



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

Harold Kelly
Director Ward One

Tony Norris
Director Ward Two

Guy Kay
Director Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director Ward Four

Myrna Abramowicz
Director Ward Five

AGENDA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Monday October 11, 2010 2:00 P.M.
1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559

GENERAL INFORMATION

Agenda items will generally be considered in the order indicated below, except for Set Matters, which will be considered at the time indicated. Agenda items may from time to time be taken out of order at the discretion of the President.

The meeting room is wheelchair accessible. Assistive listening devices and interpreters are available through the District Secretary. Requests for disability related modifications or accommodations, aids, or services may be made to the Secretary's office no less than 48 hours prior to the meeting date by contacting (707) 259-8603.

Any member of the audience desiring to address the District on a matter on the Agenda, please proceed to the rostrum and, after receiving recognition from the President, give your name, address, and your comments or questions. In order that all interested parties have an opportunity to speak, please be brief and limit your comments to the specific subject under discussion. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the President.

State law requires agency officers (Directors and Officers) to disclose, and then be disqualified from participation in, any proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use, if the officer has received from any participant in the proceeding an amount exceeding \$250 within the prior 12 month period. State law also requires any participant in a proceeding to disclose on the record any such contributions to an agency officer.

All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the Board by Board members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the Conservation, Development and Planning Department Office at 1195 Third Street, Suite 210, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except for County holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the Board at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the Board or County staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials which are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code sections 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Public Comment

In this time period, anyone may address the Board of Directors regarding any subject over which the Board has jurisdiction but which is not on today's posted agenda. In order to provide all interested parties an opportunity to speak, time limitations shall be at the discretion of the President. As required by Government Code, no action or discussion will be undertaken on any item raised during this Public Comment period.

3. Set Matters

None

4. Administrative Items

- A. Consideration of and potential approval of Minutes of Board of Directors meeting of September 13, 2010.
- B. Consideration and potential approval of Resolution 10-01 accepting grant of \$211,000 in federal transportation funds to prepare preliminary engineering plans for the Napa Valley Vine Trail.
- C. Consideration and potential action regarding Local Agency Formation Commission draft review and recommendations related to the municipal service review and setting of sphere of influence for the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District.
- D. Policy on when the District would consider taking positions on land use and other discretionary decisions before other legislative issues, and consideration of potential action on request to take position opposing the Redwood City Salt Ponds development proposal.
- E. Consideration and potential action on selecting a process for setting funding priorities for parks and open space funds available through the County Special Projects Fund, as well as updating the District Master Plan.
- F. Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances, donations and grants approved by the General Manager.
- G. Review of the District Projects Status Report.

5. Announcements by Board and Staff

In this time period, members of the Board of Directors and staff will announce meetings, events and other matters of interest. No action will be taken by the Board on any announcements.

6. Agenda Planning

In this time period, members of the Board of Directors and staff will discuss matters for possible consideration at future meetings. No action will be taken by the Board other than whether and when to agendize such matters, unless specifically noted otherwise.

7. Closed Session

- A. Conference with Real Property Negotiator (Government Code Section 54956.8)
Property: APN Nos 015-070-011, -012; 015-080-003, -007; 016-100-015, -016;
016-120-003, -004, -014, -016, -017, -020, -021, -023, -024, -025, -026;
016-140-004, -010, -011, -012, -014
Agency Negotiator: John Woodbury, NCRPOSD General Manager
Negotiating Parties: NCRPOSD and Bournemouth LLC
Under Negotiation: Instructions to Negotiator will concern terms and conditions

7. Adjournment



**Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District**

Harold Kelly
Director Ward One

Tony Norris
Director Ward Two

Guy Kay
Director Ward Three

Dave Finigan
Director Ward Four

Myrna Abramowicz
Director Ward Five

AGENDA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS REGULAR MEETING

Monday September 13, 2010 2:00 P.M.
1195 Third Street, Third Floor, Napa, CA 94559

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Meeting was called to order by President Abramowicz.
Directors Finigan, Kay, Norris, Kelly and Abramowicz were present.

2. Public Comment

None

3. Set Matters

None

4. Administrative Items

A. Consideration of and potential approval of Minutes of Board of Directors meeting of August 9, 2010.

Minutes were approved as presented.
GK-DF-HK-TN-MA

B. Consideration of and potential approval of policies related to district volunteers including insurance, supplies and commemorative items and use of District facilities.

Directors voted to Authorize General Manager to:

1. Purchase supplemental insurance policy covering District volunteers.
2. Provide District volunteers with small value personal items necessary for the volunteer activity or to express appreciation to volunteers.
3. Enter into agreements of up to eight months with volunteer caretakers.

HK-TN-GK-DF-MA

C. Project update for the Napa River Ecological Reserve (oral report)

John Woodbury gave the report.

D. Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances, donations and grants approved by the General Manager.

John Woodbury gave the report. No action taken.

E. Review of the District Projects Status Report.

John Woodbury gave the report with discussions on Napa River Bay Trail, Camp Berryessa, Skyline Park, and River to Ridge Trail.

5. Announcements by Board and Staff

- Director Dave Finigan reported that the BOS will be taking final allocation on special projects funds.
- Director Tony Norris reported that he and Director Myrna Abramowicz attended the Napa- Sonoma Marsh Restoration levee breach at the Eastern Wetlands with Ducks Unlimited and the Department of Fish & Game.
- Director Myrna Abramowicz reported that she spoke at the Mike Thompson Loop Trail dedication in American Canyon.

6. Agenda Planning

7. Closed Session

- A. Conference with Real Property Negotiator (Government Code Section 54956.8)
 Property: APN Nos 015-070-011, -012; 015-080-003, -007; 016-100-015, -016;
 016-120-003, -004, -014, -016, -017, -020, -021, -023, -024, -025, -026;
 016-140-004, -010, -011, -012, -014
 Agency Negotiator: John Woodbury, NCRPOSD General Manager
 Negotiating Parties: NCRPOSD and Bournemouth LLC
 Under Negotiation: Instructions to Negotiator will concern terms and conditions

After the resumption of Open Session, President Abramowicz announced there were no reportable actions taken in closed session.

7. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned to the regular Park and Open Space District meeting of October 11, 2010.

MYRNA ABRAMOWICZ, Board President

ATTEST:

MELISSA GRAY
 District Secretary

Key

Vote: HK = Harold Kelly; TN = Tony Norris; GK = Guy Kay; DF = David Finigan; MA = Myrna Abramowicz

The maker of the motion and second are reflected respectively in the order of the recorded vote.

Notations under vote: N = No; A = Abstain; X = Excused



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: October 11, 2010
 Agenda Item: 4.B
 Subject: Consideration and potential approval of Resolution 10-01 accepting grant of \$211,000 in federal transportation funds to prepare preliminary engineering plans for the Napa Valley Vine Trail.

Recommendation

Approve and authorize Board President General Manager to sign Resolution 10-01, accepting \$211,000 in federal grant funding for the Napa Valley Vine Trail, subject to the Napa Valley Vine Trail Board of Directors agreeing to contribute \$28,000 in matching funds.

Background

The Board on March 16, 2009 entered into an MOU with the Napa Valley Vine Trail Coalition in which the District and the Coalition agreed to work together in funding, implementing and managing the Napa Valley Vine Trail.

The Napa County Transportation Planning Agency earlier this year requested, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has recently included in the draft regional Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), a proposed grant of \$211,000 of federal transportation funds to the District, to prepare plans and specifications for the next phases of the Vine Trail which the Coalition hopes to construct. The federal grant requires a local match of \$28,000. The President of the Coalition will be recommending the Coalition provide the local match; this will be voted on by the Coalition board on October 20th.

The sections of the Vine Trail for which this funding will be used have not been finalized yet. However, it is likely that about 2/3 of the funds will be used to match other funding from Napa County to study the trail segment between the Town of Yountville and the City of Napa just west of the Wine Train tracks. Two other segments for which the remainder of the funding would likely be used include either the section between the Oat Hill Mine Trail and Bothe-Napa State Park, or the remaining gaps within the City of Napa. The final determination of which sections to focus on will be based on which of the city/county partners are first ready to provide additional matching funds and move forward.

To be included in the final adopted TIP, the Board of Directors must approve the attached resolution.

**Resolution of Local Support
STP/CMAQ Funding
Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District Resolution No. 10-01**

Authorizing the filing of an application for federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and/or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funding and committing the necessary non-federal match and stating the assurance to complete the project

WHEREAS, the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (herein referred to as APPLICANT) is submitting an application to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for \$211,000 in funding from the federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and/or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program for the Napa Valley Vine Trail (herein referred to as PROJECT) for the MTC Resolution, No. 3925, New Federal Surface Transportation Act (FY 2009-10, FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12) Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ Program: Project Selection Criteria, Policy, Procedures and Programming (herein referred to as PROGRAM); and

WHEREAS, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA) (Public Law 109-59, August 10, 2005) authorized the Surface Transportation Program (23 U.S.C. § 133) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 U.S.C. § 149) through September 30, 2009; and

WHEREAS, SAFETEA has been extended through December 31, 2010 pursuant to Public Law 111-147, March 18, 2010 and may be subsequently extended pending enactment of successor legislation for continued funding; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to SAFETEA, and the regulations promulgated thereunder, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive federal Surface Transportation Program and/or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (STP/CMAQ) funds for a project shall submit an application first with the appropriate Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), for review and inclusion in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the MPO for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay region; and

WHEREAS, MTC has adopted a Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) that sets out procedures governing the application and use of STP/CMAQ funds; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT is an eligible project sponsor for STP/CMAQ funds; and

WHEREAS, as part of the application for STP/CMAQ funding, MTC requires a resolution adopted by the responsible implementing agency stating the following:

- 1) the commitment of necessary local matching funds of at least 11.47%; and
- 2) that the sponsor understands that the STP/CMAQ funding is fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be expected to be funded with additional STP/CMAQ funds; and
- 3) that the project will comply with the procedures specified in Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised); and

- 4) the assurance of the sponsor to complete the project as described in the application, and if approved, as included in MTC's TIP; and
- 5) that the project will comply with all the project-specific requirements as set forth in the PROGRAM.; and
- 6) that the project (transit only) will comply with MTC Resolution No. 3866, which sets forth the requirements of MTC's Transit Coordination Implementation Plan to more efficiently deliver transit projects in the region.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the APPLICANT is authorized to execute and file an application for funding for the PROJECT under the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) of SAFETEA, any extensions of SAFETEA or any successor legislation for continued funding ; and be it further

RESOLVED that the APPLICANT by adopting this resolution does hereby state that:

1. APPLICANT will provide \$28,000 in non-federal matching funds; and
2. APPLICANT understands that the STP/CMAQ funding for the project is fixed at the MTC approved programmed amount, and that any cost increases must be funded by the APPLICANT from other funds, and that APPLICANT does not expect any cost increases to be funded with additional STP/CMAQ funding; and
3. APPLICANT understands the funding deadlines associated with these funds and will comply with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, as revised); and
4. PROJECT will be implemented as described in the complete application and in this resolution and, if approved, for the amount programmed in the MTC federal TIP; and
5. APPLICANT (for a transit project only) agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC's Transit Coordination Implementation Plan as set forth in MTC Resolution 3866; and
6. APPLICANT and the PROJECT will comply with the requirements as set forth in the program; and therefore be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor of STP/CMAQ funded projects; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for STP/CMAQ funds for the PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT authorizes its General Manager or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for STP/CMAQ funding for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application; and be it further

RESOLVED that the MTC is requested to support the application for the PROJECT described in the

resolution and to include the PROJECT, if approved, in MTC's TIP.

Approved and adopted the ____th day of October, 2010.

Myrna Abramowicz,
NCRPOSD President

Ayes:

Noes:

ATTEST:

Absent:

District Secretary

<p>APPROVED AS TO FORM Office of County Counsel</p> <p>By: (By E-signature) _____</p> <p>Date: _____</p>

<p>APPROVED BY THE NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS</p> <p>Date: _____</p> <p>Processed by: _____</p> <p>District Secretary</p>
--



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: October 11, 2010
Agenda Item: 4.C
Subject: Consideration and potential action regarding Local Agency Formation Commission draft review and recommendations related to the municipal service review and setting of sphere of influence for the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District.

Recommendation

Discuss draft report prepared by the Local Agency Formation Commission and, if desired, approve comments for submittal to the Commission

Background

At its October 4, 2010 meeting the Local Agency Formation Commission received a draft report from their staff regarding the District's first municipal service review and setting of a sphere of influence for the District. The Commission discussed the report, asked a few questions of the District General Manager, and continued the item to their December meeting for final consideration and action.

Staff believes the draft report fairly and comprehensively presents the District's current status and record, and agrees with the recommendations in the report, including primarily the recommendation that the sphere of influence be set to be coterminous with the District's jurisdiction (e.g., all of Napa County).

If the Directors would like to request any changes in the draft report or in the recommendations, these should be discussed and voted on at this meeting, so there is sufficient time for LAFCO staff to respond/incorporate into the report.



Local Agency Formation Commission
LAFCO of Napa County

1700 Second Street, Suite 268
Napa, California 94559
Telephone: (707) 259-8645
Facsimile: (707) 251-1053
<http://napa.lafco.ca.gov>

October 4, 2010
Agenda Item No. 8b (Discussion)

September 28, 2010

TO: Local Agency Formation Commission

FROM: Keene Simonds, Executive Officer
Brendon Freeman, Analyst

SUBJECT: Concurrent Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence Establishment for Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District
The Commission will receive a draft report from staff representing the agency's scheduled municipal service review and sphere of influence establishment for the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District. The draft report is being presented to the Commission for discussion in anticipation of future action.

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 directs Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) to review and update each local agency's sphere of influence every five years as needed. Spheres are planning tools used by LAFCOs to demark the territory representing the affected agency's appropriate future service area and jurisdictional boundary within a specified time period. All jurisdictional changes and outside service extensions must be consistent with the affected agencies' spheres with limited exceptions. Sphere determinations may also lead LAFCOs to take other actions under their authority. LAFCOs must inform their sphere determinations by preparing municipal service reviews to consider the level, range, and need for governmental services within their county jurisdiction.

A. Discussion

In accordance with LAFCO of Napa County's ("Commission") adopted study schedule, staff has prepared a draft report representing the agency's scheduled municipal service review and sphere of influence establishment for the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (NCRPOSD). The draft report represents the Commission's first evaluation of NCRPOSD; the District was formed in 2006 through special legislation which included an exemption from Commission review and approval. The draft report is organized into two principal sections. The first section is an executive summary that includes determinations making statements with respect to each factor required for consideration as part of the municipal service review and sphere establishment processes. The second section provides a comprehensive review of NCRPOSD in terms of its formation and development, relevant growth trends, organizational structure, municipal service provision, and financial standing.

Juliana Inman, Chair
Councilmember, City of Napa

Lewis Chilton, Commissioner
Councilmember, Town of Yountville

Joan Bennett, Alternate Commissioner
Councilmember, City of American Canyon

Bill Dodd, Vice-Chair
County of Napa Supervisor, 4th District

Brad Wagenknecht, Commissioner
County of Napa Supervisor, 1st District

Mark Luce, Alternate Commissioner
County of Napa Supervisor, 2nd District

Brian J. Kelly, Commissioner
Representative of the General Public

Gregory Rodeno, Alternate Commissioner
Representative of the General Public

Keene Simonds
Executive Officer

B. Summary

NCRPOSD is an independent special district formed in 2006 and authorized to provide a broad range of municipal services relating to public park and open space services in Napa County. The attached draft report concludes NCRPOSD has generally established adequate administrative, service, and financial capacities to provide an appropriate level of public park and open space services within Napa County. These capacities appear relatively sufficient to continue providing effective services in the near term based on local needs and conditions. The draft report notes the adequacy of these capacities is predicated on NCRPOSD's ability to maintain its current funding relationship with the County, which currently covers all District operating costs. NCRPOSD's capacity to meet its increasing service commitments is also significantly dependent on maintaining and expanding volunteer resources.

Based on the information analyzed in the municipal service review, the draft report recommends establishing NCRPOSD's sphere to be coterminous with its jurisdictional boundary and include all incorporated and unincorporated lands in Napa County.

C. Commission Review

Staff will provide a brief verbal summary of the draft report and highlight key policy and service related issues at the October 4, 2010 meeting. Commissioners are encouraged to provide feedback to staff on the scope and contents of the draft report. This may include requesting additional analysis. Staff respectfully requests the Commission also allow for public comments on the draft report given a public review period was initiated on September 27, 2010 and extends through October 25, 2010. Unless otherwise directed, staff anticipates presenting a final report, with or without revisions, to the Commission for consideration at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Attachments:

- 1) Draft Report

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF NAPA COUNTY

**NAPA COUNTY REGIONAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE DISTRICT:
MUNICIPAL SERVICE REVIEW/SPHERE OF INFLUENCE ESTABLISHMENT**

**Draft Report
October 2010**

Prepared by:

LAFCO of Napa County
1700 Second Street, Suite 268
Napa, California 94559
<http://napa.lafco.ca.gov>

Committed to serving the citizens and government agencies of its jurisdiction by encouraging the preservation of agricultural lands and open-space and coordinating the efficient delivery of municipal services.

Juliana Inman, Chair, City Member
Bill Dodd, Vice Chair, County Member
Lewis Chilton, Commissioner, City Member
Brian J. Kelly, Commissioner, Public Member
Brad Wagenknecht, Commissioner, County Member
Joan Bennett, Alternate Commissioner, City Member
Mark Luce, Alternate Commissioner, County Member
Gregory Rodeno, Alternate Commissioner, Public Member

Keene Simonds, Executive Officer
Jacqueline Gong, Commission Counsel
Brendon Freeman, Analyst
Kathy Mabry, Commission Secretary



This page has been left intentionally blank for photocopying

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	
A. Local Agency Formation Commissions.....	5
B. Municipal Service Reviews.....	5
C. Sphere of Influence Establishments.....	5
D. Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District.....	6
II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
A. Municipal Service Review.....	9
Growth and Population Projections.....	9
Present and Planned Capacity of Public Facilities.....	10
Financial Ability of Agencies to Provide Service.....	10
Status and Opportunities for Shared Facilities.....	11
Accountability for Community Service Needs.....	11
Relationship with Regional Growth Goals and Policies.....	11
B. Sphere of Influence Establishment.....	11
Present and Planned Land Uses.....	12
Present and Probable Need for Public Facilities and Services.....	12
Present Capacity and Adequacy of Public Facilities and Services.....	12
Existence of Social or Economic Communities of Interest.....	12
III. AGENCY REVIEW	
A. Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District.....	13
1.0 Overview.....	13
2.0 Formation and Development.....	13
2.1 Formation.....	13
2.2 Development.....	14
3.0 Adopted Commission Boundaries.....	15
4.0 Population and Growth.....	15
4.1 Population Trends.....	15
4.2 Growth Trends Relating to Public Parks and Open Space....	16
5.0 Organizational Structure.....	17
5.1 Governance.....	17
5.2 Administration.....	17
6.0 Municipal Services.....	17
6.1 Public Recreational Facilities.....	18
6.2 Public Resource Preservation and Restoration.....	20
7.0 Financial.....	21
7.1 Assets, Liabilities, and Equity.....	21
7.2 Revenue and Expense Trends.....	23
7.3 Current Budget.....	23

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	
A. Municipal Service Review.....	25
B. Sphere of Influence Establishment.....	25
V. SOURCES	27
APPENDICES	No.
Projects Identified Under NCRPOSD Master Plan.....	A
Government Code Section 56430.....	B
Government Code Section 56425.....	C
Commission Policy on Municipal Service Reviews.....	D
FIGURES	Page
Map of Proposed Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District Sphere of Influence Establishment.....	7

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Local Agency Formation Commissions

Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) are political subdivisions of the State of California and are responsible for administering a section of Government Code now known as the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (“CKH”). LAFCOs are located in all 58 counties and are delegated regulatory responsibilities to coordinate the logical formation and development of local governmental agencies and services. Specific regulatory duties include approving or disapproving proposals involving the establishment, expansion, and reorganization of cities and special districts. LAFCOs inform their regulatory duties through a series of planning activities, namely preparing municipal service reviews and sphere of influence updates. Underlying LAFCOs regulatory and planning responsibilities is fulfilling specific objectives outlined by the California Legislature under Government Code (G.C.) Section 56301, which states:

“Among the purposes of the commission are discouraging urban sprawl, preserving open-space and prime agricultural lands, efficiently providing governmental services, and encouraging the orderly formation and development of local agencies based upon local conditions and circumstances.”

LAFCOs are generally governed by a five-member commission comprising two county supervisors, two city councilmembers, and one representative of the general public.¹ Members must exercise their independent judgment on behalf of the interests of residents, landowners, and the public as a whole. LAFCOs have sole authority in administering its legislative responsibilities and its decisions are not subject to an outside appeal process.

B. Planning Responsibilities

A central planning responsibility for LAFCO is the determination of a sphere of influence (“sphere”) for each city and special district under its jurisdiction.² LAFCO establishes, amends, and updates spheres to designate the territory it believes represents the appropriate and probable future service area and jurisdictional boundary of the affected agency. All jurisdictional changes, such as annexations and detachments, must be consistent with the spheres of the affected local agencies with limited exceptions.³ LAFCO must review and update each local agency’s sphere every five years as necessary.

“Sphere” means a plan for the probable physical boundary and service area of a local agency, as determined by LAFCO.

There are several important and distinct policy considerations underlying sphere determinations. For example, inclusion within a multiple-purpose agency’s sphere, such as a city or community services district, generally indicates an expectation by LAFCO the territory should be developed for urban uses. Alternatively, inclusion of territory within a limited-purpose agency’s sphere, such as a hospital or mosquito abatement district, may be

¹ Several LAFCOs also have two members from independent special districts within their county. Each category represented on LAFCO has one alternate member.

² LAFCOs have been required to determine spheres for cities and special districts within its jurisdiction since 1972.

³ A prominent exception involves land owned and used by cities for municipal purposes that are non-contiguous to their incorporated boundary (G.C. Section 56742).

intended to support both urban and non-urban uses. It is also important to note inclusion within a sphere does not provide any guarantees the territory will be annexed. Jurisdictional changes must be considered on their own merits with particular attention focused on assessing whether the timing of the proposed action is appropriate.

Sphere determinations are guided by preparing written statements addressing four specific planning factors that range from evaluating current and future land uses to the existence of pertinent communities of interest. The intent in preparing the written statements is to focus LAFCO in addressing the core principles underlying the sensible development of each local agency consistent with the anticipated needs of the affected community. Sphere determinations may also lead LAFCO to take other actions under its authority. This may include initiating the formation, consolidation, or dissolution of local agencies. Further, an increasingly important role involving sphere determinations relates to their use by regional councils of governments as planning areas in allocating housing need assignments for counties and cities, which must be addressed by the agencies in their housing elements.

As referenced, LAFCOs inform their sphere determinations by preparing municipal service reviews to evaluate the level and range of governmental services provided in the region. Municipal service reviews vary in scope and can focus on a particular agency, service, or geographic area as deemed appropriate. Municipal service reviews culminate with LAFCO making determinations on a number of governance-related factors. This includes addressing infrastructure needs or deficiencies, growth and population projections, and financial standing. LAFCOs may also consider other factors if required by local policy. LAFCOs must complete the municipal service review process prior to making related sphere determinations.

A municipal service review is a comprehensive evaluation of the availability and adequacy of one or more services within a defined area or of the range and level of services provided by one or more agencies.

D. Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District



This report represents LAFCO of Napa County's ("Commission") scheduled municipal service review and sphere establishment of the Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District (NCRPOSD). The report represents the first comprehensive study on NCRPOSD given the District was formed through special legislation in 2006. The report has been prepared in a manner consistent with the Commission's *Policy on Municipal Service Reviews* and is organized into two principal sections. The first section is an executive summary that includes determinations addressing the factors required for both the municipal service review and sphere establishment mandates. The second section provides a comprehensive review of NCRPOSD in terms of its formation and development, population and growth, organizational structure, municipal service provision, financial standing, and regional comparisons. Standard service indicators are incorporated into the review to help contextualize and evaluate service levels.

Figure One

Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District



Legend

-  Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District Jurisdictional Boundary
-  Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District Proposed Sphere of Influence



Not to Scale
 August 16, 2010
 Prepared by BE



LAFCO of Napa County
 1700 Second Street, Suite 268
 Napa, California 94559
<http://napa.lafco.ca.gov>

This page has been left intentionally blank for photocopying

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Municipal Service Review

The municipal service review indicates NCRPOSD has generally established adequate administrative, service, and financial capacities to provide an appropriate level of public park and open space services within Napa County. These capacities appear relatively sufficient to continue providing effective services in the near term based on local needs and conditions. Importantly, the adequacy of these capacities is predicated on NCRPOSD's ability to maintain its current funding relationship with the County, which currently covers all District operating costs. NCRPOSD's capacity to meet its increasing service commitments is also significantly dependent on maintaining and expanding volunteer resources.

The following statements address the factors prescribed for consideration as part of the municipal service review process under G.C. Section 56430. These statements are based on information collected and analyzed in the agency review provided on pages 13 to 23.

1. With respect to growth and population projections for the affected area, the Commission determines:

- a) NCRPOSD's estimated resident population parallels projections for Napa County and has modestly increased on average by 0.8% annually since formation rising from an estimated 133,448 to 138,917.
- b) It is reasonable to assume the current rate of resident population growth in Napa County will decline by one-third over the next five years. This assumption is consistent with recent demographic estimates prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments, which projects Napa County's population will increase by 0.5% annually resulting in a population of 142,425 by 2015.
- c) Public park and open space growth serves as a key service indicator for NCRPOSD as it relates to addressing current and future demands given its statutorily-defined duties and powers. All five cities in Napa County own and operate public parks and open space ranging from intensive to passive uses. Importantly, it is assumed NCRPOSD and the cities have a shared customer base with regards to providing public park and open space services.
- d) Local public park and open space growth by the five cities of Napa County has been relatively minimal as total acreage has increased from 922.8 to 945.8, representing a 2.5% change over the last five years. This minimal growth is attributed to the recent downturn in the national economy and entirely limited to projects undertaken within the City of American Canyon.
- e) NCRPOSD has made a measureable contribution in increasing public park and open space growth in Napa County since its formation. In all, NCRPOSD has added over 300 acres of public park and open space lands highlighted by the opening of the Oat Hill Mine Trail, establishing the Berryessa Vista Wilderness Park, and assuming management responsibilities for the Napa River Ecological Reserve. This amount exceeds the combined park and open space growth of the five cities by 13 to 1.

2. With respect to present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs and deficiencies, the Commission determines:

- a) NCRPOSD's current public facilities are limited to two distinct properties totaling close to 900 acres in size and under development as Berryessa Wilderness Park and Moore Creek Park. NCRPOSD is also under contract with other governmental agencies to manage Oat Hill Mine Trail and Napa River Ecological Reserve.
- b) The ability of NCRPOSD to adequately operate and maintain current and planned public facilities and services is largely dependent on volunteer resources given its present and planned organizational capacity.
- c) In addition to maintaining an adequate volunteer base, NCRPOSD's ability to expand park and open space services is dependent on external revenue streams, namely grants, donations, and annual contributions from the County of Napa.
- d) NCRPOSD should establish regular visitor counts. These counts will establish baseline information with regard to the present demand for services while informing NCRPOSD in allocating current and future resources consistent with the preferences of constituents.

3. With respect to the financial ability of agency to provide services, the Commission determines:

- a) The current ability of NCRPOSD to maintain present and future operating services is entirely dependent on discretionary funds provided by the County of Napa. This discretionary funding appears increasingly vulnerable given the current structural imbalance within the County's General Fund through 2015.
- b) NCRPOSD's current financial structure is unique for a special district given it relies on various forms of outside contributions to support capital and operational expenses rather than collecting taxes, assessments, or user fees.
- c) NCRPOSD has successfully increased its unrestricted/undesignated fund balance over each fiscal year since formation with the balance currently totaling \$88,773. This amount provides NCRPOSD sufficient liquidity to cover over four months of operating expenses and demonstrates prudent financial management.
- d) Management for NCRPOSD has proven adept at obtaining grant funding through various statewide and local programs to finance several land acquisitions and trail improvements totaling over \$4.7 million. The ability to draw on outside funding helps economize NCRPOSD's resources in providing cost effective public park and open space services.
- e) The absence of long-term debt coupled with positive operating margins advantageously positions NCRPOSD to potentially raise new capital through bonded debt at favorable interest rates.

4. With respect to the status and opportunities for shared facilities, the Commission determines:

- a) NCRPOSD's services are largely oriented towards addressing recreational and open space policies codified in the County General Plan. This orientation creates a prescriptive working relationship in which NCRPOSD works closely with the County in identifying and implementing projects of shared interest and benefit.

5. With respect to accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure operational efficiencies, the Commission determines:

- a) NCRPOSD is governed by a responsive and dedicated board and staff. These characteristics enhance accountability and cultivate positive working relationships with members of the public and other local agencies.
- b) NCRPOSD's current organizational capacity is largely supported by volunteers and highlights a premium on the District providing tangible services to meet the preferences and demands of its constituents.
- c) NCRPOSD's organizational structure as an independent special district is appropriate given the District's legislative authority to provide public park and open space services for the benefit of all citizens in Napa County. This structure, nonetheless, is distinct from NCRPOSD's funding and policy orientations, which are largely deferential to the County of Napa.
- d) A review of reorganization options does not appear warranted at this time. NCRPOSD has made significant contributions and investments in elevating public park and open space services in a limited period of time.
- e) Future municipal service reviews should consider NCRPOSD's ability to establish more reliable and independent sources of operating revenues as a key preset to evaluating reorganization options.

6. With respect to the relationship with regional growth goals and policies, the Commission determines:

- a) NCRPOSD serves an integral role in developing and implementing recreational and open space policies codified in the County of Napa General Plan.

B. Sphere of Influence Establishment

It is necessary to establish a sphere for NCRPOSD to demark the District's appropriate service boundary consistent with its available and planned capacities. Based on the information collected and analyzed in the municipal service review, staff believes designating the sphere to include all incorporated and unincorporated lands within Napa County is appropriate. This designation would parallel NCRPOSD's jurisdictional boundary and reflect a policy determination by the Commission the District can adequately provide the public park and open space services for which it was formed throughout the county. This determination is supported by the following statements.

1. Present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.

The present and planned land uses within the proposed sphere are outlined in the general plans prepared by the six overlapping land use authorities. The exercise of NCRPOSD's public park and open space services support – directly and indirectly – agricultural and open space policies pervasive within these general plans.

2. Present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.

Voters recently affirmed their support and need for public park and open space services within the proposed sphere in approving the formation of NCRPOSD in November 2006. The present and probable need for these types of services is also codified as part of several policy goals and objectives in the County General Plan.

3. Present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide.

The Commission has confirmed through the municipal service review process NCRPOSD has established adequate and effective public park and open space services within the proposed sphere.

4. The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

The proposed sphere reflects social ties existing between NCRPOSD and its jurisdictional boundary which were memorialized by voters in November 2006.

III. AGENCY REVIEW

A. Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District

1.0 Overview

NCRPOSD was formed in 2006 and provides a range of municipal services relating to the operation of public parks and open space in Napa County. NCRPOSD is an independent special district governed by five elected members from the general public. Staffing services are provided by contract through the County of Napa and presently budgeted to fund the equivalent of 2.5 full-time employees. Private contractors are also regularly retained as needed to provide specialized services. NCRPOSD includes all unincorporated and incorporated lands in Napa County and has an estimated resident service population of 138,917. The current operating budget is \$255,300 with an unreserved/undesignated fund balance of \$88,773 as of June 30, 2010.

2.0 Formation and Development

2.1 Formation

NCRPOSD's formation was engendered in the early 1990s when local stakeholders began discussing options to establish elevated public park and open space services in the unincorporated area. Markedly, at the time, Napa County was one of only a handful of counties in California without a county parks department or a countywide special district dedicated to providing public park and open space services. Stakeholder discussions ultimately led the County to seek special legislation to expedite the formation of a parks and open space district in Napa County to include, among other things, an exemption from receiving written approval from LAFCO.⁴ This special legislation was sponsored by Senator Mike Thompson and codified as part of Senate Bill (SB) 1306, which was signed by Governor Pete Wilson and became effective on September 30, 1991.

Despite SB 1306's enactment, the formation of a parks and open space district in Napa County did not immediately follow. An initial formation attempt was presented to voters in November 1992 and accompanied by a second measure aimed at increasing the local sales tax rate to provide funding for the proposed parks and open space district. Successful passage of the two measures was dependent on each action being separately approved. Accordingly, while formation proceedings were approved, the parks and open space district was not formed given nearly two-thirds of voters rejected the proposed sales tax increase.

Interest in establishing elevated public park and open space services in Napa County persisted throughout the 1990s and ultimately led to a second ballot attempt in November 2000. This second attempt, though, differed from the previous effort by proposing an increase to the transient occupancy tax rate to fund certain activities under the supervision of a to-be-created parks department within the County. The measure was also rejected by close to three-fifths of voters.

⁴ Similar exemptions from LAFCO proceedings involving parks and open space district formations had been approved by the Legislature for Marin, Sacramento, San Diego, and Sonoma Counties.

By the mid 2000s, interest in establishing elevated public park and open space services were once again renewed in anticipation of the County preparing an update to its General Plan. The Board of Supervisors responded to the renewed interest by establishing a 16-member advisory committee tasked with studying various options to deliver public park and open space services in the unincorporated area. This included developing a strategy to allocate the County’s proportional share of proceeds associated with Propositions 12 and 40.⁵

In October 2005, the advisory committee completed its review and issued a report to the Board of Supervisors. The report concluded the County lacked the organizational capacity to effectively implement and manage parks and open space projects, and therefore recommended the formation of an independent district. Notably, in support of its recommendation, the advisory committee outlined four specific advantages to forming an independent parks and open space district: (a) maintaining a sustained focus; (b) establishing continuity between various projects; (c) partnering with other stakeholders; and (d) avoiding public concerns relating to eminent domain.⁶ The advisory committee also outlined a strategy to focus initial activities on improving the stewardship of existing publicly-owned open space resources in Napa County. Specific activities identified included providing maps, developing signage, and assuming trail management with initial funding provided by the County. Significantly, the advisory committee envisioned the County supporting the parks and open space district for the first two years while assisting in the development of independent revenue sources. The Board of Supervisors ultimately approved the advisory committee’s recommendation with voters approving formation proceedings by close to a three-fifths amount along with electing five board members in November 2006.

2.2 Development

NCRPOSD’s development was initiated shortly after formation by entering into a staff support agreement with the County. Staff shortly thereafter prepared a master plan to guide NCRPOSD activities through 2013. The master plan incorporates several projects recommended by the advisory committee and is primarily focused on implementing key recreational and open space policies in the County General Plan. All projects identified in the master plan are predicated on achieving four interrelated goals: (a) provide opportunities for outdoor recreation through developing a system of parks, trails, water resource activities, open space, and related facilities; (b) preserve, restore, and protect open space lands, natural resources, and special habitat areas; (c) provide historical and environmental educational programming opportunities; and (d) provide for agency management and interagency partnerships.

Timeline of Events

1992	...special legislation enacted to expedite parks and open space district formation in Napa County
1992initial measure to form parks and open space district with sales tax increase rejected by voters
2000measure to increase hotel tax to fund a County parks department rejected by voters
2003advisory committee formed by the County to study parks and open space options
2006 voters approve measure forming NCRPOSD
2008NCRPOSD adopts master plan

⁵ Proposition 12 (2000) and Proposition 40 (2002) allocated \$1.364 billion and \$1.186 billion, respectively, for additions and improvements to the California State Park system and are proportionally allocated to counties based on population. NCRPOSD received \$0.225 million from Proposition 12 and \$0.885 million from Proposition 40.

⁶ State statute specifically prohibits parks and open space districts from exercising eminent domain powers.

Key projects undertaken by NCRPOSD to date include entering into agreements with the County and the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to assume management responsibilities for the Oat Hill Mine Trail north of the City of Calistoga and the Napa River Ecological Reserve east of the Town of Yountville. Additionally, NCRPOSD recently purchased through grant awards approximately 900 acres of unincorporated land for purposes of developing two passive recreational parks. The first park, Berryessa Vista Wilderness, is located near Lake Berryessa and is open to the public, though access is currently limited to watercraft pending future improvements. The second park, Moore Creek, is located near Lake Hennessey and expected to be open to the public by 2015.

3.0 Adopted Boundaries

NCRPOSD’s jurisdictional boundary was established by ballot and is 791.4 square miles or 506,517 acres in size. It includes all unincorporated and incorporated lands within Napa County. There are a total of 49,804 assessor parcels within NCRPOSD with a combined assessed value of \$27.8 billion. A review of the database maintained by the County Assessor’s Office indicates only 40% of the jurisdictional boundary is developed as measured by assigned situs addresses. The establishment of a sphere is to be determined as part of this scheduled review and is evaluated in detail on page **** of this report.

Category	Jurisdictional Boundary	Sphere of Influence
Total Acres	506,517	TBD
Total Assessor Parcels	49,804	TBD

4.0 Population and Growth

4.1 Population Trends

NCRPOSD’s current resident population is estimated at 138,917 based on demographic information published by the California Department of Finance for Napa County. The resident population overall has risen by 4.1% over the last five years corresponding with NCRPOSD’s formation. This equals an annual increase of 0.8% and comparatively ranks sixth in terms of percentage change among all nine Bay Area counties during the period. Nearly nine-tenths of all resident population growth during the last five years occurred within the cities of American Canyon and Napa.⁷ The following table summarizes past and current resident population projections.

Past and Current Resident Population Projections
(California Department of Finance and LAFCO)

Category	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Annual Change
Population	133,448	134,726	136,276	137,723	138,917	0.8%

⁷ Between 2006 and 2010, American Canyon and Napa’s resident population increased from 14,879 to 16,836 and 76,094 to 78,791, respectively, representing 85.1% of the total population rise in Napa County.

It is reasonable to assume resident population trends in Napa County will decline by one-third over the next five years. This assumption is consistent with recent demographic estimates prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments, which projects Napa County’s population will increase by 0.5% annually through 2015 as summarized below.

Future Resident Population Projections

(Association of Bay Area Governments and LAFCO)

Category	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Annual Change
Population	139,612	140,310	141,011	141,716	142,425	0.5%

4.2 Growth Trends Relating to Public Parks and Open Space

Public park and open space growth serves as a key service indicator for NCRPOSD as it relates to addressing current and future demands given its statutory-defined duties and powers. All five cities in Napa County own and operate public parks ranging from intensive (i.e. playfields) to passive (i.e. walking trails) uses. Importantly, as part of this review, it is assumed NCRPOSD and the cities have a shared customer base with regards to providing public park and open space services.

With the preceding comments in mind, local public park and open space growth by the cities has been relatively minimal as total acreage has increased from 922.8 to 945.8, representing a 2.5% change over the last five years. This minimal growth is attributed to the recent downturn in the national economy and limited to projects undertaken within the City of American Canyon. Comparatively, despite the downturn, NCRPOSD has added a total of 306.9 acres of public parks and open space lands during this period highlighted by the opening of the Oat Hill Mine Trail, establishing the Berryessa Vista Wilderness Park, and assuming management responsibilities for the Napa River Ecological Reserve.⁸ The following table summarizes public park and open space growth over the last five years.

Local Public Parks and Open Space Acreage in Napa County

(Source: LAFCO)

City	2006 Acreage	Acreage Per 1,000 Residents	2010 Acreage	Acreage Per 1,000 Residents
American Canyon	55.1	3.7	78.1	4.6
Calistoga	15.7	3.0	15.7	2.9
Napa	800.0	10.5	800.0	10.1
St. Helena	36.0	6.1	36.0	6.0
Yountville	16.0	4.9	16.0	4.9
Special District				
NCRPOSD	0.0	0.0	306.9	2.2

⁸ NCRPOSD has recently assumed the County’s joint-management agreement with DFG to assist in restoration work and operate the existing public trails and related accommodations in the project site.

5.0 Organizational Structure

5.1 Governance

NCRPOSD is organized under the Public Resources Code §5500 to 5595 and is known as the Regional Park, Park and Open Space, and Open Space District Law. This legislation was originally established in 1933 with the intent of providing local communities organizational alternatives in preserving, improving, and protecting park, wildlife, open space, and beach lands. Special districts under this legislation generally have broad authority to construct, improve, operate, and maintain a system of public parks, playgrounds, golf courses, beaches, trails, and natural areas. There are approximately 108 of these types of special districts operating in California.

NCRPOSD's governing body is comprised of an independently elected five-member board of directors ("Board") representing the five supervisorial wards. Board terms are four years with all five current members having been originally elected at the time of formation. The Board is responsible for annually electing a President and Vice-President for purposes of serving as the presiding officers.⁹ Elections are based on a registered-voter system. NCRPOSD is statutorily empowered to obtain grants, accept gifts, and collect fees for services provided. NCRPOSD is also authorized to raise revenues through property assessments and taxes subject to voter approval.

NCRPOSD meetings are generally conducted on the second Monday of each month. Meetings are held at the Napa County Board of Supervisors Chambers. A review of agency records for the 2009-2010 fiscal year identifies NCRPOSD held 11 meetings.

5.2 Administration

NCRPOSD contracts with the County for staff support services. This includes appointing a County employee to serve as an at-will general manager for purposes of administering daily activities. The general manager's principal tasks include identifying park, recreation, and open space conversion opportunities, developing project proposals, obtaining necessary funding for permits, and forming partnerships with other public agencies, non-profit organizations, and community groups. NCRPOSD's contract with the County also provides additional support relating to accounting, legal, and various other administrative tasks. In all, the contracted staff support services provided by the County are currently equivalent to approximately 2.5 full-time employees. NCRPOSD also uses private contractors to deliver specialized project-specific services as needed.

6.0 Municipal Services

NCRPOSD provides a range of municipal services involving the operation and resource-management of public parks and open space in Napa County. These services are divided for purposes of this review into two broad and interrelated categories: (a) public recreation facility development and (b) public resource preservation and restoration. A narrative evaluation of these categories in terms of current and pending services follows.

⁹ NCRPOSD's Bylaws were adopted in 2007 and amended in 2008. The Bylaws state the President shall act as presiding officer of the Board and in that capacity shall preserve order and decorum, decide questions of order subject to being overruled by a four-fifths vote and perform such other duties as are required by these Bylaws or by vote of the Board.

6.1 Public Recreation Facility Development

Current Services

NCRPOSD's current services as it relates to public recreation facility development presently involve three distinct activities comprising a trail, open space preserve, and wilderness park. A summary of these three service activities follows.

- **Oat Hill Mine Trail** is located immediately north of the City of Calistoga and is 8.3 miles in length totaling 9.9 acres. This trail was first developed as a dirt road in the 1890s and overlays the southeast portion of Robert Louis Stevenson State Park. The County maintains an easement underlying the trail, which was originally constructed as part of a mercury mining operation before being abandoned in the 1960s. In April 2007, NCRPOSD entered into an agreement with the County to improve and operate the trail for public use, including providing signage installation, erosion control, and vegetation management.¹⁰ The trail was open for public use in May 2008 and is actively maintained by volunteers. NCRPOSD estimates the trail generates 5,000 visitors annually, although no formal count has been undertaken.
- **Napa River Ecological Reserve** is approximately 73.0 acres in size and located east of the Town of Yountville. The reserve overlays lands owned by DFG and is a protected watershed of the Napa River. NCRPOSD entered into an agreement with DFG in December 2008 to maintain the public portion of the reserve. No formal counts exist with regards to identifying usage.
- **Berryessa Vista Wilderness Park** is an approximate 224.0 acre open space area on the southwest side of Lake Berryessa on land NCRPOSD recently purchased from the Napa County Land Trust in February 2008. Public access is currently limited to watercraft with plans to eventually establish land access via the Lake Berryessa Trail, which is contemplated in the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) redevelopment plans for the area. The estimated cost to develop the park and make related improvements is \$50,000. Grants will be pursued to cover construction costs while volunteers will be utilized for operations.

Pending Services

NCRPOSD is in the process of developing nine additional public recreation facilities comprising six trails and three parks. A summary of these pending services follows.

- **Berryessa Peak Trail** is intended to be approximately 7.0 miles in length along the eastern boundary of Napa County near Lake Berryessa on DFG and BLM lands. NCRPOSD recently obtained a no-cost easement from a neighboring landowner to secure access to the lands from Berryessa-Knoxville Road and is currently negotiating with DFG and BLM to secure no-cost easements for the remaining portion of the trail. Volunteers will be utilized to construct the trail with construction anticipated to begin in late 2010.

¹⁰ The trail is secured through a non-exclusive easement maintained by the County.

- **Lake Hennessey Trail** is approximately 2.7 miles in length located on the north side of Lake Hennessey and is owned and managed by the City of Napa. NCRPOSD is negotiating with Napa to construct and operate an approximate 5.0 mile extension to loop around Lake Hennessey along with staging and picnic areas. Negotiations are on hold pending NCRPOSD completing an environmental review on the extension. The estimated cost to develop the extension and make related improvements is \$60,000. Grants will be pursued to cover construction costs while volunteers will be utilized for operations.
- **Milliken Ridge Trail** is intended to be approximately 10.0 miles in total length along the Milliken Creek watershed on lands owned by the City of Napa. NCRPOSD is currently negotiating with Napa to secure an easement for purposes of developing the trail along with establishing staging and picnic areas. Negotiations are currently on hold pending the completion of the Lake Hennessey Trail extension. The estimated cost to develop the trail and make related improvements is \$1.6 million. Grants will be pursued to cover construction costs while volunteers will be utilized for operations.
- The first phase of **Napa River and Bay Trail** is intended to be approximately 5.6 miles in length between Eucalyptus Drive and Green Island Road along the northwestern perimeter of the City of American Canyon and looping around the former American Canyon landfill site. Nearly half of the first phase is complete and open to the public. (This initial portion of the phase is managed by American Canyon.) NCRPOSD has recently secured an easement from DFG and a use permit from the County for the remaining portion of the second phase with construction anticipated beginning in 2011 with funding provided by a \$1.0 million State grant award.¹¹
- **Rector Ridge/Stags Leap Trail** is intended to be approximately 6.0 miles in total length along the Rector Creek watershed on lands owned by the State Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA). NCRPOSD is currently negotiating with DVA to secure an easement agreement for purposes of developing the trail along with establishing staging areas. There is no current timetable for beginning construction due to ongoing negotiations. The estimated cost to develop the trail and make related improvements is \$1.1 million. Grants will be pursued to cover construction costs while volunteers will be utilized for operations.
- **Vine Trail** is intended to be approximately 44.0 miles in total length generally along State Highway 29 between the Vallejo Ferry Terminal and the City of Calistoga. NCRPOSD has recently entered into an agreement with the non-profit Vine Train Coalition to partner in planning, funding, and operating the project. The estimated cost to develop the trail and make related improvements ranges from \$34.0 to \$49.0 million. Grants and private donations will be pursued to cover construction and operational costs.

¹¹ The remaining two phases of the Napa River and Bay Trail will extend further north connecting Green Island Road to Napa Pipe. There is no current timetable for these two phases.

- **Berryessa Estates Park** is intended to be approximately 480.0 acres in size located adjacent to the unincorporated Berryessa Estates community on land owned by BLM. NCRPOSD has recently applied to BLM for a no-fee transfer of the land given its surplus designation by the federal government. The estimated cost to develop the park and make related improvements is \$50,000. Grants will be pursued to cover construction costs while volunteers will be utilized for operations.
- **Camp Berryessa Park** is intended to be approximately 30.0 acres in size located along a former Boy Scout recreational site on the northwest side of Lake Berryessa north of Putah Creek on Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) land. NCRPOSD has recently prepared an agreement for review by BOR to construct and operate a public park focusing on camping-related accommodations. An accompanying environmental document is currently under preparation. The estimated cost to develop the park and make related improvements is \$1.7 million. Grants will be pursued to cover construction costs while volunteer camp hosts will be utilized for on-site monitoring and camp fees will pay for additional operations.
- **Moore Creek Park** is intended to be approximately 680.0 acres in size north of Chiles and Pope Valleys on land NCRPOSD purchased in December 2008. NCRPOSD is currently preparing a use permit application for public recreational use and camping facilities on the land. The estimated cost to develop the park and make related improvements is approximately \$500,000. Grants have been awarded to cover construction costs while volunteers, including resident volunteer caretakers, will be utilized for the majority of operations.

6.2 Public Resource Preservation and Restoration

Current Services

NCRPOSD currently provides public preservation and restoration related services to two project sites. A summary of these current services follows.

- As mentioned in the preceding section, **Napa River Ecological Reserve** is an approximate 73.0 acre area located northeast of the Town of Yountville along the Napa River on land owned by DFG. NCRPOSD has recently assumed the County's joint-management agreement with DFG to assist in restoration work and operate the existing public trails and related accommodations in the project site. Planned improvements include enhancing the trail and improving connectivity within the project site by constructing a bridge over the Napa River. The estimated cost to construct planned improvements is approximately \$13,000. NCRPOSD has recently obtained a \$100,000 grant to fund the first two years of this project. Volunteers will be utilized for operations.

- **Linda Falls** is an approximate 40.0 acre undeveloped area located along Conn Creek in Angwin. The area is anchored by a 30 foot waterfall and on land owned by the Napa County Land Trust. NCRPOSD has recently obtained a no-cost conservation easement in April 2008 from the Land Trust for purposes of providing elevated habitat protection. It is assumed this arrangement will evolve to allow NCRPOSD to eventually establish a public trail. The estimated cost to monitor and provide habitat protection is minimal.

Pending Services

NCRPOSD is in the planning process of establishing public resource preservation and restoration service at two additional project sites. A summary of these pending services follows.

- **South Napa Wetlands** is an approximate 600 acre area located south of the City of Napa at the terminus of Jefferson Street on land owned by the Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (“Flood”). NCRPOSD is currently in discussions with Flood to purchase the site at no cost for purposes of providing habitat management and environmental education opportunities for local students. Annual costs for the project are not known at this time.
- **Vallejo Lakes** is an approximate 1,500 acre area located east of the City of Napa beyond Skyline Park on land owned by the City of Vallejo, approximately 135 acres of which are within Napa County. NCRPOSD has recently initiated discussions to purchase the project site given Vallejo has designated the land as surplus. Acquisition of the project site would protect against private development as well as potentially serve as a trail extension involving Skyline Park. The estimated cost of the property is not known.

7.0 Financial

7.1 Assets, Liabilities, and Equity

NCRPOSD contracts with a private consulting firm to prepare an annual report following the end of each fiscal year summarizing the agency’s overall financial standing. The most recent report was prepared for the 2008-2009 fiscal year and includes audited financial statements identifying NCRPOSD’s assets, liabilities, and equity as of June 30, 2009. These audited financial statements provide quantitative measurements in assessing NCRPOSD’s short and long-term fiscal health and are summarized below.

Assets

NCRPOSD’s assets at the end of the fiscal year totaled \$3.05 million. Assets classified as current, with the expectation they could be liquidated into currency within a year, represented 3.7% of the total amount with the entire amount tied to cash investments with the County Treasurer.¹² Assets classified as non-current represented the remaining amount and are predominately associated with recent land acquisitions.

¹² Current assets totaled \$0.113 million and includes only cash investments.

Category	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Current Assets	18,204	107,743	112,950
Non-Current Assets	0	125,414	2,933,295
Total	\$18,204	\$233,157	\$3,046,245

Liabilities

NCRPOSD's liabilities at the end of the fiscal year totaled \$0.03 million. Current liabilities representing obligations owed within a year accounted for the entire total amount and tied to accounts payable.

Category	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Current Liabilities	0	45,847	32,880
Non-Current Liabilities	0	0	0
Total	\$0	\$45,847	\$32,880

Equity/Fund Balance

NCRPOSD's equity at the end of the fiscal year totaled \$3.013 million. This amount represents the difference between NCRPOSD's total assets and total liabilities and is entirely unreserved and available for any use. The amount is divided between designated and undesignated with the latter representing 97% of the total and tied to capital assets.

Category	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Reserved	0	0	0
Unreserved/Designated	0	125,414	2,933,295
Unreserved/Undesignated	18,204	61,896	80,070
Total Equity	\$18,204	\$187,310	\$3,013,365

NCRPOSD's financial statements for 2008-2009 reflect the District experienced a positive change in its fiscal standing as its overall equity, or fund balance, increased by sixteen-fold from \$0.187 to \$3.013 million. This increase is directly attributed to the purchase through separate grant awards of 673 acres of land with a building as part of its planned Moore Creek Park project. This purchase follows the prior year acquisition of 224 acres of land as part of the planned Berryessa Vista Park project and collectively underlies the significant increase in NCRPOSD's assets over the past two fiscal years.

2008-2009 Financial Statements

Assets	\$3.046 million
Liabilities	\$0.033 million
Equity	\$3.013 million

Calculations performed assessing NCRPOSD's liquidity, capital, and solvency indicate the District is in strong financial health. Liquidity remained high as NCRPOSD finished the fiscal year with current assets more than three times greater than its current liabilities along with 107 days cash sufficient to cover operating expenses.¹³ NCRPOSD's capital also remained entirely intact given it finished with no long-term debt while maintaining a positive operating margin.¹⁴

¹³ NCRPOSD's current ratio was 3.4:1.

¹⁴ NCRPOSD's operating margin was 2.7%.

7.2 Revenue and Expense Trends

A review of NCRPOSD’s audited and pre-audited financial statements identifies the District has maintained positive cash flow since formation as actual revenues have exceeded actual expenses by nearly five to one. Underlying the positive cash flow is increases to NCRPOSD’s grant funding and donations. The following table summarizes total actual revenues and expenses between 2006-2007 and 2009-2010.

Fiscal Year	Actual Revenues	Actual Expenses	Difference
2006-2007	170,591	152,387	18,204
2007-2008	384,485	215,871	168,614
2008-2009	3,213,089	38,802	2,825,087
2009-2010	517,211	508,510	8,701
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$4,285,376</i>	<i>\$915,570</i>	<i>---</i>
<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>203.2%</i>	<i>233.7%</i>	<i>---</i>

7.3 Current Budget

NCRPOSD’s adopted budget for the 2010-2011 fiscal year totals \$1.765 million. This amount represents NCRPOSD’s total approved expenses or appropriations for the fiscal year within its seven established governmental fund units and have matching revenue

2010-2011 Adopted Budget	
Total Expenses:	\$1.765 million
Total Revenues:	\$1.765 million
Difference:	\$0.000 million

amounts. NCRPOSD’s General Fund unit supports day-to-day activities and is budgeted at \$255,300 with over four-fifths of appropriations dedicated to contracted staff costs. All General Fund expenses are covered through a matching grant award from the County. The remaining six governmental fund units pertain to specific projects ranging from Moore Creek to Napa River Ecological Reserve with matching revenue to expense amounts.

This page has been left intentionally blank for photocopying

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

A. Municipal Service Review

The municipal service review on NCRPOSD is a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) given it may reasonably result in a future indirect physical change to the environment. The municipal service review is categorically exempt from further environmental review under Code of Regulations Section 15306. This exemption applies to basic data collection, research, and resource evaluation activities, which do not result in any serious or major disturbance to any environmental resource. This exemption applies to the municipal service review on NCRPOSD given it is strictly for information gathering purposes that may lead to an action which LAFCO has not approved, adopted, or funded.

B. Sphere of Influence Establishment

The sphere establishment on NCRPOSD is a project under CEQA given it may reasonably result in a future indirect physical change to the environment. The sphere establishment is exempt from further environmental review under Code of Regulations Section 15061. This exemption is referred to as the “general rule” and applies to projects in which it can be seen with certainty there is no possibility the action may have a significant effect on the environment. This exemption applies to the sphere establishment on NCRPOSD given it can be seen with certainty the establishment of a sphere will not result in any physical changes to the environment.

This page has been left intentionally blank for photocopying

V. SOURCES

Agency Contacts

- John Woodbury, NCRPOSD Manager

Documents

- NCRPOSD Master Plan 2008-2013, January 2009
- Association of Bay Area Governments, “Projections and Priorities,” 2009
- Napa County Support Services Agreement No. 6781 with NCRPOSD
- NCRPOSD “Audit Report for the Year Ended June 30, 2007,” (Gallina LLP)
- NCRPOSD “Audit Report for the Year Ended June 30, 2008,” (Gallina LLP)
- NCRPOSD “Audit Report for the Year Ended June 30, 2009,” (Gallina LLP)
- NCRPOSD, “Budget for Fiscal Year 2006-2007”
- NCRPOSD, “Budget for Fiscal Year 2007-2008”
- NCRPOSD, “Budget for Fiscal Year 2008-2009”
- NCRPOSD, “Budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010”
- NCRPOSD, “Budget for Fiscal Year 2010-2011”
- NCRPOSD, “Year One Report,” January 28, 2008
- NCRPOSD, “Year Two Report,” January 12, 2009

Websites

- Napa County Regional Park and Open Space District, <http://www.napaoutdoors.org/>
- Association of Bay Area Governments, <http://www.abag.org/>
- California State Controller’s Office, <http://sco.ca.gov/>
- California Department of Finance, <http://www.dof.ca.gov/>

LIST OF PROJECTS UNDER NCRPOSD'S WORK PLAN

Goal A: Provide opportunities for outdoor recreation through the development of a system of parks, trails, water resources, open space, and related facilities

- A.1 Oat Hill Mine Trail Improvements
- A.2 Milliken Creek Trails and Picnic Area Development
- A.3 Camp Berryessa Redevelopment
- A.4 Rector Ridge/Stags Leap Ridge Trail Development
- A.5 Napa River and Bay Trail Phase I Development
- A.6 Napa River and Bay Trail Phase II Development
- A.7 Lake Hennessey North Shore Trail Development
- A.8 Napa River Ecological Reserve Public Access Improvements
- A.9 Newell Open Space Preserve Improvements
- A.10 Lake Berryessa Trail Development Phase I
- A.11 Berryessa Peak and Blue Ridge Public Access Development
- A.12 Berryessa Vista Wilderness Park Development
- A.13 Pope and Putah Creeks Trail Development
- A.14 Skyline Park Improvements Phase II
- A.15 Camp Berryessa to Knoxville Recreation Area Trail Development
- A.16 Napa Crest Trail Development
- A.17 Napa River Access Development
- A.18 San Francisco Bay Trail Completion in Napa County
- A.19 Bay Area Ridge Trail Completion in Napa County
- A.20 Backcountry Camping Facilities in the Palisades Area
- A.21 River to Ridge Trail Encroachment Problem Resolution
- A.22 Moore Creek Trails, Picnic Area, and Camping Facilities Development
- A.23 Napa River Water Trail Development
- A.24 Napa Valley Greenway/Vine Trail Development
- A.25 Henry Road/Milliken Peak Area Trail Development
- A.26 Countywide Trail Network Development

Goal B: Preserve, restore, and protect open space lands, natural resources, and habitat areas

- B.1 Napa River Ecological Reserve Restoration
- B.2 Lake Berryessa Estates Open Space Preservation
- B.3 Berryessa Vista Acquisition
- B.4 Vallejo Lakes Area Acquisition
- B.5 South Napa Wetlands Habitat Acquisition
- B.6 Linda Falls Conservation Easement
- B.7 Palisades Cooperative Management Plan Development

- B.8 Skyline Park Protection and Master Plan Development
- B.9 Moore Creek Watershed Projection
- B.10 Other High Priority Habitats Preservation

Goal C: Provide for recreational, cultural, environmental, and working landscapes education

- C.1 Camp Berryessa Outdoor Education Program Development
- C.2 Napa River Ecological Reserve Environmental Education Program Development
- C.3 Napa River to Ridge Trail Interpretive Path Development
- C.4 Rector Ridge Trail Interpretive Path Development
- C.5 Napa River and Bay Trail Interpretive Path Development
- C.6 South Napa Wetlands Habitat Interpretive Facilities and Programming Development
- C.7 Huichica Creek Wetlands Interpretive Path Development
- C.8 Oat Hill Mine Trail Interpretive Path Development
- C.9 Cedar Roughs Interpretive Materials Development

Goal D: Provides for District management and partnerships

- D.1 Develop District Budget Options for Alternative Levels of Service
- D.2 Develop Public Information Programs
- D.3 Consider Establishing a Non-Profit Foundation
- D.4 Consider Forming District Advisory Committee
- D.5 Establish Partnerships with Public Art, Historical, and Cultural Interpretation Organizations
- D.6 Develop Volunteer Participation
- D.7 Prepare and Adopt District Purchasing and Contracting Policies and Procedures
- D.8 Prepare and Adopt District Policies and Ordinances for Public Use of Facilities
- D.9 Adopt Policies and Develop Partnerships, Sponsorships, and Donation Programs for Use and Promotion of District Facilities
- D.10 Consider Developing District Deputized Ranger Capacity
- D.11 Prepare and Adopt Green Standards for Building and Operations
- D.12 Develop and Implement Cooperative Strategies for Habitat Restoration
- D.13 Update Countywide Inventory of Protected Open Space Lands
- D.14 Update District Master Plan
- D.15 Establish Partnerships with Land Conservation and Public Recreational Organizations and Agencies
- D.16 Prepare and Adopt Habitat Stewardship Guidelines

California Government Code Section 56430

(a) In order to prepare and to update spheres of influence in accordance with Section 56425, the commission shall conduct a service review of the municipal services provided in the county or other appropriate area designated by the commission. The commission shall include in the area designated for service review the county, the region, the subregion, or any other geographic area as is appropriate for an analysis of the service or services to be reviewed, and shall prepare a written statement of its determinations with respect to each of the following:

- (1) Infrastructure needs or deficiencies.
- (2) Growth and population projections for the affected area.
- (3) Financing constraints and opportunities.
- (4) Cost avoidance opportunities.
- (5) Opportunities for rate restructuring.
- (6) Opportunities for shared facilities.
- (7) Government structure options, including advantages and disadvantages of consolidation or reorganization of service providers.
- (8) Evaluation of management efficiencies.
- (9) Local accountability and governance.

(b) In conducting a service review, the commission shall comprehensively review all of the agencies that provide the identified service or services within the designated geographic area.

(c) The commission shall conduct a service review before, or in conjunction with, but no later than the time it is considering an action to establish a sphere of influence in accordance with Section 56425 or Section 56426.5 or to update a sphere of influence pursuant to Section 56425.

(d) Not later than July 1, 2001, the Office of Planning and Research, in consultation with commissions, the California Association of Local Agency Formation Commissions, and other local governments, shall prepare guidelines for the service reviews to be conducted by commissions pursuant to this section.

California Government Code Section 56425

(a) In order to carry out its purposes and responsibilities for planning and shaping the logical and orderly development and coordination of local governmental agencies to advantageously provide for the present and future needs of the county and its communities, the commission shall develop and determine the sphere of influence of each local governmental agency within the county and enact policies designed to promote the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere.

(b) Prior to a city submitting an application to the commission to update its sphere of influence, representatives from the city and representatives from the county shall meet to discuss the proposed new boundaries of the sphere and explore methods to reach agreement on development standards and planning and zoning requirements within the sphere to ensure that development within the sphere occurs in a manner that reflects the concerns of the affected city and is accomplished in a manner that promotes the logical and orderly development of areas within the sphere. If an agreement is reached between the city and county, the city shall forward the agreement in writing to the commission, along with the application to update the sphere of influence. The commission shall consider and adopt a sphere of influence for the city consistent with the policies adopted by the commission pursuant to this section, and the commission shall give great weight to the agreement to the extent that it is consistent with commission policies in its final determination of the city sphere.

(c) If the commission's final determination is consistent with the agreement reached between the city and county pursuant to subdivision (b), the agreement shall be adopted by both the city and county after a noticed public hearing. Once the agreement has been adopted by the affected local agencies and their respective general plans reflect that agreement, then any development approved by the county within the sphere shall be consistent with the terms of that agreement.

(d) If no agreement is reached pursuant to subdivision (b), the application may be submitted to the commission and the commission shall consider a sphere of influence for the city consistent with the policies adopted by the commission pursuant to this section.

(e) In determining the sphere of influence of each local agency, the commission shall consider and prepare a written statement of its determinations with respect to each of the following:

(1) The present and planned land uses in the area, including agricultural and open-space lands.

(2) The present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area.

(3) The present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services that the agency provides or is authorized to provide.

(4) The existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area if the commission determines that they are relevant to the agency.

(f) Upon determination of a sphere of influence, the commission shall adopt that sphere.

(g) On or before January 1, 2008, and every five years thereafter, the commission shall, as necessary, review and update each sphere of influence.

(h) The commission may recommend governmental reorganizations to particular agencies in the county, using the spheres of influence as the basis for those recommendations. Those recommendations shall be made available, upon request, to other agencies or to the public. The commission shall make all reasonable efforts to ensure wide public dissemination of the recommendations.

(i) When adopting, amending, or updating a sphere of influence for a special district, the commission shall do all of the following:

(1) Require existing districts to file written statements with the commission specifying the functions or classes of services provided by those districts.

(2) Establish the nature, location, and extent of any functions or classes of services provided by existing districts.



LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION OF NAPA COUNTY

Policy on Municipal Service Reviews

Adopted: November 3, 2008

I. Background

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 requires the Commission to prepare municipal service reviews in conjunction with its mandate to review and update each local agency's sphere of influence every five years as necessary. The legislative intent of the municipal service review process is to inform the Commission with regard to the availability, capacity, and efficiency of governmental services provided within its jurisdiction prior to making sphere of influence determinations. Municipal service reviews must designate the geographic area in which the governmental service or services are under evaluation. Municipal service reviews must also include determinations addressing the governance factors prescribed under Government Code Section 56430 and any other matters relating to service provision as required by Commission policy.

II. Purpose

The purpose of these policies is to guide the Commission in conducting municipal service reviews. This includes establishing consistency with respect to the Commission's approach in the (a) scheduling, (b) preparation, and (c) adoption of municipal service reviews.

III. Objective

The objective of the Commission in conducting municipal service reviews is to proactively and comprehensively evaluate the level, range, and structure of governmental services necessary to support orderly growth and development in Napa County. Underlying this objective is to develop and expand the Commission's knowledge and understanding of the current and planned provision of local governmental services in relationship to the present and future needs of the community. The Commission will use the municipal service reviews not only to inform subsequent sphere of influence determinations but also to identify opportunities for greater coordination and cooperation between providers as well as possible government structure changes.

IV. Municipal Service Review Policies

A. Scheduling

Beginning in 2008, and every five years thereafter, the Commission will hold a public hearing to adopt a study schedule calendaring municipal service reviews over the next five year period. Public hearing notices will be circulated 21 days in advance to all local agencies as well as posted on the Commission website. The Commission will generally schedule municipal service reviews in conjunction with sphere of influence updates. The Commission, however, may schedule municipal service reviews independent of sphere of influence updates. The Commission may also amend the study schedule to add, modify, or eliminate calendared municipal service reviews to address changes in circumstances, priorities, and available resources.

In adopting a study schedule, the Commission will calendar three types of municipal service reviews. These three types of municipal service reviews are 1) service-specific, 2) region-specific, and 3) agency-specific and are summarized below.

- A service-specific municipal service review will examine particular governmental services across multiple local agencies on a countywide basis.
- A region-specific municipal service review will examine the range of governmental services provided by local agencies within a particular area.
- An agency-specific municipal service review will examine the breadth of governmental services provided by a particular local agency.

B. Preparation

The Commission will encourage input among affected local agencies in designing the municipal service reviews to enhance the value of the process among stakeholders and capture unique local conditions and circumstances effecting service provision. This includes identifying appropriate performance measures as well as regional growth and service issues transcending political boundaries. The Commission will also seek input from the affected local agencies in determining final geographic area boundaries for the municipal service reviews. Factors the Commission may consider in determining final geographic area boundaries include, but are not limited to, spheres of influence, jurisdictional boundaries, urban growth boundaries, general plan designations, and topography.

The Commission will prepare the municipal service reviews but may contract with outside consultants to assist staff as needed. Data collection is an integral component of the municipal service review process and requires cooperation from local agencies. The Commission will strive to reduce the demands on local agencies in the data collection process by using existing information resources when available and adequate. All service related information compiled by local agencies will be independently reviewed and verified by the Commission.

Each municipal service review will generally be prepared in three distinct phases. The first phase will involve the preparation of an administrative report and will include a basic outline of service information collected and analyzed by staff. The administrative report will be made available to each affected local agency for their review and comment to identify any technical corrections. The second phase will involve the preparation of a draft report that will be presented to the Commission for discussion at a public meeting. The draft report will incorporate any technical corrections identified during the administrative review and include determinations. The draft report will be made available to the public for review and comment for a period of no less than 21 days. The third phase will involve the preparation of a final report and will address any new information or comments generated during the public review period and will be presented to the Commission as part of a public hearing.

As noted, each municipal service review will include one or more determinations addressing each of the following governance factors required under Government Code Section 56430 and by Commission policy:

1. Growth and population projections for the affected area. (§56340(a)(1)).
2. Present and planned capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services, including infrastructure needs or deficiencies. (§56340(a)(2))
3. Financial ability of agencies to provide services. (§56340(a)(3))
4. The status of, and opportunities for, shared facilities. (§56340(a)(4))
5. Accountability for community service needs, including governmental structure and operational efficiencies. (§56340(a)(5))
6. Relationship with regional growth goals and policies. (Commission)

C. Adoption

The Commission will complete each scheduled municipal service review by formally receiving a final report and adopting a resolution codifying its determinations as part of public hearing.



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: October 11, 2010
 Agenda Item: 4.D
 Subject: Policy on when the District would consider taking positions on legislative issues, and consideration of potential action on request to take position opposing the Redwood City Salt Ponds development proposal.

Recommendation

- (1) Provide direction to staff regarding whether the District should adopt a policy on the circumstances in which the District will consider taking positions on land use and other discretionary decisions before other legislative bodies.
- (2) Take no position on the Redwood City Salt Ponds development proposal

Background

The District may legally take positions for or against proposed legislative bills, and has done so on various occasions related to state or federal legislation which could have a direct impact on the District. The District may also take positions for or against particular land use or other discretionary permits, but has not to this date done so. It has on at least three occasions asked questions about or commented on locally-proposed projects related to potential direct impacts on the work of the District, but even in those cases has not at least yet taken a position for or against the projects themselves.

Recently, two Directors were asked by opponents of the proposed development of former salt ponds in Redwood City in the South Bay whether the District would take a position in opposition to the project. Information on the proposal was distributed at the last meeting by Director Norris, and Director Kay asked that the Board schedule a discussion of whether and if so under what circumstances the District should consider taking such positions.

Our sister agency, the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, has taken a position in opposition to the project. In taking their action, they noted that while their district had no land use approval authority in this case, the project was within their geographic jurisdiction and could have a major impact on their efforts to preserve important natural resources in the immediate vicinity.

Before considering the Redwood City proposal, the Board should first discuss the circumstances under which the District might consider taking positions on land use or other local discretionary decisions. Factors to consider include (a) is there a direct relationship between the decision and the work of the District; (b) is the decision for a project which is within or outside of the jurisdiction of the District; (c) would having the District taking a position on the project make a difference in the decision; (d) would the effect of the District taking a position on the project justify the time needed

to research, consider and act on the District's position; and (e) would taking a position help or hurt the District in building public support and/or partners for the District).

Staff recommends the District be cautious when it comes to taking positions on land use and other discretionary decisions before other legislative bodies. The proposed development of 1,436 acres of former salt ponds in Redwood City is clearly contrary to the District's general mission of preserving and enhancing important habitats, but the project is located well outside of the jurisdiction of the District and has no direct link to the work of the District. It is also not clear that having the District take a position would have much impact on the project outcome. Absent a compelling District interest, staff recommends the District not take a position on this project.



Midpeninsula Regional
Open Space District

R-10-71
Meeting 10-15
June 9, 2010

AGENDA ITEM 9

AGENDA ITEM

Resolution in Opposition to the Proposed Development of the Redwood City Salt Ponds.

GENERAL MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

Approve Resolution Opposing Development of Redwood City Salt Ponds.

SUMMARY

The proposed development of a 1,436-acre salt harvesting site in Redwood City on the shores of San Francisco Bay within the jurisdictional boundaries of the District runs counter to the need to protect the area's fragile ecosystems. Accordingly, the General Manager recommends that the Board of Directors adopt a resolution opposing the plan.

DISCUSSION

DMB Associates, a developer from Arizona, is proposing to build the largest housing development on the shores of San Francisco Bay since Foster City was constructed 50 years ago. The project, which DMB hopes to start in 2013, is to partly develop and partly restore a 1,436-acre salt harvesting site in Redwood City with up to 12,000 homes for about 30,000 people on land owned by Cargill Salt. Most of the area would be developed with homes, businesses and sports fields, and less than one third, 436 acres, would be restored wetlands.

As the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has pointed out in a letter about the proposal: "San Francisco Bay and its adjacent waters are critically important aquatic resources that warrant special attention and protection" which is perhaps why this project has motivated over 100 current and former elected officials from all nine Bay Area counties and organizations and agencies such as Audubon California, the Sierra Club and the West Bay Sanitary District to communicate their fervent opposition to the plan.

There are several reasons for the District to be concerned that the proposed development, which is within the District's jurisdictional boundary, adjacent to and within the authorized expansion boundaries of the Don Edwards National

Wildlife Refuge and adjacent to the Bair Island Ecological Preserve, runs counter to the need to protect and restore the area's fragile ecosystems:

- Only five percent of the former salt marsh habitat is left and today supports numerous endangered species such as the California Clapper Rail and the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse.
- If the project were to go forward, less than one third of the salt marsh area would be restored, the remaining area would be permanently destroyed.
- The salt ponds are part of the bay and, rather than paved, they should be restored to tidal marsh for wildlife habitat, natural flood protection and cleaner water. The bay's salt ponds provide the best opportunity to restore a portion of the 150,000 acres of valuable wetlands converted to other land uses by previous generations.
- Currently, the bay land in question is zoned as a tidal plain which means that housing is not permitted on this sea-level, bay front property. Tidal plain allows for salt production, parks and other open space uses, not for housing.
- A floodplain at sea level is an inappropriate location for housing during a time of global warming because climate change could lift the bay's water level up to 55 inches by the end of the century.
- No infrastructure currently exists on the shallow salt ponds that dot the area. The proposed development would require the building of 223 acres of paved city streets in addition to transit, sewage and other infrastructure.

The fragile environment of San Francisco Bay and the long-term environmental degradation that can occur from a development of this scale in this fragile environmental context are reasons to oppose the plan and urge that these open space areas remain as open space forever.

FISCAL IMPACT

No fiscal impact is anticipated from the adoption of this resolution.

PUBLIC NOTICE

Notice was provided pursuant to the Brown Act. No additional notice is necessary.

CEQA COMPLIANCE

No compliance is required as this action is not a project under CEQA.

NEXT STEP

If approved by the Board, staff will send the resolution to the Redwood City Council.

Attachment:

Resolution

Prepared by:

Rudy Jurgensen, Public Affairs Manager

Contact person:

Same as above

RESOLUTION 10-21

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MIDPENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT OPPOSING THE DEVELOPMENT OF REDWOOD CITY'S SALT PONDS

The Board of Directors of Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District does resolve as follows:

WHEREAS, a large housing development with up to 12,000 homes for 30,000 people has been proposed on a 1,436-acre salt harvesting site in Redwood City on the shores of San Francisco Bay; and

WHEREAS, over 100 current and former elected officials from all nine Bay Area counties and organizations and agencies such as Audubon California, the Sierra Club and the West Bay Sanitary District are opposed to the plan; and

WHEREAS, the salt ponds are part of the bay and, rather than paved, should be restored to tidal marsh for wildlife habitat, natural flood protection and cleaner water; and

WHEREAS, the bay's salt ponds provide the best opportunity to restore a portion of the 150,000 acres of valuable wetlands destroyed by previous generations.

WHEREAS, the land is zoned as a tidal plain where housing is not permitted; and

WHEREAS, a floodplain at sea level is an in appropriate location for housing during a time of global warming; and

WHEREAS, housing should not be built at sea level because climate change could lift the bay's water level up to 55 inches by the end of the century.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District opposes the development of Redwood City's salt ponds.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we, the Board of Directors of Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District do hereby adopt this resolution this, the 9th day of June, 2010.

* * * * *



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: October 11, 2010

Agenda Item: 4.E

Subject: Consideration and potential action on selecting a process for setting funding priorities for parks and open space funds available through the County Special Projects Fund, as well as updating the District Master Plan.

Recommendation

Approve the outreach and priority-setting process outlined below

Background

The Napa County Board of Supervisors has asked the District to develop a recommendation for how to allocate parks and open space funding within the County Special Projects Fund over the next three years. The amount available to parks and open space will likely be \$600,000 per year. In developing the recommendation, the County asks that (a) projects be selected that are consistent with the adopted District Master Plan, (b) that interested groups and citizens be contacted to get their ideas and input, (c) that criteria and/or performance standards be adopted for setting priorities.

County staff would like the results of the District's deliberations in time to take the District's recommendation, together with recommendations from the organizations representing the other two functional program areas within the Special Projects Fund, back to the Board of Supervisors in December.

A major challenge with carrying out the above request is that we don't know how much money will really be available for new park and open space projects. With the Governor's approval of legislation authorizing local purchase of Skyline Park, making sure there is sufficient funds available for the purchase is an overarching priority. The County currently has about \$930,000 earmarked for the purchase. We will not know for at least six months whether this set-aside is sufficient, or whether other grant funds may be available to supplement County funds.

A related factor to consider is that the District is scheduled to do an update to the Master Plan in 2011.

In light of the above, staff recommends that the District hold a public hearing at its November meeting, where interested groups and individuals are asked to (a) make suggestions for updates and modifications to the Master Plan (principally Section VII, which contains projects listings, and Section VIII, which provides budget and staffing projections; and (b) ask for comments on proposed funding priorities for the next three years.

In order to provide the public with a realistic view of the funding available from the County, staff recommends that as part of the public outreach, a draft recommendation on project and funding priorities be made distributed, with the public asked to focus their comments on whether they agree with the draft priorities or, if not, how they would recommend changing the priorities. If this is agreement, staff recommends the following draft criteria and priorities:

Funding Priority Criteria

- (1) Fund basic District operations to ensure existing properties are adequately maintained, and planning and preparation for future projects continues so the District is able to effectively compete for other grant funds.
- (2) Fund existing County commitments (Moore Creek Park improvements, Skyline Park acquisition).
- (3) Fund any remaining funding gaps in active projects so they can be completed on schedule (Camp Berryessa, Napa River and Bay Trail).
- (4) Fund new projects with priority going to those which are most time-sensitive (e.g., one-time acquisition opportunities; availability of one-time matching funds).

FY 2011-12

- (1) Allocate \$375,000 to the District for administration, planning of projects, and operations.
- (2) Allocate the final installment of the County obligation to fund improvements at Moore Creek Park (estimated to be \$175,000).
- (3) Allocate \$50,000 to the Napa River and Bay Trail, to cover the required local match for \$185,000 in federal transportation grant funds to construct Segments 7&8 of the Napa River and Bay Trail.
- (4) If any of the above projects do not need all of the funds so allocated, they would be available for other high priority projects (including but not limited to Skyline Park acquisition, Camp Berryessa, Napa River and Bay Trail)

FY 2012-13

- (1) Allocate \$450,000 to the District for administration, planning of projects and operations. The increased allocation from the prior year is to cover election costs in the event there are contested races in the three wards whose Director terms are up.
- (2) Allocate the remaining \$150,000, as well as any savings from Item #1 above resulting if one or more of the wards end up not having contested races, to the highest priority projects, based on needs at that time (including but not limited to Skyline Park acquisition, Camp Berryessa, Napa River and Bay Trail, Napa Valley Vine Trail)

FY 2013-14

- (1) Allocate \$400,000 to the District for administration, planning of projects and operations.
- (2) Allocate remaining \$200,000 to the highest priority projects, based on needs at that time (including but not limited to Skyline Park acquisition, Camp Berryessa, Napa River and Bay Trail, Napa Valley Vine Trail)



Napa County Regional Park
and Open Space District

STAFF REPORT

Date: October 11, 2010
 Agenda Item: 4.F.
 Subject: Receipt of report on expenditures, encumbrances, donations and grants approved by the General Manager

Recommendation

Receive the report.

Background

Section III.A (7) authorizes the General Manager to bind the district for supplies, materials, labor and other valuable consideration, in accordance with board policy and the adopted District budget, up to \$10,000 for non-construction purposes and up to \$25,000 for construction purposes, provided that all such expenditures are subsequently reported to the Board of Directors. Section III.A(8) of the By-Laws authorizes the General Manager to apply for grants and receive donations, subject to reporting such actions to the Board of Directors. Pursuant to this authorization, the following information is provided to the Board.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Source / Recipient</u>	<u>Amount</u>
8/30/10	Map printing reimbursement	CJ YIP & ASSOCIATES	\$1.72
9/14/10	Transportation reimbursement	JOHN WOODBURY	\$76.00
9/14/10	Moore Creek supplies reimbursement	JOHN WOODBURY	\$15.70
8/31/10	Moore Creek road grading/repair	COUNTY ROAD DEPT	\$9,048.81
9/14/10	Moore Creek transportation reimbursement	JOHN WOODBURY	\$63.00

Plan of Projects

Status Report for October 11, 2010

Name of Project	Description	Status
Bay Area Ridge Trail Realignment	Amendment to the proposed alignment of the Bay Area Ridge Trail extend north to the Oat Hill Mine Trail	Ridge Trail Board has approved evaluating the amended alignment. District staff is working with the Ridge Trail and other partners to prepare the evaluation. Sonoma County agency staff have prepared an initial analysis of trail alignments on the Sonoma side of the Napa-Sonoma border. District staff is working with two volunteers to prepare the analysis for the Napa County side.
Bay/River Trail -- American Canyon to Napa	An 8+ mile recreational trail between the cities of American Canyon and Napa generally following the Napa River and interior levees of associated wetlands.	Phase One--Euclpytus Drive to Green Island Road Feasibility study completed. Phase one (American Canyon to Green Island Rd) CEQA review and Use Permit done. The contract for a \$1,032,300 California River Parkway Grant has been signed. Agreements between the Waste Management Authority, City of American Canyon and the District for the landfill loop have been signed. The District-DFG Agreement has been signed. The Authority has approved the necessary amendment to the landfill closure permit. DFG expects to complete levee repair work by early September. <u>District staff has issued the RFP to obtain the services of a civil engineering firm to prepare plans and specifications; award of the contract should come to the Board at its November meeting.</u>
Phase Two--Green Island Road to Soscol Ferry Road		Questa has completed the draft PUC permit application for a public crossing of the SMART tracks. SMART, NRCA and the PUC have verbally agreed to allow the railroad crossing; formal concurrence is now being sought. DFG has agreed, subject to further environmental review, to allow the trail to run along the eastern edge of Fagan Marsh. <u>LSA Associates has provided an administrative draft report for biological survey work for this segment; the final report is expected before the end of September, after which the District will meet with DFG and USFWS to discuss environmental issues and potential mitigation requirements.</u> DFG, the Bay Trail Project and the Coastal Conservancy have tentatively agreed on funding to prepare the supplemental environmental analysis for the section of the trail next to DFG's ponds 9 and 10 <u>this work will be handled by Ducks Unlimited on behalf of DFG.</u>
Phase Three--Soscol Ferry Road to Napa Pipe		All permits and permissions have been obtained, and construction bid documents are done. The project is ready to go to construction as soon as funding can be obtained. <u>Funding for this project is included in the draft regional Transportation Improvement Plan, which will be voted on by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in November or December of 2010.</u>
Berryessa Estates	Acquire 480 acres next to Berryessa Estates from BLM at no fee through their Recreation and Public Purpose Act procedure. Would serve as a wilderness park for local residents eventually be the northern trailhead for a trail between Berryess Estates and Pope Canyon.	The District is waiting on BLM to complete their process for the no-fee transfer of this property. CDF and the Pope Valley Volunteer Fire Department have added a proposal to construct a fire substation on a corner of the property. A community meeting with about two dozen attendees was held March 10, 2009 at the Pope Valley Farm Center to get input from and determine level of support in the community. The District has completed the donation to the District of a small, 0.2 acre property that provides critical access to the northeast corner of the property. The District has allowed excess soil from a nearby public project to be disposed of on this property, which saves them money and facilitates the eventual construction of the fire substation; staff is working on a drainage easement to the County to assure the County takes care of the extension of the storm drain under this new fill. CDF crews did extensive fire break work in 2009 to protect the residences next to the BLM land.
Berryessa Vista	Planning and stewardship of this 224 acre wilderness park.	Volunteers working with the District have completed detailed GIS mapping showing all existing roads, creek crossings, vista points and potential campsites. Continuing damage by off-road vehicles trespassing on the property was noted. No further work is anticipated until Lake Berryessa Trail planning is completed by Berryessa Trails and Conservation.
Blue Ridge/Berryess Peak Trail	Obtain right of way and construct trail to provide public access to extensive federal lands on Blue Ridge and to Beryyessa Peak	Obtained donated trail easement from the Ahmann family to close gaps between existing public lands on Blue Ridge. Undertook a reconnaissance of the trail route in December 2008. Based on this reconnaissance, a revised easement description was drafted, approved by the landowner and recorded. Botanical surveys field work needed for CEQA review is complete. At Negative Declaration and Use Permit hearing was approved December 16, 2009 by the County Planning Commission. An Operations and Management Plan has been approved by the property owner and the District. District staff and volunteers have flagged the route of the trail through the Ahmann property. <u>A volunteer trail building work party is scheduled for October 28-31, 2010.</u>
Camp Berryessa	Redevelopment of former Boy Scout Camp into a group/environmental education camp.	MOU with Bureau of Reclamation gave the District an 18 month period to develop a feasibility study for the camp. BOR has completed its cultural survey of the site. The District has completed the feasibility report, and BOR has reviewed and supports the conclusions. The District has prepared a draft land use agreement, which is undergoing review by BOR. The Coastal Conservancy has expressed preliminary support for funding most of the cost of construction for Option A. <u>A combined NEPA/CEQA document is in preparation, and scheduled to be completed before the end of 2010. A grant for \$50,000 to help with construction has been approved by the Mead Foundation. Staff is preparing a \$1.5 million grant/loan request to the State Coastal Conservancy for construction of the camp.</u>

<p>District Non-profit Foundation Organize a non-profit foundation to raise funds for District projects</p>	<p>The District Board has approved the goals, objectives and basic structure for a non-profit foundation to assist the District with fundraising. Board members are contacting potential future members of the foundation governing board.</p>
<p>Lake Hennessey North Shore Trails Would open up several miles of existing dirt access road, and construct approximately 1 mile of new single track trail, into a loop trail system on the north side of Lake Hennessey, and connecting to the planned Moore Creek Open Space Park trail system.</p>	<p>This project is being combined with the Milliken Ridge Trail project for purposes of seeking City of Napa approvals to construct and operate trails on their property. The Napa City Council in November, 2009 directed city staff to work with the District to finalize an agreement for the proposed Hennessey trails. A plant survey of the new section of trail was completed on April 3, 2010. <u>Staff is coordinating with City of Napa staff on the preparation of a draft operating and management agreement and environmental review.</u></p>
<p>Milliken Reservoir Trails and Picnic Area Would construct approximately 3 miles of Bay Area Ridge Trail plus additional feeder and loop trails, along with a staging and picnic area</p>	<p>The feasibility study has been completed, and accepted by the Board of Directors. The Napa City Council in November, 2009 approved city staff recommendation to hold off on the Milliken Reservoir trails project until the Hennessey trail project is up and running.</p>
<p>Moore Creek Open Space Park Development Development of open space park on 673 acres acquired by the District adjacent to City of Napa watershed lands at Lake Hennessey to protect habitat, provide recreational trails, and overnight camping facilities.</p>	<p>Wells at the gate house and ranch house dug, pumps installed and water quality tested, and the gate house well connected up. An agreement for surveying the boundary between the District property and adjacent private property to the east has been signed, but the survey is going slowly; District Counsel has corresponded with the owner's attorney regarding completing the work. Volunteers have demolished a large old shed, constructed a new boundary/pool fence at the ranch house, planted and irrigated 250 willows, oaks and buckeyes to stabilize a section of creek bank; demolished 3 additional decrepid structures, removed thousands of invasive French broom plants, and done a lot of tree pruning and weed removal to reduce fire risk, and hauled off more than 50 yards of trash. Work on a Proposed Negative Declaration, Use Permit application and operating agreement with the City of Napa continues. Contracts for engineering and architectural services were approved in June 2010. <u>The County road crew did extensive drainage improvements to the dirt access road in August and September 2010, including spreading soil donated and delivered without cost from a nearby construction project to raise the height of the road next to the staging area (for improved drainage and erosion control). Water meters were added to the subcreek wells to comply with new state regulations.</u></p>
<p>Napa River Ecological Reserve Restoration Remove invasive plants and restore native vegetaion in the entryway meadow, replace damaged signage and information panels, restorate the interior trail and interpretive elements, and if feasible install a seasonal bridge, using a \$100,000 grant from the State Coastal Conservancy.</p>	<p>The California Conservation Corps completed a first round of mechanical weed removal and installed an all-weather surface on the trail from the parking area to the river levee, in May 2010. In June the CCC did follow up chemical spraying and completed construction of the interpretive path. Staff is continuing to work with local teachers to development curriculum and set up educational field trips for the next school year. <u>Additional invasive weed removal was done by volunteers on two weekends in September 2010.</u></p>
<p>Oat Hill Mine Trail Improvements to first 1/2 mile of trail next to Calistoga</p>	<p>The project is on hold pending resolution of litigation. The judge hearing the legal challenge to the trail in December 2008 denied the substance of the issues raised by the plaintiff. The plaintiff in late April 2009 selected new legal counsel to represent him; this was the third legal counsel he has used on this case. The court case was scheduled to be heard on December 16, 2009, was postponed until February due to the judge's illness, was postponed until March due to plaintiff's illness, and on March 1st in the courtroom the plaintiff fired his attorney and obtained a continuance until June. At the June court hearing the judge threw out the lawsuit for failure of the plaintiff to have an attorney and to pursue the litigation in a timely way. Still remaining to be heard is a cross-complaint by the County which is intended to get judicial approval for a specific surveyed right-of-way. County staff is preparing the necessary survey documents.</p>
<p>Oat Hill Mine Trail Transfer of 40 acre parcel from BLM</p>	<p>The District in 2008 applied to BLM for a non-fee transfer to the District of a 40 acre parcel at Maple Springs on the Oat Hill Mine Trail; this application is pending.</p>
<p>Rector Ridge/Stags Leap Ridge Trail Construction of staging area and 6+ miles of Ridge Trail climbing east from Silverado Trail near Rector Creek.</p>	<p>CEQA on this project was completed several years ago--staff is preparing an update to the Negative Declaration due to the passage of time since the original approval. The project concept has been approved by the District Board, and is being positively viewed by the Veterans Home administration. <u>Veterans Home staff have been having difficulty figuring out what approval process is needed, because of ongoing discussions at the state level about the appropriate roles and future programs for the Veterans Home. District and Veterans Home staff have discussed possible short-terms steps that can be taken to get the project moving.</u></p>
<p>River to Ridge Trail Lot line adjustment to legalize River to Ridge Trail as constructed (it curenly encroaches on private property in two locations)</p>	<p>Deeds accomplishing the adjustment in property boundaries between Syar and the State have been recorded. If the County ends up not being able to purchase Skyline Park, including the area with the River to Ridge Trail, then the County and the state will need to record a new trail alignment easement description.</p>
<p>River to Ridge Trail Correct drainage problems to trail can be used year-round.</p>	<p>Two volunteer work weekends in March and April and two more in May of 2010 were organized by the District to clear brush, improve drainage, and surface about 300 feet of the trail with quarry fines to control problems with mud. About 50 feet of the trail still needs to be surfaced with quarry fines.</p>

<p>Skyline Park Trail Improvements</p> <p>Major volunteer event to reroute and repair trails</p>	<p>Staff is working with SPCA and V-O-CAL to sponsor a weekend work party on October 15-17, 2010 with approximately 125 volunteers to reroute and repair trails experiencing serious erosion problems. SPCA will donate \$1,000 toward expenses.</p>
<p>Skyline Park Facility Improvements</p> <p>Partner-sponsored improvement include a second greenhouse and a covered equestrian arena.</p>	<p>The proposals for a second greenhouse and a covered arena were approved by the Department of General Services and by the County Board of Supervisors. The sponsors of these projects are now raising funds for implementation.</p>
<p>Skyline Park Protection</p> <p>Purchase of Skyline Park from the State</p>	<p>Three past legislative efforts to authorize sale to the County failed due to unrelated disagreements between the state legislature and administration. Separately, the County in September 2009 approved a new park overlay zone and an updated Master Plan for Skyline Park. <u>A fourth legislative effort by Assemblymember Evans in 2010, sponsored by Napa County and supported by the District, was approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor. The next step is for the County and state General Services to agree on an appraisal process for determining the fair market value purchase price.</u></p>
<p>South Napa Wetlands Habitat Area</p> <p>Transfer to the District those wetlands owned by the Napa County flood control district between the Napa River, Highway 29 and Newport Drive for use as habitat and nature-based recreation.</p>	<p>Transfer approved in concept by the flood control district. Park District staff has prepared the first draft of a transfer agreement. The Flood District and staff are continuing to research details related to completing the transaction. Attorney's for the flood district have concluded it would be better from their perspective for the flood district to retain ownership of the property, but to grant an access and habitat restoration easement to the district.</p>
<p>Vallejo Lakes</p> <p>Possible purchase of 1100 acres of surplus Vallejo Water District lands, of which 200 acres are located in Napa County</p>	<p>Staff-level discussions between the District, the Land Trust of Napa County, the County of Solano and the Solano Land Trust indicate a common desire to work together to purchase this property adjacent to Skyline Park. The City Council of the City of Vallejo has officially authorized staff to pursue surplusing of the property. District staff and our partners are continuing to research issues related to the property, including potential public access locations, potential trail alignments, and easements and other encumbrances which affect the property. The State Coastal Conservancy has indicated an interest in assisting with the funding necessary to purchase the property. We are now waiting for the City to complete title research for the property so that an appraisal can be prepared. The surplusing process has slowed down due to new discussions between the City and residents of Green Valley over overall water supply arrangements. The District is working with the American Land Conservancy to find funding for the acquisition.</p>
<p>Vine Trail</p> <p>A Class I bicycle/pedestrian path extending from Calistoga to the Vallejo Ferry Terminal</p>	<p>The District has entered into an MOU with the Vine Trail Coalition to provide assistance as requested by the Coalition in receiving funds, preparing plans and environmental documents, constructing and operating the trail. The District, the Bay Area Ridge Trail, the San Francisco Bay Trail and the Vine Trail Coalition have prepared a joint Case Statement for the combined trail network for fundraising purposes. The District on February 5, 2010 submitted an appropriations request for FY 2011 to Senator Feinstein, and a similar request to Congressman Thompson on February 26, 2010 on behalf of the Vine Trail Coalition. <u>The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has included \$211,000 in the draft Transportation Improvement Plan for FY 10-11 to fund preliminary engineering work on the trail; this will be matched by \$28,000 provided by the Vine Trail Coalition.</u></p>
<p>Wild Lake Ranch</p> <p>Possible joint management of trails, camping and picnic areas through agreement between the Land Trust, which acquired the property.</p>	<p>The District is participating in the development of a strategic plan for the property, together with other public lands in the area, that is being led by the Land Trust of Napa County. The advisory committee has met once, and completed a field trip to inspect the property. The planning process was put on hold due to the freeze in the state bond-funded grant; however, the freeze was mostly lifted in August and the planning process has restarted. A community input meeting was held on March 24, 2010. The Wildlife Conservation Board approved purchasing a \$6 million easement from the Land Trust at its August meeting, this purchase will enable the Land Trust to repay its outstanding loans and start an endowment for managing the property.</p>

Completed Projects**Berryessa Vista Acquisition**

Purchase of 224 acres from the Land Trust of Napa County for use as a public park completed in early 2008 using State Prop 12 funds.

Connolly Ranch

Construction of patio, restrooms and cooking facilities completed in 2008 using State Prop 12 funds.

Oat Hill Mine Trail

The Oat Hill Mine Trail was formally opened in May Of 2008, after a major volunteer work party doing signage installation, brush removal and erosion control.

Linda Falls

Conservation easement accepted in spring 2008 from Land Trust of Napa County to provide additional protection for this 39 acre property, which is owned by the land trust

Master Plan Development

The Master Plan for 2008-2013 was approved in January 2009

Moore Creek Open Space Park

Acquisition of 673 acres in the Moore Creek Watershed completed in December 2008. Trail reroute to remove two stream crossings mostly completed in May 2009. New heater installed in gatehouse in

Napa River Ecological Reserve Improvements

Parking area paved, and rock barrier installed to control vehicular access in 2007. Trash enclosure constructed and entry signs restored by volunteers in 2008. Deteriorated kiosk removed in 2008. The District in July 2008 assumed the County's role in managing the preserve under the joint management agreement with DFG. A new maintenance contract with the non-profit organization Options 3 was started in January 2009. The old deteriorated information kiosk, which had become a serious eyesore, was removed in November 2008.

Napa River Flood Control Easement

Conservation easement accepted by District in 2007 to facilitate Flood District project and grant funding

Newell Preserve Improvements

As part of the arrangement with the land trust on the District's purchase of Berryessa Vista, the land trust was willing to use some of the proceeds from the transaction to fund a well pump and distribution system at the Preserve. However, the first well drilled by the City of American Canyon came up dry. The City has dropped plans for digging any more test wells. Provide on-site water supply for group campground and so cattle can be restricted from access to riparian areas.

River to Ridge Trail Enhancements

Installation of animal silhouettes along the entryway fence illustrating the types of birds and mammals that can be found in the area completed by Eagle Scout candidate in 2008. In November 2008 five Valley Oak trees were planted at the Highway 221 entrance to the trail with the assistance of a volunteer from CNPS.

River to Ridge Trail Entrance Enhancements

A new information kiosk was installed at the entrance in December 2008 as part of a Boy Scout project. Several Live Oak seedlings were donated by CNPS and have been planted at the entrance to improve its appearance.

Skyline Park Improvements Phase I

Erosion control work on Lake Marie Road, and paving of campground loop road, completed in 2007 using State Prop 12 funds.

Skyline Park Concessionaire Agreement Renewal

District staff negotiated renewal of concessionaire agreement on behalf of the County. The renewal involved changes to the fee schedule and amendments to and approval of subagreements with three non-profit partner organizations.