

**ALTO SANITARY DISTRICT**  
P.O. BOX 163, MILL VALLEY, CA 94942 (415) 388-3696

June 23, 2004

Foreperson  
Marin County Civil Grand Jury  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 303  
San Rafael, CA 94903

Re: Response to Report Title "Southern Marin Sewers - So Many Districts, So Few Users"

Honorable Foreperson:

Following are this District's responses to the specific findings and recommendations set forth in your referenced report:

**FINDINGS**

- F5. "Having the responsibility for sewage collection and treatment spread between so many agencies inhibits the investigation of issues that cross agency boundaries."

Response: There have been no instances of such an occurrence between this district and adjoining districts. We have never been confronted with a problem with any other district which was not investigated and amicably resolved by our managers.

- F6. "One agency is occasionally pitted against another as it seeks the lowest cost service for its constituency"

Response: This situation does not occur between sanitary districts such as ours. The boundaries and spheres of influence of such districts are clearly defined by LAFCO and there is no way we or our contiguous neighbors could affect the service fees of each other.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- R1. "A forum should be established, and meet regularly, as a way for staff and elected officials from all eleven agencies to exchange ideas and experiences."

Response: There may be some merit in this proposal, and this district would cooperate in exploring the idea further.

- R2. "An impartial facilitator should be engaged to conduct a meeting of agency representatives at which opportunities for consolidation, collaboration and cooperation are explored and short-term objectives are set."


Response: We take no exception with this proposal.

- R3. "After the facilitated meeting is held, based upon consensus regarding consolidation established by the agencies, LAFCO should proceed with a study of alternatives."

Response: Again, we take no exception to this proposal.

Thank you for affording us the opportunity to respond to your report.

Very truly yours,

  
Stanley Bransgrove  
Chair, Board of Directors

## RESPONSE TO GRAND JURY REPORT FORM

**Report Title:** SOUTHERN MARIN SEWERS – So Many Districts, So Few Users

**Report Date:** April 27, 2004

**Response by:** Tom Roberts **Title:** Manager

### FINDINGS

- I/we agree with the findings numbered: F5 & F6
- I/we disagree wholly or partially with the findings numbered: \_\_\_\_\_
  - ❖ Attach a statement specifying any portions of the findings that are disputed; include an explanation of the reasons therefor

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- Recommendations numbered \_\_\_\_\_ have been implemented
  - ❖ Attach a summary describing the implemented actions
- Recommendations numbered R1 & R2 have not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future
  - ❖ Attach a timeframe for the implementation
- Recommendations numbered R3 require further analysis
  - ❖ Attach an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or study, and a timeframe for the matter to be prepared for discussion by the officer or director of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of the Grand Jury report
- Recommendations numbered \_\_\_\_\_ will not be implemented because they are not warranted or are not reasonable
  - ❖ Attach an explanation


Date: 07/03/04 Signed: Tom Roberts, Manager

Number of pages attached 1

**ALTO SANITARY DISTRICT**  
P.O. BOX 163, MILL VALLEY, CA 94942 (415) 388-3696

July 3, 2004

TO: Foreperson  
Marin County Civil Grand Jury  
3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 303  
San Rafael, CA 94903

FROM: Tom Roberts, Manager 

Re: Attachment to Response Form

**RECOMMENDATION R 3:**

“After the facilitated meeting is held, based upon consensus regarding consolidation established by the agencies, LAFCO should proceed with a study of alternatives.”

Response: We take no exception to this proposal. However, implementation of Recommendation R 3 is dependent on the findings of the facilitated meetings required under Recommendation R 2. A series of such meetings have been scheduled but not yet held. Analysis of the findings of these meetings by LAFCO may lead to the implementation of this Recommendation.