inside the ULL outside the ULL. The County's decision was challenged in court and the County prevailed.

In 2004, the voters approved Measure J that extended to 2034 the local half-cent transportation sales tax, previously approved in 1988 (Measure C). This measure ties transportation funding to the provisions of local agency adopted urban growth boundaries.

In 2006, the County revised the countywide ULL to generally coincide with the City adopted ULLs (Antioch, Pittsburg, and San Ramon) with some exceptions such as the Tassajara Valley area.

- *City of Antioch Urban Limit Line (ULL)* – In 2005, the Antioch voters approved Measure K, which, among other things, amended the City's General Plan to establish a new City ULL that includes the Horse Valley portion of Roddy Ranch; imposed a moratorium on residential development; and restricted future development in the Deer Valley portion of the "Roddy Ranch Focus Area."
- *City of Pittsburg Urban Limit Line (ULL)* – In 2005, the voters of the City of Pittsburg approved Measure P which establishes a new ULL for the City, amends the City's General Plan, and prezones certain lands within the ULL.
- *City of San Ramon Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)* – In 2002, the City of San Ramon adopted a new General Plan (San Ramon 2020) and established an UGB to direct future growth and define the City's extent of development. The UGB boundary was ratified by the voters (Measure P). This is a 20-year UGB subject to voter review in 2012. The intent of the City's UGB is to establish a boundary for urban development that discourages urban sprawl and promotes modern and mixed-use development; preserve ridgeline, open space and agricultural areas; and create a balance between jobs and housing.

City growth and population can be affected by a number of factors, including development of vacant and underutilized land. In addition, growth and population can be affected by annexation of developed, unincorporated areas. As discussed in the agency chapters, all of the East County cities have areas within their existing boundaries and within their established SOIs with development potential. Antioch and Pittsburg have developed areas adjacent to their city boundaries and within their current SOIs where municipal services are being provided, directly or indirectly, by other agencies. Overtime, and whenever possible, these areas should be annexed into the adjoining cities.

Similarly, there are numerous unincorporated urbanized areas throughout the County. These areas are referred to as urban pockets or islands. The pockets are a result of development that has previously occurred in the County, which has resulted in some unincorporated areas being fully developed. In addition, as urban development and annexations continued outward, some unincorporated areas were “leapfrogged” and left in the County.

The role of urban counties, in general, is to provide health and human services, and municipal type services. Consequently, resources and mechanisms for providing and maintaining urban infrastructure and services are typically limited. In addition, service to unincorporated pockets and islands, which are scattered throughout the County, places a further burden on the County. Service to these small pockets and islands can result in service inefficiencies and inequities as compared to those city services provided to surrounding areas.

Specific services (e.g., water, sewer) in some pockets are provided by special districts. However, districts typically do not provide a full range of services; and it is similarly inefficient to have multiple special districts providing various services to these small, scattered pockets and islands.

In other cases, residents of urban unincorporated areas may utilize city-provided services for which they pay no property tax to the city.

Recent changes in State law provide an opportunity for cities to annex urban unincorporated islands through a streamlined process that does not require protest proceedings or elections, provided that the island meets specific criteria (Government Code §56375.3). The existence of unincorporated pockets and islands is discussed within each city’s section of this service review.