

From: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
To: [LAFCO Info](#)
Cc: [Becky Steinbruner](#)
Subject: Correspondence re: Item #6c on June 3, 2026 LAFCO Agenda
Date: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 9:00:19 AM

******CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.****

Dear Commissioners,

I have the following concerns re: Item #6c and request your Commission discuss the Report and table any actions until the LAFCO Ad Hoc Fire Service Committee holds a public meeting to discuss several issues with property owners, representative Fire District Boards affected, and the Santa Cruz County Fire Dept. Advisory Group (FDAG).

1) I feel there are islands of service gap in CSA 48 that are not addressed in the Report. For example, Redwood Drive in Aptos and areas of Aptos Creek Road that are within CSA 48 boundaries are currently served primarily by Central Fire District agreements with County Fire.

2) I am concerned by LAFCO's aggressive actions to force Pajaro Valley Fire District to dissolve and annex with Santa Cruz County Fire (CSA 48). The PVFD Board single-handedly made the decision to dissolve, without any public town hall meetings to provide a comparative cost analysis. Although there was one town hall meeting in the recent past that I attended, there was information from County Fire regarding the cost of CSA 48 assessments proposed. The PVFD property owners are not being given adequate information now in order to evaluate whether the proposed costs of annexing with CSA 48 would be supported by an increased level of service.

3) The proposed CSA 48 assessments for the PVFD area budget includes a significant revenue surplus for services intended in the future, and is not in compliance with Prop. 218 requirements that only the proportional cost of service that will actually be provided can be levied. The PVFD assessments presented at the May 23 meeting that LAFCO orchestrated could not support this requirement of California Constitution XIII D (2):

2) The agency shall conduct a public hearing upon the proposed fee or charge not less than 45 days after mailing the notice of the proposed fee or charge to the record owners of each identified parcel upon which the fee or charge is proposed for imposition. At the public hearing, the agency shall consider all protests against the proposed fee or charge. If written protests against the proposed fee or charge are presented by a majority of owners of the identified parcels, the agency shall not impose the fee or charge.

(b) Requirements for Existing, New or Increased Fees and Charges. A fee or charge shall not be extended, imposed, or increased by any agency unless it

meets all of the following requirements:

(1) Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not exceed the funds required to provide the property related service.

(2) Revenues derived from the fee or charge shall not be used for any purpose other than that for which the fee or charge was imposed.

(3) The amount of a fee or charge imposed upon any parcel or person as an incident of property ownership shall not exceed the proportional cost of the service attributable to the parcel.

(4) No fee or charge may be imposed for a service unless that service is actually used by, or immediately available to, the owner of the property in question.

Fees or charges based on potential or future use of a service are not permitted.
Standby charges, whether characterized as charges or assessments, shall be classified as assessments and shall not be imposed without compliance with Section 4.

<https://law.justia.com/constitution/california/article-xiii-d/section-6/>

Sincerely,
Becky Steinbruner
3441 Redwood Drive
Aptos, CA 95003