

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF LAFCO PUBLIC INPUT MEETING

RE: REORGANIZATION OF STRUCTURAL FIRE PROTECTION AND
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES IN UNINCORPORATED
SAN DIEGO COUNTY

PINE VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

FEBRUARY 27, 2007

REPORTED BY SHANNON L. MARCOS, CSR NO. 8348

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

1

1 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING,
2 commencing at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, February 27, 2007, at
3 28890 Old Highway 80, Pine Valley, California, Shannon L.
4 Marcos, Certified Shorthand Reporter, in and for the State
Page 1

5 of California.

6

7 APPEARANCES:

8 LAFCO, Local Agency Formation Commission
9 BY: MICHAEL OTT
10 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 452
San Diego, California 92101

10

11 Also Present:

12 Shirley Anderson, Chief Policy Research
13 John Traylor, Local Government Consultant
John Goss, Local Government Consultant

14

15

February

16 Mr. Ott: Michael Ott welcomed the public to the

17 27, 2007 public outreach meeting and made some opening remarks

18 before introducing the project team. Mr. Ott indicated that

19 Shirley Anderson would give a PowerPoint presentation and

20 and overview of the Micro Report on the Reorganization of

21 Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services in

22 Unincorporated San Diego County.

23 Mr. Ott provided an opportunity for Public Comment.

24

25

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

2

1

PUBLIC COMMENT

2

3 MR. WARNER: My name is Rick Warner. I'm a
4 20-year, 21-year resident of Pine Valley, spent 16 years on
5 the planning group here before it became the planning group,
6 and 26 years with the County, and working in special
7 districts as well as in other agencies. And I'm wondering

8 why we need this in Pine Valley? We're pretty efficient.
9 We've got a pretty good volunteer fire department up here.
10 We do a good job. In the 20 years I have been here, we've
11 maintained a five or six insurance rating the whole time
12 I've been here. And I wonder why we need this and are we
13 being penalized for being efficient by being downgraded to
14 match the rest of the county because we've done a good job
15 with our tax money?

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

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

25 MR. WARNER: That 81 percent, how many live in the

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 3

1 rural areas and how many of them live in the city?

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

8 I want to go back to one other comment that he
9 said. I have some passion about firefighters, and I
10 appreciate your comment about fire hoses. Within this

11 organizational structure here there are four to 500 people
12 on the fire line, if you will, that put water on the fire.

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

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

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

4

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

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

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: This has to do with what you
11 presented earlier. Where it says that the taxes have to
12 stay in the community, does that mean those taxes still stay
13 with the volunteer fire department so they can maintain
14 themselves or does that go to pay for the CDF, or whatever

15 paid people come in to be the pay part of the department?

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

25 MR. COSTANZO: But does that money stay within the

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

5

1 community volunteer organization or are any of those funds
2 that stays within the community but pays for those CDF
3 officers that are going to be within the community?

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

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

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

16 What is your name, please?

17 MR. COSTANZO: Tim Costanzo, C-o-s-t-a-n-z-o.

18 MS. ANDERSON: Tim, I think to some extent we're
19 talking about bookkeeping measures. There are special
20 assessment areas that are indeed only volunteers. Most of
21 them, however, are larger assessment areas. Let me see,
22 let's talk about Deer Springs just because I know they have
23 some very large assessment areas. That assessment revenue
24 pays, in most cases, for accelerated service levels within
25 that assessment area and that would have to continue. How

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 6

1 that money is applied, we don't know. That is the decisions
2 of future legislative bodies. And, in some cases, as I say,
3 it's bookkeeping, you know, money comes in, some of it's
4 applied here, some of it's applied there, but it must stay
5 to provide services in the area that it was assessed.

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

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

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

17 MS. ANDERSON: Well, when you're talking about
18 volunteer organizations, we're not talking about special
19 voter approved special assessments, I don't believe, because
20 your true volunteer agencies, your Shelter Valley, is that
21 the type of volunteer agency you're talking about?

22 MR. COSTANZO: No, I'm talking about all the
23 volunteer agencies.

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 7

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

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

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

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

15 MR. COSTANZO: Yes.

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

25 question, could it be used for personnel costs, yes.

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 8

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

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

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

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

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

20 MR. OTT: Excellent question. First of all, it
21 will not be the Board of Supervisors that will be making
22 this decision. It will be LAFCO. The Board of Supervisors
23 is represented on our commission. But in our May 7th
24 meeting, our hearing, it is conceivable that our commission,
25 LAFCO, can make a decision that would reorganize the fire

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 9

1 agencies in any type of array of models that we have shown
2 here so far.

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

16 There's also another means by which the
17 reorganization could occur as well without state
18 legislation, and that would be if there would be an entity
19 like the Board of Supervisors that would decide to make
20 structural fire protection, emergency medical services, one
21 of its core priorities, one of its core responsibilities.
22 It would take a shift in the institutional thinking within
23 the County government, that if it decided to appropriate
24 funds to make this happen, it could be a reality through a
25 discretionary action of the Board of Supervisors and that is

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 10

1 also conceivable as well. A lot will be happening between
2 now and May 7th that may make this model that we've shown
3 here a reality in terms of bridging that gap. So those are

4 two of the available things.

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

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

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

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

15 MR. OTT: Sure. First and foremost, before anybody
16 can vote on any plan, LAFCO, the agency that I mentioned in
17 my opening remarks, it has the authority to reorganize
18 agencies, must first take its vote. And then if it votes in
19 the affirmative, then there will be a chain reaction of
20 other votes that may culminate in a vote of the community,
21 but also a vote within the Board of Supervisors, for
22 example, because the Board of Supervisors has partnered with
23 LAFCO in examining and initiating the reorganization that we
24 have shown. But as far as the regulatory authority of
25 agencies to approve any of these changes of organizations

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

11

1 that we've shown on the table, that authority rest solely
2 and squarely with LAFCO and no other entity. So the very
3 first entity, the first agency that would need to start that
4 chain reaction would be LAFCO. And I'll finish my sentence
5 after the podium is moved. The chain reaction that I was
6 referring to is, it works something like this, that if LAFCO
7 were to approve one of the reorganization options here, that

8 would require, for example, if we designated the County as
9 the successor agency or designated the County Service Area
10 135 as that regional communication agencies, we had slides
11 up showing the boundaries of that, if we designated either
12 of those entities, the County of San Diego in general, or
13 more specifically County Service Area 135 as the successor,
14 that would require that the Board of Supervisors take action
15 to accept that request from LAFCO. It could not happen
16 unilaterally by LAFCO. So, again, there would be the Board
17 of Supervisors' involvement, but the Board of Supervisors
18 would act in a manner that would be responding to the action
19 that would be taken by LAFCO. It's a little complicated,
20 but it's how government works. There's an initiating
21 entity, an approving entity, and then there are different
22 responsible agencies.

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

25 MR. MACFARLANE: Mike, could I ask some questions

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 12

1 about what you just said?

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

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

9 MR. OTT: Those are the four options that we've
10 analyzed and considered them to be on the table. It is

11 conceivable that there would be hybrids, modifications.
12 It's conceivable that our commission, which we report to,
13 can decide that there should be a fifth option. But these
14 are the options that have been discussed for the past
15 several years, these are the options that have to be
16 analyzed.

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

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 13

1 considerably on tonight is what about the funding gap
2 between what exists and what is needed. The Board of
3 Supervisors plays a very important role here in terms of
4 that funding. No. 1, they sponsored legislation that I
5 mentioned that would help bridge that gap. The other
6 possibility is that the Board of Supervisors may look at its
7 County Fire Enhancement Program and decide to adjust those
8 numbers that Shirley has indicated. The County has
9 contributed so far eight and a half million dollars to
10 structural fire protection in the County. It's not
11 inconceivable that additional monies would come from the
12 Board of Supervisors. If they were to elect to do that,
13 LAFCO would have to require that there be some sort of
14 commitment regarding those funds in order to make the

15 regional fire district a reality. So that is, I think, the
16 yes and no part of the answer. It's mainly, yes, but a
17 little bit no in there.

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

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

25 Do you have any other questions?

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 14

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

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

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

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

16 MS. COURTEAU: Well, it's a big difference, isn't
17 it?

18 MR. OTT: It is. But I think it's important to
19 look at the threshold that John Traylor mentioned, the 81
20 percent threshold.

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

23 MR. OTT: Excellent point. Again, it was an
24 advisory measure. It did show very strong support for the
25 premise behind consolidation. One of the premises stated in

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 15

1 that advisory measure was that it would result in no
2 additional monies being allocated to fire protection from
3 any of you property owners. In other words, it would be
4 based on existing revenues within the County or reallocation
5 of those revenues.

6 Are there any other questions before we move on?

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

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

22 looking at about 16 other agencies and seven volunteer fire
23 organizations to --

24 MS. MOORE: In the rural area?

25 MR. OTT: -- truly bring about an organization of

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 16

1 fire services in a consolidated, coordinated manner. But
2 you are right, the first step towards consolidation has
3 occurred, but there are additional benefits that could be
4 derived from centralizing that service function further.

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

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

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

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

21 MR. TRAYLOR: Well, we're getting feedback. And
22 I'm asking for feedback so that we know how it affects it.
23 I hear stories that there is an effect on that, but I can't
24 tell you what that is. The Micro Study studied a conceptual

25 plan for reorganization. What you're talking about is

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 17

1 something that's occurring now through the Fire Enhancement
2 Program through the County of San Diego outside of the Micro
3 Study. And the options that we were tasked to evaluate and
4 put costs on, the Options 5, 6 and 7, which includes
5 volunteers, there's money in that plan to support the
6 volunteer programs where there are active volunteer
7 programs. I can't tell you firsthand what's going on now
8 because we're still getting feedback as to what effect the
9 current Fire Enhancement Program that CDF has on volunteers.
10 I hear stories, but I don't know any factual information.

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

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

16 MR. OTT: Yes.

17 MR. TRAYLOR: Yes, absolutely.

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

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

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So will you make an
25 aggressive effort to try to get those written factual

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 18

1 statements and not just expect them to come in?

2 MR. TRAYLOR: Yes.

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

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

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

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

10 MR. OTT: I would just strongly encourage all of
11 you that have strong feelings about any of the subjects
12 we're talking about to come to the microphone or to give us
13 your written comments, because we do want to hear from you.
14 We do want to base our decision, our recommendations on what
15 is important to all of you out in the community, so do use
16 this opportunity to express your concerns and comments.
17 We're doing everything we can.

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 19

1 community, the pride, the recognition, and how that then
2 equates to even better service. So we've emphasized that in
3 the report. I believe Attachment 2 to the Micro Report that

4 John Goss put together goes into quite a bit of detail about
5 the volunteer element.

6 Do you have anything to add to that, John?

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

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 20

1 MR. LAWRENCE: My name the Dan Lawrence. I
2 represent myself, I suppose. I'm from Campo. And one of
3 the things that I'm interested in was kind of brushed on but
4 not really talked about. We received a certain amount of
5 funding as a volunteer fire department from fees collected
6 for new construction of new homes and businesses and other
7 things. Those fees right now are allocated toward the

8 expansion of the existing fire department. When the top
9 three models are taken into consideration, okay, County,
10 CSA, and I forget the third one, what happens to that
11 funding? It used to go directly to the department. Now it
12 sounds like it's going to go into a general fund; is that
13 correct? And that funding will essentially come away from
14 the department then at that point; is that correct?

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

25 MR. LAWRENCE: So essentially those fees that are

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 21

1 collected by the County today go away to a larger entity?

2 MS. ANDERSON: They to go the regional entity.

3 MR. LAWRENCE: To be spent somewhere else?

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

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

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

11 reorganizational.

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

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

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

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

23 MR. LAWRENCE: Very basic question. Okay, in the
24 case of our little agency at Campo we're also a 501-C3 and a
25 CSA. When you're looking at that, we own our equipment,

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 22

1 okay. If, in fact, you dissolve the CSA, how does the
2 501-C3 continue to work or would it be forced into giving up
3 its assets back into the larger agency?

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

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

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

14 MR. OTT: I think we should start with the more
Page 20

15 formal part of the comments that we're hoping to get from
16 all of you. Bob Uribe, you have an organized presentation,
17 yes?

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

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

22 MR. URIBE: My name is Bob Uribe, Fire Chief Pine
23 Valley. First off, thanks for coming out. Thank you for
24 letting us participate openingly and having people in the
25 community and the surrounding communities have their say in

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 23

1 what's their future.

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

11 My comments are primarily from me, the fire chief.
12 I know the Board is developing their own response and will
13 provide that to you prior to April 6th. In concept I
14 believe and I support this concept of San Diego County
15 voters in their preference to develop some type of
16 regionalized system. I think that the sole authority has to
17 be developed and if it's LAFCO, let's let it be LAFCO. I

18 think the voters have to approve any type of tax increase
19 because as Proposition C as it was written was specific to
20 not increasing our taxes. There is money out there. There
21 is money out there that can be had by a penny here and three
22 cents here and those are some of the propositions, or those
23 are some of the options that are available to us.

24 San Diego Fire County Chiefs have proposed an SSP
25 that also asks for the same thing that we asked for over

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 24

1 three years ago and that is sustained funding. The
2 sustained funding to provide you with guaranteed if it's
3 two, if it's three, if it's four, it has to be there on a
4 regular basis. If it's sustained, then we can provide our
5 own reserve programs, our own volunteer programs and make
6 them accountable. More importantly they have to be
7 integrated. If they're not integrated, if they're seen as
8 something that we don't want by other career, quote,
9 firefighters, it's not going to work. It has to be an
10 integrated system.

11 I believe that there's value in our volunteer fire
12 protection program. These individuals do work for virtually
13 nothing, it's just a cost to the agency for insurance, it's
14 just a cost to the agency for their turnouts and their gear.
15 They dedicate time and effort as volunteers. Five years
16 ago, or 10 years ago, the requirements placed
17 on these young men and women and people of our community has
18 just gone up the same amount, has gone up ten-fold. The
19 certifications that are required for them today is even more
20 difficult than it once was. Likewise, the districts
21 including ours find it more and more difficult to do that.

22 So we see them as a viable member of our community.

23 Last, but not least, the current Fire Enhancement
24 Program has brought to our particular agency a new engine
25 company, a new water tender, and it's a start in the right

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 25

1 direction, but it's not sustained. And I agree, we have to
2 pursue that as something we should look into in the next
3 three years.

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

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

24 Last, but not least, it had to do with the cost

25 estimates for your station improvements. As you increase

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

26

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

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

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

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

21 MR. DUBLER: Not at this time.

22 MR. OTT: Okay. Roger Challengeberg. I can't see the
23 end of the spelling here.

24 MR. CHALLENGERBERG: Yeah, you got it. Thank you. I'm
25 Roger Challengeberg and I'm from Campo Service Area 112. One of

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

27

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

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

24 MS. ANDERSON: Page 34.

25 MR. CHALLBERG: Page 34, does it got it broken

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

28

1 down?

2 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

3 MR. CHALLBERG: I'm sorry, Shirley, I went through

4 it but I didn't see that.

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

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

29

1 I think that's it, but, you know, again we would
2 hope that we could work together on this. And we have
3 supported the consolidation of fire agencies throughout the
4 County, but we know it's going to be a long time coming.
5 I'd look at the funding sources. It specifically precluded
6 raising taxes in Prop C. As much as I appreciate Diane's
7 effort, Diane Jacob's effort in fire protection, I wouldn't

8 want to bet my horse on the school tax thing, so.

9 MR. TRAYLOR: Roger, let me address a couple of
10 your comments or questions. What you asked for for Campo
11 you'll see reflected in the Micro Study a paid person on
12 duty with your very viable volunteer company either at the
13 BLS or ALS level, so that addresses your concern. And it's
14 in the Micro Study as Options 5A, 6A or 7A. And I didn't
15 quite understand your comment about CDF, their
16 organizational structure.

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

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

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 30

1 about.

2 MR. TRAYLOR: I can't address that.

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

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

7 MR. FITCH: Yes, sir.

8 MR. OTT: Why don't you come on up. I'd just like
9 to indicate that after we get the transcript of tonight's
10 meeting finished, we will post it on our web site. It will

11 probably take a good two or three weeks depending upon
12 Shannon finalizing her version and us approving it. But you
13 can view the transcripts as they are produced on our web
14 site SDLAFCO.org.

15 MR. FITCH: Thank you. Good evening. Thank you
16 for taking the time to travel to Pine Valley. My name is
17 John Fitch. I own a home and I've lived here for six years.
18 I've been a member of the Pine Valley Fire Department for
19 the past three years. I have a state fire marshal
20 certificate, Firefighter I certification, a county EMT card,
21 and I own a Class B driver's license for operating
22 firefighting equipment. All of these things I have achieved
23 in training I have received at Pine Valley Fire Department.
24 The fire department is an asset of the community. It has
25 been built with a selfless dedication of the community

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 31

1 members past and present. In the three years that I have
2 worked here, I've worked with 16 firefighters who have
3 served this community and then advanced through career
4 positions with municipal departments. They're products of
5 the Pine Valley state fire marshal, Firefighter I, Pine
6 Valley Academy to Viejas, Alpine, Lakeside, Santee, Chula
7 Vista, Federal Fire, Los Angeles County, Del Mar, Poway and
8 five to San Diego City. Currently we have five active
9 firefighters who are paramedics.

10 The community has developed a self-sufficient
11 organization that has served it well through the years. I
12 offer to you excerpts from the most recent "Pine Valley
13 View" for your review. There are two articles from
14 residents and a letter from the fire chief for the month of

15 December.

16 Tonight I'm here speaking as an informed citizen of
17 the community. I commend the LAFCO report. I found it to
18 be a document which affords the opportunity for everyone to
19 understand the breath and scope of the matters at hand. The
20 report is illuminating in regards to recent Department of
21 Planning and Land Use, Pine Valley Fire Protection District
22 contract negotiations.

23 I would like to believe that the existing Pine
24 Valley Firefighter I and driver operator programs which
25 exist now will continue; however, I have reservations that

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 32

1 they will. I can now base this on excerpts from the Micro
2 Report. From the Micro Report, a volunteer operation not
3 aggressively supported by a successor agency, regional
4 resources could actually decline and overall costs would
5 increase. The conceptual plan itself would introduce a
6 defacto consolidation in service under the CDF contracts,
7 left in place, however, individual jurisdictions would have
8 few resources and little ability to exercise discretion over
9 fire protection issues. What was initially proposed as
10 staff augmentation as part of the County Fire Enhancement
11 Program has ended up as an operational change to CDF.

12 I can tell you that my sentiment runs from the top
13 to the bottom of the rank of existing personnel PVFD. If
14 they plan to effectively obtain personnel in Pine Valley,
15 they need to send a liaison immediately. Thank you.

16 I ask you, LAFCO and the County Board of
17 Supervisors, please take a closer look at the existing local

18 resources in Pine Valley and re-evaluate the return of
19 investment of 2.2 million dollars in the County Fire
20 Enhancement Program.

21 Again, from the Micro Report, the Micro Report
22 recommends that alternatives to certain components of
23 conceptual reorganization be evaluated. CDF costs have
24 significantly escalated in recent years. Cost to retain and
25 enhance local resources should be examined before committing

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 33

1 to a state contractor.

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

18 To me it's just plain wrong to change 911 service
19 levels without directly sensitizing the community to this
20 change before it happens. The Micro Report does not specify
21 the cost of eliminating EMT from the dispatch services. My

22 opinion is that public notification and solicitation for
23 input should be significantly valued before any changes are
24 made.

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 34

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

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

19 Without a doubt, structural fire protection is
20 essential to protect life and property. We all want it.
21 Pine Valley, we need it for our fire insurance. I notice in
22 your report the Forest Service is not mentioned at all and I
23 ask why? They need to be included in a comprehensive
24 system.

1 Valley is when a santa ana is blowing sustained gale forces,
2 you know, if a wire breaks in Mt. Laguna like it did in '72
3 or somebody throws a cigarette out the window, I want to
4 know that if I evacuate, I'll get structural protection for
5 our homes. 2300 homes were destroyed in three days in 2003.
6 We need something to protect us from that kind of
7 catastrophe. We need a county fire chief. We would like a
8 maintained comprehensive wildfire preplan for the County.
9 Ideally strike teams would come from incorporated
10 communities to provide mutual aid to us. Lookout points,
11 communications, escape routes, and safety zones would
12 already be assigned. The firefighters would have trained
13 twice a year and would have already seen the country in
14 daylight. That was the reason for Prop C.

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

17 MR. JACKMAN: Larry Jackman, speaking for myself.
18 And I happen to be a board member of San Miguel Fire
19 District since 1992. My questions basically go to the
20 Hollingsworth Bill SB806 that was introduced, how that
21 relates to LAFCO's program that you're doing in regards to
22 the bill, the state mandated consolidation. The text of the
23 bill is only two pages long, so there's a lot of detail
24 that's not stated in the bill. I was wondering how the
25 nexus between LAFCO and this bill is going to come to

1 fruition if it does? That's my question.

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

20 The dollar amount associated with the bill in terms
21 of its impact or infusion of monies in fire protection, I
22 couldn't really estimate at this time. It doesn't indicate
23 what a dollar amount would be in the bill. I believe the
24 bill references a one percent of the property tax. One of
25 the north county newspapers recently, I think as of today,

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 37

1 estimated that that amount may be around 32 million dollars,
2 but that amount may change depending upon assessed values
3 and so forth as well as details to be worked out.

4 The bill is quite promising. I think we need more
5 information about it. The San Diego LAFCO will be
6 discussing the bill this coming March 5th. We follow not
7 just fire protection matters but legislation in general.
8 And Supervisor Jacob is planning being at that meeting with
9 LAFCO. She is a member of LAFCO.

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

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

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

25 MR. OTT: Well, this is the beginning of a new

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 38

1 legislative session. In Sacramento they work on a two-year
2 cycle, so this is the first of two years. For bills that
3 can be deliberated on and acted upon in one year, the cycle
4 concludes in the fall with the Governor either signing the
5 bill or vetoing it or if he doesn't sign it, it becomes law.
6 Those are the time frames. If the bill raises significant
7 issues or there isn't agreement in both houses of

8 legislature, the matter could be deferred for another year,
9 taken up next year at this time. So the soonest we would
10 know would be in the fall of '07 and the latest would be
11 perhaps the fall of '08. I think we'll know much more as it
12 gets assigned to committees. The legislature works on the
13 committee system and they work on all the details that
14 Mr. Jackman was inquiring about. And I think through that
15 process you'll be reading about the bill in the newspapers.
16 We will be tracking it as well. You can log on to our web
17 site if you have a computer or if you want direct mail, give
18 us your name and address and we'll send you our legislative
19 updates and reports. But that is, I think, a generic
20 response to any legislative proposal that is introduced.

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

25 Are there any other questions related to that bill

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

39

1 before we move on? Feel free if you do have questions
2 regarding that legislation to ask questions. We're not
3 concluding the discussion of any particular topic.

4 Martin Marugg.

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

7 MR. OTT: Okay. Thank you for complying with our
8 rules. We'll give you a free water if you want.

9 Is anybody else dying of thirst? We have a few
10 waters up here. Does anybody need a bottle of water.

11 Dennis Sherman? Dennis, are you here? Why don't
12 you come on forward, Dennis.

13 MR. SHERMAN: I'm Dennis Sherman. I'm with Mount
14 Laguna Fire Department and I was going to get put into pile
15 two, but I feel the need here. You guys had a report from
16 Ralph Anderson & Associates, John Goss put it together, and
17 it addressed the value of the volunteers. In your Micro
18 Report you also address the value of volunteers to the tune
19 of 14 to 20 million dollars in the budget, which is pretty
20 substantial. I have a concern and my concern is, and I've
21 been kind of involved in this whole thing since the start,
22 but my concern is that we're going to be driving away
23 volunteers. At 20 million dollars, I don't know if we want
24 to be doing that. The reason that these volunteers may not
25 stay, the way that CDF is doing it right now is that they

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 40

1 send out their people with one volunteer or reserve and
2 everybody else stays home. If they happen to need
3 additional help, then maybe the second engine can go. But
4 the way the dispatch system is set up, what will really
5 happen will be another CDF second engine will respond to
6 that incident. So what really happens is the volunteers and
7 the reserves can't participate. I'll tell you that if
8 somebody gets up at 3:00 in the morning to go to a heart
9 attack and they sit at the station and don't get to go or
10 there's a rubbish fire, or any kind of a vehicle fire,
11 whatever it is, and if they come down at 2:00 in the morning
12 or 3:00 in the morning and they don't get to participate,
13 pretty soon they're not going to come and pretty soon
14 they're going to fall away from the system.

15 This report put together by Goss says we need to
16 truly, truly enhance the volunteers. We need to help the
17 volunteers. We need to support the volunteers. We need to
18 make them part of it. They can't be just something that,
19 okay, if we get really, really in trouble, then we'll let
20 you play, too. These people, they train hard, they work
21 hard, but in addition to that, they expect to participate.
22 And the participation level, if it isn't there, you're going
23 to lose them. And that's what I see happening.

24 Descanso had a fairly good volunteer system. Since
25 they have CDF staff in there, no longer. Rural Fire

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 41

1 Department, how many of them unstaffed -- John Traylor, I
2 think, how many unstaffed stations do they have where they
3 used to have volunteers?

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

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

17 I'm having some difficulty, because a while back

18 eight and a half million dollars was set aside to help the
19 needy departments in the East County, which includes Pine
20 Valley. That includes Pine Valley. So the money was turned
21 over to DPLU, as Ken and Ralph, right here, and the money
22 was -- some of the stuff was really good things. They
23 immediately went out and gave everybody a little piece of
24 the pie. Everybody got 20 to \$23,000 and this 20 to \$23,000
25 really helped some of the needy departments just so they

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 42

1 could pay their gas and light bills and things like that.
2 And that was real important. And then everybody is going to
3 get an engine of some sort and that's good. The engines and
4 stuff really won't belong to the departments. They will
5 belong on the County, but that's okay.

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

18 So, anyway, those are some of my concerns. And my
19 concerns are that the volunteers are going to be driven off.
20 And I think that with this CDF stuff, and either you take it
21 or leave it and you have to go to CDF control or else you

22 don't get the help, I think that's out of line.

23 The other part of it is that it seems that CDF has
24 jumped the gun. They are being considered in the phase in
25 the Micro Study. They are being considered. And so I

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 43

1 personally would ask that LAFCO consider not recommending
2 CDF as part of this program.

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

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

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

21 MS. TWOHY: Yes. Okay, the conceptual
22 reorganization of the San Diego County Fire Services
23 prepared by the Department of Planning and Land Use calls
24 for fire mitigation fees to help fund the plan. Well, El fin

25 Forest has recently had fire mitigation funds confiscated by

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 44

1 the Department of Planning and Land Use. My concern is how
2 and where these funds will be used. If the County intends
3 to use the money in Elfin Forest, why take it away in the
4 first place? If the County does not intend to use the money
5 in Elfin Forest, the whole purpose of mitigation funds is
6 diffused. It's rather like having a fire in Elfin Forest
7 and the County shooting water elsewhere. Mitigation funds
8 should stay and be used in the area of impact and should not
9 be used for the County wide plan. The timing of the loss of
10 these mitigation funds is also very disturbing. Those funds
11 were negotiated four years ago. For four years the County
12 had no problem with those funds remaining in Elfin Forest.
13 It was not an unusual arrangement. Rancho Santa Fe has a
14 very nice new fire station built with mitigation funds that
15 the fire district negotiated for with developers, yet
16 suddenly only a few weeks ago the Department of Planning and
17 Land Use says that Elfin Forest has overstepped its bounds,
18 that mitigation funds are domain of the DPLU. Since when?
19 It would seem that the DPLU has already set about funding a
20 program which has not been officially approved. Perhaps
21 LAFCO should ask whether the County has already made up its
22 mind. Just what's going on behind closed doors? The
23 conceptual reorganization plan was certainly developed
24 behind closed doors. On one hand for over two years at the
25 behest of the County and with County funds fire

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 45

1 professionals have been meeting to determine the best way to
2 consolidate services for the benefit of all, the Micro
3 Report. All proposals had to be submitted by a certain
4 date, presumably so they could be studied and critiqued. On
5 the other hand, the conceptual reorganization plan made
6 debut only a couple of weeks ago. Why was it allowed to be
7 introduced at the eleventh hour? Why the secrecy? What
8 makes the County in its infinite wisdom, the wisdom of an
9 outsider, think it knows better than the fire professionals
10 what is needed? I say the County should stop playing
11 armchair quarterback and respect and consider the
12 recommendations of the professionals. I do not see how
13 LAFCO in good conscience could support a plan thrown
14 together in secrecy by an agency with so little or with
15 little or no experience in fire services. I can only
16 support the initial Micro Study which was compiled by fire
17 professionals after much collaboration and consideration,
18 without Attachment 1 and monies have been identified.

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

21 MR. COSTANZO: Later, please.

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

25 MS. MCMANAS: I have something to say.

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 46

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

2 MS. MCMANAS: Hello, I'm Virginia McManas, a
3 resident of Elfin Forest Harmony Grove area. And I did not

4 vote for Prop C. Unfortunately I had doubts about the
5 intentions. My concern was that it would be more about a
6 political look good at that point in time than something
7 respectful of our tax dollars. My concern was that
8 people would view it as a mandate when it was actually a
9 survey of interest; that we needed to coordinate and that's
10 a very valid point. There must be better coordination. But
11 the outcome, as I can see, is the Department of Land Use is
12 now overseeing firefighting and CDF also. So two
13 bureaucracies now have benefited from an advisory review of
14 our coordination problem. And from my point of view, they
15 stand to benefit in the growth of their departments, which I
16 think indeed is happening and that chart did indicate. So I
17 have concern as a resident of CSA 107 that I will stand to
18 lose services; that my fire insurance will go up. I will
19 not have local firefighters to the degree I currently have;
20 that EMTs will be provided instead of paramedics, so I lose
21 medical services. I lose control of the assessment money
22 that we voluntarily gave to our fire department. We did not
23 give it to DPLU or CDF or any other agency. And I see my
24 fire department being undermined currently in terms of
25 relationships with developers in which they were to have

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

47

1 funds and those funds are no longer available to them.

2 So from my point of view, my concern as to why I
3 didn't vote for Prop C has come true, not because I wanted
4 it to work out that way, but government tends to go in this
5 direction unless we say no. We did not say give our money
6 to DPLU. We did not say give our firefighting to CDF. We
7 said we needed coordination. And we must listen to our

8 local firefighters. It must be a choice of the voters. The
9 community that is being served must have the biggest say
10 rather than departmental groups deciding how to divide up
11 our firefighting dollar for perhaps their benefit, not the
12 benefit of the services for me. So I hope not to lose
13 services, but we will see if this continues is the mandate
14 to provide, to coordinate, or is it to grow and answer
15 political issues that don't serve us well. Thank you.

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

19 MR. HUSKEY: William Huskey from Pine Valley, and
20 that's spelled H-u-s-k-e-y. I want to thank you for this
21 opportunity. As you might notice, probably 75 percent or
22 more of the people here are either firefighters or families
23 of firefighters. Now, we say that the people voted over 61
24 percent for this unification, but if you notice, there's
25 hardly any people from Pine Valley of the regular people

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

48

1 even coming in here to see what this is all about, so they
2 really don't care.

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

6 By taking this away from the local people, the
7 local fire department, you're taking more and more of the
8 rights of the private property owners away from them and
9 you're giving it to downtown. This is not why we're living
10 out here. This is not why we voted for the people. Now

11 Diane says that she'll work and run this new deal. She
12 can't even get the Forestry to give them the okay to cut all
13 this fuel down that's up here. I don't care what we do, if
14 we don't get rid of this fuel, you can put as many fire
15 departments out here as you want, you'll still have another
16 Cedar Fire. And I could go on and on and repeat what these
17 other people have said. You've heard it before. I'm glad
18 for the opportunity to get up here and express myself. I
19 would like to say more, but I'll do it in writing and send
20 it to. You thank you again.

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

24 MS. COURTEAU: Courteau. Just a short question,
25 please. I have heard that the 501-C could not be forced to

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 49

1 give up its assets, right? But how will they be able to
2 maintain these assets if the funds are cut off?

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

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

13 MR. OTT: Well, let me ask you this right now, how
14 are your funds derived for your 501-C3 today?

15 MS. COURTEAU: Various. Tax dollars.

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

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 50

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

4 MS. COURTEAU: Wonderful, good. Thanks.

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

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

17 MR. VAN BEENEN: I think a lot of the comments I

18 had have been cited by others. I'm leery of one thing, the
19 timing of all of these efforts. We went through reviewing,
20 analyzing and dealing with the CDF proposal, which
21 originally was represented as being an augmentation as I
22 think John mentioned. And at the end it turned out to be a
23 takeover of firefighting operations in Pine Valley here.
24 Interestingly enough, the funds come from the State to the
25 County. The County mandates that it be spent with CDF. We

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 51

1 had staff that presented alternative solutions for about a
2 third of the cost that would match what we would be getting
3 staffing wise from CDF, but now we'll pay three times as
4 much because it's not out of our pocket. The County is
5 giving it to us because the State is giving it to the
6 County. It's all a setup and it starts to look like, and I
7 think a few others have this feeling, it starts to look like
8 unwittingly you are the face for what the County is going to
9 do and what the County is going to put on all of these
10 districts. And while your intentions are noble, the role
11 you're playing, feeding the County's interest in having a
12 county department, your presentation up here, you said not
13 once, if you said three times I think I caught it, oh, yeah,
14 see, if you link to the County, you might be able to dip
15 into their pockets. And, yeah, if you link to the County,
16 you kept repeating that, giving a hand to what your
17 preference might be if you were to make a recommendation.
18 Yeah, a link to the County, it's a deep pocket. Well, link
19 to the State, it's a deep pocket. Stay the way you are.
20 And every time you comment to one of the questions, the
21 answer is, well, yeah, that would happen after we go through

22 the process and an agency is created, then funding would do
23 this or do that. It's always with the assumption that it's
24 going to create a new agency of some sort. And it becomes
25 clear that the agency should be out of the County.

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 52

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

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

17 That's all I have to say.

18 MR. OTT: Kabuki, that's a new one for me. Thank
19 you for your comments though, and I do mean that sincerely
20 in that we do want to convey not just the mood but the
21 importance of what you feel needs to be considered here in
22 Pine Valley as well as any community. And I hear a lot
23 about local control tonight and that certainly will be
24 conveyed, I imagine, in the transcripts.

25

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 53

1 MS. ARSIVAUD-BENJAMIN: Yes. Hi, my name is
2 Jacqueline Arsi vaud-Benj amin and I'm with the El fin Forest
3 Harmony Grove Town Council. And as a communi ty we have a
4 number of concerns with speci fi cally the county plan, I
5 should say, more so than the Micro Study. And one request
6 that we would have of LAFCO is to look at the possibi lity of
7 leavi ng the agenci es who currently have a higher level of
8 service than what is proposed. Speci fi cally our CSA 107
9 fire district currently is an ISO 4, and from what we can
10 deci pher a plan from the County would go down to a level of
11 seven. We would respectfully request that those agenci es be
12 left out of the reorgani zati on effort, because obvi ously it
13 doesn't make any sense to decrease the level of service to
14 our communi ty.

15 The other comment I would like to make is if you
16 look at the map you had on earlier, you will see that El fin
17 Forest is very much of an island. You have the bulk of what
18 you plan to reorgani ze in Escondido and then you have this
19 little finger that comes and takes us over of sorts. And
20 from a functional standpoint, and the fire department is
21 better suited to talk to this, but it really makes little
22 sense for our fire department to be aligned with CDF which
23 has different training procedures and so forth, rather than
24 with the North County fire departments with whom we're
25 already worki ng, traini ng with, and can, you know, work more

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 54

1 cooperatively with.

2 And the other point I would like to make about from
3 a community standpoint is that the fire department is more
4 than just providing emergency medical service and fire for
5 us. It's also really the heart of the community. The
6 firehouse is where we meet, it's where we have the 4th of
7 July picnic, it's where we have our town council meetings.
8 And, again, from what we can read, and I would love to know
9 exactly what would happen, but it sounds like those
10 facilities would then be used specifically for fire if they
11 were taken over by CDF, which would obviously be a problem
12 in terms of continuing community activities.

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

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 55

1 County Service Area 135 were named the successor, those
2 entities would adhere the properties and that would be a
3 condition of any LAFCO action, if LAFCO were to approve.

4 I take it also that your comment about being
5 aligned with other entities, you're essentially inferring or
6 suggesting that you be considered as part of our Phase 2?

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

10 MR. OTT: Thank you.

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

14 MS. ARSIVAUD-BENJAMIN: Exactly.

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

23 MR. OTT: Bob Kephart.

24 MS. KEPHART: My name is Bob Kephart and I'm from
25 Elfin Forest and I'm here as a citizen taxpayer. And I want

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 56

1 to address Page 1. I think it goes to the sum of the heart
2 of this report. And it really comes down to the regional
3 system for providing fire protection and emergency medical
4 services dysfunctional. I think that's a pretty broad
5 statement. I think it's a malicious statement towards the
6 volunteers, the paid fire departments, and everybody else.
7 I think it starts at the top in the County. The Board of

8 Supervisors is dysfunctional, because they won't add the
9 County charter fire protection as one of their jobs. They
10 give all the money to the Sheriff. They've taken tax money
11 after tax money, given it to law enforcement, but they just
12 don't see the point of doing anything with fire protection.
13 And it flows from there. The dysfunctional part which drove
14 this thing was major fires in the County, which it wasn't
15 these agencies that weren't the only ones who didn't
16 respond. We all responded. CDF, the agency who it looks
17 like we're going to turn all this over to, I think was the
18 lead agency and did not respond very well to the fire. The
19 City of San Diego found themselves so unprepared, you know,
20 when they claim they couldn't buy batteries for radios, it's
21 astounding of what knee-jerk reaction this whole study has
22 become in not looking at it and micro-managing what they're
23 going to do with the system. We can go back into other
24 parts of this dysfunctional part of this system and look at
25 what it really is.

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 57

1 The mission of the County has got to be decided.
2 They've got to decide whether they're going to let DPLU, who
3 cannot maintain the road I live on in an acceptable
4 condition, to also maintain the fire trucks that are going
5 to service my area and the people that go with them. I find
6 it just appalling that this is going to happen. And I'd
7 love Bill Horn to come out and walk Elfin Forest and Harmony
8 Grove Road and tell me that it's maintained in a proper
9 manner. You know, it's crazy. And we go through everything
10 else. Where is the money going to come from? This report

11 is so lacking. You inserted a County plan that we haven't
12 even talked about. Why it's in your report, I would really
13 like to know? It just doesn't make any sense that it's in
14 there. All it's done is cause controversy. It's secretive.
15 I sit on a Fire Advisory Board that's supposed to be
16 directed by the County Board of Supervisors, who I don't
17 think I've ever seen, except once when invited to a meeting
18 in 18 years. And this County Board of Supervisors is now
19 giving their DPLU, okay, you guys go out and buy this, you
20 guys do this, you guys do that. We're an advisory board, we
21 should at least know what they're buying. I have no idea.
22 I inspect fire trucks for the department that I work for,
23 and I know what we're buying, but I can't tell you what the
24 County is buying. I know ISO ratings. I've run our ISO
25 system and helped get it down to a nine. The only reason

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 58

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

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

14 I've called Riverside. I've gone other places and
Page 52

15 talked to people and it's not a good system. They're
16 staying alive, but they're not staying alive where they were
17 before. With the way society is changing, it gets harder
18 and harder to bring volunteers in. Paid people don't want
19 it. 80 percent of the firefighters in America volunteer.
20 They're in the rural area. 20 percent are in urban areas.
21 You're now going to try and convert this whole county to an
22 urban area by bringing in paid firefighters throughout the
23 County. And I just think you're not looking at the big
24 picture of the system. And the Board of Supervisors is the
25 one who needs to look at that big picture. If they don't

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 59

1 put firefighting in the County Charter, they should stay out
2 of the business. Thank you.

3 MR. OTT: Dan Lawrence?

4 MR. LAWRENCE: I'm done.

5 MR. OTT: Our last speaker is Byron MacFarlane.
6 Are you still here?

7 MR. MACFARLANE: I'm still here, most of me.
8 Can you hear me without the microphone? I am here as a
9 member of CSA 107. I'm the treasurer of the Fire Advisory
10 Board and an elected member of the Fire Advisory Board. I
11 think following Bob Kephart's comments if, in fact, the
12 County is going to take over control of fire suppression
13 efforts, if they are to take it over, if that is the vote,
14 then I acknowledge his comment about the roads, but we've
15 got a lot of volunteer firefighters here. We in the Elfin
16 Forest Harmony Grove Fire Department were two months ago
17 nine months in the arrears for our payments that we

18 requested from the County. Nine months, \$175,000. Now, if
19 the County cannot provide the funds that we have put in on
20 our monthly claim sheets to the tune of nine months, how are
21 they going to be able to run a fire department in this huge
22 county? I'm not sure.

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

25 MS. ANDERSON: Yeah, the same thing. The formal

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 60

1 term that's special assessment.

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

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

14 MR. MACFARLANE: Not just general?

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

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

21 MS. ANDERSON: No, it has to be -- the fiduciary
Page 54

22 responsibility would be by an advisory committee from that
23 area for that special assessment area, right.

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 61

1 MS. ANDERSON: Lots of advisory committees.

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

4 MS. ANDERSON: The model.

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

9 MR. OTT: It's a hot potato here. In terms of the
10 very first option, the one involving the regional fire
11 protection district. The other options are protest driven
12 in terms of election commissions for the designation of the
13 County as the successor, as well as the activation of the
14 fire powers for County Service Area 135. That would be
15 dependent upon protests within the areas that would be
16 subject to dissolution. The actual fire districts or county
17 service areas that would be proposed for dissolution of 25
18 percent of the voters, any one of those agencies were to
19 register protests, and it would be in a LAFCO proceeding,
20 not in a Board of Supervisor proceeding, it would be before
21 LAFCO at a designated time and it would not be on May 7th.
22 It would be on a subsequent date that we would announce.
23 That then could trigger an election within the entire
24 Phase 1 area that we designate and then the entire

25 population would be asked to confirm whether or not the

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 62

1 action that LAFCO approved, if LAFCO does approve it, should
2 be validated.

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

5 MR. OTT: It is a petition. It's different than
6 other types of petitions that you may have signed. We have
7 the petition forms actually on our web site. They're
8 generic, but they apply to all types of jurisdictional
9 changes and they can be filed by registered voters. Again,
10 25 percent is the threshold to trigger an election and then
11 the election would require that a majority of the people
12 approve the ballot question in order for that ballot
13 question to be ratified, simple majority. If it doesn't get
14 that majority, then it would be terminated.

15 MR. MACFARLANE: I applaud the efforts of LAFCO,
16 their study, both in the Macro and Micro Study, that you
17 have been open, you have let us know what's going on, you
18 have invited our comments, you invited fire chiefs'
19 comments; however, I was shocked, surprised, amazed when I
20 saw the DPLU document in the final study. I had frankly
21 never heard of DPLU. I didn't know who they were. I could
22 say, well, huh, you never got any permits. Well, I usually
23 just paint and put nails into things that are already up
24 there, so I don't know the process. But all of a sudden
25 there was a document in there and a new group of people who

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 63

1 wanted to influence our local control. And I cannot believe
2 that there is one person in this room that doesn't believe
3 if you don't have local control, you don't have any control.
4 What about our federal tax dollars, where do they go? None
5 of us have any idea. Well, the County takes our taxes and
6 the County gives them back to us to do the work. But in CSA
7 107 we have a fire advisory board that works very diligently
8 to use those funds to benefit our citizens and to make us
9 more available for mutual aid in the surrounding areas.

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

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

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 64

1 future. And that really is the genesis of that. So we felt
2 that it was important to attach that to our report so that
3 everybody would have that in writing. And it would be

4 something that you could review, scrutinize, comment on,
5 rather than just hearing about it verbally. So now we have
6 the benefit of a written document that we give testimony on
7 and comment on. And I think it will be helpful when we
8 conclude these workshops to be able to convey the comments,
9 your concerns, your support, whatever the case, not only
10 about that plan, but the Micro Report and any other
11 questions you have. So hopefully that answered the question
12 about that plan. I'm sure we'll have that same question
13 come up in two subsequent workshops as well.

14 Why don't you continue.

15 MR. MACFARLANE: Okay, I agree. I think the plan
16 should have been in the report; however, I think everybody
17 in the planning process, in the discussion process should
18 have known it was coming. I happened to meet these two
19 gentlemen I think on Wednesday before the report was coming
20 out from LAFCO. And the comment that I got from them, or
21 maybe it wasn't specifically from you, but the comment I got
22 was, well, we're going to have to wait for the LAFCO report
23 to see what it says. And I would have expected we were
24 having a meeting that somebody would have said, well, we've
25 got a report that's going to be included in there and that's

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

65

1 going to be part of this. I would have expected something
2 of that nature. So I was very surprised that this came up
3 and that it was handled in that way. And I guess the reason
4 I bring the point up is, I'm not sure that I want that kind
5 of happenstance to run my fire support in CSA 107.

6 I think that it's already been stated, my feeling
7 is that we should be included in Phase 2 of the effort as we

8 are an island which shows up. Now, that doesn't say, hey,
9 you guys in that big sphere should not be included in
10 Phase 2, too. I'm just saying I want to be included in
11 there. I want our local area out of Phase 1.

12 The community support for our CSA, and I'm sure it
13 exist in every CSA and every volunteer fire department in
14 this county. We went to the Viejas Fire, the Paradise Fire,
15 the Cedar Fire, we were strike teams on all of those. Our
16 station while we were on strike was manned by the community.
17 They fed the people that were there. They fed the
18 firefighters that were there to take care of our area. Plus
19 they fed people coming in from other areas. And the fire
20 station fills up. So when the question is asked about
21 whether the station is open to the community, that's a very,
22 very important part of the community and a very, very
23 important part of support for what we're doing. The wives
24 of the firefighters that are out on those strike teams have
25 somebody that's at the fire station that says, oh, yes, I'll

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

66

1 come down and I'll walk your dog, or I'll come down and help
2 you with your children, or I'll come down and take care of
3 your horses. That's very, very important. My feeling is
4 that if CDF were to come into the station, that's somebody
5 in the outside area, they're going to be hired people, they
6 are not going to have a great rapport at first with the
7 community and we're going to lose a great deal of that with
8 that type of an effort with a CDF presence. I do not see
9 the need for a CDF presence in CSA 107. And I think what I
10 see is I'm a lowly little firefighter. I'm 70 years old and

11 I go out and go on strike teams. And the reason I like to
12 go on strike teams is I like to fight fires and I don't want
13 to lose that in our CSA. I want to make sure it continues,
14 that we can have volunteers come in, go out and fight fires,
15 go out and take care of wrecks, go out and take care of
16 whatever needs to be taken care of, heart attacks, whatever
17 it may be, and that that volunteer effort continues and our
18 community continues. If CDF comes in, I think we lose that.
19 Are they necessary in California for wildfires, of course
20 they are, no doubt about it. Are they necessary as a
21 community function, I don't think so.

22 MR. OTT: Before we conclude this, I would just
23 like to ask three speakers that either deferred or wish not
24 to speak if they still want to remain in that status. Kevin
25 Dubler, do you want to speak, Chief?

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 67

1 MR. DUBLER: I'm Kevin Dubler from Julian Cuyamaca
2 Fire and I wanted to clarify a few points. First of all, on
3 Proposition C when that ballot initiative came out, I told
4 my wife that's the biggest joke of a ballot initiative I've
5 ever seen. It was worked in such away that, with all due
6 respect, any moron would vote yes on because they're asking
7 us, "Do you want to have a fire department and it's not
8 going to cost you a dime, because we're not going to take
9 any more money. It's not going to cost you anything extra."
10 Who wouldn't vote for that. We had just gotten hammered by
11 the Cedar Fire. That was all timed to be a very timely
12 ballot initiative and it was written very shrewdly by the
13 supervisors, so it got an 83 percent ballot.

14 So now I'll go on to benefit fees. We have two
Page 60

15 benefit fees. One benefit fee just passed with 74 percent
16 of the vote. Our fire district is very well liked in our
17 community. They like the job we do. They like the fact
18 that we provide ALS transport service. And just like
19 Harmony Grove, our stations are used for community meetings.
20 We have the park views that people turn out in droves for.
21 They come up to their weekend cabins just for the barbecues
22 because this is part of the community and that will be lost
23 if we go to a paid department. And you asked about
24 volunteers and whether they leave or not, Valley Center when
25 they became a Schedule A contract station essentially lost

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 68

1 all their volunteers. They have reserves, but reserves are
2 not volunteers in the same token that I'm speaking of
3 volunteers. Our district is staffed 100 percent by local
4 volunteers. We don't allow people in outside our district
5 to be volunteers, so we don't take the reserves. Reserves
6 are generally people that are trying to build up a track
7 record so they can go to work for some paid department
8 someplace. Our volunteers are all community members. Right
9 here in Pine Valley, and I learned this when we were going
10 over the Schedule A contract, we're both looking at the
11 Schedule A contract at the same time. I came down here to
12 Pine Valley to a couple of meetings, a couple of board
13 meetings, some open meetings, and I learned that Pine
14 Valley, correct me if I'm wrong, has six volunteers that
15 live in the community; is that correct? Six, and some 20 or
16 so reservists, but the numbers are opposite of that when
17 they started with reserves. They had far more community

18 members who were volunteering. And then people come in and
19 take over and they're there for the day and all of a sudden
20 some of the volunteers feel threatened and they're down the
21 road and you don't see them again. And that's happening
22 here as we speak. And that's already happened at Valley
23 Center, because one of the last volunteers currently works
24 for us up in Julian. They have reservists, but that's not
25 the same as a true volunteer fire department.

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 69

1 But to clarify the benefit fee, as I understand it
2 if we had \$1,000,000 to run our station through the new plan
3 and we have a \$100,000 benefit fee, which we have for
4 structural fire protection, that \$100,000 could offset the
5 \$1,000,000 to the tune of \$100,000, we get 900,000 from the
6 entity and 100,000 would come from our benefit fee, so our
7 net to our district is \$1,000,000; is that correct? Could
8 that happen?

9 MS. ANDERSON: It could.

10 MR. DUBLER: And so, in essence, the benefit fee
11 which our people are paying doesn't really benefit them
12 anymore because they would have gotten the million -- what
13 I'm saying, this is possible, they would have gotten the
14 \$1,000,000 to run the fire department anyhow without paying
15 \$100,000 in benefit fees, correct?

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

21 MR. DUBLER: Yes.

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

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 70

1 accomplished.

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

4 MS. ANDERSON: Yes.

5 MR. DUBLER: So actually they would be paying their
6 \$50 for every structure and not really benefiting anymore
7 than if they didn't pay that \$50?

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

10 MR. DUBLER: But who would do that?

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

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

17 MS. ANDERSON: I'm sorry?

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

22 MS. ANDERSON: Apparently you have a contract
23 between the voters and the district that says this money
24 funds the station.

25

MR. DUBLER: All I want to say is that our district

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

71

1 would also like to be left out of Phase 1. I think there
2 are some real hurdles for these districts to overcome in
3 Phase 1. And we've provided, according to our own district
4 members, very adequate fire protection for the last 25 years
5 since the County bailed on the fire protection 25 years ago.
6 We picked up the ball. We have one member sitting over here
7 who is one of the original board members, I believe. And
8 he's still with us on the board. We have long-term
9 commitments from people. One of our members just retired
10 after 22 years of being a volunteer, so we have a very
11 community-oriented volunteer fire department. We have a ISO
12 rating of five eight, which is better than the seven or
13 eight you were looking for. And what cost us the eight
14 rating are the areas that are either five miles or more away
15 from the station or are not in a recognized water district,
16 because ISO ratings are not just about fire protection,
17 they're about the water in the back country also. And we
18 can say we're going to get a seven rating for the County,
19 but we aren't unless we improve the water system. That is
20 evidenced in Julian. We've got five everywhere there's a
21 water district. And where there's not, it's an eight. And
22 that's going to continue throughout the county until the
23 water is addressed as part of this fire reunification.
24 Thank you.

25

MR. OTT: Thank you, Kevin. We have several

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

72

1 others. We have about four minutes left. Rick, did you
2 want to say anything or not? Rick Moore.

3 MR. MOORE: Well, just one question.

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

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

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 1600 Pacific Highway.

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

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

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

24 MR. COSTANZO: I would just like to reiterate
25 something that was already said once before maybe in my own

1 way. If the volunteer fire people in this new organization
2 are not called out to go on every call as they are right
3 now, they will disappear in very short order. Guys will

4 go -- like Mike said, will go to the station once or twice,
5 the third or fourth time they're just not going to show up
6 anymore. And if CDF were to be going out first on every
7 call and the volunteer agency -- let's say there's 150 calls
8 at that location per year normally and only 15 of them were
9 left over for volunteers to go out on, there would be no
10 volunteer agency, department or group to be called in the
11 future. There would be no volunteers at all, zero. And
12 that would be across the County. Any argument with that?

13 MR. OTT: Would you like to say something?

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

19 MR. OTT: One last comment, Roger.

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

25 MS. ANDERSON: You want per parcel?

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services

74

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

7 MR. OTT: Frank, you had a question. This will be
Page 66

8 the final question perhaps.

9 MR. TWOHY: Just a quick clarification on protests
10 because that's something I think my community will be
11 interested in. I notice on Page 54, if you turn to the
12 report, maybe you can clarify for me, but I see under
13 "Election Requirements Reorganization" that at least 10
14 percent of the landowners or at least 10 percent of the
15 voters at the time of the vote within the area unless you
16 are fewer than 300. So which one is correct, 25 percent or
17 10 percent?

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

20 MR. TWOHY: Thank you.

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

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

24 MR. OTT: That would be correct.

25 Are there any other questions?

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 75

1 MR. SHERMAN: One more. I just had a question on
2 the DPLU one where they're going to include volunteers and
3 stuff and it shows CDF staffing to be on some of them, the
4 5A, I think it was, it shows it to be three, three people
5 for a lot of the stations, which means one person on a day;
6 is that correct? And the reason I ask that is because on
7 Page 6 of the DPLU it says, "There will be two or more
8 permanent CDF fire personnel on an engine. CDF no longer
9 allows a station engine to be staffed by one permanent CDF
10 fire employee supplemented by volunteers or reserve

11 fire fighters."

12 MR. TRAYLOR: Okay. Dennis, let me clarify that.
13 Where there is viable volunteer programs, the option 5A, 6A
14 and 7A provides one paid EMT or paramedic to be on duty with
15 your volunteer fire company.

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

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

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

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

25 MR. SHERMAN: Okay.

Peterson & Associates Court Reporting & Video Services 76

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

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

5

6 * * *

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25