

AGENDA  
REGULAR MEETINGS  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT

Tuesday, August 11, 2015

C. BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD

7. BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS

- c. Board Legislative Committee (4.17.2015) (Burgis)

The Legislative Committee met at District headquarters on Friday, April 17, 2015.

Present: Directors: Diane Burgis, Whitney Dotson, Dennis Waespi  
Staff: Robert E. Doyle, Erich Pfuehler, Carol Victor, Jeff Rasmussen, Brian Holt,  
Dave Collins  
Consultants: Doug Houston, Houston Magnani & Associates  
Public: Pat O'Brien, Diana McDaniel, David Salniker, Friends of Port Chicago  
National Memorial

I. STATE LEGISLATION / ISSUES

A. NEW LEGISLATION

*\* Out of respect for members of the public wishing to address item II.B.1 – Restorative Justice of U.S. Navy Sailors of Port Chicago that item was taken up first by the committee. \**

**I. AB 299 (Brown D-San Bernardino) – State mandated drowning or near drowning incident report form**

Legislative Advocate Doug Houston summarized AB 299. This bill requires the Department of Public Health to put together a Submersion Incident Form for incidents that occur in the State of California. Currently, there is no such form. Houston believes the author's intent is to improve aquatic safety. The provisions of this bill would apply to all first responders on the scene of a submersion incident both fatal and non-fatal. This bill may be targeted toward aquatic providers and pool type settings, but the current language of the bill is broader. The bill would apply to all jurisdictions where there is bodily contact with water. He stated staff has concerns regarding increased liability associated with disclosing all of these instances, as well as the additional paperwork required. Staff is recommending a watch position on the bill.

General Manager Robert E. Doyle stated the bill would apply to the Roberts Regional Recreation Area swimming pool and the District's various aquatic areas. He suggested Legal Counsel and Aquatics staff look into it. He believes the intent of this bill is better tracking statewide, and also to establish safety records for California swim facilities.

Director Diane Burgis asked if the bill indicates what type of reporting was required (number of incidents, or if cooperation with victim is needed). District Counsel Carol Victor responded requests for specific information become a privacy concern and more challenging. Victor believes the target is backyard drownings and not guarded pools. What is being asked for is

very broad and open ended. The District already proceeds with investigations of loss of life, but does not currently investigate near drownings, except in extreme circumstances. The investigation is supposed to decide causation, evaluate if lifeguards were present and whether there were obstacles in the pool. It requires a lot of information. There would be an additional burden and the risk of additional exposure. Public health goals should be met without a burdensome requirement. Doyle stated the District has professionally trained lifeguards under Public Safety which is very different than a home pool or small community pool. The reach of this bill is too broad. The District would like to see if it could be narrowed and/or work with the author to see what the real intent is. The District has excellent training and an excellent record on lifeguarding.

Director Dennis Waespi stated the District already has protocols in existence with regard to reporting and documenting. Victor stated these items are publicly posted. Director Whitney Dotson stated it may be the Department of Public Health's intention is prevention. These forms may raise more public attention and could lead to prevention of unnecessary drownings or near drownings. Victor stated drownings in lifeguarded pools are rare. Drownings in pools, hot tubs and bathtubs are a huge public health risk and one of the leading causes of childhood death.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to WATCH

## **2. AB 549 (Levine D-San Rafael) – State Parks revenue generation programs and SB 204 (Pavley, D-Santa Monica) – State Parks Parks Forward recommendations**

Houston discussed AB 549 and SB 204 and stated the District was invited to submit comments to the author of SB 204 and subsequently directed those to the author of AB 549. The comments dealt with the District's relationship with, and operations of, State Parks. These bills are works in progress.

As AB 549 is currently written, it will afford the State Department of Parks and Recreation a little more time to develop the State Park Revenue Incentive Subaccount and the State Parks and Recreation Fund. These revenue generation programs are intended to ensure at least 50% of the revenue generated at a specific State Park unit is reinvested in that unit.

SB 204 currently directs the California Department of Parks and Recreation to improve energy-related efficiencies, expand services of non-profit groups, allow the department to solicit private funds, and make improvements to internal budgeting, planning and project implementation procedures.

Doyle stated these bills show there is a keen interest in doing something about State Parks. The Legislature and staff are trying to encourage the implementation of the Parks Forward Commission's recommendations.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to WATCH

## **3. AB 665 (Frazier, D-Oakley) – Disallowance of local ordinances restricting hunting and fishing**

Houston explained this is the fourth or fifth iteration of this bill. It seeks to prohibit cities and counties from adopting ordinances related to the taking of fish and wildlife. The State would

pre-empt all local ordinances. It provides the State of California fully “occupies the field of the taking and possession” of fish and wildlife. It also specifically states the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and its commission, are the only entities in the state that can adopt regulations regarding the taking of fish and wildlife. In other words, the District would be unable to legally prevent hunting and fishing near parks and along trails. There has been a lot of litigation and precedent in the courts between the State and local agencies with regard to hunting and fishing.

Victor stated this is a preemption issue, whether or not the State completely occupies the field of hunting and fishing. Some believe local governments shouldn't be able to regulate. There is a body of case law and Attorney General opinions which limit the powers of local jurisdictions to legislate for the public health, safety and welfare. This issue came up for the District due to requests to hunt at Big Break and inside the marsh along the Hayward Shoreline. Victor explained the District adopted a provision to Ordinance 38 that people cannot hunt within 150 yards of a trail. The District's ordinance is opposed by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the California Waterfowl Association. Victor doesn't believe there has been any actual enforcement. Director Burgis interjected it does not sound like it has been enforced. Victor has received one park user complaint at Big Break over the proximity of shooting. She suggested signage for next hunting season to warn park users there is hunting nearby. The concern is the ability to enforce the regulations. Currently, the bill does not mention Special Districts and is primarily aimed at cities and counties. Doyle discussed the various issues with shooting from waters adjacent to Park District properties. The lands of the State are navigable waters, and are the jurisdiction of the State fish and game code. The arguments have come to the Board. Doyle stated this is an issue of concern. Houston is recommending a watch position, and recommended the General Manager express and articulates the concerns for the record. Victor stated the District received opposition to the 150 yard limitation despite it being consistent with the State law, which prohibits discharge of a firearm for hunting purposes within 150 yards of a dwelling unit and accessory structures. The District applied that language to trails. Trails are used by people frequently; the numbers were around 20,000 to 40,000 users per month. There is a significant population using the trails. Doyle stated he believes the District has taken a reasonable position, and is asking for a buffer, so people can feel comfortable on land the District owns or manages. The District recognizes the rights of those to hunt on navigable waters, but this is a health and safety issue. Victor stated this bill got through the Legislature once, but was vetoed by Governor Schwarzenegger, so there is a potential that this could go through the Legislature again.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to WATCH

#### **4. AB 988 (Stone, D-Monterey Bay) – Outdoor environmental and recreation grant program**

AB 988 establishes an Outdoor Environmental Education Program under the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). The bill draws on reverted and unencumbered funds from Prop. 40, but also allows the DPR Director to solicit and accept private funding (foundations, corporations, etc.) to supplement the costs of the program. The bill creates a specific “California Youth Outdoor Education Account” within DPR. Houston states this is probably the third or fourth iteration of this bill over the last six or seven years. The District has supported in the past and should continue to do so. He suspects the Department of Finance and Governor would have different priorities for the unencumbered Prop. 40 funds. Doyle asked if this would be a grant program and would the District be eligible. Houston replied it will be grant programs for local agencies. Houston said over time it is anticipated

that non-profits and NGO's would help identify additional funding to underwrite the programs. Director Burgis asked if school districts were eligible. Houston replied he believes so. Director Burgis stated she has been approached by school districts looking to meet their outdoor education needs, and it's an opportunity for both parties.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to SUPPORT

#### **5. AB 1251 (Gomez, D-Los Angeles) – Greenway development and sustainment**

Houston explained this is the second year this bill has been introduced. The author represents a large portion of the upper Los Angeles River. Developing a "greenway" along the Los Angeles River is a high priority for the City. The bill essentially defines a "greenway" as a part of "an open-space element of a county or city general plan." Last year's bill suggested state funding should be available for greenways, but did not require it. The instructive language was that a "city or county may apply for alternative fuels funding, greenhouse gas reduction funds, and other land use funds, as appropriate" if it develops a greenway that acts as a transportation corridor. A large portion of cap and trade dollars have been allocated for "sustainable communities and clean transportation," so this would be an effort to tap into that funding for green transportation efforts.

The District has properties along rivers, streams and creeks that should be included in this definition. The East Bay Greenway under the BART tracks may be eligible to follow the model Los Angeles is initiating. The District also maintains a number of non-motorized corridors. Houston asked for a support position with the goal to ensure Special Districts are included as eligible for "greenway funding." Waespi asked if the East Bay Greenway would be included, Houston responded probably not specifically, but should be eligible for funding. Doyle stated the goal is to broaden the bill and ensure it is eligible. Houston stated the author may want to keep it specific to Los Angeles, but there may be a need to broaden it statewide to get enough votes to pass. Director Dotson moved to support the legislation. Director Waespi seconded, if Special Districts are included. Director Burgis asked if Assembly Member Gomez's staff has been approached to broaden the bill. Houston replied they were asked last year, and were amenable to it, but the bill did not advance through its house of origin. He will ask again this year.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to SUPPORT

#### **6. AB 1345 (Dahle, R-Bieber) – Wildfire prevention and greenhouse gas reduction**

Assembly Member Brian Dahle represents the northeast corner of the state. His District includes portions of four National Forests (Modoc, Lassen, Tahoe and Six Rivers). He introduced AB 1345 to require the Air Resources Board by January 1, 2017 to estimate the annual greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions baseline associated with wildfires in California between the years 1990 and 2015. Annually thereafter, they must approximate the GHG emissions associated with wildfires. Beginning in the 2016-17 fiscal year, \$100 million would be continuously appropriated from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection for activities that reduce GHG emissions by preventing the incidences and reducing the intensity of catastrophic wildfires.

Doyle stated gathering this data would be very helpful. Director Burgis asked if the Air Quality

Control Board has a position. Doyle answered the biggest issue with the Air Quality Control Board is it's becoming difficult for the Fire Department to get the required permits and approved dates for prescribed burns.

Government Relations and Legislative Affairs Manager Erich Pfuehler stated the Air Resources Board and Governor have been very guarded with the Cap and Trade revenue. There has been concern ever since AB 32 was enacted, that it would face numerous legal and electoral challenges (which it has). There has been a concerted effort to direct Cap and Trade funds to actions that specifically reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The conservation community will need to develop data about the value of open space and proper fuels management vis-à-vis greenhouse gas sequestration. This bill has the right intent in terms of data, but it's funding is taken from the high-speed rail account – something the Governor is unlikely to support.

Houston stated the Governor budgeted for \$1 billion in Cap and Trade spending this year. The Legislative Analyst office is now projecting revenues will be close to \$2.2 billion. The extra revenue could be used for this type of data gathering.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to WATCH

## **7. AB 1362 (Gordon, D-Menlo Park) – Stormwater definition for assessments, fees and charges**

Assembly Member Rich Gordon, and Senator Lois Wolk, introduced this legislation to define stormwater for the purposes of securing resources to upgrade stormwater treatment facilities and infrastructure. Under Proposition 218 passed in 1996, local governments are required to seek voter approval prior to the imposition or increase in general taxes or assessments, and certain user fees. Water, wastewater and refuse collection fees were exempt from Prop. 218. The legislation only defines stormwater. It will take a Constitutional Amendment to actually exempt stormwater from Prop. 218, but the process has to start with a definition. The definition in the bill is any system of public improvement or service intended to provide for the quality, conservation, control or conveyance of waters that land on or drain across the natural or man-made landscape.

Houston stated he believes the authors intend for local agencies to have the authority to increase fees for stormwater infrastructure improvement without needing to pass a ballot measure by 2/3rds. The District could possibly receive funding for creek improvements, watershed protection and shoreline restoration.

Pfuehler stated Contra Costa County asked for the District's support, and he believes it's a reasonable thing to do. The next step would be a Constitutional Amendment. The District could reassess its involvement at that point. Doyle interjected Contra Costa's big focus is likely Marsh Creek, but also the Walnut Creek Channel. Director Burgis stated some of the stormwater requirements for cities are expensive and they don't have an adequate funding stream to make improvements. Victor stated some lawsuits were recently settled requiring a number of East Bay cities to complete massive upgrades, but the funding is a real challenge. Director Waespi stated from his experience as a sanitary board member, he knows that without a Prop. 218 exemption for stormwater raising the revenue is extremely difficult. Director Burgis stated many people believe that a storm drain is a sewer, which is part of the issue. Doyle thinks enacting a specific tax or fee for stormwater infrastructure on the ballot is a really big lift. Stormwater treatment is not a well-known issue or very popular, it has no

major advocacy group other than the public agencies themselves so it makes sense they would try this route. Director Burgis asked if this was related to what Contra Costa County flood control staff are trying to do regarding a benefit assessment or funding source. Doyle stated yes, and they may pursue both the assessment and the Prop. 218 exemption.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to SUPPORT

**8. SB 371 (Hancock, D-Berkeley) and AB 746 (Ting, D-San Francisco) – San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority modifications**

Houston noted to strike the first bill SB 371. It has been substantially amended prior to this meeting.

Houston provided an overview of AB 746. It would require the Chair of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority to be an elected official from a bayside City or County (does not include Special Districts). Currently, the Chair only needs to be a resident. Pfuehler mentioned Senator Dianne Feinstein has strongly suggested the Chair be directly accountable to some base of voters. Her caution is public confidence in a new regional entity proposing a revenue measure might be undermined if the Chair was somehow not accountable in any direct way to voters. The bill also deletes the 10% limit on the Authority's total amount of bonded indebtedness and extends until January 1, 2019 the Authority's ability to reimburse county elections officials for only the incremental costs of any ballot measure. Currently, their exemption expires on January 1, 2017. This extension would leave open the option of a 2018 ballot measure. The Ting legislation also extends the Authority's sunset to January 1, 2049. The previous sunset was January 1, 2029.

Houston is seeking an amendment to allow for the chair to be an elected official from a Special District as well. Pfuehler stated in the past the District had to work hard to have a Special District elected even eligible to serve on the Authority's board. Pfuehler stated Director John Sutter is on the Authority's board. Pfuehler, Houston, and General Manager Emeritus Pat O'Brien worked to amend the enabling legislation to make this possible. Pfuehler also made the case that the omission of Special Districts for chair eligibility could eliminate potentially valuable chairpersons, particularly water and sewer professionals who operate infrastructure that relate to the Bay. He has had a conversation with David Lewis at Save the Bay who is interested in looking at amending. Doyle stated including Special Districts broadens the bench to be able to choose a person who is an advocate for the organization and for the cause. Pfuehler recommended the committee support the bill. He believes Director Sutter would favor the effort as well. Director Waespi made a motion to support and encouraged our legislative advocate to lobby on our behalf to include Special Districts.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to SUPPORT

**9. SB 422 (Monning, D-Carmel) – Santa Clara Valley Open Space District**

Houston stated the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority is now an independent district and not a county agency. The bill is seeking to change the agency's name to the Santa Clara Valley Open Space District. In addition, the bill is giving some authority to the Authority to acquire real property adjacent to their jurisdiction or watersheds within or impacting their jurisdiction. It gives them the authority to acquire lands and conservation easements on properties that aren't necessarily in Santa Clara County. The Midpeninsula Open Space District

expressed some concerns and reservations about this bill. Houston said the District doesn't have the same concerns, but for now should probably take a neutral position between the two agencies. Doyle states it has nothing to do with the name change, only the jurisdictional boundary issue. Evidently at some point in the past they had their boundaries cross. Doyle would like to continue to watch or remain neutral until they work it out.

The Legislative Committee of the Board voted unanimously to WATCH

## B. ISSUES

### I. **SB 317 (de Leon, D-Los Angeles) – Park Bond**

Houston worked to amend the bill to reflect the priorities of the District. The bill now includes \$200 million for per capita funding which is significantly less than previous bond acts in Proposition 12 and Proposition 40, but it is a step in the right direction. It also includes \$200 million for a regional park program. This is the first time there is a regional park set aside. Many other categories of funds were not included in the first set of amendments – such as the Bay Program. The regional park program was included because the District, along with other county and regional park entities, have not been very successful in securing competitive grants through the state park program. The author of the bill, the pro-tempore, was the architect of the statewide park program which directs a lot of money to underserved communities. It is a good program, but needs a complimentary effort for regional parks. The \$200 million can also be used for regional parks to do some capital improvements on some of the State facilities they operate as well.

Doyle stated the District has applied several times to the statewide park grant program established by Senator de Leon and have not been successful. Point Pinole is the prime example of a waterfront area where a project “circle” includes much of the Bay. Central Los Angeles has much higher density and no Bay so they compete better. There is \$800 million in the bill for “disadvantaged communities.” This is a priority of the author, so rather than seeking changes in this program, the goal is to add more funding into other pots. The number one push is to increase per capita up to \$500 million.

Houston stated he has inquired with the author's office about modifying his program, to make the District and other similar agencies eligible and competitive for the funding. By way of example, in Proposition 84 there was \$400 million available for a statewide park program for underserved communities. Of the \$400 million, only eight million was awarded to counties and regional parks. The rest went to non-profits and cities and smaller park districts. Doyle stated aside from park districts, it puts counties at a disadvantage as well. If you have a big county park system you are not going to be as competitive. Its city centric, high density, low income, underserved and that's what the pro tempore wanted. We don't think, however, the intent was to make it so restrictive that counties and regional agencies receive very little, so the purpose of the State Park Partners Coalition letter is to increase the funding in the other pots.

Director Burgis asked if the pro-tempore understood that was the intent. Doyle replied there are a lot more conversations that need to occur. Houston stated there is also money for the Coastal Conservancy. He has made a specific request for \$100 million set aside for the Bay Area program.

## **2. AB 495 (Gordon, D-Menlo Park) – General Manager purchasing limit**

Houston explained AB 495 is sponsored by the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (Midpen) and cosponsored by the Park District. It would increase the General Manager's purchasing limit from \$25,000 to \$50,000. This bill passed the Assembly yesterday unanimously, 79 to 0. Last year, legislation passed which unified all open space districts at the \$25,000 limit. This could be a hiccup in raising it for Midpen and the District because Governance and Finance Committee folks may view this as being a little too early. Houston will work with that committee to advance the bill. Houston thinks the strongest argument is the size of the budgets for Midpen and the District compared to the other open space districts. Director Burgis asked how long it has been limited at \$25,000. Houston answered since 1999. Doyle stated change will present cost savings for the staff to prepare all the bid documents. Collins stated an average of 75 contracts processed between the current \$25,000 limit and the future \$50,000 limit would save the District nearly \$300,000.

## **3. Other issues**

### **SB 246 (Wieckowski D-Fremont) – Climate Action Team**

Doyle, Houston and Pfuehler met with Senator Wieckowski the week before the legislative committee meeting. The Senator's Chief of Staff asked the District look into supporting SB 246. The bill's initial goal was to support the Governor's Executive Order to create a climate action team. It would place the issue in statute. The climate action team would bring together CAL EPA, Department of Natural Resources, Office of Planning and Research and a host of other agencies. Their mission is to coordinate the State's global warming and greenhouse gas emission policies in the areas of mitigating and adaptation. Doyle asked how it would be funded. Houston replied Cap and Trade funding. Pfuehler said Senator Wieckowski might be doing some field hearings with one possibly being along the East Bay shoreline. It could present an opportunity for the District to discuss projects like Breuner Marsh which are designed to adapt to sea level rise. Pfuehler believes these types of projects will eventually be eligible for Cap and Trade funding. Doyle stated Wieckowski is an East Bay Senator, and the District should support this effort. Director Waespi stated he would like to move a support position of SB 246. Victor asked the Committee to first adopt a unanimous motion to add SB 246 to the agenda. Director Waespi made the motion to add SB 246 to the agenda which received a unanimous vote. Director Waespi moved to support SB 246 which also received a unanimous vote.

## **C. COASTAL CONSERVACY BAY AREA WATER TRAIL RESOLUTION**

Pfuehler stated this request came to the General Manager from the Executive Director of the Coastal Conservancy. They are nominating the Bay Trail Water Trail as a Priority Conservation Area as part of the Plan Bay Area process. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has called or asked all government entities in the Bay Area to identify or sponsor PCA's. They asked for a support resolution from this entity. It seems like a perfectly reasonable thing to do since the District supports the program. Director Waespi made a motion to support. The Committee voted unanimously to SUPPORT.

## II. FEDERAL LEGISLATION / ISSUES

### A. NEW LEGISLATION

N/A

### B. ISSUES

*\* This item was moved to the beginning of the meeting to accommodate the guests in attendance \**

#### **I. Restorative Justice for U.S. Navy Sailors of Port Chicago**

Principal Planner Brian Holt explained the District has been working on the transfer of the former Concord Naval Weapons Station property for quite some time. The base closed in 2005. Since that time the District has been working with the city, the U.S. Navy and National Park Service (NPS) to plan and develop a new regional park on the site. The base reuse plan calls for a public benefit conveyance of about half the property to the District. Throughout that process the District has worked with a number of different partners. One of the closest partners has been the Friends of Port Chicago. The District initially worked with them and the NPS to write the Federal legislation establishing the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial as an official unit of the NPS. The District was successful in ensuring the legislation calls for the NPS and District to partner on a possible visitor center for the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial. The existing memorial site is within an active Army base which is likely to remain active for the foreseeable future. It is not accessible to the general public, or anyone who is not U.S. citizen, and it is out of the public's eye. The Board recently approved a cooperative management agreement with NPS for the Port Chicago Naval Magazine National Memorial, and are working to develop a visitor center on the property. Holt introduced Friends of Port Chicago board members David Salnicker, who is the treasurer of the Board, and Rev. Diana McDaniel, who is the president. He also spoke about Dr. Robert Allen, who was not present. Holt explained they are working to receive restorative justice for the 50 men who were court-martialed from the Navy following the explosion. They have asked the District to adopt a resolution of support. Holt believes the Port Chicago story will be central to the interpretation of the base at the visitor center. He stated this would help provide closure in this story. By supporting the effort, the District would be a part of making sure justice is served to those men.

David Salnicker said he and Rev. McDaniel have been going to various commissions and Boards asking for resolutions they will ultimately submit to The White House. They are asking for a presidential proclamation that would, at least morally, exonerate the 50 African-American sailors who were convicted of mutiny at a time when the Navy was segregated and when racial injustice was prevalent in our society. He appreciates the support and partnership with the District. He also expressed appreciation for all of Holt's work with them. Director Waespi asked if any of the 50 persons involved are still living. Salnicker answered no. Doyle explained more of the background and history of the Port Chicago explosion. Doyle stated it's a very important National and African-American site. The District has a policy of environmental justice in the master plan. This is a very important fairness issue to the people involved. He is hopeful the President will take an action. Holt added there is a historical connection between the explosion and the future parkland. The conditions that led to the explosion were there was no onsite storage for ammunition, making for unsafe conditions. Subsequent to the explosion, the Navy purchased the inland area and developed the bunkers that will be conveyed to the District. Director Dotson stated his father worked for the Navy at the Oakland Naval supply center and used to reflect on Port Chicago periodically. Director Dotson believes this is something the District should support. He made a motion to support the resolution. The

Committee voted unanimously to support. Director Burgis commented, during the San Bruno explosion, she spoke to a gentlemen who remembered the Port Chicago explosion. She stated there are people that still remember. The sooner something can be done, the more history can be collected from those who remember. She thanked them for their work. Doyle thanked them for coming.

## 2. Other issues

### III. EAST CONTRA COSTA COUNTY FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT ASSESSMENT

Doyle stated it has been policy of the Board to support other agencies when they need funds. This assessment does not have a huge financial impact to the District, but fire protection is pretty challenging in East County. Pfuehler stated it's a \$2,500 annual fee. Director Waespi asked if it was per parcel or total. Victor answered it includes all 25 parcels owned by the District in their jurisdiction. East Contra Costa Fire Protection District is the first responder for those areas. Doyle stated the District has had complaints about all of the land purchased in East County which gets taken off their tax roll. He recommends a support vote. The Committee voted unanimously to support. Victor stated due to the time constraints of the voting deadline, this item was also added to Tuesday's Board agenda.

### IV. DISTRICT SURVEY RESULTS

Doyle introduced Dr. Gary Manross who discussed the most recent District-wide survey. Collins explained the process and why the District conducts these types of surveys. Dr. Manross gave a presentation about the survey which focused heavily on Measure CC.

### V. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

**Respectfully submitted:**



**Erich Pfuehler**  
**Government Affairs Manager**