

To: East Contra Costa Fire Protection District
From: Townsend Public Affairs, Inc.
Date: February 3, 2022
Subject: Legislative Report for ECCFPD – January 2022

STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND OUTLOOK

The Capitol was active during the month of February, as legislators worked to meet the new bill introduction deadline, considered several early budget action items, and dealt with numerous COVID-19 procedural updates. Additionally, legislators and the Administration began working towards establishing consensus on funding priorities included in the Governor’s January budget framework proposal. Below is an overview of notable legislative happenings from the month of February.

STATE LEGISLATURE

February 18th marked the bill introduction deadline for all new bills to be considered in 2022. Although new bills have trickled in since the January 3rd start of session, most legislators waited until the final deadline week to introduce the bulk of their proposals. Once the deadline had passed, the Assembly and Senate introduced a combined total of 2,115 new bills. While the deadline for new bills has passed, legislators will still have the opportunity to amend or “gut and amend” existing bill vehicles to include new provisions throughout the legislative session. Assembly and Senate leadership have set hard mid-March deadlines for major amendments and amendments to “spot” legislation, meaning new and evolved legislative language will materialize in the coming weeks.

STATE BUDGET

Throughout the month of February, legislators participated in full budget and subcommittee informational hearings on specific provisions contained within the Governor’s January budget framework proposal. During these hearings, committee members heard from Department of Finance and Legislative Analyst’s Office representatives, as well as other relevant stakeholders, to consider the implementation of proposed funding programs contained in the Governor’s budget. Each of the hearings were informational in nature with no action items that would immediately alter the existing budget framework. Prior to the May budget revision, negotiations and hammered-out budget policies will materialize – which will reflect consensus between the Administration and the Legislature.

The nonpartisan Legislative Analyst’s Office released several succinct analyses of various aspects of the Governor’s budget proposal, including the [Wildfire and Forest Resiliency Package](#)



and the Governor's [Wildfire Response](#) proposals, which include assessments of proposed expenditures and issues for legislative consideration. Generally speaking, the Legislative Analyst encourages to evaluate the Governor's January Budget proposals related to wildfire in the context of the entire General Fund spending and focus on those programs that are targeted at specific outcomes and those with proven records of success. The LAO generally advises against early investment in programs without specific outcomes or those that may not prove to be cost-effective.

Assembly and Senate Budget Subcommittees will continue to hold hearings into the month of March before the Legislature shifts into agenda-heavy policy committee schedules to consider and take action on policy bills. Once the May Revise is released by the Governor in mid-May, the Budget Committees will begin to take more concrete actions and incorporate legislative priorities into the overall spending plan.

In addition to the steady pace of budget informational hearings, in February the Legislature approved, and the Governor signed, several budget items marked for "early action" – meaning funds would be made available immediately, to address urgent needs. These early action items included the following:

- **[SB 114 \(Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review\) Employment: COVID-19: supplemental paid sick leave.](#)**

This measure provides 80 hours of paid Covid-19 leave for covered employees working for an employer with over 25 employees. The previous law requiring coverage (SB 95, Statutes of 2021) expired Sept. 30, 2021. SB 114 mirrors the provisions included in the previous law, with two notable changes, which include the following additional qualifying cases for taking paid sick leave time:

- Attending an appointment to receive a COVID-19 vaccine or a vaccine booster for the employee's family member; or
- Caring for a family member who has symptoms from a COVID-19 vaccine or a vaccine booster.

- **[SB 115 \(Skinner\) Budget Act of 2021.](#)**

This measure amends the language contained within the 2021 Budget Act to provide for the immediate disbursement of funds marked for early action. This includes \$1.9 billion from the General Fund to the California Emergency Relief Fund for COVID-19 mitigation, which includes increasing testing capacity, enhancing vaccination programs, and supporting frontline workers. In addition to the new funds for COVID-19 mitigation and support, the measure allows the state to backfill funds for rental assistance not covered by federal dollars.

COVID-19 UPDATES

California lifts statewide indoor mask mandate - With Omicron cases rapidly declining, the State lifted the universal mask mandate for indoor public spaces on February 15th. The original masking mandate was instated December 15, 2020 and was designed to last until January 15, 2021. However, due to the spike in Omicron cases from the holiday season, the mandate was extended another month, until February 15th.



California to lift all masking mandates for vaccinated individuals and school settings – Following the State’s announcement lifting the indoor statewide masking mandate, on February 28th, the Governor announced the state would lift all masking mandates, including mandates that apply to school children and school personnel. Beginning March 1st, masks will no longer be required for unvaccinated individuals, but will be strongly recommended for all individuals in most indoor settings. In schools and childcare facilities, after March 11th, masks will not be required but will be strongly recommended. Masks will still be required for everyone in high transmission settings like public transit, emergency shelters, health care settings, correctional facilities, homeless shelters and long-term care facilities. Local jurisdictions may have additional requirements beyond the state guidance.

Legislation introduced to mandate vaccines for employees of all businesses – This month, Assembly Members Wicks, Aguiar-Curry, Low, and Akilah Weber introduced [AB 1993](#), which proposes to mandate vaccines for workplaces (for both employees and independent contractors) and requires employers to verify that their workers are immunized. New hires would need to have at least one shot by their first day — and the second within 45 days. Exemptions are made for persons ineligible to receive a COVID-19 vaccine due to a medical condition or disability or who hold a sincerely held religious belief. Assembly Member Wicks previously considered a similar proposal at the end of the 2021 legislative session, but ultimately decided to wait. AB 1993 is currently pending referral to the appropriate legislative policy committee for consideration. It may be heard in committee as soon as March 13th.

Governor unveils “SMARTER” Endemic Phase COVID-19 Plan – In February, Governor Newsom and various health leaders unveiled the state’s endemic strategy plan for COVID-19. The seven-part strategy – dubbed the “[SMARTER](#)” plan – focuses on addressing the late stages of the pandemic through shots, masks, awareness, readiness, testing, education, and Rx medication treatments (with each of the first letters of the words arranged in the acronym SMARTER). The strategy will use the \$1.4 billion in early action budget funds to bolster pandemic mitigation efforts.

Governor Rolls Back All but 5 Percent of COVID Executive Orders – In late February, Governor Newsom announced taking action to lift all but 5 percent of COVID-19 related Executive Order provisions, while maintaining the original COVID-19 State of Emergency. The remaining provisions include maintaining California’s nation-leading testing and vaccination programs and protecting hospital and health facility capacity, key components of the state’s SMARTER Plan to guide California’s evolving pandemic response.

Altogether, Newsom has issued 561 executive actions, specific legal waivers or directives contained within his executive orders, since the start of the pandemic. He has since rescinded all but 82. The most recent order lifts 52 of the remaining executive provisions by the end of June. Among the measures that were terminated immediately were orders to allow fairgrounds and other state-owned property to be used for pandemic relief and to direct the state to distribute COVID stimulus funds, which have already been allocated.

Maintaining the State of Emergency provides for such things as continued Brown Act flexibility for local agencies. The Governor has not yet released a timeline for which he plans to end the State of Emergency. It is not unusual for California governors to keep emergency proclamations open for years in response to disasters like wildfires and earthquakes.



Legislature to consider ending the COVID state of emergency – Senate pro Tem Toni Atkins released a [statement](#) on a Senate hearing to debate the merits of a resolution to end California’s state of emergency. [SCR 5](#), authored by Senator Melissa Melendez, is set for the first Senate Governmental Organization Committee hearing of the year on March 15th. The Committee will debate the merits of the resolution and the implications it will have on California’s ability to respond to the COVID emergency. Senator Melendez introduced an earlier version of the resolution in July 2020, but it died in the Senate Rules Committee. If passed by both houses, SCR 5 would effectively end the current State of Emergency without the Governor’s input. Certain executive orders, federal reimbursements, and federal/local agency coordination that correspond to the COVID-19 state of emergency would cease. Additionally, the passage of SCR 5 would limit the Governor’s executive powers within the scope of the declared emergency.

PRIORITY LEGISLATION

The legislative deadlines to introduce legislation in the new session is February 18th. It is anticipated that the Assembly and Senate will combine to introduce over two thousand bills for consideration in 2022.

Below are the upcoming relevant dates for the Legislature:

February 18th – Last day to introduce new bills

April 29th – Last day for policy committees to consider house of origin bills with a fiscal impact

May 6th – Last day for policy committees to consider house of origin non-fiscal bills

Below are bills that have been introduced that may be of interest to the District:

AB 1770 (Rodriguez) Ambulance patient offload time.

Current law requires the Emergency Medical Services Authority to report twice per year to the commission the APOT by local EMS agency jurisdiction and by each facility in that jurisdiction. This bill instead requires the authority to report the APOT data to the commission every 6 months. ***This bill has been referred to the Assembly Emergency Management Committee and Assembly Health Committee. A hearing date has not yet been set.***

AB 2258 (Wood) Property Assessed Clean Energy program: wildfire safety improvements

This bill would authorize a public agency that has established a PACE program, as specified, to enter into voluntary contractual assessments with property owners to finance the installation of wildfire safety improvements that are permanently fixed to real property and would provide that wildfire resiliency and safety improvements that contribute to the defensible space. ***This bill was introduced February 17th and is currently pending referral to committee.***

AB 2377 (Muratsuchi) Chief of Wildfire Prevention

This bill would establish within the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection a Chief of Wildfire Prevention, to be appointed by the Governor. The bill would require the chief to be responsible for certain activities, including prioritizing acres for fire and fuels treatment and executing those treatments. ***This bill was introduced February 17th and is currently pending referral to committee.***



AB 2477 (Rodriguez) Local Emergency Preparedness, Hazard Mitigation, and Mutual Aid Fund

This bill would establish a Local Emergency Preparedness, Hazard Mitigation, and Mutual Aid Fund to, upon appropriation by the Legislature, support staffing, planning, emergency mitigation priorities, and enhancing mutual aid to help local governments meet emergency management, preparedness, readiness, and resilience goals. The bill would require the Controller, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to transfer \$500,000,000 annually to the fund. The bill would require the Office of Emergency Services to establish the Local Emergency Preparedness, Hazard Mitigation, and Mutual Aid Fund Committee under the Standardized Emergency Management System Advisory Board. The bill, on or before July 1, 2023, would require the committee to adopt guidelines identifying eligible uses of the funds distributed pursuant to these provisions for the mitigation, prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery phases of emergency management that supports the development of a resilient community and enhances mutual aid. ***This bill was introduced February 17th and is currently pending referral to committee.***

SB 896 (Dodd) Wildfires: defensible space: grant programs: local governments.

This bill requires the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection when reviewing applications for the local assistance grant program, to award a 5 percent scoring bonus to any local government entity qualified to perform defensible space assessments in very high and high fire severity zones for using the common platform to report that information. ***This bill was introduced February 2nd and is currently pending referral to committee.***

SCA 8 (Nielsen) Wildfires: funding

The California Constitution establishes the California Fire Response Fund and requires the Controller to transfer from the General Fund to the California Fire Response Fund a specified amount. The California Constitution requires moneys in the California Response Fund to be appropriated by the Legislature in each fiscal year exclusively for specified fire prevention purposes. The California Constitution establishes the Special District Fire Response Fund as a subaccount in the California Fire Response Fund, to be appropriated to special districts that provide fire protection services. This measure would, contingent upon voter approval of an additional specified proposition at a statewide general election, revise and recast the California Fire Response Fund and the Special District Fire Response Fund, by among other things, requiring the Treasurer to annually transfer an amount equal to 1% of specified state revenues from the General Fund to the California Fire Response Fund. ***This bill was introduced February 16th and is currently pending referral to committee.***

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND OUTLOOK

CONGRESSIONAL COMMUNITY PROJECT FUNDING

TPA continues to work closely with ECCFPD to secure funding for the Fire Station project through the Congressional Community Project Funding, or earmark, process. TPA worked with ECCFPD to submit a request for \$3 million in funding for a new fire station. Congressman McNerney selected the Fire Station project as one of his top projects to be submitted to the House Appropriations Committee for consideration. The Fire Station project was included in the Six-Bill Appropriations Minibus that passed the House on July 31st, to be funded for \$1,500,000.



Congress is currently operating under a Continuing Resolution agreement to fund the federal government until March 11, 2022. This temporary extension extends current funding levels from the previous fiscal year (FY21) until March 11th. The District's \$1.5 million in funding is dependent on an overall agreement being reached by the House and the Senate and an FY22 spending bill being approved. TPA continues to advocate on behalf of ECCFPD and will continue to advocate to secure this funding in the final budget agreement.

According to sources on Capitol Hill, appropriations committees are calling offices to confirm aspects of earmarks submitted back in 2021. This action indicates that work is proceeding, and earmarks are in play. Congressional offices have also stated in February that inclusion of earmarks in the final bill are an "all or nothing" proposition. If an earmark was included in the House and Senate bills released in 2021, they will make it into the final deal. If negotiations are derailed and a deal is not struck, earmarks will not advance. Congressional offices are cautiously optimistic that a deal will be finalized before the March 11th deadline. Some of the most controversial policy riders have been resolved, and increases in defense spending have been agreed to, which has allowed the process to move forward following months of delay and protracted negotiations.

FY23 APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Sources on Capitol Hill have indicated that there will be a tight turnaround between passage of a final FY22 appropriations agreement and the initiation of the FY23 appropriations process. The House and Senate Appropriations Committees typically begin soliciting input from Members in February, following the release of the President's budget. But this year President Biden has delayed the release of his budget until State of the Union Address. That, combined with the delayed finalization of FY22 appropriations, has led to a late start to the process. The Appropriations Committees solicited input on funding levels for authorized programs and language for inclusion in their respective committee reports. It is anticipated that another round of community project funding and congressional directed spending requests will be accepted. Appropriators will be eager to get going on the FY23 process with deadlines for submission of these requests in the House likely coming in mid to late April with Senate deadlines not far behind.

ADDITIONAL COVID-19 MEASURES CONSIDERED

There is debate on Capitol Hill over whether to include additional COVID relief funds in a final funding agreement. On February 15th, the Biden Administration announced they would like to add \$30 billion in COVID-19 spending to the \$1.5 trillion government funding package. Although there are sufficient funds to respond to the pandemic, the Administration has said it wants to continue to be sufficiently prepared for future outbreaks and variants. The \$30 billion would include:

- \$18 billion for medical countermeasures (antivirals and vaccines)
- \$5 billion for testing
- \$3 billion for treatment of the uninsured
- \$4 billion to prepare for future variants

There is also discussion of another \$500 million for the Center for Disease Control and Prevention operations. Since COVID cases continue to decline in much of the country, there is skepticism



around adding additional funding for restaurants and other businesses in this proposed COVID package. The White House does not seem likely to include small business relief to benefit industries, such as restaurants.

Senate Appropriations Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-VT) is opposed to attaching additional COVID relief proposals to the current funding bill, in fear that it would derail negotiations. Some Republican lawmakers are pushing for a disaster aid bill supporting states struck by natural disasters such as Louisiana, Kentucky, New York, and California, which could be a potential vehicle for additional COVID aid, should Congress decide to pursue that path.

SENATOR PADILLA'S WILDFIRE LEGISLATION

On February 2nd, Senator Alex Padilla's bill to strengthen the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) wildfire preparedness and response efforts advanced out of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee (HSGAC). The legislation will move to the full Senate for consideration in March.

The measure, FEMA Improvement, Reform, and Efficiency (FIRE) Act (S. 3092) would allow FEMA to explore ways to pre-deploy resources during a red flag warning - similar to how the agency already does in advance of hurricane warnings. The bill would also require FEMA to prioritize survivors of disasters when selling portable housing units, thus ensuring survivors have a place to live during the rebuilding process. Additionally, the legislation would direct FEMA and the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study on potential solutions to address the availability and affordability of wildfire insurance. The bill requires separate studies to be conducted too, which include examining gaps in wildfire response and improving how the agencies provides post disaster housing assistance.

SUPREME COURT NOMINEE

President Biden announced he will nominate Ketanji Brown Jackson to the U.S. Supreme Court. This nomination will be a prime focus of the Senate over the course of the next several weeks, adding another item to the Senate's already long to-do list. Jackson would bring a unique perspective to the court as she would be the first former public defender to serve on the court. She also served in retiring Justice Breyer's chamber as a law clerk. Jackson was confirmed to the D.C. Circuit last year by a 53-44 vote, obtaining three Republican votes, indicating that her confirmation is likely.

DISTRICT LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

TPA works to further the mission of the East Contra Costa Fire Protection District in Sacramento and Washington DC. In addition to providing feedback on the priorities of the State and Federal government, the District has its own priorities that we continue to advance.



Legislative Priority 1 – Chapter 13 EMS System Modifications

California operates on a two-tiered emergency medical services (EMS) system. EMSA is the lead agency and centralized resource to oversee emergency and disaster medical services. The California Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA) is charged with providing leadership in developing and implementing local EMS systems throughout California, and in setting standards for the training and scope of practice of various levels of EMS personnel. California has 33 local EMS systems that provide EMS for California's 58 counties.

Local EMS agencies are responsible for planning, implementing, and managing local trauma care systems, including assessing needs, developing the system design, designating trauma care centers, collecting trauma care data, and providing quality assurance.

In late 2019, EMSA issued proposed Chapter 13 regulations that would have aimed to define the standards, policies, and procedures for all local EMS systems. Additionally, the proposed regulations would have clarified and made specific criteria for determining whether a city or fire district that has contracted for, or provided prehospital EMS as of June 1, 1980, has consistently provided that service without any reduction in the level of service since that time. The regulations would have also made specific criteria for the determining when an exclusive operating area may be created without a competitive process and the process to be used when awarding an exclusive operating area via a competitive process.

The EMSA proposed regulations garnered opposition from numerous entities. Additionally, CFCA's legal counsel requested that EMSA withdraw the proposed Chapter 13 regulations for failure to comply with certain substantive and procedural requirements for rulemaking under the Administrative Procedures Act. Ultimately, in August 2020, EMSA gave notice that it decided not to proceed with the rule making action related to Chapter 13.

On January 19th, the Assembly Committee on Emergency Management held an informational hearing to discuss the impact of ambulance patient offload delays on the emergency response system. The hearing consisted of two panels of state and local fire and emergency response professionals. There were several themes repeated throughout the hearing including that response and wall times are currently unacceptable, that these issues predate the stresses placed on the system by the pandemic, triage care and the expansion of telehealth should be explored as options to minimum emergency room and ambulance use saturation, and that a system of penalties/incentives should be considered to help reduce wall times.

While the hearing was informational, and no specific action was taken, the issue is on the Legislature's radar and future legislation may be forthcoming. On February 2nd, Assembly Member Rodriguez, the Chair of the Emergency Management Committee, introduced AB 1770 which would increase the reporting frequency of APOT data to the state.

Legislative Priority 2 – Mitigation Fee Act

Under existing law, the Mitigation Fee Act authorizes local agencies to impose fees to offset the impacts of new development in the form of new services and/or facilities required. The Mitigation Fee Act also imposes a variety of administrative requirements on the fees collected. No voter



approval is required to impose impact fees. The same does not apply to a District board, who is prohibited from charging a fee on new construction or development.

In 2020, numerous bills were introduced that attempted to modify the Act in ways that would have resulted in a decreased ability for public agencies to collect impact fees. The aim of these legislative efforts has been to reduce the overall cost of housing in California and provide more opportunities for home ownership or for people to be able to afford to rent housing near employment centers. However, once the coronavirus pandemic hit, and there was concern about declining revenues for local governments, the Legislature did not consider many significant bills in 2021 related to the Mitigation Fee Act.

In February, Assembly Member Grayson introduced AB 2186, which attempts to reduce the overall cost of housing by reducing the cost associated with mitigation fees, but in a manner that would not be harmful to local agencies. The Assembly Member's bill would call on the Department of Housing and Community Development to reimburse local agencies 50% for any reduction or elimination of mitigation fees that they provide to qualified rental housing developments.

Legislative Priority 3 – Professional Services

Under existing law, the Public Contract Code provides that contracts over \$25,000 must be awarded to the lowest bidder. In addition to be a low threshold, Section 20812 is inconsistent with the requirements for many public agencies, and inconsistent with other laws pertaining to Professional and Special Services.

This session legislation was introduced last year by Assembly Member Gallagher, AB 577, which would establish a \$50,000 threshold amount for county drainage districts, levee districts, and reclamation districts for the requirement to award to the lowest bidder. AB 577 was referred to the Assembly Local Government Committee for consideration, but was not set for hearing by the committee, and as such, the measure is now a two-year bill. It is possible that additional legislation will be introduced in 2022, but it is unclear if there will be any appetite within the Legislature to advance this type of legislation this year.

Legislative Priority 4 – Parcel Tax

Currently, a parcel tax requires a two-thirds vote to pass and must be applied to all parcels equally. This means that a residential property, a commercial property, and an undeveloped property would have to be assessed the same amount for fire service even though they place different levels of demand for service on the Fire District.

On December 7th, Assembly Member Aguiar-Curry reintroduced ACA 1 which would create an exception to the 1% limit that would authorize a city, county, or special district to levy an ad valorem tax to fund the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing, if the proposed tax measure is approved by 55% of voters. For purposes of the bill, "public infrastructure" includes public safety buildings or facilities, equipment related to fire suppression, emergency response equipment, or interoperable communications equipment for direct and exclusive use by fire, emergency response, police, or sheriff personnel.



Last year, ACA 1 was supported by a coalition of individual public agencies and associations, including: California Special Districts Association, League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties, East Bay MUD, and East Bay Parks. The measure also received significant support from labor, including from California Professional Firefighters.

ACA 1 has been referred to the Assembly Local Government Committee, which is chaired by the bill's author, Assembly Member Aguiar-Curry. Since constitutional amendments are not subject to the same legislative timelines as regular bills, so the measure may still be considered by the Assembly Local Government Committee despite being past the deadline for policy committees to consider bills in their House of Origin. Last session, ACA 1 was approved by the committee on a 5-2 vote.

Legislative Priority 5 – Proposition 218

Proposition 218 restrict local governments' ability to impose assessments and property-related fees, as well as requires elections to approve many local government revenue raising methods. Over time, the responsibilities expected of local fire districts have grown, however, their share of local tax revenue has not grown to meet the increased demand.

Every few years, efforts have failed to modify the State Constitution to reduce the vote threshold for parcel tax measures to 55%. That included an effort earlier in the 2019-20 legislative session, ACA 1 (Aguiar-Curry). While that measure was unsuccessful, the Legislature was able to approve a measure, ACA 11 (Mullin), for the November ballot, which appear on the ballot as Proposition 19. Proposition 19 was approved at the November 2020 General Election and allows homeowners who are over 55, disabled, or victims of wildfire or natural disaster to transfer their primary residence's property tax base value to a replacement residence of any value, anywhere in the state. An individual could use these rules up to three times in their lifetime. The measure would also limit the ability of new homeowners who inherit properties to keep their parents' or grandparents' low property tax payments. The measure would allocate most resulting state revenue to fire protection services and reimbursement to local governments for taxation-related changes.

In addition to any efforts to legislatively modify the Prop 218 voter thresholds, there is also a counter initiative effort underway that would impact the ability for local governments to raise revenue for government services. The proposed initiative, the Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act, would limit the ability of the state and local governments to enact, modify, or expand taxes, assessments, fees, and property-related charges.

In February, the Attorney General issued [title and summary](#) for the California Business Round Table-sponsored "Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act," which allowed the initiative proponents to begin signature gathering. Proponents must submit 997,139 valid signatures in order to qualify for the November 2022 ballot. The Secretary of State's recommended date to turn in signatures is April 29, 2022.

The Taxpayer Protection and Government Accountability Act would amend the California Constitution to restrict the ability of the state, local governments, other local agencies, and the electorate to approve or collect taxes, fees, and other revenues. It would require voter approval of all state taxes, would further restrict local fee authority by limiting it to the "minimum amount



necessary” to provide government services, and would require voter approval for local measures such as franchise fees. Its provisions would make it easier to challenge local revenue measures by increasing the burden of proof on local agencies while disallowing an agency’s characterization of a measure from being considered in court.

Initiative opponents comprise a [coalition](#) of organizations including the League of California Cities, California Professional Firefighters, AFSCME, SEIU, and the California Alliance for Jobs.

Legislative Priority 6 – Building a Coalition

TPA continues to work with the California Special Districts Association in efforts to further strengthen the relationship between CSDA and the District, as well as to ensure alignment on issues of importance to fire districts. TPA has worked with CSDA and the District to advocate for the District to be represented on the CSDA Legislative Committee. In December, CSDA staff notified the District that Chief Helmick has been selected to serve on the Legislative Committee for the upcoming year. The CSDA Legislative Committee began meeting in January 2022 to consider legislative and policy items that may potentially impact CSDA and its members. The committee will meet on a near monthly basis for the remainder of the legislative session.

