

---

## **2001-2002 MARIN COUNTY GRAND JURY**

---

**TITLE OF REPORT: Special Districts in Marin County**

---

Date of Report: June 14, 2002

Reports issued by the Civil Grand Jury do not identify individuals interviewed. Penal Code Section 929 requires that reports of the Grand Jury not contain the name of any person, or facts leading to the identity of any person who provides information to the Civil Grand Jury. The California State Legislature has stated that it intends the provisions of Penal Code Section 929 prohibiting disclosure of witness identities to encourage full candor in testimony in Civil Grand Jury investigations by protecting the privacy and confidentiality of those who participate in any Civil Grand Jury investigation.

## **SPECIAL DISTRICTS IN MARIN COUNTY**

### **SUMMARY**

**The Grand Jury investigated 34 special districts within Marin County in order to increase public awareness of their existence and operation. Budgets, reserves, board of director's compensation, medical and dental benefits paid to board members, along with travel and conference expense, and number of people employed by each district were reviewed.**

The Grand Jury found that the great majority of the special district boards of directors received compensation of \$100 per meeting for one meeting per month. Only Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District appeared to hold an excessive number of meetings at the maximum allowable compensation of \$198 per meeting. The Grand Jury recommends that special district directors, who receive compensation, restrict their pay to a justifiable level. The Grand Jury further recommends that boards strive to minimize the number of meetings per month.

Of the 34 special districts, seven give medical or dental benefits to board members. Board members are performing a community and public service, and are not salaried. Therefore the Grand Jury recommends that they receive no medical or dental benefits at taxpayer expense.

Thirty-two of the special districts had minimal, if any, travel and conference expense. Only two districts, Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District and Ross Valley #1 Sanitation District had what appear to be unusually high travel and conference expenses. The Grand Jury recommends that travel expenses be kept to a reasonable amount.

The Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District alone utilizes the concept of a "working board" as opposed to a "policy board". The Grand Jury recommends that Las Gallinas drop the concept of a working board in favor of a policy board.

Most districts do not provide the public with easily understood financial statements and analysis of existing and future reserves. Special district financial statements and reserves cannot be evaluated effectively without consistent terminology and formats. Some districts appear to have unreasonably high reserves. The Grand Jury recommends that the County Auditor work with the special districts to develop clear terminology and standardized formats for the reporting of their reserves.

## BACKGROUND

All California Grand Juries received a report from the Little Hoover Commission<sup>1</sup> on Special Districts in California. The Little Hoover Commission is a bipartisan board composed of five public members appointed by the Governor, four public members appointed from the Legislature, including two Senators and two Assembly persons. The Commission undertakes studies of statewide interest and concern and makes recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature. The Little Hoover Commission urged grand juries in the 58 counties to look into the special districts within their counties.

The Little Hoover Commission recommendation coincided with a suggestion to the Grand Jury to undertake an investigation of the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District. Prior Marin County Grand Juries have never undertaken an in-depth study or investigation of special districts within the County.

## METHODOLOGY

The Grand Jury developed and sent out a questionnaire (Appendix A) to all 34 special districts within the County and all 34 responded. Twenty-four districts were also contacted by phone, to obtain information relating to reserve policy and other issues. Two districts were visited to obtain additional information regarding reserves, benefits and compensation paid to board members. In addition, audited financial statements were obtained from the County Auditor's office for 10 districts.

Appendix B sets forth a summary of the information obtained from the questionnaire. Lastly, a telephone interview was held with a representative of the California Association of Sanitary Districts.

## DISCUSSION

### Special Districts in General

**Special districts are financially autonomous units of local government, the purpose and size of which can vary**

---

<sup>1</sup> Little Hoover Commission ; "Special Districts: Relics of the Past or Resources for the Future?" May 2000. 925 L. St., Suite 805, Sacramento, CA 95814; 916-445-2125; Web: [www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/report155.html](http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/report155.html). e-mail: little.hoover@lhc.ca.gov.

**greatly. Special districts provide services such as water and electricity, fire and flood protection, sewage treatment, health care, parks, libraries and recreation. Most were formed for similar underlying reasons: to provide urban services outside of city limits, to provide regional services that transcend the limits of a single city, to provide services beyond the capacity of existing local governments, or to fill a gap in services provided by other governmental agencies. The first special districts in California appeared in 1887.**

**Because special districts are governed by State laws, the County has no regulatory control over them. While this independence enables them to operate beyond city boundaries, it can also obscure the oversight that citizens generally provide for local government and sometimes leaves constituents of special districts vulnerable to abuses.**

#### Compensation

California law authorizes compensation for special district directors to a maximum of \$198 per meeting. Prior to January 2001, maximum compensation had been \$100 per meeting. Only two special districts in Marin (Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District, and Novato Sanitary District) have authorized the full \$198 per meeting. As can be seen in Appendix B, the present average compensation in the County is approximately \$100 per meeting and 11 special district's directors receive no compensation.

California Law also allows special district directors to receive compensation for up to six meetings per month. The great majority of special districts in Marin meet only once a month. Several meet twice a month and other boards schedule occasional extra meetings for important business matters such as budget preparation. Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District appears to be the conspicuous exception. Over the course of the last several years, many of its board members have consistently attended six meetings per month at full compensation. This District will be discussed in more detail later in this report.

#### Benefits

California Law allows directors of special districts to grant themselves benefits such as medical or dental insurance coverage. As Appendix B indicates, only seven out of 34 special districts do so.

One board member of the Richardson Bay Sanitary District in Tiburon expressed the opinion that the board needs quality people to serve and that dental insurance is an attraction in that regard. The Grand Jury believes that giving benefits beyond compensation for meetings to a non-salaried person performing a public service sets an undesirable precedent.

### Conference and Travel Expenses

Periodic conferences and seminars sponsored by statewide associations serve a valuable educational and informational purpose. Although state law does not place a cap on travel and conference expenses, directors of 32 of the special districts in Marin attend conferences and seminars while keeping their travel expense at a modest level. The two exceptions are Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District and Ross Valley Sanitary District #1.

In 2001 the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District spent \$40,000 on conferences and travel, and Ross Valley Sanitary District #1 spent \$18,500. In fact, the directors of Las Gallinas District attended almost every meeting that pertained to sanitary district matters - all at taxpayer expense. Conferences were held in locations such as Palm Springs, Yosemite, San Diego and Monterey.

### What the Law Allows – Should the Maximum Be Used?

The great majority of special districts in Marin keep their benefits for public service at a reasonable level. However, there are several exceptions as previously noted.

State law for special districts allows generous cash compensation, medical and dental benefits, and does not place any cap on travel and conference expenses. Citizens who live and vote in special districts need to closely examine their districts and evaluate whether the payment and benefits board members receive are reasonable for his or her public service.

### **Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District – A Case Study**

The Grand Jury studied the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District because this district appeared to have engaged in practices that stood out among the 34 special districts.

### The So-Called “Working Board” Concept

Past and present board members of the Las Gallinas Valley District related that their board is a “working board” as opposed to a “policy board”. In effect, the board members became “employees or staff” for the district and took an active role in day-to-day operations. In contrast, a “policy board” means that the employees, staff, and professional consultants run the day-to-day operation of business, and that the board of directors sets the overall policy and conducts reviews.

By organizing six subcommittees, board members could attend up to six meetings per month at full compensation for each meeting. One standing subcommittee was entitled the "Letterhead Committee" that occasionally met solely to discuss the design of the district letterhead! Note that six paid meetings per month equates to \$1,188 per month or \$14,256 per year.

One board member said the Las Gallinas Valley District was following the example of other special districts in the state in creating a "working board" and that the "working board" information came from the California Association of Sanitary Districts in Sacramento. However, in an interview with representatives of the Association, it was said that the Association had not heard of the "working board" concept.

#### Eminent Domain Lawsuit and Brown Act Violations

Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District instituted a disastrous eminent domain lawsuit wherein the District paid, from taxpayer funds, the total of \$1.6 million in costs and attorney fees for both sides. Because of the price decided on by the jury in that case, the District did not ultimately acquire the property that was the subject of the lawsuit.

The District recently paid a fine of \$7,500 for Brown Act violations for conducting business in private, without proper public notice. The Brown Act violations occurred under the old board (prior to January of 2002) and the fine was paid with taxpayers' funds.

#### New Members On Board

**It should be noted that two new Board members were recently elected to the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District Board, and that two long-term members were defeated. As a parting shot, the old Las Gallinas Valley Board voted to give former Board members lifetime medical benefits of \$200 per month. However, the new Board has rescinded this benefit.**

During an interview with a District representative in April 2002, the following information was obtained:

- In March 2002, Las Gallinas paid \$3,582 as compensation to directors for attending meetings. One board member attended 2 meetings, two attended 3 meetings, one attended 4 meetings, and one attended 6 meetings.
- The "working board" concept is currently being re-evaluated by the newly constituted board, but it has not yet been changed to a "policy board" approach.

- The medical benefit of \$200 per month, per director, remains in effect, but the travel and conference budget is under analysis for possible reduction.

While it is too early to tell, hopefully, the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District Board with two new Board members will correct the questionable practices of the past.

## **Special District Reserves**

### Funds

**The Grand Jury, in reviewing the Little Hoover Commission Report, noted that it highlighted a lack of State control or public oversight of special districts. The Grand Jury used the findings of the Little Hoover Commission as the basis for this investigation on the issue of reserves.**

**Special districts fall into two categories, (1) enterprise districts and (2) non-enterprise districts. Enterprise districts receive a majority of their funds from a direct charge to their customers. Examples are water and sanitary districts. Non-enterprise districts receive a majority of their funds from property tax revenues. Examples are fire districts and recreational districts.**

**Special districts are financially autonomous units of local government. While all districts operate under statutory authority, there are no specific provisions in district laws that govern the accumulation and use of reserves. Furthermore, there are no formal guidelines or widely accepted standards to guide special districts in the accumulation and use of reserves.**

Statewide, special districts, according to the most recent data from the Little Hoover Commission, have \$19.4 billion in reserves - almost two and half times their annual gross revenues. In most cases, the Commission found that community leaders and the public did not know the size of these reserves or why they are being held.

**The Little Hoover Commission also found that only about half of the special districts had a formal reserve policy. Of those that had formal policies, there was a wide variation in what is considered “prudent”. The Commission found there is little agreement between district officials as to the principles or accepted standards for establishing reserves by special districts. The Commission also stated that “financial rules do not require information to be presented in ways that would provide for the public or policy-makers to understand or scrutinize how districts use public funds in general, and reserves in particular.”**

### **Accounting for Reserves**

**In this section the Grand Jury will discuss the following:**

- How special districts report reserves for financial statement purposes;
- How the Grand Jury defined reserves for the purpose of compiling the numbers shown in Appendix C;
- What financial and policy factors are important in determining an appropriate level of financial reserves.

### **How Special Districts Report Reserves for Financial Statement Purposes**

**In financial statements and reports submitted to the County Auditor’s office, enterprise districts report the difference between revenues and expenditures as fund equity. Fund equity, in turn, is divided into contributed capital and retained earnings. A district’s retained earnings represent accumulated net income derived from fees, investment income and charges for services provided. In general, retained earnings shown in the equity section of the balance sheet will be represented in the asset section as cash, investments, increases in fixed assets and designated reserves. The Grand Jury found that special districts in**

**Marin, as shown in Appendix C, have accumulated significant amounts of reserves and also determined that explanations for these levels of reserves were necessary.**

How the Grand Jury Defined Reserves for the Purpose of Compiling the Numbers Shown In Appendix C under "Reserves"

**The Grand Jury used cash and cash equivalents as shown in the assets sections of the balance sheets of ten special districts shown in Appendix C. The ten districts shown in the latter table were selected based on their having the largest reserves of the 34 special districts in Marin. Cash equivalents included investments and reserves, both restricted and unrestricted. Reserves as shown in the balance sheets were held as cash or investments. The latter observation may be confusing to someone not familiar with governmental accounting.**

**Restricted reserves are set up by boards of directors after they have identified a future need, such as the replacement of existing assets. For accounting purposes, the designated reserves are transferred from a cash or investment account into the new reserve account. When one views an account titled "Board Restricted Reserves" - \$1 million, it means that cash in the latter amount has been set aside for some future project.**

What Financial and Policy Factors are Important in Determining Appropriate Levels of Reserves

**The Little Hoover Commission was unable to identify principles or accepted standards for establishing reserves by special districts. From a policy standpoint reasons for reserves were: (1) Replacement of existing asset infrastructure, (2) Operating funds, and (3) Setting aside funds for catastrophic events.**

The first two reasons make both business and economic sense. The third reason for setting up reserves is a problematic issue; if a district establishes a policy of reserving for an unknown, unspecified catastrophic event, the district could justify just about any level of reserves.

**In determining what financial factors should be examined, the Little Hoover Commission focused on the relationship between retained earnings and gross revenue for one year. When retained earnings exceed gross revenue by a large percentage, the Commission concluded that further study of the districts reserve policies was appropriate.**

The Grand Jury included additional financial information to shed additional light on ways of measuring the prudent level of a district's reserves. In Appendix C can be found: (1) The current level of retained reserves as adjusted for purposes of comparison, (2) A district's income and cash flow, which are important in financing future asset replacements. (3) The book value of fixed assets, which indicates, in general, the size of the infrastructure to be maintained. The above factors are not all inclusive. However, they do form a basis for determining prudent levels of reserves.

### **Richardson Bay Sanitary District**

An example of applying the above general principles to a real life situation is the following analysis of the financial position of Richardson Bay Sanitary District. Of the ten districts shown in Appendix C, Richardson Bay appears to have the largest reserves relative to their needs.

### **Richardson Bay Sanitary has set up a reserve as follows:**

Replacement of Infrastructure over the next 8 years	\$4,830,000
Catastrophic Event reserve	<u>\$4,000,000</u>
Total	\$8,830,000
Less: unfunded reserves	<u>\$(2,208,141)</u>
Total funded reserves	\$6,621,859
Add Cash and Cash equivalents for operating expenses	\$1,418,000
<u>Total reserves</u>	<u>\$8,039,859</u>

**As can be seen above and in Appendix C, this district has about \$8 million in reserves. Net income plus depreciation amounts to a cash flow of about \$1.35 million per year. Assets that make up the infrastructure, net of depreciation,**

are \$4.7 million. The District estimates that the cost to replace all of their facilities is \$5.5 million.

However, over the next eight years, it is estimated that operations will generate about \$11 million in cash flow. Add the latter amount to the present reserves of \$8 million and reduce by the planned asset acquisitions of \$4.8 million and the result is about \$14.2 million in reserves.

Cash Flow for the next 8 years (\$1.35M x 8)	\$11,000,000
Present reserve balance	\$ 8,000,000
Less: Planned replacement of infrastructure	<u>\$ (4,800,000)</u>
<u>Total Reserve balance in 8 years</u>	<u>\$14,200,000</u>

**Richardson Bay District can fund its asset acquisitions out of projected cash flow and never have to touch the current reserves of \$8 million. In fact, projected cash flow is about two times the projected asset acquisition.**

This district set up a \$4 million reserve for a catastrophic event, i.e. earthquake. The Grand Jury believes that setting up a reserve for a catastrophic event is a sound business decision. However, the reserve set up by the District is arbitrary as to amount and is not based on a valid study. Assuming that the latter reserve amount is appropriate, the Grand Jury believes that the total reserves are still too high, given the projected cash flow over the next eight years.

**Assuming the latter analysis is correct, what should the District do with the excessive reserves? There are many possible courses of action; one would be suspending the collection of sewer fees for two years. Sewer fees per year for the District are about \$1,160,000. If the district did not collect the latter amount, cash flow could be reduced to about \$195,000 or \$390,000 for two years. The district plans to spend \$882,000 over the next two years on its infrastructure. Therefore, the difference of \$495,000 must be financed out of existing reserves of about \$8 million. The net result would be a reduction in existing reserves to a level of**

**about \$7.5 million. The Grand Jury is only using this as an example and is not recommending it.**

**What is the Correct Amount for Reserves?**

**The Grand Jury believes that this decision should be made by the Board of Directors with input from the people that are served by the District. In making that decision, all districts, not just Richardson Bay, should take into consideration: cash flow, current level of reserves, condition of and risk to infrastructure, economic uncertainty, future expansion, and insurance coverage.**

## **FINDINGS**

1. The average compensation for special district directors who receive compensation is \$100 per meeting.
2. The majority of special districts hold one meeting per month, except when there are important business items on their agenda. Larger special districts, those with a large number of employees and large budget, frequently hold two meetings per month and at times additional meetings for important business.
3. Seven special districts out of 34 give their directors medical or dental benefits.
4. Two special districts, Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District, and Ross Valley Sanitary District #1 have unusually high budgets for travel and conference expense.
5. Alone among the special districts in Marin, the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District currently utilizes the concept of a “working board” as opposed to a “policy board”.
6. Most districts do not provide the public with easily understood financial statements and analysis of existing and future reserves. Special districts financial statements and reserves cannot be evaluated effectively by the public, due to inconsistent terminology and format.
7. The Grand Jury believes that the public has little, if any, awareness of the reserves maintained by the 34 special districts.
8. Several of the Districts reviewed by the Grand Jury appear to have reserves that are unreasonably large.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. In special districts where compensation is paid to directors for attending meetings, the amount should be specifically justified to the district's constituents.
2. Special district boards should strive to minimize the number of meetings held each month.
3. Special district board members should not receive medical and/or dental benefits at taxpayer expense.
4. Travel and conference expenses of special district board members should be kept to a reasonable amount.
5. Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District should drop the concept of a "working board" and instead operate as a "policy board", as is typical of most special districts.
6. All 34 special districts should develop and make public, written guidelines governing the present and future level of reserves shown in the balance sheets. The term "reserves" should be defined as cash or cash equivalents, both "restricted and unrestricted". If, based upon these guidelines, analysis shows that reserves are too high, the districts should implement plans to reduce fees or otherwise return the excess funds to their constituencies.
7. The County Auditor and the special districts should work together to develop clear terminology and standardized formats for the reporting of reserves.

## **REQUEST FOR RESPONSES**

**Pursuant to California Penal Code Section 933.05, the Grand Jury respectfully requests responses as follows:**

**From the Boards of Directors of all Marin County Special Districts to: Findings 1-3 and 6-8; and to Recommendations 1-4, 6, and 7.**

**From the Board of Directors of the Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District to: all Findings and all Recommendations.**

**From the Board of Directors of the Ross Valley Sanitary District to: Findings 1-4 and 6-8 and to all Recommendations 1-4, 6, and 7.**

**From the Marin County Auditor to: Recommendation 7.**

## APPENDIX A

### Questionnaire

1. Briefly state the mission or purpose and activities of the District. Please use District letterhead or otherwise identify your district.
2. How long has this Special District been in existence?
3. What are the annual budgets of the District for 2000 and 2001? What are the sources of your funds?
4. State the amount of cash reserves that the District currently holds.
5. What is the rate of compensation for each district board member per meeting for the year 2000 and 2001?
6. In the year 2000 and 2001 to date, how many times has there been more than one district meeting per month? If there has been more than one board meeting per month, set forth the month(s) and date(s) of each meeting(s).
7. Are there occasions when a Board member receives a per diem payment for a Board activity that is not for a scheduled Board meeting?
  - (a) If so, in the year 2000 and 2001 to date how many times has this occurred?
  - (b) Give examples of the nature of the activities where a per diem is paid.
8. Do board members receive any "perks" or benefits, including but not limited to medical or dental insurance, life or accident insurance, retirement, or a motor vehicle for a board member's exclusive use? Please list and give the values for each during 2000 and 2001.
9. Are there currently any salaried employees in your district? If so, how many?
10. If your district currently uses an attorney, other than the office of the Marin County Counsel, state the name and address of the attorney.
  - (a) If a private attorney is he or she retained on an annual retainer or hourly basis
  - (b) If an annual retainer, set forth the amount.
  - (c) If on an hourly rate, set forth the hourly rate.
  - (d) Set forth the amount of the hourly billings for 2000 and 2001 to date.
11. Does the attorney attend board meetings? If so, state the dates the attorney attended in 2000 and 2001 to date.

12. Do you contract for outside consultants or services? If so, please explain and set forth amounts paid in 2000 and budgeted for in 2001

13. Have any board members in 2000 or 2001 to date attended any meetings or conferences in regard to district business out of the greater Bay Area at District expense? If so, set forth the dates, the locations of the meetings or conferences, and the names of the board members so attending, and the expense each member billed to the District.

14. Do board members have an expense account paid by the District in 2000 and 2001 to date? If so, how much did each board member receive in 2000 and 2001 to date?

15. State the name, title and phone number of the person(s) responding to this questionnaire.

## APPENDIX B Survey Responses

	<i>TYPE</i>	<i>BUDGET</i>	<i>RESERVES</i>	<i>COMPENSATION</i>	<i>BENEFITS</i>	<i>CONFERENCES TRAVEL</i>	<i>EMPLOYEES</i>
Bell Marin Keys	CSD	\$335,000	\$137,000	\$0	NO	\$0	1
Marinwood	CSD	\$2,400,000	\$1,200,000	\$0	NO	\$500	20
Muir Beach	CSD	\$207,000	\$309,000	\$0	YES	\$0	1+
Tamalpais Valley	CSD	\$2,300,000	\$4,200,000	\$100	NO	\$0	12
Marin City	CSD	\$379,000	\$30,000	\$75	NO	\$0	6
Tomales Village	CSD	\$141,000	\$118,000	\$0	NO	\$0	0
Almonte	SAN	\$227,000	\$782,000	\$100	NO	\$0	1
Alto	SAN	\$178,000	\$262,000	\$75	NO	\$0	1
Homestead	SAN	\$246,000	\$643,000	\$75	NO	\$0	1
Las Galinas Valley	SAN	\$7,900,000	\$13,500,000	\$198	YES	\$40,000	16
Novato	SAN	\$11,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$198	YES	\$8,000	26
Richardson Bay	SAN	\$1,800,000	\$8,000,000	\$100	YES	\$1,000	4
San Rafael	SAN	\$5,300,000	\$5,000,000	\$100	NO	\$0	12
Ross Valley Dist#1	SAN	\$7,700,000	\$6,700,000	\$150	NO	\$18,500	20
Corte Madera Dist#2	SAN	\$4,100,000	\$2,000,000	\$0	NO	\$0	City
Tiburon Dist#5	SAN	\$1,800,000	\$3,700,000	\$100	NO	\$0	8
Sausalito/Marin City	SAN	\$2,500,000	\$2,200,000	\$160	NO	\$6,000	8
Bolinas	FPD	\$292,000	\$395,000	\$0	NO	\$0	1
Kentfield	FPD	\$2,300,000	\$1,500,000	\$75	YES	\$800	12
Novato	FPD	\$12,000,000	\$7,900,000	\$100	NO	\$2,000	83
Sleepy Hollow	FPD	\$622,000	\$1,300,000	\$100	NO	\$0	0
South Marin	FPD	\$5,100,000	\$792,000	\$100	NO	\$3,000	37
Stinson	FPD	\$242,000	\$175,000	\$0	NO	\$0	5
Tiburon	FPD	\$2,700,000	\$1,100,000	\$75	YES	\$0	21
Marin Health Care	MSC	\$381,000	\$351,000	\$0	NO	\$1,250	1
Strawberry Rec.	MSC	\$1,000,000	\$945,000	\$75	NO	\$0	5
MCR Conservation	MSC	\$668,000	\$64,000	\$0	NO	\$400	2
Bolinas	PUD	\$878,000	\$475,000	\$125	NO	\$328	1
Inverness	PUD	\$650,000	\$213,000	\$0	NO	\$0	3
Sew. Ag. So. Marin	JPD	\$2,200,000	\$5,600,000	\$0	NO	\$0	12
Central Marin San.	JPD	\$6,200,000	\$10,000,000	\$100	NO	\$950	5
Ross Valley FD	JPD	\$3,300,000	\$8,000	\$50	NO	\$0	27
North Marin	WD	\$15,700,000	\$18,400,000	\$100	NO	\$800	57
Marin Municipal	WD	\$70,500,000	\$54,100,000	\$100	YES	\$0	237

CSD=Community Service District; SAN=Sanitary District; FPD=Fire Protection District MSC=Miscellaneous District; PUD=Public Utilities District JPD=Joint Powers District WD=Water District

## APPENDIX C

### Top Ten Districts for Reserves

	<i>Retained Earnings</i>	<i>Revenue</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Reserves</i>	<i>Net income or (Loss)</i>	<i>Depreciation</i>	<i>Cash Flow</i>	<i>Assets Net of Depreciation</i>	<i>Fiscal Year</i>
Novato Sanitary District	37,406,000	11,000,000	340%	17,000,000	(1,415,000)	1,615,148	200,148	62,052,000	6/30/2001
Central Marin Sanitary Agency	13,789,000	5,700,000	240%	10,087,000	(1,418,997)	1,712,961	293,964	46,000,000	6/30/2000
Las Gallinas Sanitary District	16,320,000	3,458,000	472%	13,580,000	(813,817)	1,608,642	794,825	27,506,318	6/30/2000
Sewerage Agency of Southern Marin	11,343,000	2,200,000	515%	5,681,000	(1,476)	902,314	900,838	20,539,000	6/30/2001
Tiburon District #5	6,022,000	1,622,000	371%	3,767,000	(5,901)	434,880	428,979	7,100,000	6/30/1999
San Rafael Sanitary District	15,300,000	5,625,000	272%	5,001,698	1,478,000	837,418	2,315,418	22,644,000	6/30/2001
Richardson Bay Sanitary District	14,589,000	2,397,000	608%	8,039,000	938,855	416,488	1,355,343	4,720,803	6/30/2001
North Marin Water District	(890,000)	15,700,000		18,481,000	(117,866)	783,391	665,525	33,313,000	6/30/2000
Marin Municipal Water District	161,704,000	42,500,000	380%	54,102,000	16,444,078	6,580,791	23,024,869	221,854,000	6/30/2001
Novato Fire District	8,157,000	9,971,000	82%	7,996,000	(53,574)	0	(53,574)	11,747,000	6/30/2000