

This transcript was generated by AI and is not an official meeting record. It may contain errors.

Transcript

May 28, 2025, 4:33PM



Public Safety CAR 0:03

Maybe, maybe.

Good morning, everyone.

This is the May 28, 2025 public safety cluster agenda review meeting and.

We'll start, OK.

So there are two motions on this agenda, so therefore, the meeting's being transcribed. And with that, we'll start with a round table with justice deputies, representatives from SD1.

Good morning Annabel Martinez, supervisors for these justice deputies.

Good morning, everyone.

It's high Romo supervisor Mitchell, senior justice deputy.

And then I have Melody O Philly.

I'm sorry I'm breathing.

Melody O Philly is our assistant justice deputy, and Doctor Franklin, who's our Justice Department.

Good morning, everyone.

Steve and Edward, senior Justice deputy supervisor back and my colleague Nick Weidel. Good morning.

Morning Kyla and Ally are here for Supervisor Han today.

Good morning, Sandra.

Correction for supervisor Barger's office and Arianna Gutierrez is here.

Our fellow for the year.

OK.

Thank you.

So we'll move on to informational items and we have one today. It's board letter requesting approval for LA County and Superior Court of California to execute enhancement services contracts.

And I wasn't one that this item is being filed originally filed for June 17th.

It's being reviewed July 29th and we have representatives from the Chief Executive Office as well as the Superior Court here.

Desk side.

That's two way that is two way.

Connection. Why is it being moved to July 29th?

Good morning, everybody.

Our service Chief Executive Office and we also have Kendra King from Superior Court. So we appreciate allowing for additional time for the board letter to move through our internal processes.

We want to allow sufficient review for final approval by the Court and the CEO, so we've been asked to file slightly later.

So is it going to come back to cluster?

No, no.

This would be our cluster presentation, so we decided to keep it as planned, OK.

But then it's going to go through the approval process after it comes here, it's in the approval process.

Right now it's just it is taking a little extra time because there are a lot of competing priorities right now. And so to allow for the executive levels of both the Court and CEO to sufficiently review and sign the letter.

We have asked to move it to the next to another meeting.

July 29th.

I guess the only, but isn't it gonna? If it changes then it doesn't come back like normally it comes to us after.

It's everything. The content of the letter and the substance will be exactly the same. The only thing that's changing is the date, and then we're going to exercise one of the available one month extensions that the current contracts allow for.

So the new date of the contracts will be August 1st instead of July 1st, but all of the rest of the substance of the letter and the substance of the contracts will be exactly the same.

I guess I I just I.

'M my only issue with it is if the substance were to change, it sounds like the substance is not expected to change, but the question is I guess he's just waiting for somebody to sign off.

That's correct.

And it's not actually gonna change.

That's correct.

Alright, I'm OK with that, provided that if it does change, we will bring it back.

Absolutely yes. If anything substantive changes, we will absolutely bring it back, because then the fundamental purpose of the motion and or the contracts would be different, and we would need to bring that back to you.

Yeah. Good morning.

How much is collected per year on average?

For that I know this.

For me, right?

So for the 2022 year?

For the Linebarger they collected for fiscal year 2022-2023, 10.1 million for 23/24, it was around 10 million, Harrison Harris for 22/23 was 9.2 and then for 23/24 was 9.9.

And then once the funds are collected, how are they dispersed?

Like how much of it goes towards the vendor.

How much of it goes back to the court or any other party?

Or does it all just go to pay for that specific?

Collection program of all of that. So the vendors receive a Commission and the money that is collected is distributed according to statutes.

So it goes to the states.

The cities abortion goes to the county.

So they don't keep any of the money that they collect, they receive a Commission on what they collect and only on what they collect. But the funds are applied to the ticket and then the money is distributed the way that it's supposed to be distributed.

What's the amount?

Of Commission that they like.

Was there a percentage like they get 10% off of?

So the the new contract.

Line Burger is 9.9% Commission and then Harrison Harris is 7.

.45. Yeah. Yes, that sounds right.

OK. And then my last question is an item book that was a long time.

So is there any explicit like portions of the contract that?

Any safeguards for those who don't have the ability to pay?

So the Judicial Council actually launched my citation program, and it is an ability to pay program.

So anyone who owes money on a citation can go on to my citation.

And apply for an ability to pay, and that is a request to reduce the amount they owe to perform community service instead of having to pay.

And so that is a program that we came up on June of last year.

OK, perfect does it.

Does it also have a like a payment plan, correct? Yes. OK.

All right.

Those are my questions.

Thank you so much.

You're welcome.

Any questions?

Tina, thank you so much.

Would you like public comment?

Yes, OK.

Are there any attendees?

The person would like to comment on this item.

Or anybody.

In teams.

Seeing.

What we want?

So the next two are board motions, both written by SP4 and the first one is creating a closed caption television policy within the probation department.

That'll hand it off to representatives from customers. Great. Thank you.

So in December of last year, the county and the California Department of Justice agreed on an amendment to the 2021 stipulated judgment regarding conditions in LA County's juvenile facilities.

Part of this amendment required the probation department to implement a new CCTV review protocol that outlines when and how CCTV footage should be reviewed, especially after alleged uses of force.

The stipulated judgment also requires that the OIG select two random days per month for to audit compliance with the CCTV review protocol and submit the results to the monitor in regular monthly reports.

And all of the Oigs monthly reports that have occurred since December of last year, the OIG has noted that probation still does not have a finalized CCTV review protocol, and so the OIG is unable to review the footage and see if it complies with the protocol. Not only.

Is this a violation of the amended stipulated judgment?

But it also places our youth and staff in danger.

CCTV footage is key in investigating incidents of concern. It can be used to confirm or deny allegations and it can be used to protect both of our both.

Staff and the youth that are in our care and the knowledge that random audits of CCTV footage will be occurring can also serve as deterrence to violations of policy for all of these reasons, there needs to be a clear policy in place for reviewing CCTV footage in our.

Juvenile facilities, especially as the county prepares to pay a \$4 billion settlement for horrific incidences of abuse that happened, some of which happened to youth while in probation custody over the years.

This motion specifically directs probation to report back to the board in 60 days with a plan to develop and implement a final.

CCTV review protocol.

The plan should include consideration of best practices from other jurisdictions.

The use of random audits.

A protocol for reviewing footage after injuries and a timeline to both implement the protocol and train staff on the protocol.

And we have Eric Bates from the OIG here to answer any questions since it was his report that brought this to our attention.

I don't know, Eric, if you want to say anything proactively before my apologies, ask a question.

Good morning. Eric Bates, assistant Inspector General.

And I'm happy to answer any questions from our report. A couple of things. Just our our monthly report.

Is in response to the stipulated judgment asking us to do the random reviews for CCTV protocols.

But it initially says probation has to have the protocol in place and then we were to do the random. But just like our semiannual reports for the last 3 1/2 years, we've been proactively going out trying to get information that would.

Provide oversight to make sure the user's safe without waiting for the precedent data system to be in place, which we all know.

Probation 7A challenge with getting all the other close to starting to implement some of those data systems.

So our review has been literally randomly pulling out video recordings of use of force

incidents.

And just like in our semiannual reports, we see that there's a lack of.

Feel appropriate review, which then could be raised to a level of possible discipline.

Now as far as.

The.

Protocol policy, I was informed yesterday by the department that they do have a draft of the policy.

And I won't go into details of that.

I don't think it would be fair because it's a draft and things can change.

But what I was provided was a very comprehensive policy.

It would cover many, if not all, of our concerns, and I know it's been provided to the DOJ monitor.

And he's providing feedback.

I don't know what the expected time frame is for it to be finalized, but I do know that it's it's pretty comprehensive and it goes from 24 hour surveillance of the cameras by staff.

Monitoring.

Movement of the youth.

Documenting what they find, and it would be a tremendous help for them, because then if they see something, they can.

Notify staff to assist. If it's a youth on youth violence situation or youth on staff to where the staff members themselves don't have to try to split and take care of the situation and call for help and what not, and even proactively, they could see something that's getting.

To happen, there was one video I recently saw where two youth left the unit and were in a breezeway and no one knew where they were.

And then they came back and they obviously had a fight.

This situation would be perfect for them to be able to notify staff in the unit.

Hey, these two youth left.

They're over here and so forth.

So the draft I saw was promising. As I said, it's very comprehensive, but I just don't know when it will be finalized or implemented.

So that would be something you'd have to ask the department.

But what I did see was was was was was a good start.

Thanks and I don't know if I don't know if Erin Broom is on.

Here's not OK. Thank you, Eric.

Any questions?

I have a question for you. See, are you being asked to provide recommendations or feedback on their draft policy?

It's good question.

No, I was not.

I had to think about that.

I believe they would be open to our feedback.

They generally are regarding any of their policies.

So were the words utter to me.

No, but I think it would be received if if we do make some recommendations and is that part of the stipulated judgment that no, such as the monitoring part correct?

Question for St. 4.

I think there are a lot of, you know, we have a lot of policies that are on the books that are maybe not always.

Well, in the department and obviously this is the first step that you all are doing, but are you keeping through that making sure that whatever CCTV policy is developed is like fully implemented?

Well, that's where the OIG reviewing it is actually partly stipulated.

Judgment it great, says OIG.

Reflects random days a month to audit.

Compliance with the review protocol.

So that is written into the DOJ amendments stipulated by yes, definitely oversight.

Need a policy?

But then you need to make sure it's followed.

I have like really minor questions.

So that's what we're talking. Maybe I'm confused.

So CCTV, the way it's written in the report and the way you have it here, is both capturing television, which is an accessibility piece.

And I thought it was closed circuit TV.

Oh my gosh, I think you are totally right.

And then I tried to look in the judgment and it just says it just says CCTV.

I didn't know which one it was, but I just wanted to make sure.

No, especially I think you're right.

Policy makers and probation. They're not looking at captions.

Right, right.

And I don't want that to be confused.

I saw that and just wanted to make sure. Thank you ever moving forward. We will make that change.

You are correct, but I think I think in the OIG support it also says closed caption doesn't open. OK, well, I was looking to figure out like, where did she get this?

Where did I get this caption?

Yeah. OK.

So take a look at that.

Yes, thank you.

I could be wrong.

No, no. You could be right, Sid.

It's very funny.

That was the.

That was the we hear all the time, OK? And that was for me.

I guess I have one, but it's not.

I'm not.

I guess I'm just just curious.

Was there any consideration given to body worn cameras and whether that would also in any sense?

I realize that might not be in the stipulated judgment, but it does feel like shares Parmesan a little bit ahead in this regard.

And they're transitioning from CCTV in custody to adding body worn cameras.

Curious what a fox word about that.

And so I don't know if has that come up.

I don't.

Yeah, I mean, we were focused on making sure that we it definitely feels like the first stipulated judgment is being followed as what was required.

But that's I have not heard that brought up. I've heard it brought up in terms of jail and sheriffs, but I haven't heard. Well, I I totally appreciate and understand that needing to get in compliance with the the judgment.

So I I very much recognize this makes sense to go first.

But that's just do you know if I mean, I don't know if anyone knows this probation.

Have body worn cameras on any of their like field teams.

Yeah, that, I don't know. Yeah.

Jacob, OK.

OK.

So maybe maybe, yeah. It's just that is a interesting question. Yeah.

OK.

That's it, all right.

Any other questions all right.

All the comments OK.

Do we have any participants that want to comment on this item?

Please raise your hand.

Oh, so there's one online nobody in person. Wendy, go ahead.

Yeah, one.

JW

Julien, Wendelyn 17:03

I was just gonna agree with whoever was shaking their head that there's no.

MX

Public Safety CAR 17:06

Wait. Hold on, Wendy.

Sorry, Wendy. Hold on one.

OK.

Go ahead, Wendy.

JW

Julien, Wendelyn 17:14

Yes, I didn't want to make public comment, just agree that there are no body worn cameras.

It is actually something oversight Commissioners have brought up as a possibility.

Both body worn cameras and addressing some of the gaps that exist in the CCTV access. Some of the areas that Eric was describing where there isn't CCTV available, but that seems, as Kyla said, beyond that's the.

Next step, I suppose in the scope of this motion.

MX

Public Safety CAR 17:43

Thanks, Manny.

OK.

Excellent. OK.

So the next question also by SD4 title of Los Angeles Times application for the state

Proposition 47 grant program. OK, thank you.

So we all know that California voters passed Prop 47 in 2014. Part of the proposition required that state savings from a reduced prison population be redirected into the community for various community programs. And so since Prop 47 has passed. La County has applied for and been awarded 3 rounds of grants in the past. The grants have gone to support the RE entry intensive case management services, Ric Ms. program and the skills and experience for the careers of tomorrow sector program.

Just recently, the state released their new RFP for prop. 47 grants.

This is Cohort 5, and so the county plans to apply once again for these grants to continue funding the Ric, Ms. and sector programs.

And this round of grants will provide funding from October 2025 through to June 2029.

So the motion today authorizes jcod to apply for the most recent round of Prop 47 grant funds, and it authorizes them to accept the grant should they receive it or be awarded it. And it's worth noting that for the past three rounds, this was the same process.

The board passed a motion allowing the county department to apply for and receive prop.

47 grants in the past, odr was the entity that ran ricns.

Before Jpob was created so they were the ones that applied for and received the grant via emotion. But since the programs have since been transitioned to Jcod, Jcod will be taking the lead on the application this time.

And you all probably remember that the board did recently pass a motion directing Jcod and CEO to look at the potential impacts of Prop 36 on Prop. 47 grants.

The report back was received in April and it noted that the main programs that have historically been funded by Prop. 47 grants are the Ric, Ms. and sector program.

And we can expect to see reductions in grant funding available in the future, but we're not quite sure when we'll see those reductions or how much that will be. So in light of the future fiscal uncertainty is extra important to apply for this current round of Prop 40.

Seven grants and to make sure that we can maintain our important ricoms in sector programs through to 2029 and Adam's here. Do you want to add anything on behalf of Jpad?

I don't think so.

You took most of any talking points.

That I that I would have pulled together.

So thank you, Carla.

So I'm Adam Vitino, senior deputy director of programs at JCO.

Again, given the uncertainty, frankly of what we're starting to see with Prop 36 and jaycott is a part of a small group of folks that are kind of working to focus on impact, pull together at CC jccc by Supervisor Barger.

We're starting to certainly see an uptick the the kind of downstream impact to funding kind of as stated in the motion, we just don't know yet.

We certainly can anticipate that there will be a hit and I will say given the the current budget climate and some uncertainty around existing funds and us being a smaller new department, our lack of ongoing funding, this is a really great opportunity to sustain the programs that we.

Been able to, I mean, and they've been super successful right since inception.

Thousands of folks have come through our RCMS program.

Really promising recidivism rates.

Similar with our sector program, we have 8 providers. I think over 3000 participants at this time. And again, those are really promising programs and we know that that folks need jobs. They also need care.

And so combining the two efforts has been really successful for us and for our population.

And before my colleagues ask questions, when is the application due?

It is due in June.

We've done sort of the preliminary work already, so our team has sort of notified the state that we will be applying, which is the first step and then.

The lead on our team has also started to reach out to other departments to pull together the advisory committee.

So we've had really good response already from that.

So we're taking the steps. This would solidify our position there. And then I think late June is when the applications do.

Yeah, and this is set to go the board of June 10th. So it'll give you an enough time to.

And again, we've already started the process.

So we won't be behind at all questions or two questions.

Are the programs fully offset by the funding?

Like, do they get funded 100% if?

The buzzer awarded.

Oh, that's a good question.

And then what's the longevity of the grant? If we do get it?

Through 2029, yes. OK, June 2029.

So it's four years, I think.

2025 through 2025. Yeah. So I don't have the full budget in front of me.

I think John Franklin, Sierra from our team is on and I I hate to punt to you John, but do you know I think we have some braided funding here.

JS John Franklin Sierra 23:02

Can you?

Can everyone hear me?

MX Public Safety CAR 23:04

Yes. Thanks John.

JS John Franklin Sierra 23:06

Just confirming, I we do have we do use braided funding for both of these programs. They both receive some ARP funding in the past, for example to help help offset full program costs.

There's some cfci funding for sector specifically. I don't think our ICMS, but for sector reviews, CFCI funding, so we do BRAID funding to allow us to basically scale and sustain both of these programs at the scale that they're at.

MX Public Safety CAR 23:34

Any the other thing that does bear mentioning here is is as we ramp up in to becoming an enhanced care management provider. Again, there's a there's kind of this bridge period where executing contracts in the coming months.

There's gonna be there's gonna need to be bridge funding to get us to the position where we're actually starting to generate revenue through ECM.

And again, we're trying to be as conservative as possible.

We don't wanna over kind of extend ourselves or over.

Commit. So we're gonna need some funding to kind of get us to that place. And that's what, that's what this would do for rcms specifically for sure.

Yes, I just kind of wanted to know a little bit more about the work you're doing that

you're doing with the Department of Military veteran Affairs.

So what kind of services are being offered there?

Was that already happening or is this new so it's part of its new part of it is we've been having ongoing conversations with them for the better part of a year, maybe longer, honestly about this particular the justice involved population.

The justice involved veteran population, for example. Our doors, AB site NBA is now Co located there.

So they have a space.

At at that reentry site so that they can provide services to veterans who come through.

This would just be a continuation of those partnerships really trying to focus on on getting them care management services as well. And so it it is, it is a a further commitment I think to really making sure.

That we're working together with them in our navigation services, for example, there is a flag.

And I think it's it's have you served more than one day in, in the armed forces or something like that, that's in our kind of our screening tool.

So we're already identifying and then linking folks to services through MVA, so that all of that is already happening.

This is just kind of an expansion of that partnership.

Any questions?

I'm not.

There's a grant for it. It's 20 million.

OK.

Other questions?

Pelican, are there any attendees who would like to comment on this item?

Please raise your hand.

Seeing none.

Thank you.

Thank you. Thanks.

OK.

We'll move on to presentation items. So item 4A, this is a four letter request with delegated authority to the CEO to negotiate and execute a loan agreement with the Los Angeles Regional.

Communications system authority. That's la branks. We have representatives from

CEO.

Good morning, deputies.

My name is Stephanie Zarella.

I'm the CEO of budget.

Good morning, truck, Moore County Council.

And before you is a board letter to which excludes the request for delegated authority for the CEO or her designee to negotiate a loan of 23 million from the county to LA Ricks to execute a funding agreement, approve an appropriation adjustment to transfer 23 million within.

The County General fund.

From judgment and damaging budget to the obligated fund balance for the Elyria settlement and to execute amendments if needed, also to authorize the CEO to administer the funding agreement during the repayment period, I do want to mention the auditor controller is aware and worked with us to estab.

The necessary balance sheet accounts also the funding for this loan was previously set aside incrementally beginning fiscal year 20/20/21 up through 20/24/25.

The loan is structured.

Or would be structured over 15 years.

The first five years would be interest only.

It's a variable interest rate based on the county's treasury pool rates.

Latest update just to give you an approximate percentage was about 3.6%.

The remaining 10 years would be interest plus principal.

First payment would be after the county invoices La Ric's after July 1st, 2026 and interest accrues as soon as the contract is executed.

The county is expected to receive over 8 million approximately in interest payments over the course of the loan. In addition to the \$23 million loan.

Little background regarding Le Rix. If you're not familiar, it's a joint powers authority to improve communication between public safety agencies within the LA region.

The county is a member agency of the JPA and holds four seats on the Board of Directors, and that includes Sheriff, Fire, CEO and Emergency Medical Services.

This settlement is related to La Rick's land mobile radio, also commonly referred to as an LMR system.

The system offers interoperability.

It eliminates barriers and allows police, firefighters, paramedics to communicate directly with each other, regardless of what agency they belong to, so that's very

important for public safety in an emergency situations.

This the settlement is related to a construction or delay related to a construction project.

It was originally scheduled to complete in 2018, but there were multiple challenges that they faced, including changes in site and redesign of the system, adverse weather conditions, the 2020 fire season COVID-19 pandemic and acquiring the required tools or necessary equipment and frequency interferences. So due.

To several delays, there were delayed claims that arose between LA Ricks and Motorola that led to settlement.

And my understanding is typically with complex construction problem projects, there may be delays sometimes so that that happens in this in this case.

So LA Ricks unfortunately doesn't have the funding to be able to cover the 23 million for the settlement. Therefore, the loan from the county is necessary in order to ensure the system remains unencumbered in litigation and to ensure Lewis can pay the settlement.

The LMR system is a valuable tool for public safety and the county is the largest user of the LMR system.

And I do want to mention that it was proven to be valuable, actually, most recently in the fires in January. In the past, there have been signal issues with the system, but this time there was 100% availability. No sites went down and the system is built.

They call it a public safety grade.

Built it's able to withstand environmental threats.

Up to hurricane force winds.

It also has backup generators to ensure electricity is turned off in an area.

Communications are not impacted, so these three features are extremely important during emergencies and they ensure reliable communication. And that concludes our presentation.

We open it up for any questions. Thank you.

So to clarify, because I think I was confused when I was reading this. This \$23 million is not actually going to pay for the construction or anything of this system.

It is just a settlement with Motorola.

What? And because the settlement is because it took too long to complete.

Yeah. So for these types of complex projects, this LMR system has over I think 52 to 58 sites in it dispersed throughout the county of Los Angeles.

A lot of it is on county property and through the years it took the system almost, you

know, over 10 years to build.

It was originally a vision to be 5, but because of the complex issues related to you know we lost some sites because we had some issues in the past.

Where the higher a unions didn't want the the sites built at their stations, we had frequency interference that I know Sandra's heading nodding her head because this is a long standing wonderful project that finally got done and it was originally built with, you know, a fortuitously a.

100% of federal grant funds but Lycom.

All complex construction projects, especially for this one that had tons and tons and tons of sites.

In the extension of it and then having to go through the environmental.

Clearances for FEMA and SQA and you know the frequency interference.

I mean, this is a long story, but we actually had a repacking issue where some of their frequencies that we were relying on got repackaged to go to Mexico.

You know, as part of this huge trade deal that resulted in frequency interference and then we have to redesign parts of the system. And so as a result, you know, because of the complexity of the, the build over the years, you know the delay claim came in and.

Delay claim has been, you know, growing for a couple of years, but we didn't want to settle it out because the project had been completed yet.

Well, the project completed in November of 2024 and now we're here and we're resolving the claim and originally the claim.

Over 75 million and we were able to resolve it for 23.

So you know, we're we're satisfied with that. I think it works. But you know the good thing and important thing is.

You know, we should not allow the system, which is fantastic for public safety and was built with grandfathers, to be encumbered by, you know, very expensive litigation. You know truthfully construction litigation is very, very expensive and because the build of the period was over 10 years, it would.

Be very, very expensive to litigate and the volume of documents that you know the regulation issues related to that.

And so all the the board members, you know, I thought it could idea to try and resolve this. And so this is where we are. The funds have been set aside previously over the years, the board, my understanding is the board is actually already approved these funds through.

The years as part of Pfu is that correct part of the budgeting?

Yeah, part of the regular budgeting process.

So the funds are there and they have been approved by the board in prior years. And so now we're at this juncture where we able to negotiate down the demand and this is where we are.

Ally Rick says.

Because they, you know, they're kind of a new JPA.

They're just starting to use the system and charge subscriber rates and you know, it's good to let them loan this money and they'll pay it back.

We'll get our interest, which will be great and but most importantly, allows the system to be fully used unencumbered.

So if we don't settle this, we wouldn't be able to use this system. It would.

We would still be able to use the system, but it would be tied in intense litigation and we're trying to get more users onto the system.

Who will help pay for use of the system? And I think the litigation will detract for more people in the region signing on and, you know, wanting to use the system. So it's better to resolve it and unencumber it. I also think that if we don't resolve it.

Truthfully, the cost to all the member agencies would be higher because we would be dealing with, you know, the litigation costs. You know that come with that.

Any other further questions?

Question. Are there other JPA members also?

Like, is there a bigger number or is this really the whole 7 and this is the whole settlement and we are the largest user. And of course you know we have the funds to be able to do the loan and to structure the loan in a manner that.

Would work.

Over time, the members will assist in paying back the loan as part of their operational costs and supportive of JPA.

How many people or how many partner agencies I heard you say the county takes a big portion of how many other agencies are on the system current?

So we, the jpa's member agencies where I think we're made-up of at least 23 members right now and then the county is I wanna say we're probably 85 to 90% of the users.

And then you know, the other users that are on the system.

Make up that 10% because you know the county is massive.

The system is also used for by affiliates who for mutual aid and so in times of

disaster. Other agencies come in, you know, they're able to switch to our channels and be able to talk to each other, assuming their radios are programmed. And so the system is incred.

It's massive.

It is countrywide and it allows for lots of member agencies as well as foods to switch on and be able to use it.

How many? If you have this, I mean it's not countable, but how many times does the baby throughout the year?

Oh, it's used.

It's used every day, so La Rick's replaced County and sheriff's primary communication system and so they use it every day as part of their mutual aid.

Well, every day for their day-to-day services and then for mutual aid and during the fires, it was invaluable.

We usually, especially the Topanga area, we usually have.

Lot of issues related to having availability up there, but because we put a lot of we put sites in there, we put sites at camelita, we put sites down in Santa Monica and Malibu.

It was able to triangulate and provide full coverage for sheriff and fire working during the Palisades and before the LA riots was built.

Of course, it took us 10 years to get those sites there, but before Ally Rick was build, existing system did suffer from.

Challenges relating to having adequate communications in the area.

Yeah, got it.

And it's interagency communication, right?

So it's whoever's on, exactly, whoever's on the network. And you know, County and Sheriff of fire use it primarily every day for their communications.

And then we have other Member agencies who are subscribers that use it for their everyday communications and then we are connecting all of the other systems from like LAPD and all that and bringing them on.

We also have a hope that you know other Member other agencies in the region.

Will come on.

And that's why it's really important that the system be, you know, just unencumbered and resolved, so that everyone just comes on and uses the system and pays to use it.

So who's I guess that's that.

Who's paying to use the system outside of us?

So it's us and you know, I don't remember all of the agencies, but I think it's us.

I think it's UCLA.

I think there's a couple of like smaller cities, so I could get you guys a list of all the the current users, yeah.

That's not a problem, but our our our goal or the client's goal is to grow the users in the system, but right of of course, the county is the largest user because we do have a large fire and Sheriff department got it, OK.

Thank you so much.

Any other questions we can answer?

That's right.

Any attendees that wish to comment on this item, please raise your hand.

Thank you.

OK.

We'll move on to item 4B.

This is a board letter approved the sole source purchase of helicopters existing automation system for Sabe Aviation.

Good morning.

My name is Marcia Damasquez.

I'm here with Vanessa Lamarche from Information Officer and assistant Assistant Fire Chief Drew Smith.

The district is requesting approval of a sole source purchase of the automation system at Hellescot 69B.

The district has been utilizing 69B HOUSEBOT since 2010, entering into a lease to purchase agreement in 2018.

State aviation.

The previous owner leased the site to the district and maintained operational infrastructure until the district acquired the property in February of 2025. During the time of state install the automation system to support operational readiness during wildfire.

The automation system remotely manages water levels, pumps, sprinklers across 5 tanks, providing a reliable and efficient water source for aerial firefighting during wildfires.

The system enhances the district's operation effectiveness and streamlining refills, streamlining refills and reducing the need for on site personnel.

The district is requesting approval to purchase the automation system at a

discounted price of 290,000.

Purchasing the equipment through save is more efficient as it eliminates the need of the district.

To have the equipment removed and go through the extensive process of obtaining equivalent equipment which would lead to downtime where the district is unable to provide the necessary service in the area, the equipment is critical for air operations and wireline suppression efforts in the Santa Monica Mountains, Mal.

Topanga and the surrounding high risk areas before I open it to questions. I do have a short video.

OK.

Do you have anything else? Sorry.

Yeah. You're welcome.

Where is 69 Robbie located in?

Yeah, above.

It's just West of Topanga Canyon at the top of Saddle Peak Rd. so it divides where our Los Angeles County Fire Camp 8 is and Topanga can. OK. And it said that those four of those like tanks and then are there helipads. Also, there is.

So we have the ability with the four tanks there that the aircraft can trap from that, but we also have the option with two helipads to land.

If we need a ground fill aircraft, if we need to do any type of under aircraft work we need, we need to use a basket or we need to use anything to hitch to transport anything with, so it has that accommodations as well.

Well, as on site fuel capabilities is we need to put fuel tenders there to service our aircraft.

And then so we were leasing this property since 2010, is that right?

So we've used it for a long time.

We started leasing it in 2018, but we've been using it since 2010, OK.

And then we bought it in February of this year. Yes, from state, yes.

OK. And so now we're just trying to buy the automation system system that allows the tanks to rebuild, correct?

And those sprinklers that connects the Wi-Fi, OK.

All right. Thanks.

Any questions?

OK.

Thank you. Thank you.

Anybody want to comment on this item, please raise your hand.

Thank you.

Thank you. Wardrobe staff food. Nope.

Great job.

OK.

We'll move on to item 4C.

This is a board letter to amend the ordinance title involved with the LA County Code Unified Program for Azure Space Generator Slash tier terminating hazardous materials handler California SNL for release prevention and above ground control.

For fiscal year 2526, good morning.

Good morning. Steam justice deputies.

I'm Mario tracers.

I am the chief of the health Hazards Materials Division and to my right here is my assistant chief, Jeff Holager, and to my left here is Richard Stilwagen.

He's the fire Marshall and he's actually acting deputy chief at this time.

So thanks for taking the time to meet with us today.

I'm here on behalf Los Angeles County Fire Department's health hazmat to discuss our critical mission safeguarding public health and the environment from hazardous materials throughout our vast county.

As a state mandated certified unified agency known as a Coop, our division is on the front lines.

Clients managing vital programs related to hazardous materials and waste.

Accidental release prevention, petroleum storage and emergency response.

The scope of our work is substantial, currently overseeing over 25,000 facilities and more than 35,000 program elements designed to prevent hazardous incidents and ensure compliance.

So we're here to discuss our proposed fiscal year 20252026 ordinance and fee amendments.

These amendments are crucial to ensuring we can continue to meet our legal obligations.

Maintain essential services and effectively protect our communities.

These proposed adjustments are necessary to recover the escalating costs of administrating. Administering, excuse me, these complex and vital programs, incorporating anticipated increases in operational expenses.

We're committed to full cost recovery as mandated by state law and county code,

and to uphold the highest standards of public safety.

And Environmental Protection, your support in improving these necessary fee adjustments will directly enable us to continue our vital work ensuring a safer Los Angeles County for all.

What I do is actually just talk a little bit as well about our emergency response and some of our involvements in this past year.

We were extremely busy, say the least. As you may know, the Chiquita Canyon Landfill kept us very busy.

I was actually part of that team known as the Rmac.

The response?

Multi Agency Coordination group.

Group. I believe we contributed to averting a catastrophic incident at that landfill with the lead shade that was accumulating above 200,000 gallons per day.

There it is, an ongoing incident.

We continue to provide some support and oversight there to allow the treatment of the benzene laden waste to be rendered non hazardous for the proper disposal.

As I know you're all aware the Eaton and the Palisades fires this year were devastating health hazmat's role.

We conducted damage inspections.

We worked in the disaster recovery centers and we also supported the repopulation during those events of the public.

Post fire Health HAZMAT conducted phase one household hazardous waste removals and lithium battery reconnaissance.

We worked with US EPA directly.

We were able to actually act as a contractor and we were supported back with \$878,000 of our time spent there by US CPA refunding us for our time.

We coordinated. We currently still coordinate with public health, public works and regional planning in addressing any potential illegal disposal of fire debris. Lithium battery fires throughout the county.

I have to tell you, I want to comment on that one.

Normally you get funding from the Department of Toxic Substances Control to handle what's called off Hwy. releases.

There's a fund available or clandestine drug lab.

There is a void as far as funding when it comes to lithium ion battery incidents. As we know, the electric vehicles are one thing.

But then the smaller scooters and and various items, you'd be amazed at the number of responses that we're going to. We have an understanding with public works and we are able to then have our firefighters and LA city firefighters that we support there as well remove the pot.

Battery. What we don't want is the public taking that battery to a household hazardous waste Roundup and it reigniting right.

So what we do is we de energize that battery in saline solution.

We dry it out. We worked it out with public works where we take.

That to the household hazardous waste roundups, and so we're still in dire need of funding statewide.

I'm a board member where I go up to Sacramento.

We talk about legislation and we're still trying to seek funding to support those efforts, but in the meantime, we're one of the only one of 81 Coopers throughout the state that is actually addressing it in that fashion.

A couple of other items, as you know, drug labs, methamphetamine and fentanyl incidents continue having the right equipment to ensure, as an example, in an apartment.

Unfortunately, if there's some overdoses and to be able to detect.

Those materials to ensure that no one else came in to potentially get exposed to that is, is crucial.

We're on the oil and gas group too.

We participate with multiple agencies health hazmat coordinates with public works, public health Fish and Wildlife, South Coast AQMD and investigating oil and gas releases at facilities or from underground pipes as well in public right of ways.

We assess the extent of the release and oversee the cleanup and disposal and finally, we are also members of the illegal dumping Task force Member county wide, participating in multiple agencies.

Hhmd coordinates with public works, regional planning, sheriff's and the Da's in investigating illegal dumping involving hazardous materials and waste.

Identifies the contents of the containers coordinates and overseas the disposal.

I know my team.

I missed it last week.

I was at a board meeting, but actually Atlas Metals.

We were there and we were the samples that we took for Atlas Metals supported the case 12 to 21 items. There were the samples that my team took that ultimately led to

the shutdown of Atlas Metals to help protect the students at Jordan High School as well.

So the fee proposal, though I did ask my assistant chief to provide this as far as I wanted to point out, yes, we have had some increases.

You've probably seen me here the last couple of years.

But we did not come 2022 and 23.

To give an example, our hazardous waste increase is looking at about 6.8% for our hazardous materials and again as a handler, if you handle more than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet or £500, it's required by law to disclose that. So it.

Community right to know, but it's also for our first in firefighters to have access to that information, to know what's on scene in a business that they respond.

And as you can see, the other programs that we regulate here as well our program, I have 137 staff, our budget's about 33.3 million for fiscal year 2526.

One last comment is socializing this information with our clientele, so to speak, in the regulated community, I've worked with my team over here and we did recently. As of last week, we posted up on the fire websites.

The proposed fees and what we are doing this week and we're not slated to go to the board, I believe till July 22nd.

Is to actually send out those emails in blocks 500 at a time. Is our limitation for those 25,000 facilities?

So our goal is to get that done this week and about this week it'll it'll spill over into next week, but it will be done within the next two weeks to notify everyone of these proposed changes.

That concludes my presentation. I'm open.

We're open. Any questions?

Umm.

I have a question.

How do you calculate the percentage increase for each program?

Like, how does that?

Differ because you have the different changes.

Right, there's a variety.

So we did recently have a time study conducted by my assistant chief, Jeff Pierre.

And so in that time study, when they proposed the fee model and that fee model was approved by County Council and the auditor controller, but depending upon the amount of time for each of the programs that were inputting, there ultimately comes

up with that amount that would be.

The cost for that portion of the program element, and thus that's why you know, ideally it would be great just to have it across the board, but we wanted to apply it fairly and as you notice there.

Shared permitting fees or you may not have it in front of you.

They're actually -.3% share permitting is for the on site treatment of hazardous waste, and in that time study that he conducted, we realized that actually was being overcharged a little bit.

It wasn't taking quite as much time to conduct those on site treatment activities. Are there changes consistent with like the increases that you've had in prior years? Well, as pointed out previous year was about 4% for hazardous waste and about four point 3%.

And so this is the way the numbers when we start to put them.

Input them. Obviously we have some salary increases.

You know, rents have gone up inflation, so everything continues to go up.

I.

I'm very well aware and I did listen into the board very well, aware of the the budget constraints that we're facing this year.

I I'm continuing to brainstorm with my team to to see how do we continue to do business moving forward, right and have it be sustainable that these permit fees do not have to continue to go up.

You know, and that means doing a little bit more with less, right. And getting out there and doing more inspections with the existing staff that we have and that's kind of our game plan moving forward.

And then last question, the 25,000 facilities, does that include the other jurisdictions that you also serve as a Cooper for like city of LA? Oh, great question.

Got you. It does.

And then I think you have La Habra and another area, yeah.

So we do serve LA city, right? We have over 7000 facilities that are part of that number, Sandra, Yes.

So that's part of it.

La Habra, which is really interesting, right?

That we have engines that are out there in in Orange County in that portion of Orange County that we do the hazardous Materials Disclosure program wanted to clarify in LA City, they have their own engines and they respond, but we do the

hazardous waste program, we implement that.

For them, and Santa Monica was the last one. Yeah. Thank you. Yep.

People that are paying this, their companies, right, they're like businesses various.

And one other last comment too, is that there's a concern that we do regulate the refineries and we are aware that Phillips 66 in Carson is planning on shutting down.

So that's something that we're preparing for.

We want to make sure and ensure that they close down properly and not leave any hazardous materials behind.

Are there any participants that wish to comment on this item? Please raise your hand.

Seeing that. Thank you. Thank you.

OK.

We'll move on to item 4B, which is a four letter to amend the Ordinance on Title 32 of the Los Angeles County Code for local agency firefighters severance.

It's a little flyer from Cal Fire.

Video material.

Morning. So my name is Trevor Moore.

I'm an assistant chief with the Forestry Division, LA County Fire. I oversee the defensible space program.

Once again, Chief Stewart.

So today we're gonna talk about the first thing I'm gonna talk about is the new LRA maps for the fire Hazard severity zone.

So the state.

Excuse me, has mandated Cal Fire to produce these maps to identify these hazards.

Zones the last LRA map was in 2010.

This is the the new update.

So this is really about.

Adopting these maps as is for the unincorporated areas that are LRA for for the county, so.

The Board of Supervisors can approve these ordinance with the with the state.

Once and it's approved, then we'll have 30 days to implement it. The adoption date is July 22nd, so it'll be the same date as the the board letter.

So on March 24th.

Cal Fire put out the maps.

For all the states, so all the local responsible areas that cities that are local responsibility and unincorporated as well.

The new maps are based off of hazardous areas based off of topography, fire history, wind embercast vegetation. These things they compile to identify these areas as high fired zones and hazardous.

The big thing that's different about these maps for the LRA would be.

The previous maps only showed very high this new map.

Shows very high, high and moderate, so that actually mirrors what what Cal Fire put out for the SRA, the state responsible areas in 2022.

So they have the very high, the high and the moderate.

That's kind of the big the big difference on the maps that got put out this year.

So.

Once again, this will have impacts for our program for defensible space.

So it's going to actually elevate the numbers for our inspections. We look at about maybe 50,000 more LRA inspections and that's not unincorporated only, that's that's cities that we're also the fire provider for.

And so we look at that as something that's going to impact us.

We do charge for those inspections and that's the next board letter that we're going to talk about next.

And it also will affect.

Our fuel modification plans checking for homes that are in these identified hazardous fire areas.

So excuse me.

So the conclusion is.

Basically.

We have to adopt the ordinance I presented to different cities all over the county as well for them to adopt the ordinance, as is the the the county can adopt them and what we're recommending is the fire agencies just adopt the maps as is. They could also SN.

Lines of convenience on roads, on the maps and the county could also make it more strict, but we're we're recommending just adopt the maps as is.

And once that's done.

You know, we'll, we'll have to change our fire code code later to to reflect the adoption of these new maps and that will be a separate board letter in the future once we speak with our Fire Chief identify what we're going to do specifically in these zones and.

Then we will present again for the for the change of the fire code.

That pretty much wraps up the LRA maps.

Any questions for me?

I do have a lot of questions because as you know, this impacts our district pretty heavily and you know, especially the events of space program causes a lot of concern within our communities and seeing the new maps, we have a lot of new areas, especially in North County.

That were not previously included in the severity phones and now are, so they're gonna be quite surprised about the new requirements that they're gonna have to, you know, live with for the next, you know, few years.

So I just want to clarify. So the cities are adopting their own process, right?

The county's only adopting county unincorporated as part of this board letter.

The cities have to do their own, even if you are their firing, correct?

Yes. And do we know that if cities have started to do that yet?

Yes. So I think we have 35 cities that we are the fire provider for.

There's several of them that have already posted on their websites the new maps.

That's one of the stipulations.

And have held meetings with their.

With their cities and town councils, there's a lot of that going on.

And then there's on that booklet that I sent you.

There's the Cal Fire website that has a model ordinance that the cities are just using that same model ordinance to accept the maps and are pushing it to the state.

But they have till July 22nd as well.

And are we using the same ordinance as well?

It's just a touch different, but yeah, very similar because it's unincorporated LRA, there's little little different burbage and then as far as what's being adopted. So are we just taking the maps that caff fire released and just adopting that same version? So we're not making any changes correct.

Yeah, that's our recommendation is just to to go with the science. If they're in or they're out in the zones, yes. OK. And then as far as the defensible space program.

So you're saying you're anticipating about 50,000 new properties?

Great for next year.

Is that because you're including some of the new zones that were previously a part of the maps?

Correct. So with the like you said up in the high desert we're seeing, we have a lot of moderate which never existed and then we have some, some high as well.

So about 35,000 moderate parcels and about 30 high.

Zones as well.

Well, for the new forecasted maps, that's not specific to the high desert, but that's for the county.

So that's probably where we're seeing the greatest number. If you look at the maps, the previous maps, the very high is really similar to what it used to be. But with the new zones high and moderate, that's where we're seeing some of the growth as it pushes you.

Know further into the urban areas and a little more into the desert.

So then in just a so the the moderate and high now also need to have defensible space.

Yeah, that was my question.

Yeah. So we haven't decided specifically yet.

That's a question that's gone to our Fire Chief because the verbiage in our fire code does not specifically say we do inspect the high and the moderate in the LRA.

It's not in our code right now to do that. It specifically says very high.

So that's something that we have recommended to the Fire Chief as we would model what the state does and the SRA they do inspect the very high, the high and the moderate.

But he he needs to make that decision and then we would need to change our fire code for that specific verbiage and that's part of like the additional staff that you say is gonna come after this, correct with other things.

Yes, OK. And then do you know how soon because we started sending out notices in January. So how advanced is that gonna happen?

Yeah, so once we.

Adopt the new maps.

We'll be 30 days.

They'll be incorporated into law, so it'll be that.

Next season, so we'll have to identify it and it'll probably be October, November before we send out the new annual notice to notify homeowners that may be new to the program, saying, hey, you're now in the program, you live in, the higher the moderate you will be ins.

So yes, it'll have to be before the annual notice in January.

Yeah. And and sort of that leads up to my next question, because I think the the biggest concern is especially those new property owners that have never been part

of this. This is gonna be a quite a shock for them especially.

Because I feel the one thing that we hear the most about.

So what education is happening now? I know you've gone out to the cities. I think the COGS to also like sort of share like this is new.

This is what we need to do, but as far As for the unincorporated areas, what has been done to sort of educate residents about what's to come?

Yeah, that'll. That'll be another town hall meetings working with communities.

We you know, there's a lot of different like fire safe councils, firewise communities that have this information been pushing it out.

As far as LA County Fire, you know it's on our websites.

And then once again, the annual notice will be that that push to the, to the homeowner that will receive that in the mail to educate them on the program.

And that's usually our first step is the education piece.

So they understand where they are and where they live and and what the the implications are of that.

So that's the big part. Will be once we say yes, the high and the moderate end we will we will push that that Mailer to each person.

Yeah, yeah, 'cause. I just don't want to be January.

Yeah. Or the first thing to get is a notice that says you're being identified as a property.

These are the protest hearings that you can go to and and that's what causes a lot of the cushions right people. So if we can do a lot of like prep before that, I think that's would be our preference, especially because we know that for us there's gonna.

Be a lot of concerns from our North County folks and we have, you know, in the past where we like slow, slow roll the program in for inspection fees.

We started with the 50 the next year was 100 and the next.

150 we are going to reevaluate the cost of the inspection and see if it's going to be less or more so.

So we will do a cost analysis on that as well. But another key thing would be you know and this is something that within fire we can talk about is maybe that first year. Be an educational year where, hey, you're new.

The program we're not going to, you know, enforce immediately, but we want to educate you on this process and what we do so.

So that fear of, you know, the enforcement, the costs of of that could be waived the first year and we have talked about that.

It's a whole nother can of worms with the zone 0.

You know once.

803074 which is that first five feet is implemented, which we're still waiting on the Board of forestry and the State fire Marshall to identify what is in that first five feet will be allowed.

We we are gonna.

As the department.

You know the first three seasons will be an educational on what needs to be done and we won't be enforcing it will be enforceable for new construction or remodels immediately. But existing structures, it'll be an educational three seasons.

So we could maybe do something like that with the moderate and the high for people that are new to the program where we could, it could be maybe they're gonna still get an inspection fee, but the enforcement piece might be.

Lacks.

And and more of an educational couple. Seasons. Yeah, 'cause, I think what happened with when you did it over the the span of three years.

Yeah, properties were added.

So there was like property owners who like the first year, weren't included right in the 50, but they were included in the 100.

So they never got the benefit of the 50 and I think that's what kept causing concern, especially because they were like, why is it increasing?

Yeah, it's gonna keep increasing each year.

What am I getting for the 151 dollars? Yeah.

It specifically states in the annual notice all that information and now with the law AB 38, that's the real estate law.

So if you purchase a home that's in the very high.

Zone. You have to have a disclosure within your California Association of Realtors that says we understand we're buying a home in the in these fire hazard severity zones and we will be subject to that local fire authorities inspection.

And so they either have to have an inspection when they purchase the home, or they have several months to get on board with the local fire providers inspection and and be compliant with that local.

Ordinance so homeowners that are purchasing homes in these areas, they are notified in the in the purchasing process and they should understand where they're buying their home and if it's in LA County and where the fire provider.

They'll know that we will be inspecting and there will be an inspection fee, so they should be aware of that.

And educated upon that. Thank you.

Question do you have a breakdown?

I know you said you're expecting about 50,000 more inspections.

Do you have a breakdown? Maybe of how many parcels the snap will increase per district?

I do.

Yeah, I and I can send that to the team.

I just have some printed out, but yeah, we do have some stats for that.

I can send it to note that.

Some areas increased while coastal communities decreased. Mm hmm in in properties and courses, so the state maps in the new overlay actually took some zones out of the equation. Based off the science that was provided.

Yeah, I can send you guys the information on the breakdowns for districts.

That would be great.

Couple questions. One, on your point about for the real estate component. Since this is now going to have moderate as well.

Is that gonna be notified to like an update of now that more of those are getting included in some moderates that they're, yeah, so if they are, if once we decide, yeah, if we're gonna enforce high and moderate.

We will.

They will be flagged basically when they do a a sales transaction for the state. The state does not do so.

SRA land. They do not do AB30 eights in the moderate.

So it's just the very high and the high.

So we are looking at possibly doing that as well, just mirroring what the state does, but they they don't do an AB38 for moderate got it.

Yeah, got it.

Other question I think on some of these the because.

The way they drew the lines, some parcels split in between, some might half your half your house is gonna be in the very high, the others in the high.

That's just gonna be considered your properties in the very high, correct?

Well, that's that hasn't been specified yet, but I have seen other cities that say if you're, you know, 50% or more of your property it, it goes to the highest zone.

So if it's 51% very high, then you are very high, OK.

So we would have to identify that and and spell that out in our in our fire code. Once these are adopted.

Yes, I'll I'll assist with that.

I talked to Chief Durbin yesterday, prior to this meeting, and basically if the line touches your property, you are then in that zone, OK?

So it's an all or nothing.

Got it.

So I think that when we talk about for the education component too, of people are looking at those maps, they're gonna be thinking what, you know, making that justification.

So having that clearly spelled out and then I just wanted, I've gotten this question from cities as well of what are the consequences of them?

Not certifying these maps.

That'll be the state coming down on them.

So this this is state mandate for all cities, whether you're in the fire severity zone or not because they wanted an opportunity for cities to be able to add areas that we may not have thought of before.

So it's really their public comment period.

Would address that.

But it was mandatory for all cities and jurisdictions within California. Got it. OK.

Thank you.

I have just piggybacked off what my colleague Sandra was talking about related to. Getting the information out we I think we all know that change is really hard for people, particularly in the county. So as much and I don't know if this is a question we're getting a statement, but just as much outreach that can be done to kind of share.

Hey this is happening.

This is what this could look like like FAQ, social media just so it's like it starts to get embedded in people's brains that this is happening 'cause I can only imagine.

And we don't.

We don't have as many zones, but we do have some, you know, getting that noted and not really knowing what it is. If it's your first time getting it and not being aware and particularly for the people who have like been in their homes for a very long.

Time and this is just something new to them.

Where that, you know, could be a challenge, not only for our offices, but for your department.

So if there's ways that we can look at.

Getting information out there. I think that that would be helpful and as early as possible, like maybe not an official notice. But again, like social media or anything like that, that just says, hey, this is what this is.

Do you know what this is?

These are the things that go along with it.

I know our office would be happy to e-mail blast something out if you have it right.

I don't know about any other offices, but you know that notes like if you know, look at these areas. Here's an FAQ potentially. Might be in there.

Look forward to receiving this in October, November, potentially like, be on the lookout for that. Just preparing people for that 'cause I could just. I can only imagine the health that would come. So that'd be my only. So we're looking at this as a three-step process.

This is the first step of the adoption after.

The process is adopted, then the second step is but.

Applicant campaign throughout the county and all of its jurisdictions.

The final step will be embedding the process into the fire code, which would be the 2026 fire code.

So the state did that.

So we can align with them in code and then working with the new parcel owners over the next three years to slowly get them into compliance.

So rather than coming down with a heavy hand, say, hey, you're immediately at risk of this, we recommend you work on this item first.

Then next year we'll come in and do a little bit more.

And then we'll finally clean it up in that third year.

So I think it is a three-step process right after this is adopted, then we'll go heavy into the education campaign, OK, which will be in its totality working with the community service, the liaisons, all of our assistant chiefs getting out and speaking to their communities. And then.

Also, sending out county and local messaging of what's ahead. So thank you for that.

Thank you.

Just really quickly.

There's no zero stuff.

Is that going to be all three moderate, high, high severity, very high or is it just very high?

For the state, they are for the SRA. It's all three zones, yes, for the zone 0, correct.

Yes, that's for the state. But we still have people we can choose.

I right now the verbiage says very high.

So even with the zone 0 stuff for the LRA.

So that's something that the Fire Chief has been, you know, briefed on, and he'll need to make that decision, OK.

So whatever he decides for our defensible space.

Will also apply to Zone 0.

Correct, yes.

Just one final question in regards to the public hearing for this particular matter on on the mask, are you guys doing any type of noticing to the public to let them know that this is happening on the 22nd?

How are you doing your engagement with the cities? Maybe.

Or something with the cities they've been doing that on their own. So so this is state legislation that's come down to the city.

So it's really on them to do it.

Most of them have, just like I said, been doing online or like town council type stuff.

For the unincorporated, we have pushed out stuff on our websites, but we haven't done any.

You know, town town meetings, community meetings or anything like that yet.

Cortana, so for the materials you can send it to your CEO budget analyst. Yeah, or.

I'm listing on the agenda, OK. And your name? Michael Shea.

Hey, are there any public comments for this item?

Thank you.

All right.

Thank you very much, Steve.

Alright, I'm back again.

Alright.

This one is, you know.

Oh, sorry. No, you're good.

You have any other questions?

No. Do you want me to? OK.

I'll just announce it, OK.

So item 4 E this is the four letter for the hearing on the 2425 county of Los Angeles Hazardous Vegetation and defense charges.

And we have representatives required.

Hi, Terra Memorial, a County Fire.

Welcome back.

So this is obviously kind of tied to what we just spoke about.

So this is the current inspections that we did this last year that will show up on November's tax assessment for homeowners that live in the the zones that we have inspected so.

This is, you know, 19,000,500 and 4400 thousand and change.

For the inspection fees and the enforcement.

So those are that also includes the the tally of, I think 64 properties that we enforced.

So this is of course the cost recovery to help make this program cost neutral.

You know when the state created this these zones and said, you know, you will inspect, there is no money tied to it.

So we were just.

We have 130,000 parcels we have to inspect and so to somehow recoup those funds.

Three years ago approved by the board was the inspection fee.

So this is what this is about.

Once again, I already said that, you know, in October we will reassess the fee.

Currently it's \$151 for the inspection fee \$990.00 for the enforcement and a \$500 admin fee for enforcement.

So we do a cost analysis every season about October.

So we have those numbers solid.

So when we send out the annual notice in January.

Homeowners understand what they're getting into.

So once again.

We also use some of the funds to help with our mailing.

Our expenses on data entry upkeeping our GIS systems.

And then we also do after the annual inspection January, we do the referee hearings where we're you know.

Homeowners that come out and they can protest whether they should be inspected or not, and we do that in March.

So here we are.

And this is about.

The the letter going to the board.

Approving the 19,000,000 plus.

So any questions on the defensible space cost charge?

I just have clarification.

So joint Board letter between you and agriculture.

Just like the other two. Correct. And then this is to be assessed in next year's property taxes or this this this November?

Yeah. So it'll be on November's tax assessment.

So the work was completed this year and this is the bill from that got you. And then do we know why active and included amount for there usually in the joint letter it it it's.

They have theirs as well.

Yeah, 'cause, we have yours. But we don't have theirs.

It just says ex, yeah.

We we typically put it all together and and send it to county agencies, county agencies.

So I didn't see the joint.

It's usually a joint letter. Yeah, it is.

It just doesn't show their their portion of the assessment.

It shows yours.

Yeah, they have, like a. Yeah. If they can provide.

Oh yeah, they do have a ***.

Oh, OK.

I'll I'll talk to County AG and see if they can.

They can just produce the number for unincorporated.

Yeah. I mean, sorry for unimproved parcels. Yeah. Thank you.

Yeah. Just, I mean, I go over this every time to understand what's, you know, section of the process.

So the inspections have all already occurred. The protests have already occurred.

The out of the 130,000 properties that were inspected, only 64 had to be enforced. If that well were, we actually had to come in and clear the property for that, right.

Because of the other 130,000 cells did it themselves.

Or yeah, they could have been found non compliant and then but then they had what we called.

By owner, yes, correct. Yeah.

OK.

So only 64 we have to go in and do the clearance. That's correct. Great.

And so this this is literally just saying put that all those charges on the tax bills.

That's correct.

Any questions?

OK, have a comment.

Are there any public comments for this item?

Please raise your hand.

OK, see. Alright. I think we are. Thank you.

Oh, regular public comment. For me that was very informative and I I'm I don't cover firefighter district.

So I looked at my address.

I am a house that is divided.

And welcome to the zone.

Appreciate it.

Thank you all.

Yes. Are there any general comments?

And seeing that I I look at today's.

Thank you. Thank you.

I was gonna e-mail you later.

□ **Public Safety CAR** stopped transcription