

The Water Districts of Los Angeles County

by

Kristin A. Hawes

**The Rose Institute of State and Local Government
Claremont McKenna College**

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency | 8 |
| Castaic Lake Water Agency | 10 |
| Central Basin Municipal Water District | 11 |
| Crescenta Valley County Water District | 13 |
| Foothill Municipal Water District | 15 |
| Green Valley County Water District | 17 |
| Kinneola Irrigation District | 19 |
| La Canada Irrigation District | 20 |
| La Habra Heights County Water District | 21 |
| La Puente Valley County Water District | 22 |
| Las Virgenes Municipal Water District | 24 |
| Littlerock Creek Irrigation District | 26 |
| Newhall County Water District | 28 |
| Orchard Dale Water District | 30 |
| Palmdale Irrigation District | 31 |
| Palm Ranch Irrigation District | 32 |
| Quartz Hill County Water District | 34 |
| San Gabriel County Water District | 35 |
| San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District | 37 |
| Sativa-Los Angeles County Water District | 39 |
| Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District | 40 |
| Valley County Water District | 42 |
| Walnut Valley Water District | 44 |
| West Basin Municipal Water District | 46 |
| West Valley County Water District | 48 |

Introduction

In the last year, California's special districts have been thrust into the political spotlight. Spurred by the revelation of widespread abuses of taxpayers' money in south Orange County's Santa Margarita Water District in April, 1993,¹ journalists, political activists, and politicians at every level have turned their attention toward the state's least-known level of government. While the resultant publicity has spawned much public outrage, several investigations, and talk of constitutional reform, it has also taken place within an informational vacuum. For, despite all the fuss, a comprehensive account of the state's special jurisdictions has yet to be produced.

In an effort to fill this gap, the Rose Institute of State and Local Government has embarked upon a three-part study of Los Angeles County's Special Districts. Incorporating information furnished by county offices and the individual districts themselves, the study is not intended to advance any political or other agenda, but to provide the public with a single, representative account of the size and scope of the county's special districts.

This report contains the results of the first portion of the study, a survey of Los Angeles County's Water Districts. Begun in April, 1994, the survey elicited information from 26 of the county's 30 major water-related jurisdictions. This information has been arranged and presented so as to provide the best basis for comparison; nothing has been omitted. To facilitate understanding of the results of the Institute's investigation, the survey itself is preceded by sections detailing the history and function of special districts; a section on methodology is also included. Taken together, we at the Rose Institute believe that these sections furnish the reader with the information necessary to navigate the maze that is Los Angeles County's "hidden" level of government.

¹ The controversy stemmed from the Los Angeles Times' disclosure of blatant abuse and mismanagement of district funds by two of its directors. This abuse included the use of district funds to pay for personal meals, trips, and, on one occasion, a limousine ride through Central Park. The revelations sparked public outcry and county and federal investigations; the directors involved were suspended without pay, and subsequently retired.

Special Districts Defined

According to state law, a special district is "any agency of the state for the local performance of governmental or proprietary functions within limited boundaries." (Government Code § 16271 [d]). However, as former State Senator Marion Bergeson notes, special districts are best understood as "separate local government(s) that deliver public services."² Special districts differ from other forms of government (municipal, county, and state) in several ways. First, most special districts are "limited purpose" forms of government: they exist to serve/fill a particular need. As evidenced by their names (Mosquito Abatement Districts, Cemetery Districts, Irrigation Districts, Hospital Districts), the majority of special districts are dedicated to a single function. Although some are authorized to perform a variety of services, they rarely serve more than one purpose.

In addition to their narrow construction, special districts differ from other types of government in that they are usually established only when existing forms of government cannot provide desired services in a particular area. As a result, their boundaries often cross municipal and county lines, sometimes even drawing together individuals from non-contiguous regions in order to fill a common need.

Despite their differences, special districts also share certain features with other forms of government. They are run by independent boards whose members are either elected by a majority of the district's voters or appointed (usually by a County Board of Supervisors). The members of these boards, typically called "Directors," are charged with making and managing the district's budget and maintaining its facilities; oftentimes, special districts will also initiate programs designed to safeguard their resources and provide for the future. Like other forms

² "What's So Special About Special Districts? A Citizen's Guide to Special Districts in California," pamphlet produced by Senate Local Government Committee of California State Legislature, November, 1993, p. 1.

of government, many special districts depend on the taxpayers for their operating income.³ They are also the keepers of their own destinies: "under state law, a district can be dissolved only by the district itself."⁴

Special Districts: Past and Present

California's experience with special districts began in the late 19th Century, when farmers in Stanislaus County were faced with the prospect of establishing and regulating a reliable water supply. Lacking the benefit of a local government, they pooled their resources to create the Turlock Irrigation District. Confronted with similar situations -- the need for a particular service without the benefit of a pre-existing organizational structure -- groups across the nation followed the farmers' example: as additional water districts sprang up throughout Northern and Central California, cemetery districts became the rage in the Midwest. Since then, the country has seen the birth of districts dedicated to everything from fire control to sewage. Today, there are more than 33,000 special districts in the United States. Constituting the nation's fastest-growing form of government, they now outnumber the country's cities.

Not surprisingly, special districts have flourished in the state of their birth. California's approximately 3,400 special jurisdictions thrive on a collective annual budget that is estimated at anywhere from \$14 to \$24 billion. Taken together, they are "the state's most abundant form of local government."⁵

³ Districts which provide commodities to their residents (such as water districts), also oftentimes collect user fees. The portion of the budget composed by these fees varies in each district.

⁴ Johnson, Kevin, "America's Forgotten Fiefdoms," Los Angeles Times, May 26, 1993, page A1.

⁵"What's So Special About Special Districts?," p. 1.

The Paradox of Special Jurisdictions

In spite of their numbers and their fiscal weight, however, California's special districts remain obscure. Participation in special district elections ranks far below participation in municipal, county, and state races -- a fact that is not surprising when one realizes that few Californians can name the special districts which affect their property, let alone their special district representatives. This lack of public awareness has allowed many of the districts to function without the participation of the people they represent. Indeed, although the majority of special district meetings are open to the public, large audiences are rare: Sam Randall, General Manager of the Orange County Cemetery District (the state's largest, with a budget of \$1.6 million), says that he doubts that the average person knows his district exists, as "in my six years here, [I don't know] that a public audience has been at our meetings."⁶

This lack of public participation has granted special districts an unprecedented degree of autonomy. Free from the scrutiny that focuses on most governmental officials, directors of special districts are allowed to make their budgets, pass their resolutions, and distribute their resources in relative peace. While some contend that such low key government allows its members to act in the best interest of the community (since they are, presumably, free of many of the pressures and interests that influence politics on a larger scale), the discovery of the abuses at Santa Margarita Water District suggest that not all special districts embody the democratic ideal.

⁶Johnson, p. A1.

The Rose Institute's Survey of Los Angeles County's Water Districts

The purpose of the Rose Institute's survey of Los Angeles County's water districts is not to argue either of these perspectives. Instead, we have endeavored merely to assemble a comprehensive and objective set of information regarding these special jurisdictions. We hope that the combination of financial, political, geographic, and functional information will help to illuminate this form of government.

History and Methodology of the Survey

The Rose Institute's survey of Los Angeles County's water districts began in April, 1994, when an initial questionnaire was sent to 30 district offices. This questionnaire (a copy of which is attached as Exhibit A), asked the district managers to provide a boundary map, a statement of policy and practice, and a recent budget. It also requested that the district manager fill out a questionnaire regarding the district's electoral procedure and the composition of the current board. All told, the questionnaire has eight separate parts and was two pages long. It was designed so as to cause a minimum drain upon the district's time.

The initial mailing elicited responses from half of the county's districts. In May, those districts which had failed to respond to the survey were contacted by telephone and sent additional surveys. In July and August, a third set of surveys was sent out, followed by personal visits by one of the Institute's research assistants. In those districts which still remained outstanding, the visits were followed by telephone conferences, messages, and letters expressing the need for a complete set of data.

This perseverance ultimately elicited responses from twenty-six of the initial thirty districts.⁷ While the Institute was thus successful in an overwhelming majority of the County's water districts, the amount of information it was able to glean from each varied considerably. Indeed, where some districts returned reams of maps, budgets, and mission statements, others seemed reluctant even to divulge their electoral procedures.

In an effort to overcome this discrepancy and provide a basis for comparison, the individual district analyses have been divided into three sections. The first section "Overview", consists of a map (where available), a prose description of the district's boundaries, a discussion of the district's history, and an enumeration of its primary functions. This section is designed to furnish the reader with a basic means of comparing the various jurisdictions.

The second section, "Budget", focuses on the district's finances (including -- where available -- a budget). In it, we break down the district's major sources of income and expenditures in order to provide both a sense of the scope of the district's operation and a further basis of comparison. The third category, "Government", focuses on the procedural side of the district: how it is governed and by whom, as well as the outside agencies, if any, to which the district is accountable. When information in any of these categories is lacking, the absence is noted in the text of the report.

⁷ Of the districts which failed to participate, two -- the Rowland County Water District and the South Montebello Irrigation District -- explicitly refused to take part. In explaining her failure to complete the survey, South Montebello Secretary Patricia D. Sinclair cited a fear of the type of publicity which has consumed Santa Margarita. Anthony Poli, General Manager of Rowland Heights, expressed similar reservations, questioning the use to which the survey's information would be put.

In addition to Rowland and South Montebello, the Pico County Water District and the Golden Valley Municipal Water District are not included in the survey. In contrast to the explicit refusals of the former, the absence of these two may be traced to a not-so-benign negligence: both simply refused to answer any of the Institute's requests. After being sent at least three surveys, Golden Valley General Manager Ruth Ralphs referred a research assistant to the district's attorney. Although a prospectus was promised by the latter, information has not been forthcoming.

When it came to gathering information, Pico was no different: numerous surveys, letters, messages, and a visit by the Institute's research assistant failed to yield the desired information.

Taken together, these categories provide a broad basis for comparison of each of the 26 districts. We hope that they help to answer any questions the reader may have regarding the function of water-related government in Los Angeles County.

Back-up Materials

The Rose Institute has a file of originals of all the materials collected from the water districts. Readers who wish to consult these materials are invited to call the Institute (909 621-8159) to make an appointment to do so.

Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency

Overview

Stretching from the northernmost portion of Los Angeles County into Ventura and Kern Counties, the Antelope Valley-East Kern Water Agency incorporates portions of the cities of Lancaster, Gorman, Quartz Hill, Acron, Littlerock, Pearblossom, Mojave, California City, Rosamond and Boron. All told, the district furnishes water to 37 municipal, 3 industrial, and 20 agricultural hookups in a 2,883 square mile service area (please see map).

Budget

Antelope Valley's budget is appropriate for a district its size: in 1993-94, the district anticipated revenues in excess of \$43,110,000. In addition to fund balances in excess of \$18,000,000, this total included funds gleaned from "charges for current services" (\$9,658,690), "licenses, permits, and franchises" (\$10,941,000), and taxes (\$2,000,000) (for complete breakdown, please see budget).

The funds received by the district were scheduled to be distributed among several concerns. "Water supply contract payments" (\$11,871,035), payments on bonds (\$5,628,550), and purchased water (\$4,243,085) were expected to consume the largest chunks. In a departure from many of its fellow agencies, Antelope Valley also planned to place approximately \$14,000,000 of its revenues in reserve.

A breakdown of directors' fees was not available.

Electoral

Antelope Valley is further distinguished by the configuration of its board of directors. Unlike most of the region's boards, the district's governing body is comprised of seven directors elected from divisions. Aside from their numbers, however, Antelope Valley's

directors are fairly conventional: they choose their own officers, avoid advisory committees, and come up for reelection every four years.

The district's current board was elected at various times, with the most senior member having first won election in 1972 and the subsequent directors assuming their seats in 1976, 1984, 1986, 1988, 1990, and 1992.

Castaic Lake Water Agency

Overview

Located in the northern portion of Los Angeles County, the Castaic Lake Water Agency acts as a water wholesaler to local agencies servicing the city of Santa Clarita and surrounding, unincorporated county land (please see map).

Budget

The district declined to furnish a recent budget.

Electoral

Castaic Lake is governed by an eleven-member Board of Directors, six of whom are elected in districts, four of whom are appointed by water purveyors, and one of whom serves on an at-large basis. All members, regardless of their method of election, serve four year terms. The president of the board is elected by a voice vote of the board itself. He/she and the remaining members receive guidance from five committees: Planning and Engineering, Personnel, Public Relations, Finance, and Water Resources.

The district declined to furnish information detailing the history of the current board.

Central Basin Municipal Water District

Overview

Stretching from Montebello to Lakewood, the Central Basin Municipal Water District incorporates a diverse group of communities in southwestern Los Angeles County. Founded in 1952 as a complement to the West Basin Municipal Water District, Central Basin currently provides water to 1.4 million people in a service area spanning 227 square miles and 25 cities (please see map).

Budget

With projected revenues of \$39,410,700 in fiscal 1993-94, Central Basin's budget is impressive. Like its neighbor, West Basin, the district is largely dependent upon imported water sales for its funding: indeed, they are expected to account for 87.5% of Central Basin's 1993-94 income (\$34,505,000 of a projected \$39,410,700). The district also receives significant funding from standby charges (\$3,100,000) and recycled water sales (\$1,022,500).

Just as imported water accounts for the majority of Central Basin's income, so it constitutes the bulk of the district's expenditures. In fiscal 1993-94, the district budgeted \$33,205,000 for imported water purchases. Bond debt (\$3,251,900), operation and maintenance on two reclamation projects (\$1,063,500), water conservation programs (\$688,200), and general administrative costs (\$682,900) were expected to be additional drains on the district's coffers.

Despite such expenses, however, Central Basin anticipated a \$87,500 surplus in 1993-94. According to district literature, much of this surplus may be attributed to the district's decision to share its administrative staff with West Basin. Together, the districts employ 30 people to handle all of their administrative concerns.

While Central Basin thus scrimped on staff, this frugal attitude did not seem to apply to its Board of Directors: in the 1993-94 budget, the district's directors were allocated a total of \$140,000 to cover expenses, fees, travel, and conferences.

Electoral

While the size and scope of Central Basin's budget are thus somewhat atypical, its electoral structure is best described as conventional. The five members of its board are elected from districts to serve four year terms. The officers of the board are chosen by the board itself. West Basin does not have any provisions for recall, nor is the district advised by any committees.

The district declined to furnish information regarding the electoral history of its current board.

Crescenta Valley County Water District

Overview

Incorporating all or part of the cities of La Crescenta, La Canada, Glendale, Montrose, and Verdugo City, the Crescenta Valley County Water District covers 3.87 square of the San Fernando Valley (please see map). The district provides water and sewer services to 5,819 residential and business customers (approximately 20,370 individuals).

Budget

As evidenced by its 1993-94 budget, Crescenta Valley is almost entirely dependent upon user fees: of the district's estimated \$3,842,500 in total revenue, \$3,640,000 was expected to come from sales to consumers. Unlike most districts, Crescenta Valley did not expect to receive any property tax revenue during the 1993-94 fiscal year.⁸

Not surprisingly considering Crescenta's Valley's hilly terrain, much of the district's revenues were spent on plant operations (\$1,083,520) and the distribution system (\$471,000).⁹ In 1993-94, purchased water was expected to eat up another \$1,265,000.

The remainder of the district's budget was slated for "General and Administrative Expense." While Directors' Fees made up a relatively small (\$6,000) portion of the total, large chunks were consumed by "Salaries - General Office" and the undefined "Salaries - Statutory Officers" (\$105,000). An additional \$15,000 was budgeted for Directors' electoral expenses (for complete breakdown, please see budget).

⁸ Indeed, the district has not received any money from taxes since 1989-90, when it reported revenues of \$264.

⁹ For a breakdown of these fees, see Crescenta Valley Water District 1993-94 Budget, page 3.

Electoral

Crescenta Valley's five directors are chosen at large every four years by registered voters within district boundaries, with the exception of those voters residing in the city of Glendale. The president is chosen by a voice vote of the board; he/she is up for re-election every December. There are no special provisions for recall.

While Crescenta Valley's electoral procedures are thus very similar to the rest of the county's water districts, the district does distinguish itself by having three committees which advise the board. These committees, made up of the directors themselves, deal with issues ranging from employee relations to engineering needs.¹⁰ Each consists of two members of the board, who are responsible for researching their issue and reporting their findings to the board itself.

In contrast to many of the county's other districts, the individuals comprising Crescenta Valley's board are relative newcomers to water-related politics: its two most senior members were elected in 1991. The remaining directors won their seats in November of 1993.

¹⁰ "The Employee Relations - Benefits Committee is made up of two Board members. They research employee fringe benefits and salary packages and report to [the] entire board.

The Engineering Committee is made up of two Board members. They research and discuss water and sewage disposal needs of the District, upgrading monitoring equipment, field equipment, and any other items to improve District performance. [They] report to the entire Board.

The Finance Committee is made up of two Board members. They evaluate financial statements, rate restructuring, pending budgets, etc. and report to the entire Board."

See Crescenta Valley County Water District questionnaire, question 8.

Foothill Municipal Water District

Overview

While most water districts are water retailers -- providing service to residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural clients -- the Foothill Municipal Water District acts as a water wholesaler. Instead of selling its water to homes and businesses, Foothill supplies water to seven smaller, local water agencies. These agencies then turn around and sell their product to the people of the San Fernando Valley. Thus, although the district includes portions of La Canada-Flintridge, La Crescenta, and Altadena (please see map), its customers are the organizations which buy (and subsequently distribute) its product.

Budget

With a projected 1994-95 budget of over \$4.8 million, Foothill is Los Angeles County's second largest water wholesaler. Not surprisingly, the district's only source of operating revenue is re-sold water: in the 1994 budget, such water accounted for all such revenues (for complete breakdown, please see budget).

Ironically, the bulk of the funds derived from water sales are used to buy more water to sell. Indeed, in 1994, Foothill expected to spend \$3,502,000 purchasing water from the massive Metropolitan Water District. Purchased power (\$377,700), maintenance (\$240,700), administration (\$306,100), and capital expenditures (\$415,000) were expected to consume the remainder of the district's monies, and then some: all told, Foothill was scheduled to end the 1994-95 fiscal year \$265,950 in debt.

Foothill's budget includes moderate allocations for the members of its Board of Directors. In 1994-95, the directors are scheduled to split a total of \$25,000 to cover their fees, expenses, and election costs.

Electoral

Like the majority of Los Angeles County's water district, Foothill is governed by a five-member Board of Directors comprised of individuals elected from districts every four years. In a departure from standard practice, however, the presidency of Foothill's board rotates amongst the members of the group. The board is not responsible to any outside task forces or committees; aside from election and termination, there are no provisions for recall.

Foothill's current board counts among its members one grizzled veteran (who took office in 1952), two (presumably) seasoned pols (both were elected in 1980), and a couple of water-district neophytes (chosen in 1993). Their respective positions on the board were not available when we went to press.

Green Valley County Water District

Overview

The Green Valley County Water district is located in the northernmost portion of Los Angeles County, in the Angeles National Forest. Situated approximately 17 miles northeast of Santa Clarita, the district is comprised solely of unincorporated county land (please see map). As a result, Green Valley is one of the county's least populous water-related jurisdictions, servicing just 434 residential and 4 commercial water hookups.

Budget

The relative smallness of Green Valley is further evidenced by its budget. In 1993-94, the district expected to take in just \$241,706, the overwhelming majority of which was slated to come from water sales (\$136,031) and tax revenues (\$83,000) (for a full breakdown, please see budget).

The money received by the district was distributed among six concerns: pumping (\$20,300), transmission and distribution (\$18,375), general and administration (\$42,800), salaries (\$58,965), long-term debt (\$44,000) and capital improvements (\$57,266). The district's directors each received \$50.00 for attendance at monthly meetings, and were eligible for reimbursement (subject to a vote by the board) for all district-related travel expenses. In addition, the board was allocated a total of \$3,500 to defray election expenses.

Electoral

Green Valley's five directors are elected on an at-large basis to serve four year terms. The President of the Board, who is charged with running monthly meetings, is chosen by a voice-vote of the Board every January. Although the district indicated in its questionnaire that Green Valley had established provisions for recall, these provisions were not explained; nor did the district furnish any information regarding the existence of advisory committees.

Green Valley's current board is relatively inexperienced. The district's two most senior directors took office in 1991, while the other three board members won their seats in November of 1993.

Kinneola Irrigation District

Overview

Founded in 1953, the Kinneoloa Irrigation District is both one of the youngest and one of the smallest water districts in Los Angeles County. Comprised entirely of unincorporated county land in the hills northeast of Pasadena, the district was affected by last year's fires, which claimed nearly a quarter of its service area. Now, according to General Manager Gener Burt, Kinneola services just 450 residential hookups.

A map of the district was not available.

Budget

The district declined to furnish a recent budget.

Electoral

Kinneola's electoral scheme is typical of Los Angeles County Water Districts: the district is governed by the five-person Board of Directors whose members are chosen from districts. Each director serves a four year term; the terms themselves have been scheduled on a staggered, 3-2 system. The Board elects its president through a voice vote of the members present. There are no provisions for recall beyond those stated in Division 11 of the State Water Code, nor are there any outside task forces currently advising Kinneola's Board.

La Canada Irrigation District

Overview

Comprised of a portion of the city of La Cañada-Flintridge and unincorporated area adjacent to the city of Montrose (please see map), the La Cañada Irrigation District furnishes water to 2760 residential and 70 commercial hookups.

Budget

According to La Cañada's cash budget projection for 1994-95, the district expects to maintain a cash balance of between \$750,000 and \$775,000 through the year ending June 30, 1995 (please see budget).

The district declined to furnish a complete breakdown of revenues and expenditures.

Electoral

La Cañada is run by a five member Board of Directors. Like the majority of their peers throughout Los Angeles County, the directors are chosen from districts to serve four year terms. The board chooses its President and Vice-President every January, at the district's biennial reorganizational meeting.

First elected in 1959, Lee B. Kline, La Cañada's current president, is one of the county's senior water district officials. He shares control of the district with Vice-President Robert A. Whitmore (elected April, 1980), Director John R. Broughton (elected June, 1986), Director Daniel A. MacKenzie (elected May, 1992) and Director Arthur H. Littlejohns (elected October, 1992).

La Habra Heights County Water District

Overview

The district declined to furnish information regarding its service area and the type of service it provides. For an outline of the district, please see the map.

Budget

For the fiscal year beginning in July of 1994, La Habra Heights anticipated total revenues of approximately \$2,470,000. Slightly less than half of this total was expected to come from consumer water sales (\$1,070,592); other major sources of income included the undefined "water sales-R.T.S." (\$786,480), bond revenues (\$312,732), and tax monies (\$258,480).

Approximately 43% (\$1,052,016) of the money taken in by the district was slated to cover "administrative and general" expenses, including \$220,128 for office salaries, \$100,896 for office supplies and expenses, \$157,104 for employee benefits, and \$500,964 for depreciation. In addition, \$488,304 was scheduled for the source of supply, \$277,332 was scheduled to cover pumping, \$200,700 was scheduled to cover transmission and distribution, and \$155,148 was slated to finance interest on bonds (for complete breakdown, please see budget).

The district declined to furnish specific information regarding Directors' Fees.

Electoral

The district also declined to provide information regarding its electoral structure and the history of the current board.

La Puente Valley County Water District

Overview

With approximately 1964 residential, 23 industrial, 313 commercial, 1 agricultural, and 64 irrigation hookups (as of 1992), the La Puente Valley County Water District has, as General Manager Mary Lou Jaureguy says, "a little something for everybody." This range of services has helped to make La Puente's water service -- incorporating portions of La Puente and the City of Industry -- one of the county's most diversified.

Budget

Like most of the region's water governments, La Puente provides water directly to its customers. Consequently, the bulk of its income is derived from metered water sales: indeed, almost 76% (\$740,000 of an anticipated \$975,552) of the district's projected 1994 revenues are expected to come from water sales. Other significant sources of income include property taxes (\$110,000) and interest (\$50,000); (for a complete breakdown, please see budget).

Approximately two-thirds of the money generated by the district in 1994 is slated to cover water-related expenditures such as pumping (\$10,000), system maintenance (\$15,000), water treatment (\$16,000), transmission and distribution (\$50,000), operating salaries (\$113,000), power (\$165,000), and purchased water (\$263,000). The remaining portion is scheduled to be split between general and administrative expenses (\$305,340) and depreciation (\$13,212).

While a considerable portion of La Puente's budget is thus spent on office administration, the sum is not attributable to the district's directors. Indeed, the members of La Puente's Board have been allocated just \$6,500 for fiscal 1994. They are not scheduled to receive any additional funds for travel, elections, etc.

Electoral

In contrast to the county's other urban water districts, La Puente elects its five directors on an at-large basis. Once chosen, directors serve four year terms. They are responsible for electing their own officers.

La Puente's board is a mix of veterans and relative newcomers. For example, while the current President was appointed by the Board of Supervisors in 1991, his second in command has been serving the district since 1968. Of the three other directors, one was elected in 1983, one was elected in 1993, and the third was appointed in the fall of the same year.

Las Virgines Municipal Water District

Overview

The Las Virgines Municipal Water District was founded in 1955 for the express purpose of securing and maintaining a reliable source of water to accommodate the region's rapid suburbanization. While the district has undergone several major changes in the 39 years since its inception, its function has remained constant: today, Las Virgines' mission is to provide quality water to the 65,000 customers living and working in its 122 square mile service area (please see attached map).

Budget

Not surprisingly, considering its size, Las Virgines has one of Los Angeles County's largest water-related budgets. In 1993-94, the district anticipated total revenues in excess of \$53 million (please see budget for complete breakdown).

Electoral

Policy in Las Virgines is determined by a 5-member Board of Directors. Elected in districts every four years, these directors may be recalled by their constituents at any time. Judging from the current composition of the board, however, recall does not seem to be a real concern: current Vice President A. Macneil Stelle has been serving Las Virgines since 1965, while President Harold V. Helsley has sat on the Board since 1979. The other members of the Board were first elected in 1983, 1987, and 1989.

When the matter is reclaimed water, the Board is advised by the 20-member Reclaimed Water Seasonal Storage Project Community Advisory Committee. Comprised of representatives of home owners' associations, city government, and concerned citizenry, this Committee participates in virtually every aspect of the district's reclaimed water project.

With its incorporation of "regular folks" in the policy making-process, this committee is unique in Los Angeles County.

Littlerock Creek Irrigation District

Overview

Founded in 1892, Littlerock Creek is one of Los Angeles County's oldest water-related jurisdictions. The district currently provides water to 1160 residential and 70 agricultural hookups in and around the city of Littlerock in the northern portion of Los Angeles County (please see map).

Budget

With a budget of approximately \$1,400,000, Littlerock Creek is one of the county's smaller districts. Like many other such districts, it is dependent upon water tolls and tax revenues for a significant portion of its income: indeed, according to the 1994-95 budget, 34% (\$477,800) of the district's annual income came from water tolls; 12.5% (\$177,042) stemmed from advalorem tax revenues. Other significant sources of funds include monies received from the State Water Project (\$317,385), "water availability" (\$189,640), and money market interest (\$130,980).

The money received from each of these sources is distributed among several concerns. Approximately 53% (\$744,600) of the district's annual revenue is allocated for maintenance and distribution of the water supply; this total includes work on the source, purchased water, power fees, pumping, water treatment, and field salaries. An additional 15.5% (\$219,160) of the budget is used to pay for office administration and employee benefits. The remainder of the budget is largely consumed by non-operating expenses and capital expenditures: together, they eat up almost 31% of the district's funds.

While \$5,000 of Littlerock Creek's budget is slated for Director's Fees, the amounts the directors actually receive depend upon the number of meetings they attend. According to the district's statement of policy, directors' compensation is set on a sliding scale depending upon the meetings they attend, the length of those meeting, and additional time spent on board-

related business. As evidenced by the schedule, Directors are also compensated for all out-of-town travel related to the district.

Electoral

Like the majority of its counterparts, Littlerock Creek is governed by a 5-member Board of Directors. Members of the Board are elected on an at-large basis every four years; as Directors, they are authorized to "supervise, control, regulate, and manage the Department and to make and enforce all necessary and desirable rules and regulations."¹¹

In the past, the President of the Board was chosen by a voice vote of the Board itself. However, according to General Manager Brad Bones, in recent years, that process ceased to be effective. Now, the President is appointed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. There are no provisions for recall.

At this point, however, recall should not be an issue: with three of its directors chosen in 1993 and the fourth elected in 1991, Littlerock Creek has one of the County's newest boards. Another novice is slated to join the ranks later this year, when the Board of Supervisors appoints an applicant to fill the current vacancy.

¹¹ "Littlerock Creek Irrigation District Statement of Policy," p. XII-1.

Newhall County Water District

Overview

Located in the northern portion of Los Angeles County, the Newhall County Water District provides residential (6800 hookups) and commercial (20 hookups) water service to the Upper Santa Clara River Valley. As evidenced by the map, its service areas are scattered and non-contiguous; they incorporate both county land and the city of Santa Clarita.

Budget

According to the Forecast of Operations for the Years 1995-1999, the district derives all of its operating income (estimated at \$4,128,700 in 1994-95) from water sales. The money gleaned from user fees is augmented by revenue received from property taxes (estimated at \$672,000 in 1994/95), interest (estimated at \$28,100 1994/95), and additional, undefined sources (estimated at \$54,100 in 1994-95). In the 1994/95 year, the district anticipates income totaling \$4,882,900.00.

According to Newhall's forecast, over half of this total will be consumed by costs directly related to the maintenance of the water supply (approximately \$2,485,500).¹² An additional \$1,272,000 is slated to cover "General and Administrative Costs." Other expenditures are listed in the report.

All told, Newhall expects to record a net gain of \$27,000 in the upcoming year. As evidenced by the budget itself, this gain is largely dependent upon the property taxes received by the district: without them, Newhall would be approximately \$512,400 in the red.

The District did not provide a breakdown of Directors' Fees.

¹² Of this total, \$235,000 has been allocated for "Source of Supply"; \$1,170,200 has been allocated for pumping; \$231,400 has been allocated for water treatment; \$399,900 has been allocated for "Transmission & Distribution"; and \$449,000 has been allocated for "Other Operating." See Newhall County Water District Forecast of Operations for the Years Ending June 30, 1995 - 1999, Exhibit 1.

Electoral

Not surprisingly (considering the non-contiguous nature of the district), Newhall's five directors are elected at large. All serve four year terms, with the President being chosen by a voice vote of the Board. The recall process is governed by Division 12 of the State Water Code.

Currently, there is one vacancy on the Newhall board. Of the four other directors, two -- Bob Wade, the current President, and Dan Hays, the Vice-President -- have been serving the district since 1973. At the other end of the spectrum, Directors Lynn Plambech and Ed Dunn were both elected in 1993.

Orchard Dale Water District

Overview

Founded in 1954 to meet the water needs of a rapidly expanding community, the Orchard Dale Water District currently serves 4,000 residential and 50 commercial hookups in the cities of La Mirada and Santa Fe Springs (please see map).

Budget

In 1994-95, Orchard Dale anticipates income of approximately \$1,667,136. Almost 98% of this total is expected to come from water services and meter charges. Other sources of revenue include interest (\$20,000) and delinquency fines (\$8,600).

While Orchard Dale thus expects to earn most of its money from a single source, its distribution system is more balanced. In 1994-95, the district's three greatest expenses are expected to be purchased water (\$514,800), "water replenishment tax" (\$197,600) and administrative and general salaries (\$177,240). The remainder of the district's funds are to be split amongst several dozen smaller concerns.

One such concern is Directors' Costs: in 1994-95, Orchard Dale's board is slated to receive \$9,550 in "fees" and \$6,000 for "travel and special meetings." Although modest, these figures represent increases over the previous year's allocations (for complete breakdown, please see budget).

Electoral

Orchard Dale's board is comprised of five directors elected at large to serve four year terms. The board elects its own officers on an annual basis. There are no committees currently advising it.

Members of the district's present board were first elected in 1965, 1978, 1980, and 1993 (2), respectively.

Palmdale Irrigation District

Overview

Incorporating portions of the city of Palmdale and surrounding, unincorporated county land, the Palmdale Irrigation District furnishes water to approximately 22,500 residential (20,500), commercial (1,500), industrial (300), and agricultural (160) hookups in the northern portion of Los Angeles County (please see map for service area).

Budget

In its 1994 Budget, Palmdale anticipated total revenues in excess of \$12,800,000. Approximately 64% of this total was expected to come from water sales (\$8,300,000), with other significant sources of income including "assessments" (\$2,146,000), "capital improvement fees" (\$1,100,000) and interest (\$952,000).

The district's major expenditures included "operations and production" (\$2,849,000), "depreciation" (\$2,000,000), "facilities" (\$1,828,000), business office and administrative charges (\$2,155,000), interest on long term debt (\$669,000), and engineering costs (\$645,000). Despite such hefty figures, Palmdale expected to end 1994 with net earnings of approximately \$3,096,000.

Director's expenses were not available (please see budget).

Electoral

Like the majority of the county's water-related jurisdictions, Palmdale is governed by a five-member Board of Directors. These directors are elected from districts, and serve four-year terms. They elect their own officers and appoint a General Manager to oversee day-to-day operations in the district.

Palmdale's current Board is a mixed group, with its Directors having assumed office in 1971, 1987, 1989, 1991, and 1993.

Palm Ranch Irrigation District

Overview

Situated in the northern portion of Los Angeles County, the Palm Ranch Irrigation District provides water to a portion of the city of Quartz Hill and a single tract in the city of Palmdale. All told, the district incorporates 1500 hookups, approximately 1350 of which are in use at any given time. The bulk (1435) of these are residential, though the district does offer commercial water service in 40 locations.

Budget

In 1993-94, Palm Ranch collected revenues of \$660,013.90, with approximately 95 % of this total stemming from domestic water sales. Unlike many of the county's other water-related jurisdictions, Palm Ranch did not receive any tax monies in fiscal 1993-94. Instead, the remaining 5 % of its budget was split fairly evenly amongst a handful of small concerns (please see budget).

The monies collected by the district were distributed among several concerns, with salaries (\$166,649.39), power (\$168,862.43), and depreciation expenses (\$82,052.00) eating up the biggest chunks. Despite such fees, Palm Ranch ended the year in the black, spending just \$599,375.74 of the \$660,000 it generated.

Some of the district's savings may be traced to the compensation received by its Board of Directors. While many of the County's water-related jurisdictions allocate funds for directors' election costs and travel expenses (in addition to their stipends), Palm Ranch gives its five Directors a total of \$8,000 per annum.

Electoral

Like the majority of the county's water governments, Palm Ranch is ruled by a five-member Board of Directors. These directors are elected in districts, except when a candidate is running unopposed. When such a situation occurs, the election is cancelled and the

candidate appointed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors. All directors -- whether elected or appointed -- serve four year terms. According to General Manager James Baker, the district's provisions for recall are included in the Los Angeles County Code; the directors are advised by the county Board of Supervisors and LAFCO.

Palm Ranch's current board is a mix of water-district veterans and relative newcomers. According to Baker, current Vice-President Wayne D. Nygaard has held office since 1975. He is joined on the board by Secretary Philip L. Counts (elected in 1989), President Edward J. Lisbony (1991), Assistant Secretary Jess Baker (1992), and Director Don Chaissen (1994). Each was granted his title by a voice vote of the Board.

Quartz Hill County Water District

Overview

Located in the northernmost portion of Los Angeles County, the Quartz Hill County Water District services 3,725 residential and 125 commercial hookups in Lancaster, Palmdale, and the surrounding area (please see map).

Budget

With a 1993-94 budget of \$1,777,500, Quartz Hill is one of Los Angeles County's smaller water districts. As evidenced by the budget, the bulk of its revenues stem from water sales (\$1,400,000), with additional monies coming from new services (\$117,500) and "other" (\$260,000).

These funds are distributed among a variety of concerns, with purchased water (\$350,000), wages (\$198,000), professional services (\$150,000), and power (\$150,000) eating up the largest chunks. The district's directors receive a total of \$15,000 for their services.

Electoral

Like most of the county's water-related governments, Quartz Hill is governed by a five-member Board of Directors. Elected on an at large basis, each member serves a four year term. The members of the board select their own officers. There are no specific provisions for recall, nor are there any task-forces or committees currently advising the board.

When it comes to length of service, Quartz Hill's present board is the county's most diverse. Current President Olan M. Flick has been serving the area's water needs since April of 1958. While they can't match Flick, Directors Donald Raven and Michael F. Risolo have also amassed considerable experience, first winning election respectively in 1978 and 1980. Director Lee Richardson took office in 1987; Frank Rymon, the Board's junior member, won his seat in 1991.

San Gabriel County Water District

Overview

Incorporating portions of the cities of San Gabriel, Rosemead, and Temple City, the San Gabriel County Water District provides water to approximately 8,125 residential and commercial hookups in the San Gabriel Valley (please see map for service area).

Budget

In calendar year 1994, San Gabriel's Board of Directors anticipated revenues of \$2,837,555. Approximately 96% of this total was expected to come from water sales (\$2,725,935), with the remaining 4% derived from water quality authority assessments, interest, and a number of smaller sources (for complete breakdown, please see budget).

San Gabriel expected to distribute these revenues among five major concerns: water production (\$1,062,067), general and administrative expenditures (\$926,364), capital investment and improvement (\$687,200), transmission/distribution (\$179,067), and customer service and meter reading (\$169,940). All told, the district anticipated a deficit of \$187,083 in calendar 1994.

According to the District's administrative code, members of the Board of Directors are to receive: "one hundred (\$100.00) dollars for each day's attendance at meeting of the Board and fifty (\$50.00) dollars for each day's attendance at meeting of committees to which the Director has been appointed or nominated by the Board, not to exceed six (6) days in any calendar month." The code also stipulates that directors shall be reimbursed for expenses incurred during board-related business. In 1994, \$42,300 was allocated for "Convention/Travel/Training"; an additional \$15,000 was slated to defray the cost of election expenses.

Electoral

San Gabriel's directors are chosen on an at-large basis to serve four year terms. They elect their own officers, and serve on their own committees. The Board has not established any special provisions for recall.

The district's current Board is the most experienced in Los Angeles County, with members assuming office in 1968, 1971, 1972, and 1974. Current Vice-President Kenneth Bauchman is the novice in the group, having won his seat in 1989.

San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District

Overview

The San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District is unique among its counterparts in Los Angeles County: while the district incorporates portions of the cities of Alhambra, Azusa, Monterey Park, and Sierra Madre, it does not have a single hook-up: for, unlike its residential water-supplying counterparts in the rest of the San Gabriel Valley, the district deals only in replacement water and groundwater recharge.

Budget

In Fiscal Year 1994-95, San Gabriel Valley expects to take in over \$4 million in unrestricted revenues. Almost 99% of these funds are expected to come from three sources: interest revenue (\$1,621,250), tax revenue (\$1,450,000), and water sales (\$900,000). The district expects to take in an additional \$175,000 from the sale of hydraulic power, \$1,206,991 in tax revenue from the State Water Project, and \$1,229,000 in bond revenues.

While such numbers make for a hefty total, San Gabriel Valley actually plans to operate under a deficit in Fiscal 1994-95. The reason for this deficit lies with the State Water Project: the district expects to spend \$4,500,000 of its funds on project expenses. San Gabriel Valley has slated an additional \$2,464,755 for "Unrestricted General Operating Expenses:" this figure incorporates salaries and benefits, office expenses, system maintenance, and water costs (for a complete breakdown and exact figures, please see budget). All told, San Gabriel Valley expects to end the 1994-95 fiscal year \$816,386 in debt.

The district budgets more of its funds for its board than most other water-related jurisdictions. Indeed, in the 1994-95 fiscal year, San Gabriel Valley Directors were allocated \$21,000 to cover "Directors Fees," \$25,000 to cover "Travel and Conference" costs, and \$20,000 to defray election expenses.

Electoral

With the exception of its budget, San Gabriel Valley's Board of Directors is typical of those in water districts throughout Los Angeles County: it is comprised of 5 members who are elected in districts (or "divisions") every four years. The district declined to provide information on its internal electoral policies and provisions for recall, saying only that they were governed by the Municipal Water Act of 1911. It did, however, note that there are no committees currently advising the Board.

San Gabriel Valley's present Board is relatively new to office: none of its members has held office for more than five years. The Board's three senior members, Vice-President Leroy E. Moeller, Secretary-Treasurer Carol Montano and Director Charles I. Corp, all gained their seats in the fall of 1990. Director John S. Leung and President Joseph C. Reichenberger assumed office in 1992.

Sativa-Los Angeles County Water District

Overview

Located in the Willowbrook area, the Sativa-Los Angeles County Water District provides water service to 1350 residential hookups in urban Los Angeles.

The district declined to furnish a map.

Budget

The district declined to furnish a recent budget.

Electoral

Sativa is run by a five-member Board of Directors. Elected in districts, the directors each serve four-year terms. The President of the Board is chosen by a vote of the members present. There are no provisions for recall, nor are there any committees currently advising the Board.

The district declined to furnish information regarding the history of the current board.

Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District

Overview

The Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District is a study in contrasts. Incorporating one of the region's most populous service areas (including portions of the cities of El Monte, Monterey Park, Rosemead, South El Monte, South San Gabriel, Temple City, Arcadia, San Gabriel, South Pasadena, Hacienda Heights, Industry, La Puente, Baldwin Park, Covina, Glendora, West Covina, Azusa, Bradbury, Duarte, El Monte, Irwindale, and Monrovia), the district has but 9 connections. Although it boasts one of the area's larger budgets, it counts only a handful of customers.

These dichotomies have their root in Upper San Gabriel Valley's existence as a water wholesaler. Acting as an agent between the massive Metropolitan Water District and nine of the region's smaller, localized agencies, the district effectively transfers water from one provider to another. In the world of Southern California water, Upper San Gabriel Valley is the consummate middleman.

Budget

In the 1994-95 fiscal year, the district anticipates revenues of approximately \$14,620,000. Of this total, approximately \$6,880,000 is expected to come from water purchases, \$1,900,000 is expected to derive from "parcel charges," \$1,100,000 is slated to come from water conservation contributions by the Metropolitan Water District, and \$3,150,000 is expected to carry over from fiscal 1993-94. Other significant sources of revenue include reclaimed water contributions and surcharges from water sales (for a complete breakdown, please see budget).

According to the 1994-95 budget, Upper San Gabriel Valley intends to spend every penny it earns: "No provision is made to reserve funds for prior year commitments or known future obligations." Indeed, after the district spends the slated \$6,880,000 on water purchases,

\$2,588,000 on its water reclamation program, \$2,490,000 on its capital program reserve, \$1,235,000 on its water conservation project, \$1,092,000 on administration, and \$335,000 on various other concerns, Upper San Gabriel Valley won't have a cent left. A substantial portion of the district's administrative expenses may be traced to its Board of Directors. With each director slated to receive approximately \$20,400 in salary in fiscal 1994-95, Upper San Gabriel Valley has one of the county's most lucrative compensation schedules. When the \$30,000 budgeted for meetings and conferences and the \$85,000 marked for election expenses are added to this total, the district ranks first in total director compensation.

Electoral

Its budget aside, the Upper San Gabriel Board of Directors is typical of those governing water districts around Los Angeles County: its five members are chosen from districts to serve four year terms, and there are no provisions for recall. Not surprisingly, considering the district's status as a wholesaler, there are no outside/citizen committees currently advising the Board. The Board is presently fairly new to office: its three senior directors assumed office in 1991, while the two other officers were elected in 1993.

Valley County Water District

Overview

Formed in 1925 under the state's County Water District Law, the Valley County Water District is one of Southern California's older water-related jurisdictions. Currently, the district provides domestic water service to approximately 12,000 customers in a 12.8 mile service area. This area incorporates portions of the cities of Baldwin Park, Irwindale, West Covina, and Azusa, in addition to the Santa Fe Dam Recreation Area (please see map). "At the present time, the District has seven plant locations and ten wells."¹³ It forms a part of the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District (a portion of the Metropolitan Water District).

Budget

Like most of the county's other water-related jurisdictions, Valley is a water retailer. As such, the district is largely dependent upon water sales for its revenues. In the 1993-94 adopted budget, almost 85 % (\$2,816,900 out of \$3,348,400) of Valley's income was expected to derive from water sales and service. The remaining 15 % of Valley's revenues were divided between taxes (\$142,000), interest (\$90,000), a rate increase (\$200,000), and a water quality assessment (\$95,000).

While the bulk of Valley's monies thus flow from a single source, the district distributes its funds more evenly. In 1993-94, it expected to spend 30 % (\$845,500) of its funds on system maintenance, 29 % on salaries and wages (\$799,500), 20 % on purchased power (\$569,100), 12 % (\$347,000) on service and supply, and 9 % (\$256,300) on employee benefits (for a complete breakdown, please see budget).

In 1993-94, the members of Valley's Board of Directors were scheduled to receive \$24,000 in compensation, \$30,000 for travel, and \$10,000 to defray election expenses.

¹³ "Valley County Water District - History and Organization," synopsis furnished by Valley County Water District.

Electoral

Valley is run by a Board comprised of five Directors. These directors are elected at large every four years. Valley's current board is a mix of "career" water district officials and relative newcomers. Indeed, while its current President was elected in 1993, Valley's Vice-President has held office since 1969. The three other board members began serving in 1979, 1983, and 1993, respectively.

The district declined to provide information regarding provisions for recall and the method of choosing an executive director. It did, however, note that there are no standing committees currently advising the Board.

Walnut Valley Water District

Overview

Incorporating portions of the cities of Walnut, Diamond Bar, Industry, West Covina, Pomona, and Rowland Heights, the Walnut Valley Water District covers approximately 28 square miles in the San Gabriel Valley (please see map). Founded on July 10, 1952, the district currently serves approximately 100,000 multi-use consumers through 25,000 service connections. According to a synopsis furnished by the district, Walnut Valley is "totally dependent on a 100% potable water supply purchased from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California...through the Three Valleys Municipal Water District."

Budget

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1994, Walnut Valley anticipated total annual expenditures in excess of \$13,000,000. This total included an anticipated \$8,372,363 for purchased water, \$2,334,401 to cover general and administrative expenses, \$790,275 to cover transmission and distribution expenses, \$677,256 for pumping charges, and \$635,445 for customer service expenses (for a complete breakdown, please see budget). Walnut Valley's directors were allocated a total of \$103,066 to cover their salaries, election expenses, and conference and committee costs.

The district declined to furnish a statement of anticipated revenue.

Electoral

Walnut Valley is governed by a five-member Board of Directors. The directors are elected in districts to serve four year terms. The Board elects its own officers at an organizational meeting each January.

In addition to attending board meetings, directors usually serve on at least one of the five committees which advise the Board. Comprised of members of the Board and district

staff, these committees deal with issues such as finance, engineering, personnel, public information, and legislation. Committee membership is determined by the President of the Board on an annual basis.

Walnut Valley's directors also are active in the Association of California Water Agencies Joint Powers Insurance Authority, the Joint Water Line Commission, the Puente Basin Water Agency, and the Three Valleys Municipal Water District.

Currently, the district's board is a combination of water district veterans and relative newcomers. President Keith K. Gunn and Vice-President Edward N. Layton were elected in 1984 and 1985, respectively, while Vice-President William G. Wentworth assumed office in 1987; Assistant Treasurer Donald L. Nettles won his seat in 1993. Ironically, the only director without a board title is the one with the most experience: Rev. Richard C. Engdahl has been representing the residents of District II since 1977.

West Basin Municipal Water District

Overview

Running from Topanga and West Hollywood in the North, through Culver City, Inglewood, Marina del Rey, and Redondo Beach (to name a few of its component cities), and finally ending at the shoreline in Rancho Palos Verdes, the West Basin Municipal Water District incorporates a diverse group of non-contiguous communities (please see map). Established in 1947 to alleviate a water shortage and regulate the supply, the district currently acts as a water wholesaler to 11 retail water suppliers. In addition, it has embarked (with the Central Basin Municipal Water District) on a recycling program intended to replace imported water with water treated and recycled by district facilities and a conservation program designed to educate consumers as to the most efficient use of the water supply.

Budget

With anticipated operating revenues of \$80,217,700 in fiscal 1993-1994, West Basin has the largest budget of any of Los Angeles County's water related-jurisdictions. While the bulk of its revenues stem from sales of imported water (\$67,720,000), the district also receives significant monies from meter charges (\$91,700), interest (\$326,000), sales of desalted water (\$924,000), conservation credits from the Metropolitan Water District, of which West Basin is a member (\$1,041,000), and standby charges (\$10,100,000).

Not surprisingly, considering the district's status as a wholesaler, the majority of the funds generated by West Basin are poured back into the purchase of imported water (\$64,130,000). Bond debt (\$10,390,700), conservation programs (\$1,841,600), maintenance on the desalter (\$1,074,900), maintenance on the recycling project (\$840,000), and administration expenses (\$658,000) also consume significant portions of the district's funds. In spite of the big numbers, however, West Basin expects to finish the year with a surplus of approximately \$814,000.

Part of the reason for this surplus may be traced to West Basin's implementation of a new management strategy. In an effort to cut costs and streamline management of long-term projects, the district shares a staff with the Central Valley Municipal Water District. Together, the two employ a staff of 30 to oversee property management, security, office production, and personnel services.

While they have thus combined their staff, the districts have maintained separate Boards. The budget for West Basin's board is the second largest in the county: the 1993-94 budget allocated \$80,000 for "Directors Fees/Expenses," \$40,000 for "Travel," and \$25,000 for conference costs; each of these schedules represented an increase from the 1992-93 budget. There was, however, one cut: the 1993-94 budget did not set aside any money to cover director's election fees. In the past, the members of the board had been given as much as \$75,000 to aid their campaigns.

Electoral

While the size and scope of West Basin's budget are thus somewhat atypical, its electoral structure is best described as conventional. The five members of its board are elected from districts to serve four year terms. The officers of the board are chosen by the board itself. West Basin does not have any provisions for recall, nor is the district advised by any committees.

The district declined to furnish information regarding the electoral history of its current board.

West Valley County Water District

Overview

Located in the northern portion of Los Angeles county, the West Valley County Water District is the region's smallest water-related jurisdiction. Founded in accordance with the County Water District Act of 1949, West Valley currently provides water to 160 residential hookups in unincorporated county land.

The district declined to furnish a map of its service area.

Budget

West Valley's size is further evidenced by its budget: in 1993-94, the district expected to take in just \$127,980. The majority of this total was expected to stem from "water revenue," a category incorporating water sales (\$68,500) and "meter access" (\$23,000). Additional sources of income for the district included a "standby assessment" (\$33,000) and installation revenue (\$16,000) (for complete breakdown, please see budget).

The monies generated by West Valley were slated to be split among a host of smaller concerns. Indeed, the district's greatest expense was the \$11,000 earmarked for administrative and clerical costs. Other "significant" costs included power for water pumping (\$8,000) and capital improvements (\$7,600).

In West Valley, directors' fees are set by statute, with each director entitled to \$100.00 for every board meeting he/she attends or for each day of service he/she provides the district. In 1993-94, such expenses were expected to total \$4,000 (a figure which was double the amount budgeted for similar fees during the previous year).

Electoral

West Valley elected the five members of its Board of Directors on an at-large basis every four years. The members of the board choose their own officers annually; they are not advised by additional committees or task-forces.

West Valley's current board is relatively new to office, with two of its members appointed in 1988, one appointed in 1990, and the remaining two elected in 1991.