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Mr. Ott: Michael Ott welcomed the public to the February 27, 2007 public outreach meeting and made some opening remarks before introducing the project team. Mr. Ott indicated that Shirley Anderson would give a PowerPoint presentation and an overview of the Micro Report on the Reorganization of Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services in Unincorporated San Diego County.

Mr. Ott provided an opportunity for Public Comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

MR. WARNER: My name is Rick Warner. I'm a 20-year, 21-year resident of Pine Valley, spent 16 years on the planning group here before it became the planning group, and 26 years with the County, and working in special districts as well as in other agencies. And I'm wondering...
why we need this in Pine Valley? We're pretty efficient. We've got a pretty good volunteer fire department up here. We do a good job. In the 20 years I have been here, we've maintained a five or six insurance rating the whole time I've been here. And I wonder why we need this and are we being penalized for being efficient by being downgraded to match the rest of the county because we've done a good job with our tax money?

MR. OTT: Any of you two gentlemen, who would like to take a stab at answering that?

MR. TRAYLOR: Thank you for your question. Why we're doing it: Following the Cedar Fire, your Board of Supervisors put an advisory ballot, Proposition C on the ballot. 81 percent of the voting members of the community, the County, advised the County Board of Supervisors that they were in favor of the reorganization under a regional fire protection district in answer to your question.

MR. WARNER: That 81 percent, how many live in the rural areas and how many of them live in the city?

MR. TRAYLOR: Well, we actually have a breakdown of each of the voting precincts, which included every community including Pine Valley. There was no community that was broken down by the Office of the Registrar of voters that was less than 61 percent. I don't know where Pine Valley fell on that, but it certainly was not less than 61 percent.

I want to go back to one other comment that he said. I have some passion about firefighters, and I appreciate your comment about fire hoses. Within this
1 organizational structure here there are four to 500 people
2 on the fire line, if you will, that put water on the fire.

MR. OTT: Are there any other questions related to
3 the presentation before we break that down and ask people to
4 come up to the podium? Why don't you come to the mike.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I live in Pine Valley. Your
1 career volunteer, I guess I'm unfamiliar, is that one career
2 person, is that paid volunteers, what is that model really?

MR. TRAYLOR: There is a real mix of volunteers
within the communities. Some are very viable volunteer
programs. In that case we will put a paid paramedic on
duty, a paid EMT every day of the week to complement the
volunteer program as part of the cost model. For those
communities that, quote, have a volunteer fire station but
list zero volunteers, San Diego Rural Fire Protection

District has several stations where they list zero
volunteers, we put paid members in there. So that's how we
cost the model out. If there's a viable volunteer program
that's working very well, we want to supplement, complement
that by, in a sense, in the best of all worlds paying one of
your volunteers to be on duty 24/7.

MR. OTT: Why don't you come to the microphone and
state your name and your question. And then we will get to
the list of speaker slips here as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This has to do with what you
presented earlier. Where it says that the taxes have to
stay in the community, does that mean those taxes still stay
with the volunteer fire department so they can maintain
themselves or does that go to pay for the CDF, or whatever
paid people come in to be the pay part of the department?

MR. OTT: Well, I think your question relates to the comment that we made regarding having the special assessments that have been voter approved within the communities that have approved those, that those revenues stay within the community. That would be a requirement. If LAFCO were to approve any of these reorganization models, we would make it a legal term and condition that those voter-approved monies that are segregated by community would have to remain within the community.

MR. COSTANZO: But does that money stay within the community volunteer organization or are any of those funds that stays within the community but pays for those CDF officers that are going to be within the community?

MR. OTT: Well, again, the special assessment revenue would stay within the community. The general property tax monies that all of us pay would be available for general purposes by whatever regional entity would be formed or if one would be formed.

MR. COSTANZO: So none of those funds will be used in any way to pay for any of the paid staffed, CDF or otherwise, that would be coming in, it would all stay with the volunteer agencies; is that what you're saying?

MR. OTT: Shirley, do you want to come up here? I think you were the one that made that comment a couple of times during your presentation.

What is your name, please?

MR. COSTANZO: Tim Costanzo, C-o-s-t-a-n-z-o.
MS. ANDERSON: Tim, I think to some extent we're talking about bookkeeping measures. There are special assessment areas that are indeed only volunteers. Most of them, however, are larger assessment areas. Let me see, let's talk about Deer Springs just because I know they have some very large assessment areas. That assessment revenue pays, in most cases, for accelerated service levels within that assessment area and that would have to continue. How that money is applied, we don't know. That is the decisions of future legislative bodies. And, in some cases, as I say, it's bookkeeping, you know, money comes in, some of it's applied here, some of it's applied there, but it must stay to provide services in the area that it was assessed.

MR. COSTANZO: I understand that, but you still haven't answered the question and, that is, does that money stay with that particular volunteer department even though it becomes part of a larger organization? Does it stay to pay for their training and their staff as they are right now to support the overall agency or does some of that money go to pay for the CDF staff within that community?

MS. ANDERSON: It could go to pay for CDF staff in the community.

MR. COSTANZO: Then that would financially break the volunteer organizations.

MS. ANDERSON: Well, when you're talking about volunteer organizations, we're not talking about special voter approved special assessments, I don't believe, because your true volunteer agencies, your Shelter Valley, is that the type of volunteer agency you're talking about?
MR. COSTANZO: No, I'm talking about all the volunteer agencies.

MS. ANDERSON: Okay. There are two different kinds of agencies.

MR. COSTANZO: Let's take a CSA that has funds dedicated to that area that's been voted on. For example, they've got funds that take care of their volunteer organization and if you take any of those funds away from that organization to pay for the paid staff, they could no longer maintain their volunteer equipment or their training because that's where their money comes from, that's my question.

MS. ANDERSON: Volunteer organizations by definition are not public agencies and they do not have property tax revenue or special assessment revenue. Only the parent agency does.

MR. COSTANZO: Okay. Let's take CSA 107.

MR. TRAYLOR: Let me try. You're CSA?

MR. COSTANZO: Yes.

MR. TRAYLOR: You're a volunteer organization within the CSA? So the answer to your question is the special assessment would go into a general fund to be used in your community. It would not necessarily go directly to your fire department to be used as your fire department so pleases, because the governance would be for the whole region. Now, that money can't be spent outside your CSA boundary where those assessments were voted in, but it could be used for general service delivery. So to answer your
question, could it be used for personnel costs, yes.

MR. COSTANZO: That's what I thought. Thank you.

MR. GOSS: I just might add, that that money would have to be used if it's for a special service, like a paramedic service, that service has to be maintained under the organization.

MR. OTT: Any other questions related to the presentation?

MS. REED: Hi, my name is Nancy Reed and my question is kind of where do we go from here? I want more information on how this is going to work. I understand we're going to have hearings and the Board of Supervisors is going to vote.

My question is, is what sorts of things will the Board be voting on? And my underlying question is nothing pencils out on anything that you have shown us, so I'm having a hard time thinking that the Board is going to approve anything that is basically a bottomless money pit and it can't afford itself. So in your report, I imagine, that you will be giving the Board some options?

MR. OTT: Excellent question. First of all, it will not be the Board of Supervisors that will be making this decision. It will be LAFCO. The Board of Supervisors is represented on our commission. But in our May 7th meeting, our hearing, it is conceivable that our commission, LAFCO, can make a decision that would reorganize the fire
agencies in any type of array of models that we have shown here so far.

You’ve asked about the big unknown, the financial need for an agency. We’ve indicated that that gap between local resources and needed resources ranges anywhere from 22 to about 47 million dollars. Big chunk of change. A significant amount of money. The Board of Supervisors is an active player in this discussion. They have been addressing that financial gap by seeking legislation. They just obtained an author, Senator Hollingsworth, to help bridge this gap that we’ve shown on the screen here as well as in the Micro Report. Those of you that are interested in following the legislation, it was just introduced on Friday, Senate Bill 806, which would provide needed funding to make something like this happen.

There’s also another means by which the reorganization could occur as well without state legislation, and that would be if there would be an entity like the Board of Supervisors that would decide to make structural fire protection, emergency medical services, one of its core priorities, one of its core responsibilities. It would take a shift in the institutional thinking within the County government, that if it decided to appropriate funds to make this happen, it could be a reality through a discretionary action of the Board of Supervisors and that is also conceivable as well. A lot will be happening between now and May 7th that may make this model that we’ve shown here a reality in terms of bridging that gap. So those are
two of the available things.

We'll move the podium over and then start the more formal part of the question and answer.

MR. TWOHY: Actually, Mike, I was looking for a little clarification on what you just said about the Board.

MR. OTT: Frank, why don't you come up to the microphone.

MR. TWOHY: Frank Twohy, Elfin Forest, California here. My question, could you relate once again, Mike, what you were saying about the Board may not vote on this plan? I'm sorry, I drifted.

MR. OTT: Sure. First and foremost, before anybody can vote on any plan, LAFCO, the agency that I mentioned in my opening remarks, it has the authority to reorganize agencies, must first take its vote. And then if it votes in the affirmative, then there will be a chain reaction of other votes that may culminate in a vote of the community, but also a vote within the Board of Supervisors, for example, because the Board of Supervisors has partnered with LAFCO in examining and initiating the reorganization that we have shown. But as far as the regulatory authority of agencies to approve any of these changes of organizations that we've shown on the table, that authority rest solely and squarely with LAFCO and no other entity. So the very first entity, the first agency that would need to start that chain reaction would be LAFCO. And I'll finish my sentence after the podium is moved. The chain reaction that I was referring to is, it works something like this, that if LAFCO were to approve one of the reorganization options here, that
would require, for example, if we designated the County as the successor agency or designated the County Service Area 135 as that regional communication agencies, we had slides up showing the boundaries of that, if we designated either of those entities, the County of San Diego in general, or more specifically County Service Area 135 as the successor, that would require that the Board of Supervisors take action to accept that request from LAFCO. It could not happen unilaterally by LAFCO. So, again, there would be the Board of Supervisors' involvement, but the Board of Supervisors would act in a manner that would be responding to the action that would be taken by LAFCO. It's a little complicated, but it's how government works. There's an initiating entity, an approving entity, and then there are different responsible agencies.

Are we ready start with the part of the presentation here?

MR. MACFARLANE: Mike, could I ask some questions about what you just said?

MR. OTT: Come to the table. And why don't you just state your name so that everybody could hear your question.

MR. MACFARLANE: I'm Byron MacFarlane from CSA 107 and I represent CSA 107 and myself. And this question is, when Shirley discussed the four options, those are the only four options on the table; is that correct?

MR. OTT: Those are the four options that we've analyzed and considered them to be on the table. It is
conceivable that there would be hybrids, modifications.
It's conceivable that our commission, which we report to,
can decide that there should be a fifth option. But these
are the options that have been discussed for the past
everal years, these are the options that have to be
alyzed.

MR. MACFARLANE: Did you say that if, in fact, you
choose the fire protection district or the status quo, that
the Board of Supervisors would not be voting on that and
they would only be voting on the County successor and the
CSA 135?

MR. OTT: Yes and no. There would be no Board of
Supervisors' action taken to form the regional fire
district. It would be a question put forth directly to the
voters. However, the big question that we focused

considerably on tonight is what about the funding gap
between what exists and what is needed. The Board of
Supervisors plays a very important role here in terms of
that funding. No. 1, they sponsored legislation that I
mentioned that would help bridge that gap. The other
possibility is that the Board of Supervisors may look at its
County Fire Enhancement Program and decide to adjust those
numbers that Shirley has indicated. The County has
contributed so far eight and a half million dollars to
structural fire protection in the County. It's not
inconceivable that additional monies would come from the
Board of Supervisors. If they were to elect to do that,
LAFCO would have to require that there be some sort of
commitment regarding those funds in order to make the
regional fire district a reality. So that is, I think, the yes and no part of the answer. It's mainly, yes, but a little bit no in there.

MR. MACFARLANE: Okay. And then one last item. I look at the cover of the Micro Study and there are it looks to me like eight votes listed there. Is that essentially correct, eight votes, two supervisors?

MR. OTT: Correct, LAFCO consists of an eight-member commission, and it takes five of those eight to move any motion and to pass any motion.

Do you have any other questions?

MR. MACFARLANE: No. I will have more questions later.

MR. OTT: Okay. Well, we want to make sure that we covered everything in our presentation before we move to the speaker slips. I saw a few more hands in this area.

MS. COURTEAU: Alice Courteau from Elfin Forest. I'm just trying to remember when we voted, what year was Prop C, a couple of years ago? Was this advisory to find out what was possible in terms of a reorganization and/or was this a mandate that a reorganization must have?

MR. OTT: Excellent question. 2004 was the election date. It was advisory. It was not mandatory. If it was mandatory, we wouldn't be standing here talking about this. We would be telling you how it's going to happen and when it's going to happen.

MS. COURTEAU: Well, it's a big difference, isn't it?
MR. OTT: It is. But I think it's important to look at the threshold that John Traylor mentioned, the 81 percent threshold.

MS. COURTEAU: Yes, to look into it absolutely. That sounds like a great idea to look into it.

MR. OTT: Excellent point. Again, it was an advisory measure. It did show very strong support for the premise behind consolidation. One of the premises stated in
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that advisory measure was that it would result in no additional monies being allocated to fire protection from any of you property owners. In other words, it would be based on existing revenues within the County or reallocation of those revenues.

Are there any other questions before we move on?

MS. MOORE: My name is Darlene Moore. I have been a resident of Pine Valley for 25 years. I'm wondering why you come to ask us for our comments and give us your options and different scenarios that we have? Pine Valley has already signed a contract with CDF, so how will that affect us?

MR. OTT: I believe about 11 different agencies have signed contracts with the Department of Forestry. The aspect of consolidation is occurring today with or without LAFCO. And I think that the element of the County making the funds available, eight and a half million dollars, to have CDF contracts signed between some of the participating jurisdictions and CDF has already resulted in a functional consolidation in your community. It is a matter of really going further of not just looking at Pine Valley, but
looking at about 16 other agencies and seven volunteer fire organizations to --

MS. MOORE: In the rural area?

MR. OTT: -- truly bring about an organization of fire services in a consolidated, coordinated manner. But you are right, the first step towards consolidation has occurred, but there are additional benefits that could be derived from centralizing that service function further.

MS. MOORE: And when you mention the other departments that have already signed with CDF and you mentioned on your options with the CDF and career volunteers and how that affected the budget into, what was it, 20 million dollars or more, how is that affecting now that they've already been into their contracts without those volunteers, how are they as far as their budget goes now?

MR. OTT: John, do you want to share?

MR. TRAYLOR: I'm not sure I understand your question. For those communities that have and their boards that have signed contracts with CDF, how does that affect the volunteer program?

MS. MOORE: Just to look at Descanso, they had volunteers that I'm sure you had budgeted in with CDF. Well, now they have no volunteers left and how is that affecting their budget?

MR. TRAYLOR: Well, we're getting feedback. And I'm asking for feedback so that we know how it affects it. I hear stories that there is an effect on that, but I can't tell you what that is. The Micro Study studied a conceptual
something that's occurring now through the Fire Enhancement Program through the County of San Diego outside of the Micro Study. And the options that we were tasked to evaluate and put costs on, the Options 5, 6 and 7, which includes volunteers, there's money in that plan to support the volunteer programs where there are active volunteer programs. I can't tell you firsthand what's going on now because we're still getting feedback as to what effect the current Fire Enhancement Program that CDF has on volunteers. I hear stories, but I don't know any factual information.

MR. OTT: Are there any other questions before we move on?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you say you heard stories, are you making an effort to find out what exact effect that had here?

MR. OTT: Yes.

MR. TRAYLOR: Yes, absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because once you dismantle us, we're gone and if things don't work out.

MR. TRAYLOR: Well, that's why as a result of these workshops, as a result of written statements, written factual statements, we will come to some conclusions and make some recommendations.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So will you make an aggressive effort to try to get those written factual
statements and not just expect them to come in?

MR. TRAYLOR: Yes.

MS. ANDERSON: We're looking for people like
yourself and everyone else to provide us with this input.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I know we're the little
guys, though.

MS. ANDERSON: That's where it comes from.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're up against the County
here, so.

MR. OTT: I would just strongly encourage all of
you that have strong feelings about any of the subjects
we're talking about to come to the microphone or to give us
your written comments, because we do want to hear from you.

We do want to base our decision, our recommendations on what
is important to all of you out in the community, so do use
this opportunity to express your concerns and comments.

We're doing everything we can.

We did mention in the Micro Report the importance
of the volunteer element to fire protection cannot be
underestimated. The price tag that we put on the value that
you provide to the community goes beyond the 14 million
dollars countywide that volunteers equate to. That's a
significant amount of money that needs to be looked at as a
local resource, but beyond the dollar amount of the work
that you provide, the importance that you have in the

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services
John Goss put together goes into quite a bit of detail about the volunteer element.

Do you have anything to add to that, John?

MR. GOSS: I think there is a concern that as individual stations or operations may have career firefighters introduced to them, that it might hurt the volunteer program, so one of the things that is recommended here that if you have a broader, larger, unified regional fire district, there's a lot you can do to enhance the volunteer program. You can enhance training, you can enhance standards. There are suggestions that a volunteer manual be created that will provide guidance to volunteer committees as well as the volunteers and the reserves that you currently have at the various stations. If this is going to work, and all we're doing is offering, you might say, a road map for how a new district would be created, because once it's created that new policy will be the one that may be in charge. You will have to have I think incentives to keep the volunteer program going and that's outlined in the report.

MR. OTT: Thank you. We have looks like a couple of more questions.

MR. LAWRENCE: My name the Dan Lawrence. I represent myself, I suppose. I'm from Campo. And one of the things that I'm interested in was kind of brushed on but not really talked about. We received a certain amount of funding as a volunteer fire department from fees collected for new construction of new homes and businesses and other things. Those fees right now are allocated toward the
expansion of the existing fire department. When the top three models are taken into consideration, okay, County, CSA, and I forget the third one, what happens to that funding? It used to go directly to the department. Now it sounds like it’s going to go into a general fund; is that correct? And that funding will essentially come away from the department then at that point; is that correct?

MS. ANDERSON: The broad concept that needs to be grasped here, when we create a regional entity all the local entities go away, they're dissolved. Your volunteer agency that works under a public agency 107 as a CSA, CSA would be dissolved. All the fees that would be applicable to that area for a new building, whatever, go to the new agency with the exception of voter-approved special assessments. They go to the new agency, but they must be retained in that little circle where the voters approve them and for the purpose that the voters approve them.

MR. LAWRENCE: So essentially those fees that are collected by the County today go away to a larger entity?

MS. ANDERSON: They go to the regional entity.

MR. LAWRENCE: To be spent somewhere else?

MS. ANDERSON: Well, this is a decision that would be made by the directors of the new entity.

MR. LAWRENCE: What I haven’t heard here is in this particular area we have full-time fire agencies that are operated by the tribes. They have not been even mentioned here now.

MS. ANDERSON: They're not part of the
reorganization.

MR. LAWRENCE: So how is that going to work with the new agency that might be formed? When we see response now, okay, we get response from CDF, we get response from our local agencies, and we get response from the tribes.

MS. ANDERSON: It would be the same cooperative response that you receive now continued to the new agency.

MR. LAWRENCE: And we wouldn't assist them in their funding at all, they would remain a private agency away from everything?

MS. ANDERSON: They're not part of local government, right. Completely separate.

MR. LAWRENCE: Very basic question. Okay, in the case of our little agency at Campo we're also a 501-C3 and a CSA. When you're looking at that, we own our equipment, okay. If, in fact, you dissolve the CSA, how does the 501-C3 continue to work or would it be forced into giving up its assets back into the larger agency?

MS. ANDERSON: As far as anyone can figure out, there's no way to force a 501-C3 to give up their assets. It's a privately held corporation. The volunteers and the assets held by the corporation would work cooperatively with a new entity in the same manner that you're working cooperatively with the CSA that oversees you now.

MR. LAWRENCE: So basically in this case we end up with status quo?

MS. ANDERSON: That's one way of looking at it, yes.

MR. OTT: I think we should start with the more
formal part of the comments that we're hoping to get from all of you. Bob Uribe, you have an organized presentation, yes?

MR. URIBE: Just the organization of the Pine Valley Fire.

MR. OTT: Bob, why don't you come to the microphone.

MR. URIBE: My name is Bob Uribe, Fire Chief Pine Valley. First off, thanks for coming out. Thank you for letting us participate openly and having people in the community and the surrounding communities have their say in what's their future.

Fire protection is something that's dear to all our hearts. We don't think of anything that's going to happen to us until it actually does or it happens to our neighbor or it happens to someone in our family. So fire, EMS services, when we see something coming over the top, we look for something that's going to be there for sure and guaranteed. For years here all of the organizations have looked for some type of cooperative effort and I think your efforts with LAFCO are in the right direction.

My comments are primarily from me, the fire chief. I know the Board is developing their own response and will provide that to you prior to April 6th. In concept I believe and I support this concept of San Diego County voters in their preference to develop some type of regionalized system. I think that the sole authority has to be developed and if it's LAFCO, let's let it be LAFCO. I
think the voters have to approve any type of tax increase because as Proposition C as it was written was specific to not increasing our taxes. There is money out there. There is money out there that can be had by a penny here and three cents here and those are some of the propositions, or those are some of the options that are available to us.

San Diego Fire County Chiefs have proposed an SSP that also asks for the same thing that we asked for over three years ago and that is sustained funding. The sustained funding to provide you with guaranteed if it's two, if it's three, if it's four, it has to be there on a regular basis. If it's sustained, then we can provide our own reserve programs, our own volunteer programs and make them accountable. More importantly they have to be integrated. If they're not integrated, if they're seen as something that we don't want by other career, quote, firefighters, it's not going to work. It has to be an integrated system.

I believe that there's value in our volunteer fire protection program. These individuals do work for virtually nothing, it's just a cost to the agency for insurance, it's just a cost to the agency for their turnouts and their gear. They dedicate time and effort as volunteers. Five years ago, or 10 years ago, the requirements placed on these young men and women and people of our community has just gone up the same amount, has gone up ten-fold. The certifications that are required for them today is even more difficult than it once was. Likewise, the districts including ours find it more and more difficult to do that.
So we see them as a viable member of our community. Last, but not least, the current Fire Enhancement Program has brought to our particular agency a new engine company, a new water tender, and it's a start in the right direction, but it's not sustained. And I agree, we have to pursue that as something we should look into in the next three years.

Our advisory boards that have to be put forward to the Board of Directors, I believe that the 11 people board is going to be more receptive than just the Board of Directors or the County Board of Directors because I think they've got more than enough on their plate.

We support the concept of a regional fire protection district. And I believe that centralizing our dispatch and emergency medical dispatch included in that is imperative. It's difficult to keep records and all the requirements placed upon us administratively today, however, the funding that you are able to sustain, and if the County is able to step up to that, we'd appreciate it. I support personally the four on-duty ALS career volunteer combination because it's the best and most realistic in our rural setting. We would prefer to have a system of ALS services here in Pine Valley. It was not listed on the Micro Study itself. I believe going back and looking into the Alpine/Pine Valley corridor for running call volume will justify that use. And I would make that one of the major requirements for us being totally supportive of this.

Last, but not least, it had to do with the cost
estimates for your station improvements. As you increase

fire protection to these areas, the fire stations themselves
have to be improved upon. Requirements for having quality
of life for each of these agencies is important to
maintaining, not just our career firefighters, but
maintaining our reserve and volunteer firefighters as well.
I do not believe status quo is something we can have. If it
has to be something, it’s up to all of us to find something
that is acceptable at all levels with both combination
career reserve and volunteer firefighters. And, most
importantly, that we do it in a format that’s organized and
it’s based on one levelheaded agency at the top end that’s
able to provide us that.

And thank you very much for your time. And, again,
I will give you something back in writing prior to your
May 6 deadline. Thank you very much.

MR. OTT: Thank you, Bob. We’ve not established
any time limit for giving comments, but do try to be as
concise and brief as possible.

Kevin Dubler, are you here? Would you like to speak?

MR. DUBLER: Not at this time.

MR. OTT: Okay. Roger Challberg. I can’t see the
end of the spelling here.

MR. CHALLBERG: Yeah, you got it. Thank you. I’m
Roger Chal
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the things that I would like to comment on is we talk a lot about Proposition C. Proposition C was good news, bad news. Good news is it established -- 80 percent of the County felt like most of us did, there was a need for consolidation. The bad news is that unfortunately it gave people kind of the mother, apple pie, whole works. A lot of people thought, okay, we don't have to worry about fire protection locally because the County is going to take care of it. To give you an example, prior to the proposition thing going to ballot, Campo Fire had, I think, three or four propositions on the ballot that we came within three, four votes of two-thirds. Prop C was on the ballot with our proposed benefit fee, we were slaughtered. We had the worst beating we've ever taken in a fire election, partly because people thought that the County was going to take care of it.

One of the things I would suggest is that you look at some of the figures that are needed. The benefit fees paid by the district range from zero, in our case, to hundreds of dollars in the case of other districts. I'd like to see a chart that doesn't give a total income for benefit fees, but says, okay, this is what X, Y, and Z districts are paying in benefit fees, that way we can get a better idea.

MS. ANDERSON: Page 34.

MR. CHALLBERG: Page 34, does it got it broken down?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MR. CHALLBERG: I'm sorry, Shirley, I went through
it but I didn't see that.

    Okay. The other thing is as we look at that, I liked the idea that has been mentioned tonight that the fees stay within the district. What Campo would like to do, we're looking at it right now, we're trying to go slowly because we've spent a lot of our people's money on elections that haven't gone anywhere and we don't want to waste anymore, so we're looking at it closely. What we would like to do is to get a benefit fee which would enable us to have one paid firefighter on duty. Right now we're fortunate, the reserve program, that we have three or four firefighters on duty, they're well trained, but unfortunately after they get their year in, they're eligible to go somewhere else. We've lost in the last two or three months five or six. Now they've been replaced, but we got to retrain them. It would be nice to have one person on duty 24 hours a day that can respond out there with the reserve, so I think that's important.

    Some of your CDF charts need to be updated in there, because CDF, which I think now is going to be Cal Fire as of July 1st, needs the organization in there that is not tied in with their present organization.

I think that's it, but, you know, again we would hope that we could work together on this. And we have supported the consolidation of fire agencies throughout the County, but we know it's going to be a long time coming. I'd look at the funding sources. It specifically precluded raising taxes in Prop C. As much as I appreciate Diane's effort, Diane Jacob's effort in fire protection, I wouldn't
MR. TRAYLOR: Roger, let me address a couple of your comments or questions. What you asked for for Campo you'll see reflected in the Micro Study a paid person on duty with your very viable volunteer company either at the BLS or ALS level, so that addresses your concern. And it's in the Micro Study as Options 5A, 6A or 7A. And I didn't quite understand your comment about CDF, their organizational structure.

MR. CHALLBERG: Well, the organizational structure that you have in the report is not synonymous with what they have today. They changed, what was it, Pete, the first of the year? When did you go into the new organization?

MR. TRAYLOR: Roger, in the Micro Report we don't have a CDF organizational structure. If you're talking about the conceptual plan from the County, it, I believe, has a CDF organizational structure.

MR. CHALLBERG: That's the one I'm probably talking about.

MR. TRAYLOR: I can't address that.

MR. CHALLBERG: I just want to make you aware of it's not what they have. Okay.

MR. OTT: Thank you, Roger. John Fitch is our next speaker, and is John here?

MR. FITCH: Yes, sir.

MR. OTT: Why don't you come on up. I'd just like to indicate that after we get the transcript of tonight's meeting finished, we will post it on our web site. It will
probably take a good two or three weeks depending upon Shannon finalizing her version and us approving it. But you can view the transcripts as they are produced on our web site SDLAFCO.org.

MR. FITCH: Thank you. Good evening. Thank you for taking the time to travel to Pine Valley. My name is John Fitch. I own a home and I've lived here for six years. I've been a member of the Pine Valley Fire Department for the past three years. I have a state fire marshal certificate, Firefighter I certification, a county EMT card, and I own a Class B driver's license for operating firefighting equipment. All of these things I have achieved in training I have received at Pine Valley Fire Department. The fire department is an asset of the community. It has been built with a selfless dedication of the community members past and present. In the three years that I have worked here, I've worked with 16 firefighters who have served this community and then advanced through career positions with municipal departments. They're products of the Pine Valley state fire marshal, Firefighter I, Pine Valley Academy to Viejas, Alpine, Lakeside, Santee, Chula Vista, Federal Fire, Los Angeles County, Del Mar, Poway and five to San Diego City. Currently we have five active firefighters who are paramedics.

The community has developed a self-sufficient organization that has served it well through the years. I offer to you excerpts from the most recent "Pine Valley View" for your review. There are two articles from residents and a letter from the fire chief for the month of
Tonight I'm here speaking as an informed citizen of the community. I commend the LAFCO report. I found it to be a document which affords the opportunity for everyone to understand the breath and scope of the matters at hand. The report is illuminating in regards to recent Department of Planning and Land Use, Pine Valley Fire Protection District contract negotiations.

I would like to believe that the existing Pine Valley Firefighter I and driver operator programs which exist now will continue; however, I have reservations that they will. I can now base this on excerpts from the Micro Report. From the Micro Report, a volunteer operation not aggressively supported by a successor agency, regional resources could actually decline and overall costs would increase. The conceptual plan itself would introduce a defacto consolidation in service under the CDF contracts, left in place, however, individual jurisdictions would have few resources and little ability to exercise discretion over fire protection issues. What was initially proposed as staff augmentation as part of the County Fire Enhancement Program has ended up as an operational change to CDF.

I can tell you that my sentiment runs from the top to the bottom of the rank of existing personnel PVFD. If they plan to effectively obtain personnel in Pine Valley, they need to send a liaison immediately. Thank you. I ask you, LAFCO and the County Board of Supervisors, please take a closer look at the existing local
resources in Pine Valley and re-evaluate the return of investment of 2.2 million dollars in the County Fire Enhancement Program. Again, from the Micro Report, the Micro Report recommends that alternatives to certain components of conceptual reorganization be evaluated. CDF costs have significantly escalated in recent years. Cost to retain and enhance local resources should be examined before committing to a state contractor.

To the County Board of Supervisors, please return to the Pine Valley Fire Board and ask what it would cost to staff equivalent level of service with local resources. On a different but related subject, I have problems with the required dispatch change from Heartland to CDF Monte Vista. Most of us know that CDF does not offer emergency medical dispatch for 911 callers. For those who don’t know, this is from the Micro Report, is provided by all dispatch organizations within the region except CDF. EMT dispatchers are trained and authorized to provide emergency medical instructions to 911 callers prior to the arrival of first responders. It goes on to say to raise the CDF level of dispatch to the standard of all other dispatchers in the region, unspecified additional costs for upgrading communication equipment, plus ongoing costs for added staffing will be passed on to contracting agencies.

To me it’s just plain wrong to change 911 service levels without directly sensitizing the community to this change before it happens. The Micro Report does not specify the cost of eliminating EMT from the dispatch services. My
opinion is that public notification and solicitation for
input should be significantly valued before any changes are
made.

To finish, I'd like to understand if there is

action to come from the Micro Report Executive Summary, it
states that there's a 22 million dollar shortfall on
revenue, but in the next paragraph it goes on to state that
contracting with CDF to provide all services could
inaugurate a comprehensive system, the County would be able
to activate an expanded Fire Enhancement Program without
delay and satisfy Prop C requisite that services in the
unincorporated area be consolidated with existing, not new,
revenue. It appears that that is what is happening now.
And it appears that it's a temporary fix for a long-range
problem.

Again, from the Micro Report, the County Fire
Enhancement Program allocated a total of 8.5 million in
County general funds. The Micro Report must conservatively
view the infusion of County revenue as a one-time support.
The reliance on a non-sustained revenue provides a backup for
the chronic underfunding of the region's volunteer fire
departments.

Without a doubt, structural fire protection is
essential to protect life and property. We all want it.
Pine Valley, we need it for our fire insurance. I notice in
your report the Forest Service is not mentioned at all and I
ask why? They need to be included in a comprehensive
system.
The largest concern for me as a citizen of Pine Valley is when a Santa Ana is blowing sustained gale forces, you know, if a wire breaks in Mt. Laguna like it did in ’72 or somebody throws a cigarette out the window, I want to know that if I evacuate, I’ll get structural protection for our homes. 2300 homes were destroyed in three days in 2003. We need something to protect us from that kind of catastrophe. We need a county fire chief. We would like a maintained comprehensive wildfire preplan for the County. Ideally strike teams would come from incorporated communities to provide mutual aid to us. Lookout points, communications, escape routes, and safety zones would already be assigned. The firefighters would have trained twice a year and would have already seen the country in daylight. That was the reason for Prop C.

MR. OTT: Thank you, John. The next speaker is Larry Jackman. Larry, are you still here?

MR. JACKMAN: Larry Jackman, speaking for myself. And I happen to be a board member of San Miguel Fire District since 1992. My questions basically go to the Hollingsworth Bill SB806 that was introduced, how that relates to LAFCO’s program that you’re doing in regards to the bill, the state mandated consolidation. The text of the bill is only two pages long, so there’s a lot of detail that’s not stated in the bill. I was wondering how the nexus between LAFCO and this bill is going to come to
fruition if it does? That's my question.

MR. OTT: Tough question. There are a lot of
details that I'm sure will come out of SB806 in the upcoming
months. It was just introduced as both you and I mentioned
on Friday. The first step is for it to be assigned to a
committee. It will undoubtedly go to a rules committee and
then probably to an appropriations committee of the
legislature. Some of those details will be worked out there
in terms of any questions or clarifications needed. The
bill in its present form is, like you mentioned, Mr.
Jackman, only a couple of pages in length. It has rather
broad implications, though, in terms of allocating property
tax money, tax monies from school districts in the county to
fire protection agencies or an agency that would be
consolidated by LAFCO. And then the caveat there for any
people that may be affiliated with school districts in the
audience, the State of California would be required to
backfill any monies that would be shifted from the property
taxes that now currently go into schools.

The dollar amount associated with the bill in terms
of its impact or infusion of monies in fire protection, I
couldn't really estimate at this time. It doesn't indicate
what a dollar amount would be in the bill. I believe the
bill references a one percent of the property tax. One of
the north county newspapers recently, I think as of today,
estimated that that amount may be around 32 million dollars,
but that amount may change depending upon assessed values
and so forth as well as details to be worked out.
The bill is quite promising. I think we need more information about it. The San Diego LAFCO will be discussing the bill this coming March 5th. We follow not just fire protection matters but legislation in general. And Supervisor Jacob is planning being at that meeting with LAFCO. She is a member of LAFCO.

By the way, your two members on LAFCO with the County, Dianne Jacob and Supervisor Bill Horn, your alternate is Greg Cox. In any event, we will probably find out more information on Monday, but also the legislative process those answers will be forthcoming. The bill is integral to whatever path that LAFCO takes, so we will be following it. Our actions may be tied to whatever the outcome of that bill is, but hopefully there will be other options put out on the table as well in addition to that legislation.

The next person is Barbara Howell. Barbara, are you here?

MS. HOWELL: I'm here. My question is on the same topic. I just wanted to know about the Hollingsworth Bill, too, and what the length of time is to consider that?

MR. OTT: Well, this is the beginning of a new legislative session. In Sacramento they work on a two-year cycle, so this is the first of two years. For bills that can be deliberated on and acted upon in one year, the cycle concludes in the fall with the Governor either signing the bill or vetoes it or if he doesn't sign it, it becomes law. Those are the time frames. If the bill raises significant issues or there isn't agreement in both houses of
legislature, the matter could be deferred for another year, taken up next year at this time. So the soonest we would know would be in the fall of '07 and the latest would be perhaps the fall of '08. I think we'll know much more as it gets assigned to committees. The legislature works on the committee system and they work on all the details that Mr. Jackman was inquiring about. And I think through that process you'll be reading about the bill in the newspapers. We will be tracking it as well. You can log on to our web site if you have a computer or if you want direct mail, give us your name and address and we'll send you our legislative updates and reports. But that is, I think, a generic response to any legislative proposal that is introduced.

Another element of that bill is it would require two-thirds vote of both houses, the assembly and the senate for it to move on to the Governor's desk. Most bills require a simple majority of legislative.

Are there any other questions related to that bill before we move on? Feel free if you do have questions regarding that legislation to ask questions. We're not concluding the discussion of any particular topic.

Martin Marugg.

MR. MARUGG: I just put that in case I had a question.

MR. OTT: Okay. Thank you for complying with our rules. We'll give you a free water if you want. Is anybody else dying of thirst? We have a few waters up here. Does anybody need a bottle of water.
MR. SHERMAN: I'm Dennis Sherman. I'm with Mount Laguna Fire Department and I was going to get put into pile two, but I feel the need here. You guys had a report from Ralph Anderson & Associates, John Goss put it together, and it addressed the value of the volunteers. In your Micro Report you also address the value of volunteers to the tune of 14 to 20 million dollars in the budget, which is pretty substantial. I have a concern and my concern is, and I've been kind of involved in this whole thing since the start, but my concern is that we're going to be driving away volunteers. At 20 million dollars, I don't know if we want to be doing that. The reason that these volunteers may not stay, the way that CDF is doing it right now is that they send out their people with one volunteer or reserve and everybody else stays home. If they happen to need additional help, then maybe the second engine can go. But the way the dispatch system is set up, what will really happen will be another CDF second engine will respond to that incident. So what really happens is the volunteers and the reserves can't participate. I'll tell you that if somebody gets up at 3:00 in the morning to go to a heart attack and they sit at the station and don't get to go or there's a rubbish fire, or any kind of a vehicle fire, whatever it is, and if they come down at 2:00 in the morning or 3:00 in the morning and they don't get to participate, pretty soon they're not going to come and pretty soon they're going to fall away from the system.
This report put together by Goss says we need to truly, truly enhance the volunteers. We need to help the volunteers. We need to support the volunteers. We need to make them part of it. They can't be just something that, okay, if we get really, really in trouble, then we'll let you play, too. These people, they train hard, they work hard, but in addition to that, they expect to participate. And the participation level, if it isn't there, you're going to lose them. And that's what I see happening.

Descanso had a fairly good volunteer system. Since they have CDF staff in there, no longer. Rural Fire Department, how many of them unstaffed -- John Traylor, I think, how many unstaffed stations do they have where they used to have volunteers?

MR. TRAYLOR: Well, as of about four months ago they had two unstaffed volunteer fire stations. You know, this is a dynamic process. Any given day conditions can change.

MR. SHERMAN: I've heard a lot from even the people here in Pine Valley and it's not my place to be doing the talking for Pine Valley. Pine Valley has made a decision to go with DPLU and CDF, that's their decision. But I've also heard a lot, that we have some real unhappy firefighters that are saying, hey, if that's the way it's going to be, see you later. And I guess that needs to come out of their mouth and not mine, because I'm not part of this department here.

I'm having some difficulty, because a while back
eight and a half million dollars was set aside to help the needy departments in the East County, which includes Pine Valley. That includes Pine Valley. So the money was turned over to DPLU, as Ken and Ralph, right here, and the money was -- some of the stuff was really good things. They immediately went out and gave everybody a little piece of the pie. Everybody got 20 to $23,000 and this 20 to $23,000 really helped some of the needy departments just so they could pay their gas and light bills and things like that.

And that was real important. And then everybody is going to get an engine of some sort and that's good. The engines and stuff really won't belong to the departments. They will belong on the County, but that's okay.

I support reorganization, I do. I do support that, but I'm having difficulty when DPLU goes to a department and says either you go into a CDF contract under CDF control or you get nothing. You don't get the help. And I do know that there were some board members from Pine Valley that asked, said, well, hey, you give us a lot less money than that, we can provide even better service. And that was not an option. So I question the wisdom in spending of County funds, and probably I'm going to get my birthday taken away here, but what it boils down to is that it seems like, Ralph and Ken will probably kick me all the way home, it seems like DPLU is representing CDF with County funds.

So, anyway, those are some of my concerns. And my concerns are that the volunteers are going to be driven off. And I think that with this CDF stuff, and either you take it or leave it and you have to go to CDF control or else you
don't get the help, I think that's out of line.

The other part of it is that it seems that CDF has jumped the gun. They are being considered in the phase in the Micro Study. They are being considered. And so I personally would ask that LAFCO consider not recommending CDF as part of this program.

MR. TRAYLOR: I just want to say we are looking for feedback, factual feedback on conditions now so that when we go forward to the public hearing with the LAFCO Commission we have some factual information about what's happening in the community now. I will tell you that the individual boards have made decisions to either sign contracts with CDF, so the individual governance from your communities have made those decisions. But as a LAFCO staff member and as we go forward to make recommendations to the LAFCO Commission, we do want factual feedback.

Don, you made a very good point. I will continue to make announcements and recommendations that we're looking for feedback, written feedback, factual feedback, so I'll continue to make those announcements, and we just want to know what the facts are.

MR. OTT: Thank you, Dennis. Dennis, thank you for your comments, we do take them seriously. Gail Twohy, are you here?

MS. TWOHY: Yes. Okay, the conceptual reorganization of the San Diego County Fire Services prepared by the Department of Planning and Land Use calls for fire mitigation fees to help fund the plan. Well, Elfin
Forest has recently had fire mitigation funds confiscated by the Department of Planning and Land Use. My concern is how and where these funds will be used. If the County intends to use the money in Elfin Forest, why take it away in the first place? If the County does not intend to use the money in Elfin Forest, the whole purpose of mitigation funds is diffused. It's rather like having a fire in Elfin Forest and the County shooting water elsewhere. Mitigation funds should stay and be used in the area of impact and should not be used for the County wide plan. The timing of the loss of these mitigation funds is also very disturbing. Those funds were negotiated four years ago. For four years the County had no problem with those funds remaining in Elfin Forest. It was not an unusual arrangement. Rancho Santa Fe has a very nice new fire station built with mitigation funds that the fire district negotiated for with developers, yet suddenly only a few weeks ago the Department of Planning and Land Use says that Elfin Forest has overstepped its bounds, that mitigation funds are domain of the DPLU. Since when? It would seem that the DPLU has already set about funding a program which has not been officially approved. Perhaps LAFCO should ask whether the County has already made up its mind. Just what's going on behind closed doors? The conceptual reorganization plan was certainly developed behind closed doors. On one hand for over two years at the behest of the County and with County funds fire
professionals have been meeting to determine the best way to consolidate services for the benefit of all, the Micro Report. All proposals had to be submitted by a certain date, presumably so they could be studied and critiqued. On the other hand, the conceptual reorganization plan made debut only a couple of weeks ago. Why was it allowed to be introduced at the eleventh hour? Why the secrecy? What makes the County in its infinite wisdom, the wisdom of an outsider, think it knows better than the fire professionals what is needed? I say the County should stop playing armchair quarterback and respect and consider the recommendations of the professionals. I do not see how LAFCO in good conscience could support a plan thrown together in secrecy by an agency with so little or with little or no experience in fire services. I can only support the initial Micro Study which was compiled by fire professionals after much collaboration and consideration, without Attachment 1 and monies have been identified.

MR. OTT: Thank you, Gail. Our next speaker is Tim Costanzo. Tim, are you here?

MR. COSTANZO: Later, please.

MR. OTT: Okay. We'll put you in a different category here. Virginia McManas, are you here? Have you already spoke or do you have something else?

MS. MCMANAS: I have something to say.

MR. OTT: Why don't you come up to the microphone.

MS. MCMANAS: Hello, I'm Virginia McManas, a resident of Elfin Forest Harmony Grove area. And I did not
vote for Prop C. Unfortunately I had doubts about the intentions. My concern was that it would be more about a political look good at that point in time than something respectful of our tax dollars. My concern was that people would view it as a mandate when it was actually a survey of interest; that we needed to coordinate and that's a very valid point. There must be better coordination. But the outcome, as I can see, is the Department of Land Use is now overseeing firefighting and CDF also. So two bureaucracies now have benefited from an advisory review of our coordination problem. And from my point of view, they stand to benefit in the growth of their departments, which I think indeed is happening and that chart did indicate. So I have concern as a resident of CSA 107 that I will stand to lose services; that my fire insurance will go up. I will not have local firefighters to the degree I currently have; that EMTs will be provided instead of paramedics, so I lose medical services. I lose control of the assessment money that we voluntarily gave to our fire department. We did not give it to DPLU or CDF or any other agency. And I see my fire department being undermined currently in terms of relationships with developers in which they were to have funds and those funds are no longer available to them. So from my point of view, my concern as to why I didn't vote for Prop C has come true, not because I wanted it to work out that way, but government tends to go in this direction unless we say no. We did not say give our money to DPLU. We did not say give our firefighting to CDF. We said we needed coordination. And we must listen to our
local firefighters. It must be a choice of the voters. The community that is being served must have the biggest say rather than departmental groups deciding how to divide up our firefighting dollar for perhaps their benefit, not the benefit of the services for me. So I hope not to lose services, but we will see if this continues is the mandate to provide, to coordinate, or is it to grow and answer political issues that don't serve us well. Thank you.

MR. OTT: Thank you, Virginia. Next speaker is William Huskey. William, are you here? Come on up, William.

MR. HUSKEY: William Huskey from Pine Valley, and that's spelled H-u-s-k-e-y. I want to thank you for this opportunity. As you might notice, probably 75 percent or more of the people here are either firefighters or families of firefighters. Now, we say that the people voted over 61 percent for this unification, but if you notice, there's hardly any people from Pine Valley of the regular people even coming in here to see what this is all about, so they really don't care.

Diane Jacob has put some good stuff in the paper that if you tell me we're going to do this, we're going to get it. She wanted to get off the hot seat.

By taking this away from the local people, the local fire department, you're taking more and more of the rights of the private property owners away from them and you're giving it to downtown. This is not why we're living out here. This is not why we voted for the people. Now
Diane says that she'll work and run this new deal. She can't even get the Forestry to give them the okay to cut all this fuel down that's up here. I don't care what we do, if we don't get rid of this fuel, you can put as many fire departments out here as you want, you'll still have another Cedar Fire. And I could go on and on and repeat what these other people have said. You've heard it before. I'm glad for the opportunity to get up here and express myself. I would like to say more, but I'll do it in writing and send it to. You thank you again.

MR. OTT: Thank you. Have I called Barbara Howell? I have, okay. Alice, I can't begin to pronounce your last name, so do we have an Alice here?

MS. COURTEAU: Courteau. Just a short question, please. I have heard that the 501-C could not be forced to give up its assets, right? But how will they be able to maintain these assets if the funds are cut off?

MR. OTT: Well, I think that the discussion that we've had so far about the 501-C3s is that they will remain now as well as after any unification of the actual public agencies that may overlay them, so their assets, their fund raising capability, will not be affected, per se, through any reorganization effort. And it's something that those of us sitting at this table we have no control over. Our commissioners or Board of Supervisors they don't as well.

MS. COURTEAU: So do you foresee that there will be funds to maintain the rigs?

MR. OTT: Well, let me ask you this right now, how are your funds derived for your 501-C3 today?
MS. COURTEAU: Various. Tax dollars.

MR. OTT: Again, what we're talking about here in terms of funding changes is related to property taxes, it's related to benefit fees, special assessments. We don't have the ability to attach funds or any conditions to the 501-C3 monies which we've gone into a bit of discussion in the Micro Report. John.

MR. TRAYLOR: Let me give you a direct answer to your question about the maintenance and operation and fuels and ongoing equipment needs and things like that. Do you have a copy of the Micro Study? In Exhibit 1 within the

Micro Study there's a breakdown of overhead costs, which include maintenance, fuels, and all of that for existing equipment including equipment owned by 501-C3s.

MS. COURTEAU: Wonderful, good. Thanks.

MS. ANDERSON: Perhaps a concept that we haven't been able to get over here is that if 501s and the volunteers remain autonomous agencies or autonomous departments that work cooperatively within a regional agency, but they're financially supported by the regional agency, that's what John is speaking of that equipment, maintenance, all that sort of thing, new facilities, comes out of the budget of this new regional agency. That's the model.

MR. OTT: It's 8:20 and we're nearing the end of our speaker slips here. We still do have about a half a dozen to go. Gary Van Beenen? Gary, are you here?

MR. VAN BEENEN: I think a lot of the comments I
had have been cited by others. I'm leery of one thing, the timing of all of these efforts. We went through reviewing, analyzing and dealing with the CDF proposal, which originally was represented as being an augmentation as I think John mentioned. And at the end it turned out to be a takeover of firefighting operations in Pine Valley here. Interestingly enough, the funds come from the State to the County. The County mandates that it be spent with CDF. We had staff that presented alternative solutions for about a third of the cost that would match what we would be getting staffing wise from CDF, but now we'll pay three times as much because it's not out of our pocket. The County is giving it to us because the State is giving it to the County. It's all a setup and it starts to look like, and I think a few others have this feeling, it starts to look like unwittingly you are the face for what the County is going to do and what the County is going to put on all of these districts. And while your intentions are noble, the role you're playing, feeding the County's interest in having a county department, your presentation up here, you said not once, if you said three times I think I caught it, oh, yeah, see, if you link to the County, you might be able to dip into their pockets. And, yeah, if you link to the County, you kept repeating that, giving a hand to what your preference might be if you were to make a recommendation. Yeah, a link to the County, it's a deep pocket. Well, link to the State, it's a deep pocket. Stay the way you are. And every time you comment to one of the questions, the answer is, well, yeah, that would happen after we go through
the process and an agency is created, then funding would do this or do that. It's always with the assumption that it's going to create a new agency of some sort. And it becomes clear that the agency should be out of the County.

Why is there an assumption that we wouldn't stay pretty much as we are with some funding for the independent district? I don't understand why the presumption is we're going to move to this other thing, when I haven't seen a person here that has worked in the back country, that has run an operation in the back country, and I don't see anybody on LAFCO's Board that lives, works and runs anything in the back country. Because I'll tell you, your two county supervisors are more interested in the empire building down at the County operations building, your admin building.

I just don't understand why the timing of all of this and why we're continuing to play the Kabuki. That's what it looks like. Not that it's what your intent is, but that's what it looks like, and you're feeding right to the County's wishes and interests and that's not necessarily the interest of all these people here.

That's all I have to say.

MR. OTT: Kabuki, that's a new one for me. Thank you for your comments though, and I do mean that sincerely in that we do want to convey not just the mood but the importance of what you feel needs to be considered here in Pine Valley as well as any community. And I hear a lot about local control tonight and that certainly will be conveyed, I imagine, in the transcripts.
MS. ARSIVAUD-BENJAMIN: Yes. Hi, my name is Jacqueline Arsivaud-Benjamin and I'm with the Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Town Council. And as a community we have a number of concerns with specifically the county plan, I should say, more so than the Micro Study. And one request that we would have of LAFCO is to look at the possibility of leaving the agencies who currently have a higher level of service than what is proposed. Specifically our CSA 107 fire district currently is an ISO 4, and from what we can decipher a plan from the County would go down to a level of seven. We would respectfully request that those agencies be left out of the reorganization effort, because obviously it doesn't make any sense to decrease the level of service to our community.

The other comment I would like to make is if you look at the map you had on earlier, you will see that Elfin Forest is very much of an island. You have the bulk of what you plan to reorganize in Escondido and then you have this little finger that comes and takes us over of sorts. And from a functional standpoint, and the fire department is better suited to talk to this, but it really makes little sense for our fire department to be aligned with CDF which has different training procedures and so forth, rather than with the North County fire departments with whom we're already working, training with, and can, you know, work more
And the other point I would like to make about from a community standpoint is that the fire department is more than just providing emergency medical service and fire for us. It's also really the heart of the community. The firehouse is where we meet, it's where we have the 4th of July picnic, it's where we have our town council meetings.

And, again, from what we can read, and I would love to know exactly what would happen, but it sounds like those facilities would then be used specifically for fire if they were taken over by CDF, which would obviously be a problem in terms of continuing community activities.

So do you know or can you answer whether or not those current fire buildings would be taken over by CDF and would only be able to use for those activities?

MR. OTT: Well, in general, any of the properties of the individual districts, whether it be a County service area, whether they be owned by a fire protection district, they would transfer to whatever the regional entity that we would name. If it would be a regional fire protection district, a brand new district, those properties, those assets, the personnel, if there are any, would become the responsibility of the new entity. The same thing would occur as a result of the different models that we've looked at. If the County were named as a successor or if the

County Service Area 135 were named the successor, those entities would adhere the properties and that would be a condition of any LAFCO action, if LAFCO were to approve.
I take it also that your comment about being aligned with other entities, you're essentially inferring or suggesting that you be considered as part of our Phase 2?

MS. ARSIVAUD-BENJAMIN: Yes, absolutely. We prefer to be taken out of Phase 1 and be with the Phase 2 organizations, like Rancho Santa Fe, North County.

MR. OTT: Thank you.

MS. ANDERSON: I believe your question was whether or not if your agency came under contract with CDF whether your facilities would become exclusively the domain of CDF?

MS. ARSIVAUD-BENJAMIN: Exactly.

MS. ANDERSON: And I can respond to that question. As Mike had indicated, when a consolidation takes place or an agency dissolved and transferred, the assets all go to the new agency. Whether that new agency then in turn decides to contract with CDF as a service provider and what CDF constraint would have on those facilities, I don't know. Maybe our County people who are administering CDF contracts know. I don't know.

MR. OTT: Bob Kephart.

MS. KEPHART: My name is Bob Kephart and I'm from Elfin Forest and I'm here as a citizen taxpayer. And I want to address Page 1. I think it goes to the sum of the heart of this report. And it really comes down to the regional system for providing fire protection and emergency medical services dysfunctional. I think that's a pretty broad statement. I think it's a malicious statement towards the volunteers, the paid fire departments, and everybody else. I think it starts at the top in the County. The Board of
Supervisors is dysfunctional, because they won't add the County charter fire protection as one of their jobs. They give all the money to the Sheriff. They've taken tax money after tax money, given it to law enforcement, but they just don't see the point of doing anything with fire protection. And it flows from there. The dysfunctional part which drove this thing was major fires in the County, which it wasn't these agencies that weren't the only ones who didn't respond. We all responded. CDF, the agency who it looks like we're going to turn all this over to, I think was the lead agency and did not respond very well to the fire. The City of San Diego found themselves so unprepared, you know, when they claim they couldn't buy batteries for radios, it's astounding of what knee-jerk reaction this whole study has become in not looking at it and micro-managing what they're going to do with the system. We can go back into other parts of this dysfunctional part of this system and look at what it really is.

The mission of the County has got to be decided. They've got to decide whether they're going to let DPLU, who cannot maintain the road I live on in an acceptable condition, to also maintain the fire trucks that are going to service my area and the people that go with them. I find it just appalling that this is going to happen. And I'd love Bill Horn to come out and walk Elfin Forest and Harmony Grove Road and tell me that it's maintained in a proper manner. You know, it's crazy. And we go through everything else. Where is the money going to come from? This report
is so lacking. You inserted a County plan that we haven't
even talked about. Why it's in your report, I would really
like to know? It just doesn't make any sense that it's in
there. All it's done is cause controversy. It's secretive.

I sit on a Fire Advisory Board that's supposed to be
directed by the County Board of Supervisors, who I don't
think I've ever seen, except once when invited to a meeting
in 18 years. And this County Board of Supervisors is now
giving their DPLU, okay, you guys go out and buy this, you
guys do this, you guys do that. We're an advisory board, we
should at least know what they're buying. I have no idea.

I inspect fire trucks for the department that I work for,
and I know what we're buying, but I can't tell you what the
County is buying. I know ISO ratings. I've run our ISO
system and helped get it down to a nine. The only reason

it's at a nine is because DPLU will not make people put in
fire hydrants. We're going to turn this all over to the
County it looks like. And that's what your report is kind
of leaning to.

So I would really like to you address and identify
what was dysfunctional about the system. What's
dysfunctional about the medical system, which you aren't
even looking at. And if we're going to turn it over to a
bunch of CDF people to be our medical support, what are you
going to do with the County? How many systems are you going
to take down with this whole system? And you are taking
down the volunteer system in what is going on in this
county.

I've called Riverside. I've gone other places and
talked to people and it's not a good system. They're staying alive, but they're not staying alive where they were before. With the way society is changing, it gets harder and harder to bring volunteers in. Paid people don't want it. 80 percent of the firefighters in America volunteer. They're in the rural area. 20 percent are in urban areas. You're now going to try and convert this whole county to an urban area by bringing in paid firefighters throughout the County. And I just think you're not looking at the big picture of the system. And the Board of Supervisors is the one who needs to look at that big picture. If they don't put firefighting in the County Charter, they should stay out of the business. Thank you.

MR. OTT: Dan Lawrence?
MR. LAWRENCE: I'm done.
MR. OTT: Our last speaker is Byron MacFarlane.
Are you still here?
MR. MACFARLANE: I'm still here, most of me.
Can you hear me without the microphone? I am here as a member of CSA 107. I'm the treasurer of the Fire Advisory Board and an elected member of the Fire Advisory Board. I think following Bob Kephart's comments if, in fact, the County is going to take over control of fire suppression efforts, if they are to take it over, if that is the vote, then I acknowledge his comment about the roads, but we've got a lot of volunteer firefighters here. We in the Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Fire Department were two months ago nine months in the arrears for our payments that we
requested from the County. Nine months, $175,000. Now, if the County cannot provide the funds that we have put in on our monthly claim sheets to the tune of nine months, how are they going to be able to run a fire department in this huge county? I'm not sure.

Now, Shirley, could I ask you a question. Are benefit fees the same as special assessments?

MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, the same thing. The formal term that's special assessment.

MR. MACFARLANE: Okay. Because there was a question asked earlier about the benefit fees and how they would stay within the area. And that was Tim Costanzo who asked the question. And I got the feeling that the benefit fees would be there but they could be directed as spent in that area by whoever was in control, whether it was the County or the Fire Protection District, or whoever it was?

MS. ANDERSON: It's going to depend from assessment area to assessment area, because some voter-approved assessment areas is a specific contract between voters and what that money is going to be spent on. It says this will buy four on.

MR. MACFARLANE: Not just general?

MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, in those cases that's what you get. In other cases a voter-approved special assessment is another pot of money. That pot of money will have to stay in that area.

MR. MACFARLANE: Could be spent by somebody who directs it from outside the area?

MS. ANDERSON: No, it has to be -- the fiduciary
responsibility would be by an advisory committee from that area for that special assessment area, right.

MR. MACFARLANE: So either in one of the four options there would be advisory committees formed for --

MS. ANDERSON: Lots of advisory committees.

MR. MACFARLANE: And they would be listened to by the --

MS. ANDERSON: The model.

MR. MACFARLANE: Okay, I understand the special assessment. A second question, what protest can cause a vote to come for the, I guess, it was the last three of those?

MR. OTT: It's a hot potato here. In terms of the very first option, the one involving the regional fire protection district. The other options are protest driven in terms of election commissions for the designation of the County as the successor, as well as the activation of the fire powers for County Service Area 135. That would be dependent upon protests within the areas that would be subject to dissolution. The actual fire districts or county service areas that would be proposed for dissolution of 25 percent of the voters, any one of those agencies were to register protests, and it would be in a LAFCO proceeding, not in a Board of Supervisor proceeding, it would be before LAFCO at a designated time and it would not be on May 7th. It would be on a subsequent date that we would announce. That then could trigger an election within the entire Phase 1 area that we designate and then the entire
population would be asked to confirm whether or not the action that LAFCO approved, if LAFCO does approve it, should be validated.

MR. MACFARLANE: Would that be by petition, is that how the protest would be lodged?

MR. OTT: It is a petition. It's different than other types of petitions that you may have signed. We have the petition forms actually on our web site. They're generic, but they apply to all types of jurisdictional changes and they can be filed by registered voters. Again, 25 percent is the threshold to trigger an election and then the election would require that a majority of the people approve the ballot question in order for that ballot question to be ratified, simple majority. If it doesn't get that majority, then it would be terminated.

MR. MACFARLANE: I applaud the efforts of LAFCO, their study, both in the Macro and Micro Study, that you have been open, you have let us know what's going on, you have invited our comments, you invited fire chiefs' comments; however, I was shocked, surprised, amazed when I saw the DPLU document in the final study. I had frankly never heard of DPLU. I didn't know who they were. I could say, well, huh, you never got any permits. Well, I usually just paint and put nails into things that are already up there, so I don't know the process. But all of a sudden there was a document in there and a new group of people who...
wanted to influence our local control. And I cannot believe
that there is one person in this room that doesn't believe
if you don't have local control, you don't have any control.
What about our federal tax dollars, where do they go? None
of us have any idea. Well, the County takes our taxes and
the County gives them back to us to do the work. But in CSA
107 we have a fire advisory board that works very diligently
to use those funds to benefit our citizens and to make us
more available for mutual aid in the surrounding areas.

MR. OTT: If I could just interrupt, since the
question has come up several times about how that County
plan came to be.

MR. MACFARLANE: I don't need an answer.

MR. OTT: Well, there is an answer because there
have been a couple of the same comments. We, like you, have
wanted additional information about the County's Fire
Enhancement Program. We've had meetings with Ken and Ralph,
Gary Pryor, Ivan Holler, the planning director, the
assistant planning director. They answered our questions.
We've formally put forth a questionnaire to them and their
response to us was this reorganization plan, conceptual
plan. It wasn't as much done in secrecy as it was in
response to LAFCO staff asking the Planning Department what
is their vision, their strategy for providing funding for
fire protection services in the County today and for the

future. And that really is the genesis of that. So we felt
that it was important to attach that to our report so that
everybody would have that in writing. And it would be
something that you could review, scrutinize, comment on, rather than just hearing about it verbally. So now we have the benefit of a written document that we give testimony on and comment on. And I think it will be helpful when we conclude these workshops to be able to convey the comments, your concerns, your support, whatever the case, not only about that plan, but the Micro Report and any other questions you have. So hopefully that answered the question about that plan. I'm sure we'll have that same question come up in two subsequent workshops as well.

MR. MACFARLANE: Okay, I agree. I think the plan should have been in the report; however, I think everybody in the planning process, in the discussion process should have known it was coming. I happened to meet these two gentlemen I think on Wednesday before the report was coming out from LAFCO. And the comment that I got from them, or maybe it wasn't specifically from you, but the comment I got was, well, we're going to have to wait for the LAFCO report to see what it says. And I would have expected we were having a meeting that somebody would have said, well, we've got a report that's going to be included in there and that's going to be part of this. I would have expected something of that nature. So I was very surprised that this came up and that it was handled in that way. And I guess the reason I bring the point up is, I'm not sure that I want that kind of happenstance to run my fire support in CSA 107.

I think that it's already been stated, my feeling is that we should be included in Phase 2 of the effort as we...
are an island which shows up. Now, that doesn't say, hey,
you guys in that big sphere should not be included in
Phase 2, too. I'm just saying I want to be included in
there. I want our local area out of Phase 1.

The community support for our CSA, and I'm sure it
exist in every CSA and every volunteer fire department in
this county. We went to the Viejas Fire, the Paradise Fire,
the Cedar Fire, we were strike teams on all of those. Our
station while we were on strike was manned by the community.
They fed the people that were there. They fed the
firefighters that were there to take care of our area. Plus
they fed people coming in from other areas. And the fire
station fills up. So when the question is asked about
whether the station is open to the community, that's a very,
very important part of the community and a very, very
important part of support for what we're doing. The wives
of the firefighters that are out on those strike teams have
somebody that's at the fire station that says, oh, yes, I'll
come down and I'll walk your dog, or I'll come down and help
you with your children, or I'll come down and take care of
your horses. That's very, very important. My feeling is
that if CDF were to come into the station, that's somebody
in the outside area, they're going to be hired people, they
are not going to have a great rapport at first with the
community and we're going to lose a great deal of that with
that type of an effort with a CDF presence. I do not see
the need for a CDF presence in CSA 107. And I think what I
see is I'm a lowly little firefighter. I'm 70 years old and
I go out and go on strike teams. And the reason I like to go on strike teams is I like to fight fires and I don't want to lose that in our CSA. I want to make sure it continues, that we can have volunteers come in, go out and fight fires, go out and take care of wrecks, go out and take care of whatever needs to be taken care of, heart attacks, whatever it may be, and that that volunteer effort continues and our community continues. If CDF comes in, I think we lose that. Are they necessary in California for wildfires, of course they are, no doubt about it. Are they necessary as a community function, I don't think so.

MR. OTT: Before we conclude this, I would just like to ask three speakers that either deferred or wish not to speak if they still want to remain in that status. Kevin Dubler, do you want to speak, Chief?
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MR. DUBLER: I'm Kevin Dubler from Julian Cuyamaca Fire and I wanted to clarify a few points. First of all, on Proposition C when that ballot initiative came out, I told my wife that's the biggest joke of a ballot initiative I've ever seen. It was worked in such away that, with all due respect, any moron would vote yes on because they're asking us, "Do you want to have a fire department and it's not going to cost you a dime, because we're not going to take any more money. It's not going to cost you anything extra." Who wouldn't vote for that. We had just gotten hammered by the Cedar Fire. That was all timed to be a very timely ballot initiative and it was written very shrewdly by the supervisors, so it got an 83 percent ballot. So now I'll go on to benefit fees. We have two
benefit fees. One benefit fee just passed with 74 percent of the vote. Our fire district is very well liked in our community. They like the job we do. They like the fact that we provide ALS transport service. And just like Harmony Grove, our stations are used for community meetings. We have the park views that people turn out in droves for. They come up to their weekend cabins just for the barbecues because this is part of the community and that will be lost if we go to a paid department. And you asked about volunteers and whether they leave or not. Valley Center when they became a Schedule A contract station essentially lost all their volunteers. They have reserves, but reserves are not volunteers in the same token that I'm speaking of volunteers. Our district is staffed 100 percent by local volunteers. We don't allow people in outside our district to be volunteers, so we don't take the reserves. Reserves are generally people that are trying to build up a track record so they can go to work for some paid department someplace. Our volunteers are all community members. Right here in Pine Valley, and I learned this when we were going over the Schedule A contract, we're both looking at the Schedule A contract at the same time. I came down here to Pine Valley to a couple of meetings, a couple of board meetings, some open meetings, and I learned that Pine Valley, correct me if I'm wrong, has six volunteers that live in the community; is that correct? Six, and some 20 or so reservists, but the numbers are opposite of that when they started with reserves. They had far more community
members who were volunteering. And then people come in and take over and they're there for the day and all of a sudden some of the volunteers feel threatened and they're down the road and you don't see them again. And that's happening here as we speak. And that's already happened at Valley Center, because one of the last volunteers currently works for us up in Julian. They have reservists, but that's not the same as a true volunteer fire department.

But to clarify the benefit fee, as I understand it if we had $1,000,000 to run our station through the new plan and we have a $100,000 benefit fee, which we have for structural fire protection, that $100,000 could offset the $1,000,000 to the tune of $100,000, we get 900,000 from the entity and 100,000 would come from our benefit fee, so our net to our district is $1,000,000; is that correct? Could that happen?

MS. ANDERSON: It could.

MR. DUBLER: And so, in essence, the benefit fee which our people are paying doesn't really benefit them anymore because they would have gotten the million -- what I'm saying, this is possible, they would have gotten the $1,000,000 to run the fire department anyhow without paying $100,000 in benefit fees, correct?

MS. ANDERSON: That is one of the issues, that being separate areas with different levels of funding is that there has to be some minimum level of service throughout the whole region that is supported by a regional --

MR. DUBLER: Yes.
MS. ANDERSON: And then services up and above that minimum level would be provided by special benefit fees in the areas. It's going to be a hard task for somebody to figure out how to do it, but that's how it would have to be accomplished.

MR. DUBLER: But it could happen the way I'm talking?

MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

MR. DUBLER: So actually they would be paying their $50 for every structure and not really benefiting anymore than if they didn't pay that $50?

MS. ANDERSON: And would lead the road open to disbanding that benefit fee in the future.

MR. DUBLER: But who would do that?

MS. ANDERSON: The voters. You voted it in, you could vote it out.

MR. DUBLER: Our second benefit fee that just recently passed specifically states this is to fund a new station. Now, that money could not be thrown into the general pot, that would have to go towards --

MS. ANDERSON: I'm sorry?

MR. DUBLER: The new benefit fee they just passed in the last election, it specifies it's for a new station. That money would have to stay in the district and go to the new station?

MS. ANDERSON: Apparently you have a contract between the voters and the district that says this money funds the station.
MR. DUBLER: All I want to say is that our district would also like to be left out of Phase 1. I think there are some real hurdles for these districts to overcome in Phase 1. And we've provided, according to our own district members, very adequate fire protection for the last 25 years since the County bailed on the fire protection 25 years ago. We picked up the ball. We have one member sitting over here who is one of the original board members, I believe. And he's still with us on the board. We have long-term commitments from people. One of our members just retired after 22 years of being a volunteer, so we have a very community-oriented volunteer fire department. We have a ISO rating of five eight, which is better than the seven or eight you were looking for. And what cost us the eight rating are the areas that are either five miles or more away from the station or are not in a recognized water district, because ISO ratings are not just about fire protection, they're about the water in the back country also. And we can say we're going to get a seven rating for the County, but we aren't unless we improve the water system. That is evidenced in Julian. We've got five everywhere there's a water district. And where there's not, it's an eight. And that's going to continue throughout the county until the water is addressed as part of this fire reunification. Thank you.

MR. OTT: Thank you, Kevin. We have several
others. We have about four minutes left. Rick, did you want to say anything or not? Rick Moore.

MR. MOORE: Well, just one question.

MR. OTT: Why don't you come up to the microphone.

MR. MOORE: My main question is after listening to what's going on tonight is it appears if this goes through, we're going to lose local control. Local control is going to move away from us. How far away is it going to move?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 1600 Pacific Highway.

MR. OTT: Well, that certainly is one option. The other option, if a regional fire district were to be formed, it would depend upon where that headquarters would be and that hasn't been determined yet.

MR. MOORE: Well, the problem with being an old coot like me is, Alzheimer's hasn't set in, and I remember back before Prop 13 we had a countywide fire protection agency. And when Prop 13 passed, we had had a taxpayer revolution and the first thing the County dropped was the fire protection. It went right down the toilet. I hate to introduce a mode of skepticism, but I've been there.

MR. OTT: We've gone over that history in our report in not so graphic a way. Tim Costanzo, do you want to say anything?

MR. COSTANZO: I would just like to reiterate something that was already said once before maybe in my own way. If the volunteer fire people in this new organization are not called out to go on every call as they are right now, they will disappear in very short order. Guys will
go -- like Mike said, will go to the station once or twice, the third or fourth time they're just not going to show up anymore. And if CDF were to be going out first on every call and the volunteer agency -- let's say there's 150 calls at that location per year normally and only 15 of them were left over for volunteers to go out on, there would be no volunteer agency, department or group to be called in the future. There would be no volunteers at all, zero. And that would be across the County. Any argument with that?

MR. OTT: Would you like to say something?

MR. COSTANZO: All of us go with CDF on fire calls all the time. We have a good relationship with them, but this is being stuffed down our throats and like everybody else says, it's communities and they're destroying the communities with this. It just won't work.

MR. OTT: One last comment, Roger.

MR. CHALLBERG: I looked at Page 34. That's not what I was talking about. I did the math and what I am looking at is just, for example, Potrero has got a $56 benefit fee. If I'm not mistaken Elfin Forest is over 400. Isn't it 400 bucks per parcel?

MS. ANDERSON: You want per parcel?

MR. CHALLBERG: Yeah, I want the parcel rate because I want to demonstrate that we got like Campo zero. In other words, the community is providing zero dollars. We've got something like Elfin Forest, they've done a fantastic job. We're trying to get our community behind us. We need that kind of figure. I can do the math.

MR. OTT: Frank, you had a question. This will be
the final question perhaps.

MR. TWOHY: Just a quick clarification on protests because that's something I think my community will be interested in. I notice on Page 54, if you turn to the report, maybe you can clarify for me, but I see under "Election Requirements Reorganization" that at least 10 percent of the landowners or at least 10 percent of the voters at the time of the vote within the area unless you are fewer than 300. So which one is correct, 25 percent or 10 percent?

MR. OTT: 10 percent is the correct amount, Frank. Thanks for clarifying that.

MR. TWOHY: Thank you.

MR. OTT: That would be for the LAFCO initiated part of that reorganization.

MR. TWOHY: Well, I'm hoping it's the County also.

MR. OTT: That would be correct.

Are there any other questions?

MR. SHERMAN: One more. I just had a question on the DPLU one where they're going to include volunteers and stuff and it shows CDF staffing to be on some of them, the 5A, I think it was, it shows it to be three, three people for a lot of the stations, which means one person on a day; is that correct? And the reason I ask that is because on Page 6 of the DPLU it says, "There will be two or more permanent CDF fire personnel on an engine. CDF no longer allows a station engine to be staffed by one permanent CDF fire employee supplemented by volunteers or reserve
MR. TRAYLOR: Okay. Dennis, let me clarify that.

Where there is viable volunteer programs, the option 5A, 6A and 7A provides one paid EMT or paramedic to be on duty with your volunteer fire company.

MR. SHERMAN: So then it's okay with CDF to only have one CDF guy on?

MR. TRAYLOR: I'm not talking about CDF.

MR. SHERMAN: That's what I was. That's from their proposal.

MR. TRAYLOR: Again, that's assuming that you have a viable engine company that's made up of volunteers and we want to maintain an EMS level at the EMT and paramedic level to support that volunteer company. I cannot speak for CDF.

MR. SHERMAN: Okay.

MR. OTT: All of your questions were taken as testimony and we will form our recommendations to the LAFCO Commission based on the input. Thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 9:04 p.m.)