

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|---|------------------|---|--|
| Comments received prior to April 13th, 2010 (Changes to document shown in red) | | | |
| 1 ARPD, Tary Smith March 2, 2010 | p. 69 | The City of Pittsburg has set aside by Council action \$600,000 dollars for the planning and construction of the Ambrose Park Project. To date we have spent in the neighborhood of \$120,000 on planning expenses. No park improvements have been made to date. The City has been involved in plan review and fiscal control of said Pittsburg funds to date. | Added content to document. |
| 2 | p. 65 | ARPD participates in both CARPD and CPRS. Perceived benefits are insurance pools, training, sharing of knowledge of prior experience and legislative support. | Added content to document. |
| 3 Contra Costa County Supervisor, District I March 22, 2010 | p. 130 | The Montalvin Manor Redevelopment Advisory Council has been providing informal feedback to Public Works Special Districts staff about M-17 issues. The RAC is composed of community members and one business seat from both District I and District II, and they meet monthly. Gabriel Lemus (Redevelopment Agency) staffs the RAC. | Added content to document. |
| 4 Vicki Koc, Alamo Resident March 24, 2010 | Exec. Sum. | Executive Summary Policy Option. I strongly concur that in built-out areas, like CSA R-7A, that collaboration with schools and partnering with non-profits should be a strong goal. | Noted. |
| 5 | p. 30 | The table outlines that for R-7A that maintenance is provided by the county for two schools. This is in error and is later stated correctly in the text that the County provides maintenance at Alamo School and that the Town of Danville provided maintenance for Rancho Romero School. | Revised Table 3-8 (showing facility sharing practices). While the San Ramon Valley Unified School District is responsible for maintenance of the Rancho Romero School Park, the County (through CSA R-7) has partnered with SRVUSD to provide additional park facilities in the area. As part of the agreement, the CSA provides park maintenance services through the County at the Alamo Elementary School and pays for park improvements at Alamo Elementary and Rancho Romero School in exchange for public use of the facilities. |
| 6 | p. 38 | MSR Determination #10. I strongly concur that CSA info be reported separately to improve clarity and transparency within the County annual audit. | Noted. |
| 7 | p. 38 | MSR Determination #14. Reads "Areas with anticipated high growth rates are M-30...". This is misleading as stated by itself as it implies large growth numbers when what is projected is growth from 70 people to 120 people. Given the location and topography, and that these are custom homes on large lots, even that is debatable. Currently 70 people live in 26 homes. | Updated determination to reflect the fact that the high growth rate will yield only a minimal population increase. |
| 8 | p. 152 | Paragraph 1. Sentence 5. Hap Magee Ranch Park does not lie solely 'within the Town of Danville'. It lies within the Town of Danville and the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County as was outlined on p. 149 to be 9.1 acres in Danville and 8.1 acres respectively. Please change the wording to accurately reflect p. 149 detail. | Updated to reflect the fact that Hap Magee Ranch Park is partially located within the Town of Danville. |
| 9 | p. 152 | Paragraph 2. Sentence 2. A more accurate description of the location of GVRPD should not be in reference to the CSA R-7A but rather to its geographic location as within the Town of Danville and serving Danville residents. | No revision. The description of the location of GVRPD is in reference to CSA R-7 because it gives spatial context to consolidation as a governance alternative: consolidation is theoretically possible due to GVRPD's location immediately adjacent to CSA R-7. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/Section | Comment | Response |
|---|--------------|---|--|
| 10 | p. 153 | Shared Facilities #12. Correction: "No further opportunities for facility sharing were identified." Please correct as there is a future possibility at Stone Valley Middle School. | Updated. |
| 11 | p. 153 | #15. Accountability. It is noted that there is an opportunity for consolidation with GVRPD. I believe this would be problematic and not in the best interest of CSA R-7A. See comments below. | Noted. |
| 12 | p. 154 | SOI Option 3: Expand to include Green Valley Pool District. This location is within the Town of Danville and serves its nearby Danville residents. To expand CSA R-7A to include this location leapfrogging over Danville territory and attach it to the unincorporated Alamo County recreation district is gerrymandering at its worst. It also totally ignores geography and that the GVRPD is clearly within the SOI of the Town of Danville. | No revision. While consolidation of CSA R-7 with GVRPD is not recommended, expanding the CSA R-7 SOI to include GVRPD would not involve "leapfrogging," "gerrymandering," or the ignoring of geography, as GVRPD is located immediately adjacent to CSA R-7. |
| 13 | p. 154 | An additional option should be considered: Remove M-30 from the Town of Danville. M-30 has 26 homes of which approximately 20 are within the unincorporated area of Alamo and have Alamo addresses. Six I believe are within the Town of Danville and may have Alamo addresses. In addition the only road into this area passes directly by Hap Magee Ranch Park which is a joint park with land in both the Town of Danville and unincorporated County. This park is about half mile from the Alamo Springs development. In general the southern border of that road is Danville and the northern border is unincorporated Alamo. Therefore, remove M-30 from the Town of Danville and have it remain in Alamo to coincide with its geographic location. | No revision. No portion of CSA M-30 is within the Town of Danville, so the identified SOI option is not applicable. The CSA was created to serve the Alamo Spring subdivision, a portion of which is located in the Town of Danville; however, the CSA only includes those homes in Alamo Springs outside of the Town of Danville. |
| 14 LAFCO Commissioner, Sharon Burke March 25, 2010 | p. 147 | Document states that the boundary area of R-7 is 20.6 square miles. The CFA for the incorporation of Alamo previously prepared by LAFCO states the entire area of all of Alamo is approximately 10 square miles, and R-7 does not include the Round Hill Country Club area of Alamo. It would seem the approximate square mileage should be somewhere around 8 square miles. | Correct area is 8.21 sq miles per County GIS, or approximately 5,254 acres. Revised area and population density in MSR. |
| 15 | p. 148 | The bounds of CSA R-7 encompass the unincorporated community of Alamo - as previously mentioned, R-7 does not include the Round Hill area but this sentence appears to be inclusive of all of Alamo. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 16 | p. 149 | There is no need for restrooms at Andrew Young Park. It is a small pocket park and visitors do not stay long and it is immediately adjacent to the commercial area which contains restaurant, service station and store bathrooms. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 17 | p. 149 | Others have commented on the capital needs stated by the county for R-7 which are not accurate. Most of the listed capital improvements are already completed or not necessary. This resulted in Burr Consulting misstating the capital needs of the district. | Updated text to include this information. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|-------------|------------------|---|---|
| 18 | p. 4 and p. 152 | Governance options - CSA R-7 property taxes paid by M-30 residents help fund Hap Magee Park, which is the closest park facility to M-30. As Alamo is a single community of interest with a recent incorporation drive, it does not make sense to detach M-30 from the rest of the Alamo Park and Recreation District, but to leave the community of interest intact. Governance option 2, the consolidation of the two CSAs into one CSA with a zone to leave the County-Danville agreement intact makes more sense. | While it is true that some of the property taxes paid by CSA M-30 residents to CSA R-7 fund Hap Magee Ranch Park, benefit assessments paid by CSA M-30 residents to the Town of Danville also fund Hap Magee Ranch Park, in addition to other enhanced services provided by the Town. While both governance alternatives are legitimate options, a consolidation of CSAs R-7 and M-30 would create a more complex agency with layers of zones and financing mechanisms, and may not necessarily improve efficiency. |
| 19 | | Under governance options for R-7, I believe the consultant should have suggested that the district's SOI be expanded to include the Round Hill Country Club area. It is the only area of the Alamo community presently excluded from the district, and the district almost completely surrounds the Round Hill area, save only a small corner of open space that prevents a complete island being made of the area. Round Hill residents frequent district parks and attend district sponsored activities, although a fee is required for recreation programs attended by Round Hill residents. The district's main facility, Livorna Park, is located closer to Round Hill Country Club than to any other defined neighborhood in Alamo. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 20 | p. 153 | As far as I know, there is no deteriorating infrastructure within the district. The district's facilities were all built within the last 15 years. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 21 | p. 153 | As far as I know, there are no deferred maintenance costs in the district. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 22 | p. 149 | I believe special mention should be made that the district does not now provide recreation programming for seniors, an identified need in the community of Alamo, which has a large population of seniors. Currently, seniors in Alamo attend senior programs in Danville or Walnut Creek, paying non-resident fees. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 23 | p. 150 | The MSR states that the district does not provide enough parkland to the district residents consistent with General Plan goals. The district needs to make the acquisition of additional parkland a high priority. Although the community is largely built out, there are pockets of land that should be actively pursued by the district while real estate values are currently at a low. The district should make it a priority to use its available reserve funds to develop and acquire additional parkland for its residents or to develop school property such as Stone Valley Middle School into additional parkland. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 24 | p. 150 | The MSR does not mention the approximately \$800,000 in grant funding available as a result of the passage of Proposition WW through the East Bay Regional Park District. This is a significant source available to the district. | Measure WW allocations by agency are shown in Table 3-10. |
| 25 | p. 150 | One other commenter correctly identified Stone Valley Middle School as a possibility for district development. This has been an identified need in the district for some time. | Added footnote stating that many of the capital needs listed in the County Parks Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for CSA R-7 have already been completed, are not necessary, or were never discussed with the MAC. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|--|------------------|---|--|
| 26 Nancy Dommes, Alamo Resident March 26, 2010 | pp. 149-150 | Andrew H. Young Park - the report suggests <i>construct restrooms</i> - this has never been discussed or planned. | See response to comment #25. All plans for improvements listed on pp. 149-150 for Alamo area parks came from the County Parks CIP. The CIP was prepared in 2006-2007 by staff from the Department of Conservation and Development and the Public Works Department. The CIP was developed to identify countywide park needs in order to raise the Park Impact Fees to fund future park capital improvements. The CIP document went to the Board of Supervisor's Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC). The TWIC recommended the document for approval by the full Board of Supervisors. A public hearing was held on May 1, 2007 and the CIP was adopted by the Board of Supervisors. |
| 27 | pp. 149-150 | Alamo School - report also lists <i>construct restrooms, BBQs, play area equipment</i> - none of this has been discussed or planned. | See response to comment #26. |
| 28 | pp. 149-150 | Hap Magee Ranch Park - again, report lists <i>construct restrooms</i> - public restrooms were constructed years ago. | See response to comment #25. |
| 29 | pp. 149-150 | Livorna Park - listed is <i>construct restrooms, play and picnic areas, improve access</i> - there are no plans to construct additional restrooms, the play and picnic areas were renovated years ago, and access does not require improvement. | See response to comments #25 and #26. |
| 30 | pp. 149-150 | Rancho Romero - <i>picnic tables and BBQ's</i> are already constructed. Items <u>not</u> included are install shading on ball field dugouts, and possible installation of shade structure on upper playground. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 31 | pp. 149-150 | Left completely off the list is: Monte Vista High School Pool - construct shade structure (which has been talked about but still not completed) | Updated text to include this information. |
| 32 | p. 148 | On the recap of the FY 08-09 income/expenses, the administration expense seems low from what was provided to the R-7A committee. | The administration expense indicated in the report is what was provided by County Public Works for FY 08-09 in CSA R-7. This data was provided by the County on January 20, 2010. |
| 33 Steve Mick, Alamo Resident March 26, 2010 | p. 2 | Disagrees with statement that "many of the CSAs are built-out and lack available land for new park facilities." | Noted. |
| 34 | p. 4 | MSR fails to list all services provided to CSA M-30 residents by the Town of Danville. | Noted. Only park and recreation services were covered in the service duplication and boundary overlap discussion in the executive summary because those are the only services that are duplicated by CSA R-7. The Town of Danville provides additional services to the CSA M-30 area, which are included in a more lengthy discussion of service duplication and boundary overlap in the governmental structure and operational deficiencies section at the end of the parks chapter. |
| 35 | p. 7 | Disagrees with SOI update recommendation to exclude the CSA M-30 boundary from the CSA R-7 SOI. | Noted. |
| 36 | p. 22 | Disagrees with statement that "many of the CSAs are built-out and lack available land for new park facilities," and "consequently, there will likely be little improvement to the LOS in M-17, R-7, R-9, and R-10 unless the CSAs can capitalize on facility sharing and open facilities to the public that are not presently available for general use." | Noted. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|---|------------------|--|--|
| 37 | p. 28 | Disagrees with facility conditions finding, that "facilities within CSA R-7 were identified by the County as being in excellent condition; however, significant improvements (including improved access, restrooms, upgraded irrigation and drainage, new picnic and BBQs, and play areas) are planned for all park facilities between 2009 and 2011. There are no plans for additional facilities in CSA R-7 at this time." | Updated text to include the opinion of Alamo MAC that many of the infrastructure needs identified in the CIP are not necessary or outdated. |
| 38 | p. 30 | The table should reflect that maintenance costs of Hap Magee Ranch Park are shared equally with R-7A and CSA M-30 | Revised to state that maintenance is funded jointly by the Town of Danville and the County. |
| 39 | p. 33 | Figure 3-2 shows R-7 costs to be highest at about \$23,000. This does not seem correct - does this figure also include upgrades? | This figure is based on facilities maintenance only. As reported by the County, facilities maintenance in FY 08-09 for CSA R-7 was \$368,369. When divided by the acres of parkland maintained by the CSA (15.8 acres), the result is approximately \$23,300. (See comment #86.) |
| 40 | p. 37 | Disagrees with finding that "While facilities within CSA R-7 were identified as being in excellent condition, significant improvements are planned in the near future." | See response to comment #37. |
| 41 | p. 193 | This description [of CSA M-30] is lacking. The subdivision is quite small and it's not clear what park facilities would fit in the subdivision. Hap Magee Ranch Park is less than 0.4 miles from the subdivision. While Hap Magee Ranch Park is owned jointly by the county and the Town, it is administered by a joint powers agreement between the Town and R-7A. Maintenance costs are equally shared between the two." | The intent of this paragraph is to explain the duplication of services. Added content to clarify relevance. |
| 42 | p. 193 | It's not clear what the implication of the statement, "The nearest County-owned facility financed by CSA R-7 funds is Andrew H. Young Park, which is approximately one mile from the border of CSA M-30" is. M-30 residents live quite close to Hap Magee Ranch Park, a premier park facility which is supported by tax revenue from R-7A and the Town of Danville and is partly owned by the County. The distance to Andrew H. Young Park is moot. As a matter of record, a facility that is actually closer than Andrew H. Young Park to the M-30 subdivision is Rancho Romero School Park." | CSA M-30 residents currently pay property tax to CSA R-7 for maintenance of Hap Magee Ranch Park, and a benefit assessment to the Town of Danville for maintenance of Hap Magee Ranch Park, among other enhanced services. The distance of Andrew H. Young Park from CSA M-30 is germane to the discussion, as it is solely funded by CSA R-7 funds, unlike Hap Magee Ranch Park, which is also funded from other sources (CSA M-30 and the Town of Danville). If CSA M-30 residents no longer paid property tax to CSA R-7, funding for maintenance of Andrew H. Young Park would also be decreased. Maintenance of the Rancho Romero School Park is provided by the San Ramon Valley USD, while only improvements are funded by CSA R-7. |
| 43 | p. 170 | Typographical error in footnote #164: Change CSA R-7 to CSA R-10. | Revised. |
| 44 PHRPD, Bob Beggren March 29, 2010 | p. 98 | Paragraph #4, last sentence should also include: The District expects to sell the bonds in three series, starting in 2010, to fund construction of a new senior center, teen center, community center, upgrades to Pleasant Oaks Park, and replacing restrooms at park facilities. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 45 | p. 99 | Page 99: Infrastructure: There are approximately 270 acres of parks and open space within PHRPD, including approximately 205 acres of parks directly maintained by the District (63 acres of which are developed)... | Updated developed parkland acreage in Table 3-4 and Table 3-7, and in accompanying text, to reflect six acres of Paso Nogal Park as developed. |
| 46 | p. 101 | Page 101: Table 8-4: Maintained Park Acres 205 | No revision to maintained park acres. Paso Nogal Park was already included in maintained parkland calculations. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/Section | Comment | Response |
|---|--------------|---|---|
| 47 | p. 103 | Page 103: Paragraph #3: "and many residents of the City of Lafayette likely use this park facility." | Revised. |
| 48 | p. 104 | Page 104: 3) ...including approximately 205 acres of parks directly maintained by the District (63 acres of which are developed) | See response to comments #45-46. |
| 49 | p. 105 | Page 105: 12) ...and Valley View Middle School. | Revised. |
| 50 | p. 106 | Page 106: SOI Option #3 ...and residents of this area likely visit the park frequently due to the proximity. | Revised. |
| 51 | p. 106 | Pleasant Hill Recreation & Park District is in agreement with the recommendation to adopt the SOI for the existing boundaries including the SOI of the City of PH (including 16 acres of the City currently located outside of PHRPD). | Noted. |
| 52 BBKUCD, Mark White March 29, 2010 | p. 5 | On Page 5, it is stated that the BBK Union Cemetery District is charging slightly less than the amount required by law for Endowment Care. The law states that the grave size is to be determined by the number of square feet of grave area. That square footage is to be multiplied by \$4.50 per square foot. This District interpreted that to mean the exact grave size, which in this cemetery is 3 ft. x 8 ft. which equals 24 square feet. That multiplied by the price per square foot is \$108.00. This means the District is in fact charging \$52 above the amount prescribed by law. | Updated grave dimensions provided previously by BBKUCD with actual grave sizes used by the District to calculate the endowment care fee. Based on the dimensions of 3 ft. by 8 ft. for all grave sites (in Section D, E and F), the endowment care fee charged by BBKUCD exceeds the minimum amounts required by law. |
| 53 | p. 5 | Ten years ago, this District did a survey on Endowment Care. The findings of the survey revealed that if this District were to charge an amount that would fill the Endowment Care Fund to a level that would sustain the Cemetery grounds without the help of property taxes, then BBKUCD would have to charge more for goods and services than the local Private Cemeteries and Non-profit Cemeteries currently do. In other words, taxpayers would pay "twice" as much for their burial needs. | Added related findings to MSR that endowment care fees may be too low to cover long-term maintenance costs of existing plots. Note that ALCD had a similar comment (# 106). |
| 54 | pp. 6-7 | The MSR recommends that this District add the west side (old part) of Oakley to the District; or remove the east side (new part) of that same city. This District has been trying since 1988 to add the western portion of Oakley. However, there are two primary factors for this not happening. (1) Oakley does not wish to pay mitigation fees due to the fact it will shrink its property tax base; and (2) Union Cemetery District will not have a portion of the property taxes generated from old Oakley (due to Prop.13). Therefore, Union Cemetery District and the City of Oakley are at an impasse. As to removing new Oakley from this District, that is not very practical since Bethel Island is a part of the District and by removing new Oakley would form a big political hole in the north eastern portion of Union Cemetery District. As to a small portion of the City of Antioch being in the District, this report is the first time that has been revealed. | Removing the eastern portion of the City of Oakley from BBKUCD would not create a "hole" in the district, and neither would it make Bethel Island a noncontiguous area. As shown on Map 12-3, Bethel Island (and other Delta islands) would still be contiguous to the remainder of the district boundary via Holland Tract, to the east of the City of Oakley. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/Section | Comment | Response |
|-------------|--------------|--|--|
| 55 | p. 44 | The report states that "Districts are also restricted from acquiring mausoleums constructed prior to 1937 or constructing new ones. The principal act requires districts to maintain cemeteries owned by the district." This is not the way the State Health & Safety Code reads. It states as follows: "A district may acquire maintain or repair a mausoleum for crypt entombment that was completed on or before May 1, 1937. A district may construct additions to the mausoleum." (H&S Code Section 9051(a). In other words, a district may not build any mausoleums after 1937, unless the district built or acquired one that was built prior to May 1, 1937. Exceptions are adding to a legally built or acquired mausoleum to maintain service. | Revised. |
| 56 | p. 54 | Page 54, the report mentioned that both ALCD and BBKUCD are members of California Association of Public Cemeteries (CAPC); and California Special Districts Association (CSDA). BBKUCD is also a member of another state-wide organization, the Public Cemetery Alliance (PCA) which was not mentioned. It is through the PCA that BBKUCD is insured. PCA and Golden State Risk Management have collaborated to provide risk management services to many public cemetery districts in California. | Added text to reflect BBKUCD's membership in the Public Cemetery Alliance. |
| 57 | p. 55 | The report says, "BBKUCD charges between \$3,343 and \$4,703 for regular in-ground burial services, depending on the location of the lot, and \$1,253 for a cremation niche, inclusive of all fees." To address the first statement; it is awkwardly worded in that this District has a sliding scale of fees, depending upon grave location or niche location. This is done so that even families with limited income can afford some kind of interment at the cemetery. Some families feel it is their duty to provide a more elaborate level of burial. These families can then be also accommodated, through higher levels of service. | Noted. |
| 58 | p. 55 | The report says, "BBKUCD charges a non-resident fee of \$500 for an in-ground burial and \$85 for a niche interment." There is also a third tier of out of district fees charged. People choosing in-ground cremation burials, in designated spots, are charged \$75.00 for out of district service fees. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 59 | p. 59 | The MSR states that neither ALCD nor BBKUCD have long-range spending plans. This was not always the case at BBKUCD. Until 1992-93, this District had both a 5-year plan and a 10-year plan. The District was also developing a salary scale. However, income became very unstable during that fiscal year when the State of California made its first grab at the property taxes. Since then, there has been no method by which income can be thought of as "stable". Thus BBKUCD stopped making long-term plans due to the instability of the state budget and later, the unstable, overall economy. | Noted. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|---|------------------|--|---|
| 60 | General | Not in the report – BBKUCD also offers pre-need sales of lots and services. That is the District will form a contract with a family or individual. The contract allows the District to collect money “up front” and the family or individual then “locks in” today’s prices for tomorrow’s interment. – thus beating inflation. The money is turned over to the Contra Costa County Treasurer’s Office and is placed in an interest-bearing account. When the lots or services are needed for the burial of one of the persons on the contract, then the money is transferred from this escrow-like account to the District’s General Fund for use. | Pre-need sales was mentioned as a service offered by BBKUCD on p. 230, under the "Nature and Extent" heading of the BBKUCD profile. A footnote was added to the document containing the additional information presented in this comment. |
| 61 LAFCO Commissioner Sharon Burke March 30, 2010 | p. 148 | On page 148 of the MSR prepared by Burr Consulting, a budget is shown for R-7A. I feel two items are misleading. I do not think it is correct to include \$204,945 in Capital Outlays in the "Operating Expenditures". Basically, R-7 runs at a surplus every year over and above administration and maintenance costs and the surplus is added to the fund balance. Although correctly labeled as Capital Outlays, including capital expenditures in the Operating Expenditures gives the impression that expenditures are close to revenues when this is not accurate and a truer picture of the district would be presented by not including capital expenditures in the annual budget example shown. | Revised Table 10-12 to remove the word "operating" from total expenditures. |
| 62 | | In addition, it is misleading to label one category "Recreation and Senior Services". The district currently does not provide any senior services and I am concerned that members of the public might see this and conclude that services are currently provided. | Added footnote to Table 10-12 indicating that senior services are not currently provided by the CSA. |
| 63 Contra Costa County Supervisor, District III March 30, 2010 | p. 152 | There is strong opposition to the concept of consolidating Green Valley Recreation and Park District (GVRPD-Green Valley Pool), an isolated island of land completely surrounded by the Town of Danville, with the Alamo Parks and Recreation District R-7A District. I oppose this option as does the Alamo Municipal Advisory Council (AMAC). Given the geographic location of the GVRPD, it does not appear to be an appropriate match with Alamo but would be more aligned with the Town of Danville. | Added text to the document stating community opposition to consolidation with GVRPD. The boundaries of GVRPD are clearly within the Town of Danville; however, the GVRPD serves member families and individuals who reside both outside of the District's boundaries and outside of the Town of Danville's boundaries. Although consolidation of CSA R-7 with GVRPD is not recommended, it was identified as a possible option due to the fact that the agencies are located immediately adjacent to one another. |
| 64 | p. 90 | There is also reference to the GVRPD as having Alamo households, this is not the case. | The MSR does not reference the GVRPD as having Alamo households within the District. Instead, it references the fact that some families that use the pool are located outside of GVRPD, in the Town of Danville and the unincorporated community of Alamo. |
| 65 | p. 127 | Map 10-3 does not appear to reflect the GVRPD. | Map 10-3 indicates the central county parks and recreation CSAs only, and therefore does not depict GVRPD. |
| 66 | p. 4 | The option of consolidating CSA M-30 into R-7A is worth further discussion with both districts, the County and the Town of Danville. | Noted. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/Section | Comment | Response |
|-------------|--|--|---|
| 67 | pp. 152-153, pp. 186-187, p. 188, and p. 195 | There appears to be conflicting information in the MSR report about what services are eligible for funding and what services are actually being funded. | Based on the page numbers referenced, it is assumed that this comment is in reference to CSA M-30. For CSA M-30, services eligible for funding include parks and recreation, law enforcement, street maintenance, landscaping, and street lighting. Parks maintenance and landscaping services are provided by the Town of Danville's LLAD, while road maintenance (on the public roads leading to the CSA) is provided by the Town of Danville. Law enforcement in the CSA is provided to the Town of Danville and CSA M-30 by contract with the County Sheriff. Funds for street lighting in CSA M-30 are transferred to, and provided by, CSA L-100. |
| 68 | p. 30 and p. 42 | There may be some editing errors between M-30 and R-7A in the report | Added clarifying content to descriptions of CSA R-7 and CSA M-30 throughout the report. |
| 69 | Map 3-1 | Map 3-1 does not clearly designate M-30 vs. R-7A. | Maps have been revised in an attempt to make this clear. Map 10-3 also illustrates this area and is more zoomed in. |
| 70 | Misc. | Hap Magee Ranch Park is equally owned and maintained by both Contra Costa County and the Town of Danville. This is not reflected in several places of the report. The Town of Danville is the operator of the park but the County contributes an equal share of the maintenance costs. | Revised throughout the report. |
| 71 | p. 152 | Hap Magee Ranch Park does not lie solely "within the Town of Danville." Its boundaries lie across both the Town of Danville (9.1 acres) and the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County (8.1 acres) as was outlined on p. 149. Once this is correctly reflected, there is likely to be different data for calculations that will affect other charts in the report. | Revisions made in text to clarify the location of Hap Magee Ranch Park and joint maintenance of facility between the County and the Town of Danville. Acreages were allocated properly in figures and tables (9.1 acres vs. 8.1 acres), thus no revisions to tables or figures were necessary. |
| 72 | p. 37, p. 149, pp. 150-152 and p. 192 | There is not concurrence that the condition of all R-7A facilities is excellent. In fact, there are facilities that have reached their full life expectancy and will need to be replaced within the next few years. Further, there is current discussion in the Alamo community about planning for additional park facilities for R-7A. This is not referenced in the MSR. | Updated text to include the opinion that some park facilities have reached their full life expectancy. However, other comments suggest facilities are relatively new and few needs exist (see comments #17 and #20). Also, added text concerning additional park facilities in Alamo community. |
| 73 | p. 153 | Determination (#7-8) for R-7A are not consistent with previous descriptions ("excellent" vs. "deteriorating" and "lack of funding"). | Revised determinations based on comments regarding facility conditions and needs. |
| 74 | p. 38 | I agree as reflected that CSA information should be reported separately to improve clarity and transparency within the County annual audit (#10). | Noted. |
| 75 | p. 38 | Determination #14 reads: "Areas with anticipated high growth rates are M-30..." This implies large growth numbers when what is projected is growth from 70 people to 120 people. Any projected growth should be reflected as "minimal" growth. | See response to comment #7. |
| 76 | p. 30 | The table outlines that R-7A maintenance is provided by the county for two schools (page 30). This is in error and is later stated correctly in the text that the County provides maintenance at Alamo School and that the Town of Danville provides maintenance for Rancho Romero School. These corrections need to be made and consistency reflected. | See response to comment #5. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|---|------------------|--|--|
| 77 | p. 193 | CSA M-30 indicates the nearest owned County facility is Andrew H. Young Park. This is inaccurate as it is actually Hap Magee Ranch Park as referenced above. This inaccurate information appears to come from the previously referenced error that Danville fully maintains Hap Magee Ranch Park when it is actually a 50% split of both ownership and maintenance. | See response to comment #71. |
| 78 | p. 154 | Under SOI options, there should be an option that provides for the consolidation of M-30 into R-7A (p. 154). The reference to consolidating with GVRPD may be an editing error. If this is the case, the new option would either replace Option 3 or become Option 4: "Consolidation of M-30 into R-7A and removal of M-30 from the Town of Danville." M-30 has 26 homes of which approximately 20 are within the unincorporated area of Alamo and have Alamo addresses, six are "adjacent to" the Town of Danville, and Hap Magee Ranch Park is about a half mile from the Alamo Springs development located in Alamo. In general, the southern border of La Gonda Way is Danville's boundary and the northern border is unincorporated Alamo, Contra Costa County. Therefore, M-30's SOI needs to be removed from the Town of Danville and remain in Alamo to coincide with its geographic location. | The option to consolidate CSA M-30 with CSA R-7 was included in the SOI options for CSA M-30, because no SOI change would be required for CSA R-7. SOI Option #3, consolidation with GVRPD, is a legitimate option and not an editing error. CSA M-30 does not have territory in the Town of Danville (see response to comment #13). |
| 79 | p. 154 | Option 3: Expand to include Green Valley Pool District. This location is within the Town of Danville and serves its nearby Danville residents. If CSA R-7A was to expand to include GVRPD, it would require leapfrog over Danville territory to attach it to the unincorporated Contra Costa County (Alamo) recreation district. It would also ignore geography and that the GVRPD is clearly within the SOI of the Town of Danville and previous LAFCO discussion with representatives of the GVRPD to work with Danville to address the GVRPD's ongoing issues. | See response to comment #12. |
| 80 | p. 170 | Footnote #164 indicates "a subsidiary district of the City of Hercules." This may be a typo. | Revised typographical error. |
| 81 County Public Works, Julia Bueren March 30, 2010 | p. 17 | The second sentence, "All services provided by the CSA are supplied by contract providers..." Change the sentence to say, "Community Center coordination and recreation programming provided by the CSA are supplied by contract; maintenance of the community center building is provided by the County." | Revised. |
| 82 | p. 19 | Change the recreation attendance for CSA R-10 to reflect 500 participants in youth baseball. | Revised Table 3-2 (and accompanying text) and Table 10-20 to account for additional recreation participation. |
| 83 | p. 28 | The second paragraph, second sentence, "Improvements include a new swimming complex, a new basketball court..." Change the sentence to start with "Proposed improvements include..." | Revised. |
| 84 | p. 30, Table 3-8 | Two schools are listed as being maintained by the County. Change to show the following: Alamo Elementary School Park is maintained by the County and Rancho Romero School Park is maintained by the San Ramon Valley Unified School District. | Revised Table 3-8. |
| 85 | p. 33 | Maintenance costs for County Service Area M-16 were \$9,576 for 2.4 acres which is \$3,990 per acre. | Updated Table 10-4, Table 10-5 and Figure 3-2, and accompanying text. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/Section | Comment | Response |
|-------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| 86 | p. 148 | Maintenance costs for County Service Area R-7 were reported as \$368,369 (shown on page 148 CSA R-7 expenditures), maintained park acres is 30.3 which is \$12,157 per acre. Figure 3-2 should be changed to reflect this. | No revision. While there are 30.3 acres of maintained parkland available to CSA R-7 residents, only 15.8 acres are funded by CSA R-7: Andrew H. Young Park (0.2 acres), Alamo Elementary School Park (3.1 acres), Livorna Park (4.4 acres), and 8.1 acres of Hap Magee Ranch Park. $\$368,369 / 15.8 = \sim\$23,000$. |
| 87 | p. 133 | County Service Area M-16, FY 08-09 Financial Information: Replace with following amounts to clarify construction costs (capital outlays) for Big Oak Tree Park. Total Revenues: \$292,417 Total Expenditures: \$292,417 Carryover from previous year: \$14,704 Project Management: \$169,705 Property tax: \$25,901 Capital Outlays: \$113,136 Restricted Donations: \$15,700 Maintenance: \$9,576 Other General Fund ¹ : \$92,895 Intergovernmental Rev/Grants: \$143,217 (1) Other general fund sources include sources other than those listed separately. | Updated Table 10-4. |
| 88 | p. 148 | The footnote for Other Expenditures for \$33,800 should be changed to (3) Other includes reimbursements to CSA M-17 for a transfer made in error. | Updated Table 10-12. |
| 89 | p. 152 | Governance Alternatives, Paragraph 1: Change the sentence, "...Hap Magee Ranch Park, which lies within the Town of Danville..." to show that Hap Magee Ranch Park lies within both the Town of Danville and unincorporated Contra Costa County. | See response to comment #8. |
| 90 | p. 154 | SOI Option 3: Public Works has concerns about the consolidation of CSA R-7 with GVRPD as a possible option to improve the operations of GVRPD. A consolidation would not be an enhancement to County Service Area R-7. There are not adequate financial resources to cover the additional costs for maintenance and capital improvements for the pool. Given the location of GVRPD, Public Works recommends that it would be more appropriate for GVRPD to be within the SOI of the Town of Danville. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 91 | p. 158 | "In FY 08-09, parks and recreation services in the CSA were financed entirely by park dedication fees." Change the sentence to say: "In FY 08-09, parks and recreation services in the CSA were financed by park dedication and developer in lieu fees," and under revenues, change the park dedication fees line to say "Park Dedication Fees/Developer In Lieu." | Revised Table 10-16. |
| 92 | p. 159 | Park and Recreation Facilities, Valley View Elementary: Change "...a proposed school with children's play area, sports court, restrooms, architectural, and engineering costs" to "a proposed children's play area, sports court, restrooms, architectural and engineering costs at the school site." | Revised. |
| 93 | p. 170 | Typographical error in footnote #164: Change CSA R-7 to CSA R-10. | Revised. |
| 94 ALCD, Primo Facchini | General | The ALCD Board elected to use word "interment" rather than "burial." Please replace the word "burial" with "interment" in the MSR document. | Revised to use "interment" instead of "burial" where appropriate, as interment more broadly includes both in-ground burials and cremation niche placements. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/Section | Comment | Response |
|-------------|--------------|---|--|
| 95 | p. 52 | First par., remove the word "concrete"—the pathways are asphalt. | Revised. |
| 96 | p. 52 | Figure 4-3 – Confirm that the photo of the niches is indeed at Lafayette Cemetery and not Alamo Cemetery. | Photo is indeed of niches at Lafayette Cemetery. |
| 97 | p. 53 | Fourth par. – What is the basis for using the word "obligated"? Districts can't get the money to provide for this, and it puts a large burden on the district that doesn't have the funds. ALCD is concerned that the average reader will assume ALCD is not fulfilling its obligations. | The Legislature defined such districts' mission as providing cost-effective interments to their constituents (Health & Safety Code §9001(b)). Further the law requires these districts' boards to provide adequate cemetery space for the foreseeable future (Health & Safety Code §9061(c)(3)) due to their practice of allowing burials of non-residents (i.e., non-taxpayers). If public cemetery districts do not plan for, acquire and develop additional cemetery facilities as existing facilities reach capacity, they cannot fulfill their legislative intent because they would no longer be able to provide cost-effective interments to property tax-paying residents of the district. |
| 98 | p. 53 | Last par – the illogical boundaries of ALCD have been a concern of the district for a long time. | Noted. |
| 99 | p. 54 | Under Opportunities – The document is correct in stating that there are no opportunities for facility sharing. | Noted. |
| 100 | p. 54 | Last par. - Contra Costa is a chapter of the California Special Districts Association | Revised. |
| 101 | p. 56 | Under Maintenance Costs – Reference should be to Figure 4-5, not 4-4. | Revised. |
| 102 | p. 57 | Third par. – Why does the report refer to private cemeteries in this paragraph. Is that just for comparison's sake, or was it actually a typo? | The reference to private cemeteries is not a typographical error. The 2008 Endowment Care Fund Survey conducted by the State Cemetery and Funeral Bureau of the Department of Consumer Affairs only surveyed private cemeteries. The lack of sufficient endowment care funding at private cemeteries prompted the minimum endowment fees required by the Health and Safety Code to be doubled for both private and public cemeteries. |
| 103 | p. 57 | ALCD is concerned with statements in the document about "responsibility." What authority is being cited? The District is concerned that the general reader will assume ALCD is not fulfilling its obligations. Acquiring new land is difficult due to limited funding and limited availability of land. | See response to comment #97. If the district is not able to acquire and develop new cemetery facilities as existing facilities reach capacity, it will no longer be able to fulfill its intended mission. While the district may lack the funds to acquire new land within the district, Health & Safety Code §9007 provides options for purchasing non-contiguous lands. |
| 104 | p. 59 | Determination #3: The district is not able to conduct capital improvement planning due to a lack of funds. | Noted. |
| 105 | p. 59 | Determination #4: Again, what is the citation for the "legal responsibility" statement? | See response to comment #97. |
| 106 | p. 59 | Determination #5: The endowment care fund obligation was only established in 1985—there is no money to maintain older interment sites, and in fact the \$500 endowment care fee the district charges doesn't even generate enough funds to take care of the newer sites. | See comment and response to comment #53. The authors share the district's concerns that fees are inadequate, which is precisely why the MSR recommends that the cemetery districts conduct formal planning related to the sufficiency of the endowment care fund and remaining interment capacity: the less remaining capacity there is, the more urgent the need to establish sufficient endowment care fees. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|-------------|------------------|--|--|
| 107 | p. 60 | Determination #12: ALCD obviously can't use taxpayers' assets to share facilities with private cemeteries. | Noted. |
| 108 | p. 60 | Determination #13: The district sometimes sends notices to churches, and they do as much outreach as possible, but do not have the funds to spend on outreach—too expensive to do special mailing, etc. | Added text to ALCD profile stating outreach efforts and limitations. |
| 109 | p. 60 | Governmental Structure: ALCD has been concerned about the boundaries of the district for a long time. | Noted. |
| 110 | p. 60 | Last par. -- Right now, ALCD is getting .0004 of the 1%; not enough to do more than the bare minimum, and ALCD is sure that no other district would be willing to give up any part of their share of the tax in any sort of property tax transfer agreement. | Noted. |

Supplementary Comment Log (comments rec'd. after 4/13/10)

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|---|------------------------|---|--|
| Comments received after April 13th, 2010 (Changes to document shown in blue) | | | |
| 111 ARPD, Tary Smith April 14, 2010 | p. 67 | Since the RFI/data collection phase of the MSR, ARPD has hired part-time staff to do in-house programming. Also, ARPD has nine instead of seven full time employees. Left out were a fulltime Recreation Supervisor and a full time Teen Center Coordinator. | Updated staff positions in ARPD profile. |
| 112 LAFCO Commissioner George Schmidt | General | Population of El Sobrante in MSR seems to be significantly overstated. | Revised population and parkland calculations per 1,000. Population used was according to LAFCO directory for CSA R-9; however, according to the 2000 Census and GIS analysis, the population of the CSA was only 12,260. Adjusting for growth since 2000, the population of the CSA in 2009 was approximately 12,750. |
| 113 Contra Costa County Supervisor, District III April 20, 2010 | General | Of particular importance to District III is that the Green Valley Pool not be merged into R-7A nor any other area managed by the County. | Noted. |
| 114 | p. 215 | I oppose the consultant's recommendation to reduce R-7A's SOI to exclude the area of M-30. I support option #2 that suggests consolidating R-7A and M-30 and making a new zone for M-30 and adopting a zero SOI for M-30. | Noted. The LAFCO staff recommendation differs from that of the consultant. LAFCO staff also recommends SOI option #2 for CSA M-30, and SOI option #4 for CSA R-7. |
| 115 | p. 215 | The document should be corrected to reflect the nearest park to M-30 is not the Town of Danville, as stated in the report, it is Hap Magee Ranch Park which is maintained by both the Town and County equally. | Updated text to note that Hap Magee Ranch Park is the closest park facility to CSA M-30, and that the park is maintained by both the Town and County equally. |
| 116 | General | The homes in M-30 are located in the unincorporated area of Contra Costa County and the residents of M-30 can attend and apply to serve on the Alamo MAC to address representation issues. | Updated policy option in executive summary to state that residents of CSA M-30 can attend and apply to serve on the Alamo MAC to address representation issues. |
| 117 | Maps 10-6 and 10-13 | The Monte Vista Pool is maintained by R-7A and the Town of Danville rather than M-30. The Maps 10-6 and 10-13 should not imply M-30 maintains it. | Maps 10-6 and 10-13 have been revised to correctly reflect the maintenance arrangement for the tennis courts (not the pool) at the Monte Vista High School and San Ramon Valley High School. Resurfacing of the tennis courts at both locations is treated as a capital expenditure by the Town of Danville, and no CSA M-30 funds are used. |
| 118 | p. 212 | R-7A and the County equally split the cost of maintaining Hap Magee Ranch Park. The footnote (3) incorrectly implies the agreement is based on acreage instead of the 50%-50% dollar split. | Revised footnote in Table 10-26. |
| 119 | p. 213 | It is not clear in item 5, where the Town of Danville plans to make the park capital improvements by 2014. Please clarify if this is for all parks in Danville or if it is for a specific park? Is it for Hap Magee Park? | The Town of Danville reported that the \$600,000 figure represents the amount currently appropriated in the Town's CIP for all park projects, with some amount being allocated for virtually every park owned by the Town, and that no CSA M-30 funds are included in this amount. |
| 120 | General | It is important to acknowledge that R-7A remains intact with a functional advisory body. The only change was the recent creation by the Board of Supervisors of the Alamo Municipal Advisory Council (AMAC) who assumed the advisory functions for R-7A. This was done to streamline government operations for the community of Alamo and bring these advisory bodies under one "umbrella." | Noted. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/ Section | Comment | Response |
|--|------------------|--|---|
| 121 LAFCO Commissioner Sharon Burke April 21, 2010 | General | Financing is adequate for CSA R-7, as evidenced by the \$3 million fund balance for the CSA in FY 08-09. | A beginning fund balance of nearly \$3.2 million for CSA R-7 in FY 08-09 is reflected in Table 10-12. This amount is significant, and could potentially help plan and fund new parkland acquisition within the CSA. A considerable fund balance is one indication of an agency's financial ability to provide service. For a comparison of total revenue per capita, see Figure 3-5. |
| 122 LAFCO Commissioner Gayle Uilkema April 21, 2010 | p. 184 | CSA R-10 may be receiving property taxes and/or assessments to fund park and recreation services through countywide Landscape and Lighting District Zone 38. | CSA R-10 does not receive property taxes or assessments; however, LL-2 Zone 38 receives assessments for landscaping, irrigation, recreational facilities and related improvements in Rodeo. Some expenditures of LL-2 Zone 38 benefit park and recreation facilities within the CSA. Also, the CSA R-10 advisory committee has input through the County Public Works Department in Zone 38 funding. |
| 123 | General | The advisory committee of CSA R-10 may not be able to be rolled into the Rodeo Municipal Advisory Council. Additional follow-up should be done to verify that this is a possible option. | Noted. The option seems feasible given that it was recently done in Alamo with CSA R-7 and AMAC, and is currently underway in El Sobrante with ESMAC and CSA R-9. |
| 124 | General | Remove reference to R-10 advisory committee vacancies, as there are no vacancies on the R-10 advisory committee. | Revised. |
| 125 | General | Confirm that the approximately \$25,000 shown in the County budget as flowing through the County (CSA R-4) to the Town of Moraga are the only property taxes received by the CSA. | Confirmed. Property taxes collected by CSA R-4 and passed through to the Town of Moraga are only collected in the unincorporated portions of the CSA, located to the south and southeast of the Town. Revenues collected by CSA R-4 are used to supplement the Town's parks and recreation budget. The \$26,898 collected by CSA R-4 in FY 07-08 represented approximately 4% of the Town's park and recreation budget. |
| 126 LAFCO Meeting April 21, 2010 | General | Cemetery district names do not correspond to their service areas. It is recommended that the districts consider changing their name to more accurately reflect the communities served. | Noted. |
| 127 LAFCO Meeting April 21, 2010 | General | Follow-up with the City of Pittsburg is needed to discuss possible joint-use arrangements between ARPD and the City. | Noted. |
| 128 ALCD, Primo Facchini April 27, 2010 | p. 230 | ALCD boundary was formed according to the boundaries of the Lafayette, Walnut Creek and Danville Unified School Districts at the time. | Updated text to include this information. |

Log of Comments

Public Review Draft Municipal Service Review: Parks and Cemetery Services

| # Commenter | Page/Section | Comment | Response |
|-------------|--------------|--|--|
| 129 | p. 230 | I believe that former taxpayers are only eligible for burial if an interment right was purchased while a resident of the district (see footnote #216). Confirm requirement in Health & Safety Code §9061. | Footnote #216 is specifically concerned with the eligibility requirements of non-residents. Health & Safety Code §9061(c) does not mention the purchasing of an interment right. It states that a person is an eligible nonresident if (1) "the person was a resident of the district or paid property taxes on property located in the district for continuous period of at least five years, a portion of which time period shall have occurred within the 10 years immediately before the person's death," and (2) "The district receives a written request for the interment of the person from a person who is a resident of the district or who pays property taxes on property located within the district, and the person submitting the written request is not a trustee, officer, or employee of the district and is not a funeral director or an employee of a funeral director." |
| 130 | p. 233 | Table 11-1 should include the physical address of the cemetery office. The address is 3285 Mt. Diablo Blvd. | Updated Table 11-1 to include this information |
| 131 | p. 233 | The word "constituents" is more appropriate than "customers." | Updated. |
| 132 | p. 234 | The document states "the District has not conducted a formal review of the adequacy of the endowment care fund to determine if the fund balance will be enough to provide perpetual care to the cemetery facilities." The endowment care fund obligation was only established in 1985, thus there is no money to maintain older interment sites. Determining the adequacy of such a fund is impractical because no funds were collected prior to 1985, so the amount needed to charge present customers would be prohibitively high. | The authors share the district's concerns, and acknowledge the difficult predicament that the agencies face. See comments #53 and #106. The recommendation that the agencies conduct formal planning is intended to highlight the foresight and planning that should occur as cemetery facilities reach capacity. While endowment care funds only exist for post-1985 plots, the District could use property taxes of approximately \$220,000 per year to fund maintenance of older plots. |
| 133 | p. 235 | Change the phrase "sale of cemetery property and land" to "interment rights." | Revised. |
| 134 | p. 237 | Add Memorial Gardens Concord to the list of nearby private cemetery facilities. | Updated text to include this information. |
| 135 | p. 237 | Change "lift gate" to "lift bed." | Revised. |
| 136 | p. 240 | Change language of determination #11 to state that the district is currently participating in the Proposition 1A Securitization Program. | Revised. |
| 137 | p. 241 | The District is concerned about the 21 acres of land within the City of Orinda, and what the implications for the District are of removing these parcels. | In the short term, affected property owners within the City of Orinda may qualify for burial as non-residents under Health & Safety Code §9061. It is recommended that the district consult legal council and/or the California Association of Public Cemeteries for guidance. |