All proceedings before the Board of Trustees are conducted in English. The District does not furnish interpreters and, if one is needed, it shall be the responsibility of the person needing one. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in the meetings of the District, please contact the Manager at (209) 982-4675 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting to enable the District to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.

1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – This time is reserved for members of the public to address the Board of Trustees relative to matters within the jurisdiction of the San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District. No action may be taken on non-agenda items unless authorized by law. Speakers should hold comments on items listed as a Public Hearing until the Hearing is opened. Comments will be limited to five minutes per person.

3. CONSENT CALENDER
   a. Minutes of the February 20, 2018 regular meeting of the Board of Trustees
   b. Expenditure and financial reports for February 2018
   c. District activities report for February 2018
   d. Public Information and Outreach Month End report for February 2018
   e. Manager’s report
   f. Correspondence

4. CSDA FIELD COORDINATOR PRESENTATION: CSDA PROGRAMS, SERVICES AND 2018 UPDATE

5. MEETING WITH BRENT LESOVSKY REGARDING LDA PARTNERS PROPOSAL FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES

6. REPORT OF ATTENDANCE AT THE AMERICAN MOSQUITO CONTROL ASSOCIATION (AMCA) ANNUAL CONFERENCE HELD FEBRUARY 26 - MARCH 2, 2018
7. REVIEW / DISCUSSION / ACTION TO ACCEPT THE 2017 DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT

8. REPORT ON DISTRICT'S APPEAL OF THE CITY OF STOCKTON'S PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO ALLOW CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A MEDICAL CANNABIS CULTIVATION FACILITY AT 7979 S. AIRPORT WAY

9. REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO DISPOSE OF SURPLUS DISTRICT EQUIPMENT

10. CLOSED SESSION (Pursuant to CGC §54957)

   Public Employee – Performance Evaluation / Public Appointment
   Title:   Manager

REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION

11. COMMENTS FROM TRUSTEES AND STAFF ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

12. OTHER BUSINESS; ANNOUNCEMENT OF FUTURE BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

   • The next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be 1:00 p.m. Tuesday, April 17, 2018

13. ADJOURN
Board Meeting Information

To: Board of Trustees
From: Eddie Lucchesi, Manager
CC: Chris Eley, Legal Counsel
Date: 3/12/2018
Re: March 2018 BOT Meeting, Agenda Item 3

3. CONSENT CALENDAR
   a. Draft minutes of the February 20, 2018 regular meeting of the Board of Trustees
   b. Expenditure and Financial reports for February 2018
   c. District activities report for February 2018
   d. Public Information & Outreach report for February 2018
   e. Manager's report
   f. Correspondence

The Consent Calendar consists of items that require approval or acceptance but are self-explanatory and generally require no discussion. If the Board would like to discuss any item listed, it may be pulled from the Consent Calendar and discussed separately.

If there are no items that the Board would like to discuss separately, it is recommended that the Board of Trustees approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

Attachments
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO & VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT
7759 SOUTH AIRPORT WAY, STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA 95206

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

February 20, 2018

1. Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District was held Tuesday, February 20, 2018, at the District's Stockton office. President Colombini called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Trustees Present:
Gary Haskin
Mike Manna
Glenn Page
Jay Colombini
Francis Groen
Omar Khweiss
Greg Selna

Staff Members Present:
Eddie Lucchesi, Manager
John Fritz, Assistant Manager
Jamie Tuggle, Secretary
Emily Nicholas, Administrative Assistant

Trustees Absent:
Greg O'Leary
Gary Lambdin
Jack Fiori
Marc Warmerdam

Legal Advisor: Chris Eley, Attorney at Law

Other: None

2. Public Comment Period
There was no public comment

3. Consent Calendar

a. Minutes of the January 16, 2018 regular meeting of the Board of Trustees
e. Manager's report
f. Correspondence
Following review and discussion of the Consent Calendar, it was moved by Trustee Groen, seconded by Trustee Khweiss, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented; motion passed unanimously.


   Manager Lucchesi introduced the Board that his report of the conference was in his manager’s report. Trustee Warmerdam was absent and could not present the Board with his report.

   b. MVCAC Annual Conference Presentations from District Staff.
   Manager Lucchesi introduced Dr. Shaoming Huang, the District’s Entomologist. Dr. Huang presented the Board with his presentation from the conference. His talk was on a field trial gaging the effectiveness of a pyrethrin aduticide on local mosquitoes. Assistant Entomologist Sumiko De La Vega provided a presentation on the analysis of West Nile virus activity during varying levels of drought conditions in San Joaquin County.

   c. Request for authorization to attend MVCAC Spring Quarterly Meeting, April 26-27, 2018.
   Manager Lucchesi requested authorization for designated staff and interested trustees to attend the upcoming MVCAC Spring Conference scheduled for April 26th-27th, 2018 in Lake Tahoe, CA. Following review and discussion, it was moved by Trustee Selna, seconded by Trustee Haskin to authorize interested trustees and designated staff to attend the April 26th-27th, 2018 conference; the motion passed unanimously.

5. 2017 Annual Statements of Economic Interest Filings (FPPC FORM 700: District Policy 1020).

   Manager Lucchesi and Legal Counsel Eley reviewed with the Board the 2017 Annual Statements of Economic Interests. Following discussion, Trustees Groen, Khweiss, Page, Colombini, Selna, Manna, Haskin, Legal Counsel Eley, and Manager Lucchesi signed and submitted Form 700 for CY 2017. Trustee Warmerdam, O’Leary, Fiori, and Lambdin will be presented the forms at the next regular Board meeting.

6. Resolution 17/18-05 (DRAFT) of the Board of Trustees directing the preparation of the engineer’s report for the Mosquito, Vector, and disease control benefit assessment for fiscal year 2018-2019.

   Manager Lucchesi introduced a draft resolution directing the preparation of the engineer’s report for the Mosquito, Vector, and Disease Benefit Assessment for fiscal year 2018-19. Following review and discussion, it was moved by Trustee Groen, seconded by Trustee Selna, to approve resolution 18/19-04 as presented; the motion was unanimously approved.
7. Request for authorization to accept proposal for architectural services to modify public entrance to the District’s Stockton Office. Board will consider contract proposal from LDA Partners per scope of work to be performed.

Manager Lucchesi reviewed the proposed plans for improvements to the front entrance of the District’s Stockton Office. He presented the proposal for architectural services from Mr. Lesovsky of LDA Partners. The proposal stated it would cost $33,540.00 for him to have designs and construction plans developed. Trustee Haskin asked what the cost proposal covers. Manager Lucchesi said it would cover more detailed plans and information from an electrical engineer and structural engineer. The Board directed Manager Lucchesi to obtain more detailed information relative to the associated costs of the proposal prior to the Board’s authorization. Manager Lucchesi stated he will follow up with LDA Partners regarding the Board’s questions.

8. Request for authorization to develop an eligibility list for the position of Mosquito Control Technician I, fill the current vacancy for the position of the Vector Ecologist, and to fill the upcoming vacancy of the Mechanic II position.

Manager Lucchesi informed the Board that there are current vacancies in the Mosquito Control Technician I and Vector Ecologist positons, and an upcoming vacancy in the Mechanic II position that will need to be filled. After review and discussion, it was moved by Trustee Groen and seconded by Trustee Manna to start the process of filling these positions. This motion was unanimously approved.

9. Update on District’s appeal of the City of Stockton’s Planning Commission decision to allow Conditional Use Permit to operate a medical cannabis cultivation facility at 7979 S. Airport Way.

Manager Lucchesi updated the Board on the District’s appeal of the City of Stockton’s Planning Commission decision to grant a “Conditional Use Permit” to develop and operate a medical cannabis cultivation facility located next to the District’s Stockton Office. Manager Lucchesi received word that the District’s appeal would be on the agenda for the City of Stockton’s Council meeting scheduled for February 27, 2018. Manager Lucchesi reported he sent letters to the Mayor and Councilmembers regarding the District’s concerns of the “Conditional Use Permit”. Manager Lucchesi and the Executive Committee also met with Vice Mayor Holman prior to the Board meeting regarding the situation. Legal Advisor Eley stated that although a difficult task, the District should follow through with this process. Manager Lucchesi said he will keep the Board apprised of the outcome of the appeal.
10. Executive Committee Report.

President Colombini informed the Board that the Executive Committee met to further discuss the Performance Evaluation of the Manager and to discuss a new contract for the Manager. He suggested that they convene in Closed Session to discuss the matter further.

11. CLOSED SESSION (Pursuant to CGC §54957)

A. Public Employee Performance Evaluation (§54957)
   Title: Manager

Prior to convening to closed session, President Colombini announced the reason for the closed session. The Board convened to closed session at 2:40 p.m. and reconvened to open session at 2:50 p.m.

REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION:

President Colombini called upon Legal Counsel Eley to provide a report of the closed session. Legal Counsel Eley reported that the Board of Trustees had met in closed session to discuss the performance evaluation of the Manager. The Board concluded they were pleased with the Manager’s performance thru this evaluation period and postponed any decision on any salary adjustment or new contract until next month when more Board members are anticipated to be in attendance.

12. Comments from Trustees and Staff on non-agenda items.

None

13. Other Business; Announcement of future Board and Committee meetings.

- Manager Lucchesi announced the next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees will be 1:00 p.m. Tuesday, March 20, 2018.

14. Adjournment

There being no further business, it was moved by Trustee Khweiss, seconded by Trustee Manna to adjourn the meeting at 2:54 p.m.; the motion passed unanimously.
San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District
Budget and Actual Comparison
July 2017 through February 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul '17 - Feb 18</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC. REVENUES</td>
<td>$387,339.85</td>
<td>$755,953.00</td>
<td>51.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY TAX</td>
<td>2,755,048.01</td>
<td>4,823,603.00</td>
<td>57.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>67,046.10</td>
<td>75,750.00</td>
<td>88.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERGOV'T REVENUES</td>
<td>54,914.28</td>
<td>94,222.00</td>
<td>58.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>1,658,745.17</td>
<td>3,120,831.00</td>
<td>53.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>4,923,093.41</td>
<td>8,870,359.00</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES</td>
<td>1,614,366.71</td>
<td>2,641,991.00</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>1,454,531.81</td>
<td>2,429,162.00</td>
<td>59.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL SERVICES AND SUPPLIES</td>
<td>1,668,899.33</td>
<td>3,047,895.02</td>
<td>54.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>4,737,797.85</td>
<td>8,119,048.02</td>
<td>58.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER CHARGES</td>
<td>1,065.85</td>
<td>35,610.00</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>26,933.79</td>
<td>393,000.00</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>27,999.64</td>
<td>428,610.00</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET CHANGE SURPLUS (DEFICIT)</strong></td>
<td>$157,295.92</td>
<td>$322,700.98</td>
<td>48.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>ASM</td>
<td>ASM</td>
<td>ASM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/2018</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2018</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/2018</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/31/2018</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**February 2018**

**FUND REPORT**

San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE Hardware</td>
<td>$ 42.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapco</td>
<td>6,056.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airgas</td>
<td>164.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Marketplace</td>
<td>441.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>1,379.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes Welding Supply</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Bill, Inc</td>
<td>337.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Alarm</td>
<td>234.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big W Sales</td>
<td>730.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttes/Center State Pipe Supply</td>
<td>76.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalPERS</td>
<td>53,271.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDWG Inc.</td>
<td>760.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevron and Texaco Card Services</td>
<td>2,190.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lodi</td>
<td>341.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stockton</td>
<td>242.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutch &amp; Brake Xchange Inc.</td>
<td>338.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Welders Supply</td>
<td>11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Outdoor Environments, Inc.</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV, Certified Public Accountants</td>
<td>16,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Vega, Sumiko (Monterey conference, Travel)</td>
<td>651.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Dental</td>
<td>4,472.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devencenzi, P Aaron (Monterey conference, travel)</td>
<td>180.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eley, Christopher K</td>
<td>876.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite IV Contractors Inc.</td>
<td>918.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRI Inc.</td>
<td>6,751.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Bank</td>
<td>273.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farwest Steel</td>
<td>93.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FedEx</td>
<td>77.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food For Less</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;K Services</td>
<td>1,318.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton Tractor Stockton</td>
<td>237.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee Products</td>
<td>177.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Service Apps</td>
<td>133.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainger</td>
<td>936.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang, Shaoming (Monterey conference, travel)</td>
<td>113.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLand Internet Solutions</td>
<td>449.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>103.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Circle</td>
<td>620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Milano Co., Inc.</td>
<td>122.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jensales Inc.</td>
<td>26.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; M Sharpening</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGC Biosearch Technologies Inc.</td>
<td>140.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Technologies Corp (Invitrogen)</td>
<td>195.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe’s</td>
<td>301.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriott Hotel</td>
<td>2,868.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference, meals</td>
<td>24.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moniz, John (to reimburse for supplies)</td>
<td>36.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N&amp;S Tractor</td>
<td>77.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestle Pure Life Direct, Nestle Water</td>
<td>287.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Image Sign Co</td>
<td>232.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newegg</td>
<td>160.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
<td>2,934.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG Architectural Coatings</td>
<td>117.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raley's</td>
<td>9.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rexel Norcal Valley</td>
<td>88.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin County Dept of Public Works</td>
<td>23.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin County ISD</td>
<td>2,630.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Magazine</td>
<td>899.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI Consulting Group</td>
<td>11,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheraton (AMCA conference, lodging)</td>
<td>758.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart &amp; Final</td>
<td>395.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stericycle Environmental</td>
<td>99.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stericycle Inc.</td>
<td>204.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Auto Parts</td>
<td>98.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Filter Supply Co., Inc.</td>
<td>281.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Petroleum Co.</td>
<td>10,947.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Scavengers Association, Inc</td>
<td>219.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SuperShuttle (AMCA conference, travel)</td>
<td>71.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Home Depot CRC/GECF</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Record</td>
<td>473.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unum Life Insurance</td>
<td>2,651.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Telecom</td>
<td>459.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon Wireless</td>
<td>895.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Service Plan CA</td>
<td>705.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VWR International</td>
<td>254.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilbur-Ellis</td>
<td>1,551.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Meat &amp; Deli</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Membership Inc.</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$145,238.33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTINUATION OF SWIMMING POOL INSPECTIONS

The District continues to work with the County Assessor’s office and the County GIS department to develop a list of properties with swimming pools that are either in default or full foreclosure. However, due to a software change they have not been able to generate a pool list for the past several months. They are currently working to solve the problem.

GENERAL FIELD ACTIVITIES

February weather conditions ranged from unseasonably warm to unseasonably cold with little to no precipitation to speak of. Cool season mosquitoes such as Culiseta incidens and Culisita inornata became active during the warm spells in February, causing an uptick in service requests. These mosquitoes are larger than the average mosquito making them very noticeable to the public.

Field Technicians began zone inspections on a limited basis, focusing on drains, ponds, industrial and residential mosquito breeding sites. In addition to the Culisita species of mosquitoes mentioned above, first generation Culex species were identified breeding in a number of different locations throughout the County.

Technicians also delivered equine West Nile virus brochures for horse owners in their operational areas. These brochures were designed to make horse owners aware of WNv and to get their horses vaccinated.

Cemetery urn applications began in February. Technicians apply insect growth regulator pellets to each urn that will provide near season long mosquito control. The urn will be monitored throughout the summer to ensure efficacy continues.

Technicians also began handing out letters to tire companies to remind them to keep tires out of the rain and not to accumulate water. It is also an opportunity for us to do inspections for mosquito breeding while on the premises.

TOTAL TREATMENT WORK CONDUCTED DURING THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUND WORK</th>
<th>AERIAL WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103 Acs Larvicided</td>
<td>0 Acs Larvicided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Acs Adulticided</td>
<td>0 Acs Adulticided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Acs Herbicided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/13/2018 ACTIVITY.REP
SERVICE REQUESTS

20 Mosquitoes
35 Neglected Pools
30 Fish Requests

WORK SCHEDULED FOR MARCH

- CONTINUE TO INSPECT NEGLECTED SWIMMING POOLS REPORTED FROM THE PUBLIC AND IDENTIFIED ON THE UPDATED LIST OF HOME FORECLOSURES.

- CONTINUE CEMETERY URN TREATMENTS.

- CONTINUE TECHNICIAN TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.

- BEGIN SEASONAL SOURCE INSPECTIONS ON A LIMITED BASIS.
PUBLIC INFORMATION & OUTREACH MONTH END REPORT
For month ending February, 2018

To: Ed Lucchesi, Manager

From: Aaron Devencenzi, PIO

Monthly Activities

- A full page mosquitofish ad was completed for the March issue of San Joaquin Magazine. San Joaquin magazine also will be including a District profile along with a ½ page ad in April. I worked with the production editor in editing the written profile and choosing a stock photo.

- For the period of February 1, 2018 through February 28, 2018 there were 11,388 visitors to the District’s website. The site averaged 406 visitors per day. For the month, there were 15,544 page views with an average of 1.36 page views per visitor. In January, there were 392 visitors per day.

- Educational outreach during the month included eight presentations to 10 classes. The District participated in Lodi Middle School career day where I and Sumiko De La Vega split presentations to discuss career opportunities in mosquito control. We also included mosquito biology and prevention.

- The District received final approval from Lincoln Unified School District. All six employees passed the background check and are allowed to participate in school presentations. As a result we sent 50 letters to LUSD 5th and 6th grade schools inviting them to schedule a free classroom presentation. Presentations were scheduled in March and April.

- AgVenture was held in Lodi for the northern part of the county. Third grade students, teachers and parents participated in 37 short presentations on mosquito biology, mosquito prevention, and mosquitofish. Chris Hiers and I spoke to a total of 1047 students, teacher, and parents.

- I attended the annual MVCAC conference in Monterey CA.

- I began contacting digital billboard advertisers for local sign costs in San Joaquin County.

- Work continued on writing and designing the 2017 Annual Report. A final copy was given to management for review and editing.

- I purchased supplies and helped setup the Spray Safe event held at the San Joaquin County Arch Rd. office.

- The Safety cabinets were checked for sufficient supplies and a replacement order was made for both the Stockton and Lodi yards. Updates, broken links, and compatibility browser issue were corrected for the sjmosquito.org website.
MANAGER'S REPORT

For the period February 15, 2018 – March 13, 2018

- Emily Nicholas and I attended the 30th Annual Vector Control Joint Powers Authority (VCJPA) Workshop and Board meeting, Santa Cruz, CA. The VCJPA Workshop was held on February 22nd, followed by the VCJPA Board meeting on February 23rd. The Workshop covered our self-insurance program that includes, but not limited to, Investment and Financial Overview, Safety and Loss Control, Pooled Liability, and our Pooled Workers' Compensation Program. Special attention was dedicated to changes under SB 1160 effective January 1, 2018 regarding the medical treatment utilization schedule (MTUS) for injured workers. The intent is to improve the quality of care by assuring that drugs provided to injured workers meet evidence based medicine standards in an effort to prevent opioid addiction. Additional State legislative updates were reviewed that included Waters of the U.S., Wetland Policies, Drone use, Employer responsibilities, CEQA, and LAFCOs. The Board meeting covered detailed information relating to general liability and workers' compensation warrants, Treasurers report, and Administrative matters including a report on the VCJPA Investment Portfolio.

- I met with Brent Lesovsky, Architect with LDA Partners, to review his proposal presented before the Board at the February 2018 BOT regular meeting. Mr. Lesovsky agreed to meet with the full Board to review his proposal and respond to questions. This item will be discussed and reviewed by the Board during the Board meeting. (Agenda Item #5).

- Legal Counsel Chris Eley and I attended the Public Hearing at the City of Stockton City Council Meeting, to appeal the City of Stockton's Planning Commission approval of the conditional use permit to operate a medical cannabis cultivation facility at 7979 S Airport Way. More detailed information will be provided during the Board meeting. (Agenda Item #8)

- District received four new replacement vehicles ordered in November of 2017. The District's mechanics have already completed the necessary modifications to install the flatbeds removed from the vehicles being replaced. The work includes removing the pick-up boxes from the new vehicles, installing heavy duty leaf springs, attaching flat bed, and installing associated controls (throttle cables, wiring, sending unit, etc.) from the pick-up cab to the auxiliary engine used to operate the spray equipment. Once that is completed, they will add safety beacon lights, place District decals on the doors, and calibrate the spray equipment prior to releasing them for use. The rigs will all be field ready by the end of the month.

- Posted job announcement for the Vector Ecologist position in the MVCAC Jobs Bulletin as well as listing on the AMCA web-site. In addition, Assistant Manager Fritz posted the position on the "Jobs Board" at the AMCA Conference in Kansas City. We also notify area universities that include UOP and the UC and State colleges. We are currently updating the Mechanic II Job Description and will be posting that opening this month. For the MCT I vacancies, Assistant Manager Fritz is using the Job Search web-site Indeed™ in addition to the MVCAC Jobs Bulletin to enhance our pool of candidates.

- In the area of facility maintenance projects, we hired a roofer to remove and replace three skylights located on the chemical warehouse building that were damaged by the recent hail storm. Those skylights are more than 30 years old and very brittle. We will be looking at evaluating the need to replace the balance of those fixtures, since they are single paneed and their integrity is fragile at best. The replacements available today are double paneed.

- Received confirmation from the City of Lodi that at their February 21, 2018 city council meeting, Trustee Jack Fiori was re-appointed to represent the City of Lodi on the District's Board of Trustees. Additional information available under Agenda Item 3F.
In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you are a disabled person and you need a disability-related modification or accommodation to participate in this meeting, please contact Ms. Katie Achterberg at (916) 290-4624 or (916) 244-1199 (fax). Requests must be made as early as possible, and at least one full business day before the start of the meeting.

Documents and materials relating to an open session agenda item that are provided to the VCJPA Board less than 72 hours prior to a regular meeting will be available for public inspection and copying at 1750 Creekside Oaks Dr., Suite 200, Sacramento, CA 95833.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approx. Time</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 AM</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTRODUCTIONS AND REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Welcome, Introductions, and Opening Remarks by President Tamara Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. 2017 Year In Review and Looking Forward into 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INVESTMENT AND FINANCIAL OVERVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*A. Financial Position Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 AM</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAFETY AND RISK CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*A. General Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*B. Review of Safety Recognition Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POOLED LIABILITY PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. General Overview:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*1. Primary Pooled Layer, Mid-Layer Pool, and Aggregate Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*2. Litigation Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*3. Excess Coverage - California Affiliated Risk Management Authorities (CARMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*4. Employment Practices Liability Coverage - Employment Risk Management Authority (ERMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>15 MINUTE BREAK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. POOLED WORKERS’ COMPENSATION PROGRAM
   A. General Overview:
      *1. Primary Pooled Layer, Mid-Layer Pool, and Aggregate Pool
      *2. Excess Coverage – Local Agency Workers’ Compensation
          Excess Joint Powers Authority (LAWCX)
   *B. Presentation by Acclamation Insurance Management Services (AIMS)
      Regarding Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) Drug
      Formulary Changes

6. PRESENTATION BY ALLIANT INSURANCE SERVICES
   *A. State of the Insurance Market
   *B. Alliant Property Insurance Program (APIP)
   *C. Alliant Crime Insurance Program (ACIP)

7. POOLED PROPERTY PROGRAM
   *A. General Overview

8. POOLED AUTO PHYSICAL DAMAGE PROGRAM
   *A. General Overview

9. GROUP PURCHASED PROGRAMS
   *A. General Overview of the Business Travel Accident Program and
      Employee Assistance Program

10. LEGAL MATTERS
    *A. Legislative Update

12:15 PM
LUNCH

11:00 PM
11. PRESENTATIONS/TRAINING
    A. Leading Challenging (And Not So Challenging) Employees Through
       Challenging Situations to Create Great District Environments

3:30 PM
12. REVIEW OF SERVICE PROVIDERS
    A. Results of Membership Satisfaction Survey
       1. Bickmore – Program Administration, Accounting, Litigation
          Management, Workers’ Compensation Claims Oversight, Loss
          Control, and Actuarial Services
       2. Acclamation Insurance Management Services (AIMS) –
          Workers’ Compensation Third Party Claims Administration
          Services

*Reference materials enclosed
3. Bartkiewicz, Kronick & Shanahan – Legal Counsel Services

4:00 PM

13. CONCLUSION OF WORKSHOP

*Reference materials enclosed
Board Meeting Information

To: Board of Trustees
From: Eddie Lucchesi, Manager
CC: Chris Eley, Legal Counsel
Date: 3/12/2018
Re: March 2018 BOT Meeting, Agenda Item 3f

3f. Correspondence Information

Letter from City of Lodi, notifying District of the Re-appointment of Trustee Jack Fiori.

Attachment
February 22, 2018

Mr. Jack Fiori
1021 Lakewood Drive
Lodi, CA  95240

Congratulations! The City Council, at its Regular Meeting of February 21, 2018, concurred with the Mayor's recommendation to reappoint you for an additional four-year term (expiring December 31, 2021) on the San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District Board.

On behalf of the Lodi City Council and the City of Lodi, may I extend to you our sincere appreciation for the time and talent you have continued to dedicate toward serving as a member of this important group. We wish you continued success in your endeavors to serve the best interest of our citizens during this upcoming term.

Again, thank you for your dedication toward improving the quality of life in our community.

Sincerely,

Jennifer M. Ferraiolo
City Clerk

JMF/PMF

cc: San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District Board
   B&C folder
   follow-up
4. CSDA FIELD COORDINATOR PRESENTATION: CSDA PROGRAMS, SERVICES AND 2018 UPDATE

Dane Wadie, Public Affairs Field Coordinator with the California Special Districts Association (CSDA), will be providing a presentation to the District's Trustees on the benefits of the District's membership in the CSDA. The District has been a sustaining member of this Association for over twenty years. He will be discussing the programs and services offered by this Association.

Attachment
Printing made possible by the California Special Districts Alliance, a partnership between CSDA, the CSDA Finance Corporation and the Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA).
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Board Member/Trustee Roles

Make and approve district policy
Set the direction of the district
Make decisions
Establish strategic goals and objectives
Be an advocate for special districts
WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW
as a Special District Board Member/Trustee

Commitment and Responsibilities
As a board member or trustee for a special district, you have committed to serve the best interests of the community, provide services that are essential to the community and represent the people who placed you into office.

With a strong commitment, there are a number of responsibilities as a board member/trustee on a special district board. Some of these will be identified and detailed in this handbook so that you will have an even better understanding of special districts and your role as a board member/trustee.

One of the most significant responsibilities as a board member/trustee is to understand that the board is a team and you need to work together as such. Understanding the dynamics of the group as well as the individual perspectives and opinions of the other board members that you sit with is crucial to the success of the team and district you represent. This unified approach will help to strengthen the district and provide the grounds for maintaining a clear vision of the future, a unity of purpose and a cohesive board of board members/trustees.

Additionally, the board of board members/trustees typically has specific responsibilities that coincide with their overall role as board members/trustees. For example, in the area of human resources, the board’s charge is to support and assess the performance of the general manager, approve personnel policies, establish salary structure and benefits packages, approve job descriptions and organizational structure, and establish a strong communications link between the board and general manager.

Another example of specific responsibilities can be seen when taking a look at some of the financial aspects of the district. Typically, the board will ensure that sound fiscal policy exists and that practices and controls are in place so that the district, staff, general manager, and board have direct accountability to their constituents. Furthermore, a board may be involved in such things as the approval of the annual budget, developing reserve guidelines, establishing financial goals, reviewing district finances, developing capital improvement plans, setting rates and fees, and the like.

Clearly, as demonstrated above, being a board member/trustee on a special district board entails a commitment to being actively involved in setting the direction of the district and, most importantly, serving the best interests of the community and the constituents that the district serves.

Accountability
Special districts, governing officials, and management are accountable to the voters and customers who use their services. Every special district must submit annual financial reports to the California State Controller and also must follow state laws pertaining to public meetings, bonded debt, record keeping, conflict of interest, and elections. Special districts are also required to submit salary data annually to the State Controller.

The role of staff and the general manager
The roles of the staff and general manager are very different from that of the board members/trustees, and it is important to understand what the responsibilities and reporting avenues are of each respective group.

The general manager and staff of the district are encouraged to make recommendations and play an active role in moving the district forward. Their main role is to maintain and advance the operations of the district and implement those policies, strategies, and directives that are approved by the board of board members/trustees. All directives for staff should be given by the general manager or designated supervisor within the district.

The general manager is the executive staff officer of the district and for the board of board members/trustees. He/she administers the district and has exclusive management and control of the operations and works of the district, subject to approval by the board of board members/trustees, and provides day-to-day leadership for the district. He/she delegates authority at his/her discretion and has authority over and directs all employees, including hiring, disciplinary action and termination. He/she seeks to carry into effect the expressed policies of the board of board members/trustees, including planning the short, medium, and long term work program for the district, facilitating constructive and harmonious board relations, preparing and managing the district budget, conducting studies, and delivering written and oral presentations.

OVERALL YOUR ROLE AS A BOARD MEMBER/TRUSTEE IS TO:

- MAKE AND APPROVE DISTRICT POLICY
- SET THE DIRECTION OF THE DISTRICT
- MAKE DECISIONS
- ESTABLISH STRATEGIC GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
- BE AN ADVOCATE FOR SPECIAL DISTRICTS

[Image of California Special Districts Association]
WHY GOVERNANCE IS IMPORTANT
By Davis Campbell, Governance Consultant | Trainer

Local boards are the reason, and really the only reason, why local control is local. Special district boards are the voices of the community. Boards are also a large reason why special districts exist.

The truth is that every elected or appointed public official needs to worry about governance; governance is what boards do. Governance is taking the wishes, needs, and desires of the community and transforming them into policies that govern the district. Survival of special districts as a concept depends in large part on how well we do our jobs as board members/trustees or trustees. The quickest way to destroy special districts is for the public to perceive districts as not responsive to the needs of the community or as not being governed effectively.

If governance is important, how do we do it well?
The good news is that in recent years a lot of work has been done on effective governance. Based upon a model developed by the California School Boards Association (CSBA) and adapted by the California Special Districts Association (CSDA), there are three critical dimensions to effective governance. The CSBA Effective Governance Model provides an in-depth examination of the three critical dimensions that interact to determine how a board operates and its effectiveness as an organization.

- First, the model looks at the board as an organizational entity;
- Second, the individuals who serve as effective board members and make up the board;
- And third, the specific jobs the board must perform.

All three of these dimensions or elements of a board must be viewed as a whole in order to truly develop an effective governance operation.

Components of the Effective Governance Model

The board as an organization
Any board, public or private, nonprofit or corporate, exists as an organizational entity, with its own unique organizational culture, norms, values, and operating style. There are attributes or characteristics that are consistently present in boards that operate in a highly effective way. Effective boards become known as effective because they operate in an organizational environment of trust, honesty and openness. These boards exhibit, as a team, the following characteristics:

- All board members are perceived to be equally legitimate—no matter how different or difficult an individual may be.
- The board strives to maintain a “no secrets, no surprises” operating norm.
- The board recognizes and accepts that conflicts and differences are inevitable, not necessarily “bad,” and must be faced and analyzed.
- The effective board tends to immediately turn to solutions rather than playing the “gotcha” game.
- The effective board treats all staff with dignity and respect.
- The effective board treats all community members with dignity and respect, even in the face of criticism and opposition.
- The effective board exhibits creative thinking, knows how to handle failure as well as success, encourages risk-taking and creates a climate of support for excellence.
- The effective board assumes collective responsibility for the conduct, behavior and effectiveness of the board.
The board leader
While boards develop unique organizational cultures, they are, after all, composed of individuals. It is individuals and their values, skills, and knowledge that shape how boards operate at any given time. Individuals also determine whether the board will sustain effective behavior as a group role.

Not everyone who serves on a special district board becomes an effective board member or leader. Those who do become effective board members also become highly valued community leaders. When an entire board is composed of truly effective board members rather than individuals, the board becomes highly effective.

So, what are the characteristics of effective board members and how are they different than those who just serve on boards?

- Effective board members think about governance differently. They have distinctly different attitudes from non-effective board members. Effective board members understand the fundamental role of the citizen leader in the governance of special districts.

For example, effective board members understand fundamental principles of effective governance. They understand that the authority of any board member rests only with the board as a whole; that the board, not the individual board member, governs the special district. They tend to worry when an individual is attempting to impose his own agenda on the district rather than working to build support for an institutional agenda.

- Effective board members know that how a board member governs is as important as what a board member does. They know that manners make a huge difference.

- Effective board members work hard to make the team successful.

- Effective board members understand they need to establish trust. They treat everyone with respect, and expect others to treat them the same way.

- Effective board members respect the diversity of perspective and styles.

- Effective board members always keep confidential information confidential.

The real challenge to special districts is how to learn and achieve as board members. There are governance skills required and to be learned in order to be effective. But first, we must establish a culture of participation in our special district community. Every board member must understand that, just as we expect our staff to be involved in their profession, to learn and develop new skills, so too must we as effective board members learn and hone our governance skills. We must encourage our colleagues to branch out and learn the skills of governance. We must establish a culture of participation and continuing education in the special district community. The future of special districts in California depends upon it.

What effective boards do: The special district board's job in the district
The third dimension addresses the specific responsibilities of the governing board. We know that effective boards have strong competency-based cultures and that individual effective board members have strong governance skills, but the third question is: To do what? What are the duties and responsibilities of boards in the systems? The answer is that special district boards have certain responsibilities that no one else in the system can perform.

The specific responsibilities of the board are clustered into four areas: setting the direction for the district; establishing and supporting the structure of the district; holding the district accountable on behalf of the community; and serving as community leaders.

These are the essentials of effective district governance: a competency-based, highly effective board organization and culture; individual citizens serving as effective board members, accomplishing the specific duties and responsibilities that only governing boards can do on behalf of their communities.

SPECIAL DISTRICT RESOURCES
California Special Districts Association
www.csda.net
Senate Local Government Committee
www.sen.ca.gov
Assembly Local Government Committee
www.assembly.ca.gov
Official California Legislative Information
www.leginfo.ca.gov
League of California Cities
www.cacities.org
California State Association of Counties
www.counties.org
California Local Government Finance Almanac
www.californiafinance.com
California Association of LAFCos
www.calafco.org
Governor's Office of Planning & Research
www.opr.ca.gov
California State Controller's Office
www.sco.ca.gov
California Legislative Analyst's Office
www.lao.ca.gov
Special District Leadership Foundation
www.sdlf.org
Special District Risk Management Authority
www.sdrama.org
CSDA Finance Corporation
www.csdafinance.net
What are special districts?
Special districts are a form of local government. They are created by their constituents to meet specific service needs for their communities. Most perform a single function such as water delivery, fire protection, wastewater or cemetery management to name just a few. Some, like community services districts, provide multiple services.

Special districts are not cities and counties, they are not school districts, they are not Mello-Roos districts, and they are not state government. Special districts work hand-in-hand with cities and counties to provide communities with essential public services and to keep pace with the demands of fulfilling all the public service needs of California’s rapidly growing population.

What kinds of special districts are out there ... to name a few?
- Airport
- Public Cemetery
- Community services
- Drainage
- Flood control
- Fire protection
- Healthcare/hospital
- Harbor/port
- Irrigation
- Library
- Mosquito abatement and vector control
- Police protection
- Reclamation
- Recreation and park
- Open space
- Resource conservation
- Sanitation/wastewater
- Transit
- Utility
- Water
- Water conservation
- Waste management

How does a special district differ from a city or county?
Special districts are limited-purpose local governments. They provide only the services their residents desire within a designated, limited boundary. By contrast, cities and counties are general-purpose local governments. They provide a broad array of services for residents throughout their geographic boundaries. Furthermore, counties in unincorporated areas, and cities are responsible for land-use decisions.

What is the difference between independent special districts and dependent special districts?
Independent special districts are governed by their own boards of board members/trustees who are elected by voters or appointed to fixed terms by elected officials in their districts. These boards do not consist of ex officio members who are officers of the county or another local agency. About two-thirds of the state’s special districts are independent special districts.

Dependent special districts are governed by other, existing legislative bodies such as a city council or a county board of supervisors, or appointees that serve at the pleasure of those bodies and can be removed or replaced any time at their will.

How are special districts funded?
Special districts are funded either through local property tax revenues, fees charged to customers for their services or a combination of the two. Special districts that rely primarily on property tax revenues are considered non-enterprise, while districts that primarily generate revenue through fees for service are considered enterprise.
How are special districts created?
Special districts require majority-vote approval by citizens in the proposed district to be created, or a two-thirds vote if a new tax is required to fund the district's operations. When residents or landowners want new services or a higher level of service not otherwise provided by cities and counties, they can propose to form their own special districts to pay for and administer the services by applying to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

What is Proposition 13?
Proposition 13, enacted by voters in 1978, imposed strict limits on property taxes to one percent of property value, causing special districts, cities, and counties to lose much of their local control and funding security. Before Prop 13, special districts received $945 million from property taxes (1977-1978). Shortly after Prop 13 was imposed (1978-1979), special district property tax revenue dropped to $532 million, a loss of almost 50 percent.

What is ERAF?
ERAF is the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund. During the recession of the early 1990s, the state took property taxes from special districts, cities, and counties and shifted them into ERAF to offset its debt and spending obligations to education. That mandated property tax shift of precious local government revenue continues today despite the fiscal hardships it has caused local governments. Since ERAF began in 1992, the state has annually shifted over $500 million in local property tax revenue from special districts.

What is Proposition 1A?
Proposition 1A limited the state's future ability to transfer funds away from local governments, except in the case of fiscal emergencies. The amount is limited to 18 percent of property tax revenues in a county and must be paid back within three years, with interest.

What is LAFCo?
Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCo) are responsible for coordinating logical and timely changes in local governmental boundaries, conducting special studies that review ways to reorganize, simplify and streamline governmental structure and preparing a Sphere of Influence for each city and special district within each county. The LAFCo's efforts are directed to seeing that services are provided efficiently and economically while agricultural and open-space lands are protected.

Where do special district tax dollars go?

- Fire, Emergency, Medical & Police: 35%
- Transit: 17%
- Flood Control & Water: 27%
- Parks & Recreation: 9%
- Other: 12%
ELECTS LAWS
For Elected or Appointed Officials

Under the Political Reform Act, a public official may not participate in any way in a decision in which the public official has a "disqualifying conflict of interest". The law states that:

"No public official at any level of state or local government shall make, participate in making or in any way attempt to use his official position to influence a governmental decision in which he knows or has reason to know he has a financial interest."
California Government Code § 87100

As this applies to special districts, a conflict of interest regarding a particular district decision would exist if it were "...reasonably foreseeable that the decision will have a material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the official, a member of his or her immediate family..." or any of one's other financial interests.
California Government Code § 87103

In essence, the most important things you need to know about the Political Reform Act are:

- The law applies only to financial conflicts of interest—those arising from economic interests.
- Whether you have a conflict of interest depends heavily on the situation related to each district decision.
- The best way to avoid conflict of interest problems is to learn and recognize the various economic interests from which conflicts can arise.

In addition to the conflict of interest laws, public officials must also disclose all personal economic interests. Special district officials are affected through their respective district's conflict of interest code/policies that a district is required to have by law. Therefore, as a public official, you are required to file a "Statement of Economic Interests" with the Fair Political Practices Commission when you begin your term, annually and when you end your term.

In the Statement of Economic Interests, public officials are required to disclose all sources of income as well as interests in real property, investments, gifts and the like. Given that it's the law and also that the public, including media, have full access to statements of economic interests, it is recommended that officials be completely open, honest and always disclose all financial interests as this could help prevent future problems.

There are numerous other legal "dos" and "don'ts" for public officials, many of which deal with personal loans, gifts, free travel, payments, honoraria, contracts and holding dual offices. It is recommended that officials research all of the specifics of the laws related to their position.

Lastly, there are additional laws that affect public officials and violation of them may not only cause you to lose your position, but also may result in criminal penalties. According to the publication A Local Official's Guide to Ethics Laws (2002 Edition) some areas that can result in criminal prosecution and/or forfeiture of office include:

- Bribery
- Payments for appointments to office
- Willful or corrupt misconduct in office
- Embezzlement
- Misuse of public funds
- Violation of the Open Meetings Law/ Brown Act
- Prohibited political activities
- Conviction of a crime

As can be seen above, public officials are held accountable for their actions both by their constituents who elect them and by the law. As an elected or appointed official...
THE RALPH M. BROWN ACT
California Government Code §54950-54962

for a special district, it is your responsibility to promote ethical conduct within your district and understand the ethics laws to ensure that you are always keeping the interests of your constituents in the forefront.

AB 1234 and ethics training requirement
In 2005, the State Legislature passed Assembly Bill 1234 by Assembly Member Simon Salinas (D-Salinas), which requires local government officials to take ethics training every two years, with a requirement that they take their first training no later than a year after they start their first day of service with the district. This and similar legislation were proposed after incidences that occurred in several districts over lapses in ethical judgement.

Specifically, if a district provides any type of compensation, salary or stipend to any board member or provides any type of expense reimbursement, then all members of that board must participate in the ethics training, as well as any designated employees (like the general manager). The training must be at least two hours every two years, and a record must be kept by the district. These are public records and are subject to the California Public Records Act.

PUBLIC OFFICIAL ETHICS LAW RESOURCES

California Special Districts Association
www.csda.net

Institute for Local Government
www.ca-ilg.org

Fair Political Practices Commission
www.fppc.ca.gov

Official California Legislative Information
www.leginfo.ca.gov

Office of the Attorney General
www.ag.ca.gov

The basis of the Ralph M. Brown Act is that “All meetings of the legislative body of a local agency shall be open and public, and all persons shall be permitted to attend any meeting of the legislative body of a local agency ...”

While the Brown Act has gone through a series of additions and amendments, the core of the Act remains the same: to ensure that the meetings of local government bodies, formal or informal, be open and accessible to the public at all times.

The Act begins by stating the following:

“In enacting this chapter, the Legislature finds and declares that the public commissions, boards and councils and the other public agencies in this State exist to aid in the conduct of the people’s business. It is the intent of the law that their actions be taken openly and that their deliberations be conducted openly. The people of this State do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies which serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know. The people insist on remaining informed so that they may retain control over the instruments they have created.”

As public agencies, special districts must comply with the Brown Act. This means meetings must be open to the public and agendas posted in a location accessible to the public and on the district website if it has one.

The Brown Act is very detailed as to what is permissible and is amended periodically. It is recommended that public officials read the Ralph M. Brown Act in its entirety and receive some type of training and/or read various publications on the Act.

BROWN ACT RESOURCES

Open & Public IV: A User’s Guide to the Ralph M. Brown Act
www.csda.net

Search CA law/codes
www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html

Education/Trainings
www.csda.net
YOUR ROLE
AS A SPECIAL DISTRICT ADVOCATE

The special district community and its governing officials, more than ever, are coming together to create a presence and united voice. The California Special Districts Association (CSDA) is continuing to work to increase the visibility of special districts with key decision-makers and create a network of activists throughout California. All special district officials should play an active role in educating other local officials and legislators on special districts and the issues that impact their resources and services.

Special districts can no longer sit idle as competing interests vie for shrinking state resources. The time for active engagement is now!

Ever looming state budget deficits have necessitated increased legislative advocacy and grassroots engagement by special district officials in a more active and visible manner. It is the job of every elected official to educate state legislators early about special districts and gain support for protecting local revenues and services.

Meet with legislators
One of the key roles you can play as a board member/trustee and special district advocate is to meet with your legislators. Cultivating relationships with decision makers is essential; it is the most significant advocacy role you can play as a special district official. Meetings can be as simple as stopping by your legislator’s
local office to introduce yourself and the special district you represent, or even setting up a formal appointment to discuss issues that are facing your district and special districts in general.

Another possibility is to hold a breakfast or coffee event and invite the legislator and his or her staff to attend, or to take them on a tour of your facility. CSDAs Advocacy & Public Affairs Department can help districts set meetings with their legislators in the district or the Capitol. These are the most effective types of meetings.

**Respond to Calls to Action**
Throughout the legislative session, you may receive a “Call to Action” from various organizations, including CSDA. These Calls to Action typically pertain to a particular piece of legislation that will affect your district. It is imperative that you take a moment to review the information and take action! A visit, phone call, fax, email or letter to your legislator can make a huge difference on issues that could affect your district, and how it operates.

CSDA also regularly updates its Grassroots Action Center with the top legislative issues facing special districts, including tools that help districts take action such as sample letters. If your district is new to such efforts, CSDA offers members a Grassroots Advocacy Guide as well as sample policies for taking a position on legislation.

**Get involved at the local and state levels**
CSDA encourages all special district staff board members/trustees to get involved in activities and events throughout the state. This includes participation in local special district chapters and LAFCo meetings, as well as statewide functions like CSDAs annual Special Districts Legislative Days. These are opportunities to learn and discuss the major issues of the year, as well participate in visits with legislators in the Capitol.

CSDA has a Grassroots Mobilization Survey, which asks board members and staff if they know a particular legislator, and how well they know that legislator. At specific points during the legislative session, respondents will be asked to make a phone call or two to that legislator to support a bill that promotes special districts or to oppose legislation that would harm districts. If you know a legislator, be sure to fill out the Grassroots Mobilization Survey.

**Work together with cities, counties and other special districts**
Much like the special district you represent, the cities, counties and other special districts near you play an integral role in your region. As a board member/trustee, you should work to establish strong relationships and help to create an atmosphere that is conducive to sharing information and ideas with other local agencies.

Get to know other elected officials in your area. This will help you to better understand issues facing other local governments and can also assist in identifying issues that each agency may have in common. Partnering with cities, counties and other special districts on common issues can bring additional influence to a specific cause or legislative matter and result in benefiting each agency’s constituents.

**RESOURCES FOR BECOMING A SPECIAL DISTRICT ADVOCATE**

California Special Districts Association (CSDA)
www.csda.net

League of California Cities
www.cacities.org

California State Association of Counties
www.counties.org

California Association of LAFCos
www.calafco.org

California State Senate
www.senate.ca.gov

California State Assembly
www.assembly.ca.gov
The California Special Districts Association (CSDA) is a 501c(6), not-for-profit association that was formed in 1969 to ensure the continued existence of local, independent special districts. For over 40 years, CSDA has been offering its members cost-efficient programs and representation at the State Capitol with a strong and diverse membership throughout California.

The association is governed by an 18-member Board of Directors elected by mail ballots. The Board consists of three board members/trustees from each of the six regions throughout California. Additionally, there are a number of committees and local chapters that provide input and guidance. The CSDA standing committees include:

AUDIT | EDUCATION | ELECTIONS/BYLAWS | FINANCE | FISCAL | LEGISLATIVE MEMBERSHIP AND RECRUITMENT

CSDA provides education and training, risk management and insurance coverages, industry-wide litigation, public relations support, legislative advocacy, capital improvement and equipment funding, collateral design services and, most importantly, current information that is crucial to a special districts management and operational effectiveness.

CSDA is the only statewide association representing all types of independent special districts. Membership in CSDA is a valuable district's investment in its future! Through membership, special districts take an active role in educating the general public, their constituents and legislators as to the important role that special districts play in California.

CSDA BENEFITS & SERVICES

The purpose of the California Special Districts Association (CSDA) is to provide special districts throughout the state with representation, advocacy, education and services that can positively affect their operations. While our governmental affairs program serves the interests of all special districts in the state regardless of their affiliation with CSDA, these efforts are only possible with the support of these same special districts. Get involved through membership!

Legislative and legal representation

Legislative advocacy: CSDA is the only voice in the Capitol that represents and fights for all California special districts, regardless of services provided. CSDA employs full time in-house lobbyists who review and monitor every bill introduced for its potential impact on California's special districts. Any bills requiring action are quickly brought to the attention of the CSDA Legislative Committee and Board of Directors in order to determine a position on each respective issue and then lobbied accordingly.

Litigation support: CSDA often involves itself in litigation, or pending legal cases, on behalf of its members, including testifying in court, filing amicus briefs and requests for publication, among others.

Competitive risk management/workers’ compensation/health coverage and financing opportunities

Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA): Through CSDA membership, districts can access quality coverage through SDRMA which has been created and run by special districts for 20 years. Because SDRMA is not subject to the profit-driven policies of private corporations, they offer tailored, comprehensive coverage at a substantial savings to special districts.

CSDA Finance Corporation: Need help funding capital improvement or equipment projects? The CSDA Finance Corporation was designed specifically to help CSDA members enhance revenues and reduce costs associated with these projects through the use of innovative finance programs.

Critical and current information

CSDA e-News: an electronic newsletter sent directly to your email every week, which includes updates on key legislation, information on new education workshops and trainings, and other important news that affects CSDA members and special districts in general. Additionally, there are job listings and sponsorship opportunities for those entities looking for publicity.

California Special District magazine: CSDA's bimonthly magazine, California Special District, is read not only by members of other special districts, but
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also by legislators and other decision-makers in the state. The articles highlight special district-specific topics, as well as broader policy issues that affect the state, like infrastructure and governance.

CSDA website — the CSDA website’s “Members Only” section houses tools and information useful to any and every special district and features, among other resources:
- A directory of your Senate and Assembly representatives and contact information;
- A list of bills important to special districts, CSDAs position on those bills and sample template letters for your district to use;
- Discounted pricing on publications at the online CSDA Bookstore;
- Reduced rates on classes and workshops by registering for an event through the Education Calendar;
- Links to additional resources related to special districts.

CSDA listserv: The email listserv provides a convenient way for CSDA members to discuss issues of importance with other special districts, share relevant information and get answers to questions from those most qualified to answer: people who have been through the same experiences.

Discount on publications: CSDA members receive significant savings on various guides, manuals and brochures offered through CSDA. Some of these include:
• A Local Official’s Guide to Ethics Laws: This comprehensive guide, published by Open & Public IV include: meetings, legislative bodies/committees, notice and agenda, teleconferencing, rights of the public and when to legally hold closed sessions. It is imperative that all district representatives have a clear understanding of the current Brown Act to avoid violations of the law.

• Sample Policy Handbook: This handbook is an accumulation of policies written and edited by Harry Ehrlich, as well as the adapted policies of various districts throughout the state. Handbook contents include: general board policies, including adoption and amendment of policies; over 80 personnel policies such as sexual harassment, advancement of wages, benefits, educational assistance and remuneration; operational policies on accounting, budget preparation and more; board of director policies such as the role of officers, attendances and committee makeup; board meeting policies regarding such issues as setting agenda, conduct and minutes; facilities development policies including annexation and environmental review guidelines. For a complete list of the contents in this handbook, contact the CSDA office.

Additional member benefits
Free legal advice: Every CSDA member is entitled to one hour of free legal advice to assist in resolving any legal issue or question. The CSDA legal counsel has been representing special districts for 50 years and is well versed in helping special districts in a variety of areas.
Local chapters: Several counties in California have a local chapter. These chapters provide a local forum for the discussion, consideration and interchange of ideas concerning local issues and CSDA’s purposes and direction. Not only do these local chapters advocate at the local level, they also help to inform the public of the benefits of local control, establishing a local communication network and carrying out programs of mutual benefit to member districts. Get involved locally!

Hardworking, dedicated staff: The staff at CSDA is fully motivated and working hard every day of the week to represent you and ensure your district’s success. We are here for you!

Professional Development Opportunities
CSDA is dedicated to providing high-quality educational opportunities at a reasonable price. The workshops offered vary from extensive board member and governance training to legal issues and the development of policy and personnel manuals. Workshops are offered throughout the year and at special district office locations throughout California. We now offer a variety of webinars specifically designed for special districts. Webinars provide yet another avenue to stay current and receive continuing education on a variety of topics.

Special District Leadership Academy
One of the most significant and comprehensive training series a special district board member should participate in is the CSDA Leadership Academy. The Academy focuses on four areas that all board members should know in order to do their jobs effectively. These include:

1) Governance foundations
2) Setting direction/community leadership
3) The Board’s role in human resources
4) The Board’s role in finance

CSDA has developed this program and curriculum in conjunction with experts in governance as well as highly experienced special district officials and managers.

Annual Conference
The CSDA Annual Conference is an opportunity for special district employees, managers and board members to receive the latest information about special districts and the issues facing them, as well as attend workshops on the latest management techniques. The conference is also an outstanding place to visit with exhibitors and meet and network with your peers from other special districts throughout the state.

Special District Legislative Days
CSDA’s Legislative Days is an annual two-day legislative conference in Sacramento. Special district leaders come to the state’s Capitol to exchange ideas with legislators and Capitol staff who are critical to the growth and survival of special districts and hear from key legislators and policy experts on topics that directly impact special districts. District representatives also get to know legislators, staff and policy experts in a casual setting at the legislative reception.

Special District Leadership Foundation (SDLF)
The SDLF is a collaborative effort of eight special district organizations dedicated to excellence in local government. SDLF has implemented the Special District Administrator Certification Program, which certifies those who succeed as one of the “best of the best” in their profession. The Foundation also has implemented a similar program for special district governing officials and has endorsed the CSDA Leadership Academy as its core governance training. Lastly, a program called Districts of Distinction showcases the best of the best in districts.

Open, Ethical Leadership: AB 1234 compliance
CSDA has worked in collaboration with highly respected law firms specializing in local governments to develop the content and curriculum for ethics training courses. Board members are required by law to take a two-hour ethics training course every two years and this workshop that CSDA offers satisfies this requirement. Remember—it’s the law!

Networking Opportunities
CSDA Annual Conferences, seminars and Special Districts Legislative Days provide unequalled opportunities to network with others in your chosen profession and discuss common problems, solutions and experiences.
A MORE ACTIVE AND VISIBLE APPROACH
For CSDA

CSDA is taking a more active and visible leadership role in advancing the cause of special districts.

One of the most significant goals of CSDA is to build support for special district issues by educating key decision-makers and the media about the value of special districts in providing essential services that voters want and need. By expanding our base of influence, we are raising the visibility and clout of special districts to make your voices heard.

CSDA is focusing more on the policy arena to strengthen special districts' voice and enhance your visibility in the State Capitol. CSDA has a focused mission toward grassroots and public outreach in strategic coordination with traditional lobbying efforts.

CSDA is positioned, now more than ever, as a powerful advocate, key resource and referral network on issues that impact special districts. This new approach signals an opportunity for us to elevate the profile and influence of special districts and to provide CSDA with the firepower it needs to become a leading advocate and key resource on issues that impact special districts.

To get there, CSDA will continue to:

• Build support for special district issues by educating key decision-makers and the media about the value of special districts in providing essential services that voters want and need.

• Focus on common interests and help districts better serve their customers by placing a greater emphasis on top-notch education and training in advocacy, governance, administration, risk management and finance.

• Strengthen our connection and value to special districts by improving our communications channels, information sources and membership forums.

• Focus on the Special District Leadership Academy—the only curriculum endorsed by the Special District Leadership Foundation.

Grassroots mobilization
CSDA's effectiveness on legislative matters is directly linked to the level of participation of special districts and we need active engagement in our advocacy programs to establish a strong and lasting presence. This means being continually responsive to calls for action and cultivating relationships with your constituencies and key decision-makers on the state and local levels to build a strong coalition of support.

CSDA is committed to an effective grassroots mobilization effort. As a special district board member/trustee, you may have relationships to state legislators that would be beneficial to the entire special district community in California. CSDA has a survey to find out who exactly you know in the Capitol so we can make that important connection when an important vote is needed to promote and protect special districts.

CSDA Core Beliefs

The CSDA Board of Directors believes that special districts are closest to the community and the most responsive form of local government in California.

The Board therefore believes that CSDA can and should:

• Be the leading and passionate voice for all special districts.

• Be aggressive and resolute in representing and advocating for the needs of all special districts.

• Strengthen support for special districts by educating the public, media and public policy makers on all levels on the value and function of special districts.

• Capitalize on the strengths of the diversity of special districts, fully representing all types and forms of districts.

• Be the premiere training provider for all special districts, striving for effective governance, leadership and administration.

• Provide a wide range of high-quality services and resources to member districts.
**Key Media Messages**

Special districts are an integral part of the local government framework.

Special districts work hand-in-hand with cities and counties to fulfill all of California’s public service needs.

Special districts are a form of local government. They are not cities; they are not counties; they are not school districts; they are not Mello-Roos districts; and they are not state government. Special districts are limited-purpose local governments providing only the services their constituents want and need.

Special districts fill voids in city and county services and heighten the level of services desired by their constituencies.

Special districts can serve single or multiple functions and can serve small neighborhoods or large regions. They tailor their services to citizen demand.

Special districts are funded either through a share of local property tax revenue and/or fees generated from their constituents who vote to form them and hold them accountable for all that they do.

Special districts are special because they provide focused services that residents in their communities want, need and approve at the ballot box.

No special district can operate without the consent of voters deciding what services they want for their communities.

Nearly all of California residents rely on special districts for some form of service that is delivered to their homes, businesses and/or communities.

Everyday, millions of Californians are served by special districts. This includes the water that brews our coffee in the morning, the parks our children enjoy, the street lights and the fire trucks we depend on, an evening BBQ without mosquitoes, the books that enrich our knowledge—all thanks to special districts.

Special districts serve the public by delivering critical, life-saving fire and police protection, as well as essential healthcare services.

Special districts are closest to the communities they serve and therefore provide expedient and responsive services to customers.

Independent special districts are governed by their own boards of directors. They are elected by voters in their district or appointed to fixed terms by elected officials in their district who are accountable to their constituents.

Special district board members and trustees all take an ethics training course every two years to ensure what they do on a day-to-day basis is compliant with state law and to best serve their constituents.

Special districts only provide the services that their constituents want and need.
Special districts can link costs to benefits. That is, only those who benefit from special district services pay for them. Those who do not benefit do not pay.

Special districts are open, visible and accountable to their constituents.

Special districts are visible because their services are either used or seen almost everyday by their constituents.

As public agencies, special districts must comply with the Brown Act, which means meetings of their governing boards must be open and publicly announced.

Special districts cannot be formed without the consent of a majority of voters in their districts, and they cannot raise taxes without two-thirds support.

Special districts are accountable to voters and the customers who use their services. They must submit annual financial reports to the State Controller and also must follow state laws pertaining to public meetings, bonded debt, record keeping and elections.

Special districts do their jobs and do their jobs well. Like any public entity, not much is reported about them when customers are pleased and things are going well. It's typically when controversy arises like a rate hike or service reduction that they become more apparent. As the Little Hoover Commission agrees: "No news is good news. The vast majority of special districts are successful and clearly many are."

Special districts and the core services they provide will be devastated if the state continues to balance the books off the backs of local governments.

Special districts have lost $10 billion since the state began shifting local property tax revenue to offset its own debt and spending obligations as far back as 1992 and it continues to shift over $500 million per year.

Property tax revenue losses are particularly difficult for independent special districts because, unlike cities and counties, property tax revenue is often the sole or primary source of funding for the provision of services.

Loss of additional local government revenue to the state presents a serious hardship for many independent special districts that can only be absorbed by program cuts and staff and service reductions.

It's unfair to ask residents of special districts to replace the property tax revenue taken by the state that they originally voted to go to special districts. This could result in double taxation on these residents just to restore the same services to their original level.
RESPONSES to tough questions

Why are some special districts supported by property taxes, others by fees or both?

Special districts designated as "non-enterprise districts" are funded through a portion of property taxes. They don't lend themselves to fees because the services benefit the entire community and not just individual residents. About three-quarters of the state's special districts are non-enterprise districts. Some of them include libraries, police and fire protection, mosquito and vector control, and public cemeteries. Though non-enterprise districts rely overwhelmingly on property taxes for their operational expenses, certain services, such as a park district's pool, can generate a small amount of fee revenue.

Special districts that are designated as "enterprise districts" run more like a business enterprise and therefore charge customers "user fees" for specific services provided. For example: water rates for the amount of water consumed or room charges for patient hospital stays. Virtually all water, wastewater and healthcare districts are enterprise districts.

Both enterprise and non-enterprise districts can pursue bonds to pay for capital improvements—for instance, to pay for a new dam or library building. In such cases they must receive a two-thirds majority vote to issue general obligation bonds backed by property taxes.

While some enterprise districts are supported by both property taxes and user fees, the property tax revenue they receive is typically minimal and primarily used to pay for their bond debts and/or stabilize rates.

How are special districts staffed? Don't they have board members who are heavily compensated for doing very little?

The staffing of special districts is based on size and budget. Some rural districts operate only with volunteers or staff that is paid minimally. For others, the administration or staffing may require a larger commitment of resources. The budget allocated for the operational needs of the special district is approved by an elected board in a public meeting. Board member compensation is set in statute by the Legislature. Some districts have the statutory authority to adjust their board member compensation.

Can special districts tax a resident without his/her consent?

No. Proposition 13 limited property taxes to one percent of property value. Many special districts get a share of these revenues and if they require additional revenue, they must get the approval of voters by a two-thirds majority.

Once a special district is formed, how much is a resident taxed for the services received?

The individual is taxed based on a portion of what is reallocated to that special district from the total amount of property tax revenue collected for local government purposes.

If a special district wants more than what the original allocation provided, it can request "special taxes" but Prop 13 and state law require that special taxes be approved by a two-thirds majority vote. A general obligation bond that raises property taxes also requires two-thirds voter approval.

Special assessments are another way voters can pay for special district services. But unlike special taxes, property owners pay benefit assessments only for the projects or services that directly benefit their property such as sewers, parks and water systems. In such cases, the amount of the assessment must be directly related to the benefit received. Proposition 219 enacted in 1996 required local governments, including special districts, to get weighted ballot approval from property owners before they can levy benefit assessments.

Why do we have Mello-Roos districts and special districts funding our services? Doesn't that amount to double taxation?

Mello-Roos is just a funding mechanism. You cannot visit or see a Mello-Roos district. Special districts deliver services; Mello-Roos districts do not. California law allows many special districts along with cities and counties and schools to establish Mello-Roos districts to finance public works and public services. Local governments use Mello-Roos solely as a financing tool to provide the essential services their constituents want and need.

Wouldn't you say special districts are the worst form of fragmented government?

Special districts actually are the best real-world solution to meet the essential public service needs of citizens that are not already being met by cities and counties because of a lack of funding or infrastructure.
RESPONSES

to tough questions

There are approximately 2,100 special districts compared to 480 cities and 58 counties. Why so many and why can’t they be consolidated to save taxpayers money?
What really matters is the quality of services and how well a special district responds to the customers it serves. Consolidation may work in some cases. In fact, CSDA and special districts are open to reorganization if it is deemed to be cost-effective, lead to increased efficiency and is supported by the constituents they serve.

But when special districts merge into a larger district, they must serve a much larger area. And when that happens, they may become further removed from the neighborhood residents who originally created them. Consolidation, often, may end up costing customers more in the long run. First, costly studies must be conducted to determine if merging is even feasible or acceptable to voters. After that is done, the districts may find that they lack the infrastructure to consolidate if, for instance, existing sewer or water pipes cannot be connected or replaced to cover larger areas.

Aren’t special districts seen as inefficient because of the abundance of services that seem to overlap or are duplicative?
While special districts may dot many local landscapes, they are the closest public agencies to the communities they serve and therefore are able to provide the most expedient and responsive services. Furthermore, because special districts focus on a single function or limited functions, they are able to focus their efforts, which leads to discipline and innovation.

Every county has a Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) that ensures the services provided by special districts and other local agencies do not overlap. LAFCOs also conduct Municipal Service Reviews on special districts every 5 years.

What is ERAF?
ERAF is the Education Revenue Augmentation Fund. During the recession of the early 1990s, the state took property taxes from special districts, cities and counties and shifted them into ERAF to offset its debt and spending obligations. That mandated property tax shift of precious local government revenue continues today despite the fiscal hardships it has caused local governments.

How much has been lost because of ERAF?
Since ERAF began in 1992, the state has shifted over $10 billion in local property tax revenue from special districts, and continues to shift about $500 million per year.

If special districts are hurting for so much funding because of ERAF and Prop 13, why do some have such huge reserves?
Special districts, like cities and counties, need reserves to ensure they can respond to their constituents in the event of emergencies or disasters like flooding and earthquakes. Prudent reserves often are needed to accumulate the capital to pay for large public works projects. In addition, reserves provide a safety cushion in lean years, stabilizing consumers’ rates.

CSDA has developed the Special District Reserve Guidelines, a comprehensive guide for accumulation and management of special district reserves. The report sets strict policy procedures and high standards for all independent special district members to follow in handling their fiduciary responsibilities.

Note: The Guidelines are available through CSDA at no cost to members.

What’s to stop some special district administrators from using these reserves for high-priced junkets or for “official meetings” that turn out to be nothing more than free vacations?
Local accountability is key here. As the public agencies that are closest to the people they serve, special districts are directly accountable to their constituents. As such, their leaders will be held to answer to the voters who elected them or elected officials who appointed them for any actions that come into question.

How are special districts scrutinized? Who are they accountable to and how often must they undergo checks and balances?
Special districts are accountable to the voters who elect their boards of directors and the customers who use their services—just like city council members, boards of supervisors, and state and federal legislators. Special districts must submit annual financial reports to the California State Controller and also must follow state laws pertaining to public meetings, bonded debt, record keeping and elections.

As public agencies, special districts must comply with the Brown Act. Meetings must be open and public. Special districts cannot form, their rates cannot increase nor can their governing boards be elected without the consent of a majority of voters in their district.
IN SUMMARY

In summary, being a special district board member/trustee is an important job and one that should be taken seriously. Clearly, the position requires that elected or appointed officials wear numerous hats and be knowledgeable in a wide range of areas. The California Special Districts Association (CSDA) has developed this handbook to provide board members/trustees with some of the core information that is needed to be an effective and productive official within a special district. CSDA encourages officials to do further research, use the resources referenced throughout the handbook, participate in continuing education opportunities and seek the expertise of legal counsel where appropriate.

Most importantly, use CSDA as the first resource on special district issues. We welcome any feedback on this handbook or how CSDA can better serve special districts in California. 877-924-2732.

“
The most remarkable thing about our country is that; ordinary citizens control almost every major institution, public and private ... Does this make sense? What it makes is a democracy. We, the people, govern ourselves.”

Henry N. Brackell, Regina H. Paul in Time for Curriculum
Board Meeting Information

To: Board of Trustees
From: Eddie Lucchesi, Manager
CC: Chris Eley, Legal Counsel
Date: 3/13/2018
Re: March 2018 BOT meeting; Agenda Item 5

5. MEETING WITH BRENT LESOVSKY REGARDING LDA PARTNERS PROPOSAL FOR ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES

The Board of Trustees, at their February 2018 regular meeting, discussed the proposal from LDA Partners to provide architectural services to design and engineer improvements to the front lobby of the District’s Stockton office.

In review, I initiated the services of Brent Lesovsky of LDA Partners, based on his experience in completing these types of projects for other commercial businesses. To that end, Mr. Lesovsky created a preliminary design for enhanced security to the front entrance of the Stockton office, and provided the Board with an illustration of a preliminary concept for their review at our January 2018 regular BOT meeting. Following that meeting, the Board directed the Manager to proceed further by requesting a cost estimate associated with comprehensive architectural services for the proposed project.

During the February 2018 regular meeting, the Board presented questions regarding details within Mr. Lesovsky’s proposal and related costs associated with the scope of work. Through Board direction, I followed up with Mr. Lesovsky to seek clarification regarding some of the questions presented to me by the Board. Following my review, Mr. Lesovsky offered to discuss his proposal with the full Board, and field any questions regarding his proposal.

Following the meeting with Mr. Lesovsky, the Board will direct staff on how to proceed with further development of this proposed project.

This item requires Board action.

Attachment
February 9, 2018

Mr. Eddie F. Lucchesi
Mosquito & Vector Control District
San Joaquin County
7759 South Airport Way
Stockton, CA 95206

RE: Proposal for Architectural Services
Lobby and Security Remodel

Dear Mr. Lucchesi:

It has been our pleasure working with you and the Board through the schematic design for enlarging the lobby and enhancing security. This proposal addresses the continuation of architectural and engineering services for the further development of the design and construction documents.

Consulting Engineers for this project include:

Accessibility Consultant: Pacformance
Structural Engineer: J.H. Lawder, Inc.
Electrical Engineer: EJQ Electrical Engineering (tentative)

The Architectural Services shall include the following:

1. Meet with yourself to review and confirm the design to date, project budget, and schedule.
2. Proceed with design development.
3. Issue background drawings to consulting engineers for their use in preparing documents for construction.
4. Prepare and submit preliminary estimate of probable cost.
5. Prepare architectural construction documents consisting of drawings and specifications.
6. Present interior finishes for approval and incorporate into the construction drawings.
7. Coordinate accessibility, structural, and electrical consultants' work for inclusion into the construction documents. This proposal assumes that the existing HVAC capacity and distribution will not require analysis or alteration to accommodate the proposed work.
8. Coordinate owner furnished fixtures, furniture and equipment.
9. Assist Owner in submitting documents to the County for plan review and provide responses to plan check comments.
10. Field questions and provide addenda throughout the bidding process.
11. Provide construction administration including five site visits, responses to requests for information, and review of submittals.

Architectural services shall not include:

1. Additional services beyond those listed herein.
2. Invasive or destructive investigations.
3. Design and documentation for furnishings, equipment, IT, security, and communication systems.
4. Preparation of General Condition documents for bidding.
5. Required permit and regulatory fees.
6. Any testing, inspections, or soils analyses required by this work.
7. Review of bids and payment requests.
8. Additional services caused by project delays or interruption.
9. Additional services caused by Contractor errors or default in executing the construction project in a proper or timely manner.
10. Detailed inspections or testing before, during, or after construction.
11. Preparation of “as-built” drawings.

Fee Proposal:
The above services shall be performed for the fixed fee of Thirty Three Thousand Five Hundred and Forty Dollars ($33,540.00).

Authorized additional services provided on an hourly basis shall be in accordance with the billing rate of the Independent Contractor Agreement:

- Principal Architect: $200.00/hour
- Project Architect/Manager: $165.00/hour
- Draftsman: $155.00/hour
- Clerical/Staff: $95.00/hour

Reimbursable expenses are in addition to the compensation for basic services and shall include the actual expenditures made by the Architect and his employees in the interest of the project. Reimbursable expenses shall be billed as cost plus 15% to be as itemized as follows:

- Reproduction Costs
- Shipping/Postage
- Telephone Charges
- Computer Plotting
- Mileage/Travel outside of San Joaquin County

General Conditions:

1. Changes to the scope of work shall be subject to renegotiation. This proposal is subject to renegotiation if not agreed upon within sixty (60) days.
2. All work will be billed monthly for service performed to date. All monthly billings not paid within 30 days shall be considered past due, and shall accrue interest from the 31st day at a rate of 1-1/2% per month or 18% per annum.
3. Should the project be terminated or extended beyond sixty days from the date of this proposal, the Architect shall be compensated for all services performed to date. The Architect may, at his discretion, terminate services if payments are not made within 60 days.
4. Drawings and specifications as instruments of service, not products, shall remain the property of the Architect, whether the project for which they are intended is executed or not. The Owner shall be permitted to retain copies of Architect's work for information and reference in connection with the Owner's use of the project. The Owner or others shall not use the drawings or other work, for other projects, for additions to the project, or completion of the project by others, except by written agreement by Architect.
5. Services provided by the Architect and his Consultants will be performed in a manner consistent with that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the same profession currently practicing under similar circumstances.
6. Should the project be terminated or extended beyond sixty days from the date of this proposal, the Architect shall be compensated for all services performed to date.
7. LDA Partners, LLP cannot assume responsibility for construction means, methods, techniques, sequences or procedures, safety precautions, programs connected with the work, or for acts and omissions by the Contractor, subcontractors, or others.

If this proposal is acceptable, please sign below and return a copy to our office.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this proposal. LDA Partners look forward to a continued and successful relationship with yourself and the Mosquito and Vector Control District.

Sincerely,

Brent Lesovsky AIA.
C9733

Representative
San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District

Date

BL:pm

Lobby & Security Remodel
Mr. Lucchesi

Page 3
February 9, 2018
Board Meeting Information

To: Board of Trustees
From: Eddie Lucchesi, Manager
CC: Chris Eley, Legal Counsel
Date: 3/15/2018
Re: March 2018 BOT Meeting, Agenda Item 7

7. REVIEW / DISCUSSION / ACTION TO ACCEPT THE 2017 DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT

Attached is a copy of the District’s 2017 Annual Report. The report summarizes administrative, operational, and technical aspects of the District’s mission and services.

Following review and acceptance by the BOT, staff will make the report available on the District’s website and distribute electronic copies of the report to the following entities:

1. City of Escalon
2. City of Lathrop
3. City of Lodi
4. City of Manteca
5. City of Ripon
6. City of Stockton
7. City of Tracy
8. San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors
9. SJC Agricultural Commissioner
10. SJC Public Health Services
11. SJC Environmental Health Department
12. SJC Grand Jury
13. Local Legislatures

This item requires Board action.

Attachment
The District's Board of Trustees meets on the third Tuesday of each month at 1:00 p.m. at the District's office:
7759 S. Airport Way Stockton, CA 95206
(209)982-4675 or 1-800-300-4675, district@sjmosquito.org

Page 4 and page 20 photo of mosquito, tick and erythema migrans courtesy of James Gathany - CDC
On behalf of the Board of Trustees and staff of the San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District (District), I am pleased to submit the 2017 Operational and Fiscal Year Report. This report includes information on District administration and operations during the past year.

Financially, the District experienced a 3% increase in revenues from that of 2016, primarily due to an increase in property values and increases in commercial and residential real estate development. Since the mid-nineties, local property taxes earmarked for the District continue to be diverted to the State of California’s Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF). These revenue diversions have prompted the District to continue implementing the Mosquito, Vector, and Disease Control assessment approved by County landowners in 2005. This nominal charge generates a revenue stream that helps address vector-borne disease surveillance and operational control measures, community education and outreach activities, and as last year other related vector control operations to address the arrival of invasive mosquito species.

Operationally, staffing levels were maintained to meet the challenges of West Nile virus (WNV). For 2017 WNV activity was similar to that of 2016 regarding collected mosquitoes infected with the virus. Although higher mosquito vector populations were collected, the infection rate of those mosquitoes tested in 2017 was 5% less than that of 2016. In addition, there was a decrease in infection levels of recovered dead birds from that of 2016 and a decrease in horse cases from eight in 2016 down to two in 2017. Although statewide there was a decline of human cases, the number of confirmed human cases for San Joaquin County increased to 14, as compared to 12 cases in 2016. The District emphasizes virus detection in local mosquito populations in the efforts to prevent the further spread of mosquito-borne diseases. These efforts were extremely important during this past year.

In the early spring of 2017, the District was faced with the challenge of responding to mosquito breeding in the areas affected by the aftermath of the January and February storms. The affected areas were expansive, and required numerous aerial larvicide applications to control mosquito larvae found in these areas. The District’s work was increasingly important, due to the fact that these locations were hot spots for WNV activity during the three previous years. We were faced with unforeseen challenges related to the damages from these storm events, and the necessity to educate our public regarding the mosquito control efforts along designated areas most affected by these storms and related flooding was crucial. The District’s comprehensive approach to ensure the prevention of mosquito-borne virus located in or near the affected flood-lands proved to be successful when comparing the high mosquito vector populations to the percentage of WNV infection.

Surveillance and control measures were implemented using the District’s integrated pest management (IPM) plan and the California Mosquito-Borne Disease Surveillance and Response Plan. These plans are used to detect and respond to West Nile virus activity. In 2017, the District continued the use of specific trapping devices used to collect new invasive mosquito species such as Aedes aegypti (the Yellow Fever mosquito) and Aedes albopictus (the Asian Tiger mosquito). The District continues to refine diagnostic work in the laboratory, and consistently tests the effectiveness of mosquito control products. Public education is invaluable to ensuring landowners and water managers operate their property in a manner that does not create a public nuisance. In addition, we must annually examine our revenue sources and budget expenditures to remain as fiscally sound as possible.

Mosquito and vector control is an important service of public health protection. We remain vigilant in the effort to consistently prevent the spread of WNV and annually evaluate our response strategies in preparation for the arrival of invasive mosquito species capable of spreading mosquito-borne diseases. The Board of Trustees and staff should be commended for their continued dedication and tireless work in providing a quality mosquito and vector control program for the residents and visitors of San Joaquin County.

Respectfully submitted,

Eddie Lucchesi,
Manager

Respectfully submitted,

Eddie Lucchesi, Manager
Board of Trustees

Jay Colombini - San Joaquin - County President
Omar Khweiss - City of Lathrop - Vice president
Greg Selna - City of Tracy - Secretary
Jack V. Fiori - City of Lodi
Francis Groen - City of Ripon
Gary Haskin - City of Escalon
Gary Lambdin - City of Stockton
Michael Manna - San Joaquin County
Gregory O'Leary - San Joaquin County
Glenn Page - City of Manteca
Marc Warmerdam - San Joaquin County

Mission Statement
Adopted by the Board of Trustees
On May 21, 1996

San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District provides comprehensive vector surveillance and control services to enhance the public health and quality of life for the residents and visitors of San Joaquin County. As a locally controlled independent agency, we seek to fulfill our mission through the following commitments:

- To utilize the most advanced administrative and operational technology available;
- To provide stewardship for public funds by stressing efficiency in our operations;
- To encourage citizen participation in achieving our mission;
- To educate the public regarding the health implications of disease transmitting pests;
- To provide services consistent with an awareness and concern for environmental protection;
- And lastly, to provide and maintain a safe and effective public health pest management program.

San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District is an independent special district. The District’s operations are funded by San Joaquin County property taxes, a special tax, and a benefit assessment. The District is governed by an eleven member Board of Trustees, seven representing each incorporated city and four representing the county at large. The Board employs a manager who oversees program functions, hires and supervises staff. The staff consists of full and part-time employees to facilitate the daily district operations.
District History

In 1932, San Joaquin County health officials enlisted the aid of Civilian Conservation Corps to remove brush along streams to reduce mosquito producing stagnant water. In 1942, local citizens organized a petition signed by 3,800 residents to form a district. The Board of Supervisors formed the Northern San Joaquin County Mosquito Abatement District on January 22, 1945. A second district, the San Joaquin Mosquito Abatement District, was formed in 1955, for the remaining portion of the County. Due to the growing concern of encephalitis in the County, demands for mosquito control continued to increase. In 1980, by mutual consent of their governing bodies, the two independent districts combined to form San Joaquin County Mosquito Abatement District. The District expanded its mission to include another vector, ticks in 1992 & 1993. To reflect the newly adopted tasks, the District changed its name to San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District. To date, the District provides service to all of the residents and visitors of San Joaquin County covering 1,420 square miles.

(excerpt from original document)

Dated: January 22, 1945

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF
SAN JOAQUIN -- STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By: (W.R. Ruggles) Chairman

Attest: R. E. Graham, County Clerk
By: (J. R. Plummer) Deputy Clerk
Said motion was seconded by Supervisor Stuckenbruck and duly carried

NORTHERN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO ABATEMENT DISTRICT, RESOLUTION FIXING
BOUNDARIES
Supervisor Rimington moved that the following Resolution be passed and adopted, towit:

BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

RESOLUTION AND ORDER FOR THE INFORMATION OF THE
NORTHERN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO ABATEMENT DISTRICT

This matter came on regularly for hearing before this Board on January 15, 1945, at the hour of 11:00 A.M., in
the offices of the Board in Room 3 of the County Courthouse in the City of Stockton, County of San Joaquin, State of
California, being the regular meeting place of said Board, and as authorized by Section 2216 of the Health and Safety Code,
said hearing was adjourned to January 22, 1945 at the hour of 10:00 A.M., at the same place, and from the proceedings
and evidence the Board finds:

That due and legal petitions are on file in the Office of this Board, which comply with the provisions of Chapter
5, Division 3 of the Health and Safety Code and from testimony and evidence introduced, it appears to this Board that the
public necessity and welfare requires the formation of a mosquito abatement district; and this Board does declare and order
that the territory within the boundaries hereinafter described and which are hereby fixed and determined, be organized as a
mosquito abatement district to be known as the NORTHERN SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO ABATEMENT
DISTRICT.

This Board further finds and declares that certain objections and protests to the formation of
said District and to the inclusion of certain territory therein were filed, and the same were duly and legally heard and
considered and are hereby denied.

This Board further finds and declares that the territory hereinafter described includes the city of Lodi in said
county, and there is on file in the office of this Board the duly authenticated Resolution of the said City for its inclusion in
the District.
"Vector" Defined

According to the California State Health and Safety Code, Section 2002(K): "Vector" means any animal capable of producing discomfort or injury, including, but not limited to arthropods (mosquitoes, flies, fleas, lice, ticks, mites, etc.), small mammals (rabbits, rodents, etc.) and other vertebrates, but not including domestic animals.

Vectors can transmit infectious organisms that cause human and animal diseases. These diseases can be serious and sometimes fatal. Arthropods, particularly haematophagous insects, are the major group of vectors transmitting diseases (vector-pathogen) including encephalitis (mosquito-virus), malaria (mosquito-protozoan), typhus (flea/lice-bacterium), plague (flea-bacterium), dog heartworm (mosquito-roundworm), and Lyme disease (tick-bacterium). Encephalitis-causing viruses transmitted by arthropods are called arboviruses (Arthropod-borne viruses). The California Arbovirus Surveillance Program emphasizes forecasting and monitoring activity of St. Louis encephalitis (SLE), western equine encephalomyelitis (WEE), and West Nile virus (WNV). These viruses are maintained in the wild bird-mosquito cycles, and therefore are not dependent upon infections of humans or domestic animals for their persistence. Infections of humans and domestic animals by these viruses are transmitted by bites of infected mosquitoes that have fed on infected wild birds. WNV is currently of most concern in San Joaquin County. This virus was first detected in San Joaquin County in 2004 and reached epidemic risk levels in 2005 - 2008 and 2012 - 2017.

There are 17 mosquito species found in San Joaquin County. Three of them are of major public health concern; *Culex tarsalis*, is the principal vector of WEE, SLE and WNV, *Culex pipiens*, is the vector of WNV, and SLE, and *Anopheles freeborni*, the vector of malaria.

**Mosquitoes of San Joaquin County**

1. *Culex tarsalis*  
   Western Encephalitis mosquito

2. *Culex pipiens*  
   Northern House mosquito

3. *Culex stigmatosoma*  
   Banded foul water mosquito

4. *Culex erythrothorax*  
   Tule mosquito

5. *Anopheles freeborni*  
   Western malaria mosquito

6. *Anopheles franciscanus*  
   No common name

7. *Anopheles punctipennis*  
   Woodland malaria mosquito

8. *Aedes nigromaculatus*  
   Irrigated pasture mosquito

9. *Aedes melanomus*  
   No common name

10. *Aedes dorsalis*  
    No common name

11. *Aedes sierrensis*  
    Western treehole mosquito

12. *Aedes washinon*  
    No common name

13. *Aedes vexans*  
    Inland flood water mosquito

14. *Culiseta incidunt*  
    Cool-weather mosquito

15. *Culiseta inornata*  
    Large winter mosquito

16. *Culiseta particeps*  
    No common name

17. *Orthopodomyia signifera*  
    No common name

**"INVASIVE AEDES" MOSQUITOES - The Facts:**

- **Invasive Aedes** refers to two mosquito species, *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*. These two species are found in many countries throughout the world.

- **The District** is currently providing surveillance to detect these invasive mosquitoes. No invasive mosquitoes were detected here in 2017.

- **Invasive Aedes** have the capability to carry Zika, dengue, yellow fever, and chikungunya.

- **Call the District** if you notice daytime biting mosquitoes.
Mosquito Development

Mosquitoes complete a full metamorphosis: egg, larva, pupa, and adult. Critical to the mosquito’s life cycle is water. Egg rafts are laid on still or standing water. Each raft contains 100 - 300 eggs. The eggs hatch to larvae. The larvae grow through 4 instars, shedding their outer skin as they grow to the next stage. Once the larvae reach the 4th stage (or instar), they then transform to pupae. The pupal stage is the equivalent of the cocoon, where the adult insect body develops. Once development is complete, the pupae hatch off the water as adult mosquitoes. The adult female then needs to take a “blood meal” to provide necessary nutrients to her eggs. In warmer weather, mosquitoes complete a full metamorphosis, on average, in seven to ten days. Mosquito development around residential properties is the primary source for urban mosquitoes.

Find & Eliminate Mosquito Development Sources!

- Report Neglected Pools
- Remove Vegetation
- Clean Gutters
- Dump Standing Water
- Change Water in Bird Baths
- Keep Debris from Reaching Catch Basins
Integrated Pest Management

District operations are based on a concept that utilizes several different approaches to vector control. The concept is referred to as Integrated Pest Management (IPM). The District’s definition of IPM is “a sustainable approach, or plan, to managing public health pests and vectors, by combining, biological, chemical, legal, natural and physical control tactics in a way that minimizes economic, health and environmental risks.” IPM can also be considered as a systematic approach to public health pest management, which combines a variety of surveillance and control practices. With regards to implementing a plan to control vectors, IPM can be defined as socially acceptable, environmentally responsible and economically practical protection of the public’s health and well being. In the spirit of IPM, Integrated Mosquito Management (IMM), is a process that is directly related to the specific control of mosquitoes.

Since the need for mosquito control was recognized in the early twentieth century, increased knowledge of mosquito biology has driven the formulation of a variety of methodologies designed to successfully reduce both mosquito nuisance levels and mosquito-borne disease transmission. As the knowledge base from which these methodologies were derived have matured, the technologies are increasingly seen as mostly complimentary or synergistic in nature, providing optimal control as part of an overall strategy. IMM has been developed to encourage a balanced usage of cultural and insecticidal methodologies and habitat manipulations in order to minimize adverse environmental impacts. IMM is knowledge-based and surveillance-driven, and when properly practiced is specifically designed to accomplish the following:
1. Protect human, animal and environmental health.
2. Promote a rational use of pesticides.
3. Reduce environmental contamination to soil, ground water, surface water, pollinators, wildlife and endangered species.
4. Utilize natural biological controls to conserve and augment other control methods.
5. Use target specific pesticides to the extent possible.
6. Emphasize the proper timing of applications.
Mosquito Population Surveillance

The District collects mosquitoes in various types of mechanical traps to target specific mosquito species that are vectors of encephalitis viruses. The trap types are referred to as Encephalitis Virus Surveillance (EVS) traps and gravid traps, which are used extensively throughout the District covering different types of mosquito breeding sources. Upon placement, the traps run for 24 hours prior to collection. Contents of the traps are analyzed each week. Each trap's contents indicate the population in a specific area along with information about the mosquito species distribution. The data is submitted to the California Vector Borne Disease Surveillance Gateway system for compilation with other vector control agency data. In 2017, we collected record high numbers of mosquito vector populations since the arrival of WNV in 2004, with substantially higher mosquito numbers in the periods of April-June.

![Gravid Trap](image)

### 2017 Total Mosquito Collection

![Graph showing total mosquito collection for 2017, 2016, 2015, and 2012-2016 average](image)

In 2017, The District expanded surveillance activity for invasive *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* mosquito species, which are vectors of Dengue, Chikungunya, Yellow Fever and Zika virus. The District deployed mosquito oviposition traps (Ovitrap and GAT traps) in approximately 138 locations in six cities that include residential neighborhoods, nurseries, the Port of Stockton, freight carriers, RV Parks, marinas, tire dealers/recyclers, cemeteries and public parks. These two mosquito species have been discovered in San Mateo County, Merced County, Fresno County, Tulare County, Madera County and Southern California, but not been found in San Joaquin County.

![Ovitrap](image)
Mosquito-Borne Disease Surveillance

In combination with mosquito population surveillance, early detection of mosquito-borne diseases is critical to developing a proactive and effective control and prevention response. The District uses several surveillance methods to test for the presence of encephalitis viruses and other pathogens. These methods include testing wild dead birds and groups of mosquitoes for the presence of pathogens within their bodies using quantitative RT-PCR. For many years, dead birds and mosquitoes have been the earliest indicators of WNV activity in San Joaquin County.

In San Joaquin County, WNV was first detected in 2004 with three human cases, followed by intensive amplification and transmission resulting in 36 human cases and 19 horse cases in 2005. WNV activity subsequently went through a pattern of 2-3 years of average or below average activity followed by 1-2 years of moderately high activity. This pattern generally agrees with what has been observed nationally, although regional variations exist and outbreaks occurred intermittently in the nation.

The 2017 year is considered a high WNV activity year in the pattern cycle. The mosquito vector populations reached a historical high and the number of mosquito samples positive for WNV was the second highest since 2004. Although the WNV minimum infection rate in mosquitoes was at an average level, the overall WNV transmission in San Joaquin County still reached and stayed at epidemic planning levels during most of the summer period. Consequently, there were 14 human cases and 2 equine cases reported in our county.
Mosquito-Borne Disease Surveillance

From 2004 to 2017, a total of 26,191 mosquito samples (pools) from nine different mosquito species were tested by VecTestTM, RAMP® and/or RT-qPCR; of which there were 2,017 positive mosquito samples (7.70%) that were of species *Cx. tarsalis* (1,011), *Cx. pipiens* (983), *Cx. erythrothorax* (19) and *Ae. vexans* (4). In 2017, there were 2,975 mosquito samples tested for diseases, resulting in 242 collections being positive for WNV. In comparison, there were 353 out of 2,794 mosquito samples tested positive for WNV in 2016.

The District received dead bird reports from residents through the statewide WNV hotline (1-877-968-2473). The reports are used by the California Department of Public Health to create statewide risk maps. These maps assist the District in targeting areas for additional mosquito control efforts. From 2004 to 2017, the District received 13,767 dead bird reports and tested 1,861 birds, resulting in 543 positive birds. About 80% of the positive birds are corvids (crows, ravens, jays, magpies) and the rest are mostly passerine birds ( sparrows, finches, robins). In 2017, the District received 233 dead bird reports of which 40 able to be tested with 7 being WNV positive.

![Positive Mosquito Samples and Dead Birds, 2004 - 2017](image)

![WNV Activity In San Joaquin County, 2017](image)
Geographic mapping indicated that hot zones of WNV activity in mosquitoes are located in the Delta area, north portion of City of Stockton, City of Manteca, and along the southern border of San Joaquin County. The District will continue to employ robust and sensitive methods to monitor WNV activity in dead birds and mosquitoes.
The District is divided into 19 operational zones, each staffed with a state certified mosquito control technician. Zones are grouped into one of three regions under the direction of a regional supervisor. There are a total of 115 mosquito source types categorized by agricultural, natural, residential, and industrial/commercial sources. Examples include: field crops, animal waste ponds, irrigation ditches, natural drains, treeholes, containers, septic tanks, ornamental ponds, roadside ditches, railroad borrow pits, tires, storm water retention ponds, and catch basins.
Flooding of 2017 - Special Report

Early in 2017, California began to see relief from one of the longest drought periods in recent history. For a local comparison, in 2016 from January through May, San Joaquin County received 6.4 - 15.8 inches of rain fall (average of low to high collection sites) compared to 10.6 - 28.1 inches received during the same time period in 2017. The result: rivers in SJC were at, or over, maximum water capacity which resulted in small levee breaks, seepage, and flooded low lands. Sierra reservoirs went from drought historic lows to full capacity. Water was released daily in preparation for additional storms.

Homes, resort areas, homeless camps, industrial and agricultural properties all flooded. The results were early high mosquito counts, consisting mainly of *Cx. tarsalis* and the potential for a high level of disease transmission.

A review of the District’s surveillance records by California Department of Public Health showed “mosquito abundance in some of these areas was more than 2000-3000% higher than (the District’s) five year averages of these locations. In particular, some of these areas were along the San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Mokelumne Rivers and in the San Joaquin Delta.” With the significance of this event, quick action was necessary.

Early on, aggressive control actions began to take place. Technicians were documenting and reporting vast flooded areas. In response, additional EVS surveillance traps were placed in areas of greatest concern. Mosquito control efforts regarding specific treatment areas were communicated to the public. A news release titled “Mosquitoes-Storms-Flooding”, and a flyer discussing mosquito prevention after the rain storms, were sent via social media. The released information was well covered by local media.

In addition, Q&A talking points were developed for District employees to use when encountering the public. The San Joaquin County Office of Emergency Services (SJCOS) offered the District assistance with on-going communication on emergency conditions. As weather warmed, Sierra snow melt filled the reservoirs and water was released to already full rivers and tributaries. As a result, *Cx. tarsalis* numbers began to spike, prompting ground and aerial control applications.

Aerial larviciding and adulticiding occurred along the Mokelumne, San Joaquin and Stanislaus Rivers, as well as Delta island flood-lands. The District spent a total of $321,493 to treat 42,571 acres, as compared to the last three year average costs (January 1 - June 30 of 2014 – 2016) of $9,866 to treat 40.3 acres.
In early March, Governor Brown declared a State of Emergency in San Joaquin County in response to the February storms. Working with CalOES, a “Project” application was completed. After President Trump approved a Major Disaster Declaration, a subsequent request for public assistance was developed. FEMA began working with the District in developing a “scope of work” that required numerous supportive documentation. While working with FEMA, it became apparent that FEMA often handles “single event disaster”, but the winter storms continued to have affects through June due to the amount of snow melt released from the reservoirs which continued to sustain high water levels in the rivers.

On April 17, 2017 a second news release was sent out titled “Wet Weather Is Resulting In Many Mosquitoes and Other Bugs”. The news release was well received, being reported on television, newspapers and public radio.

An ad was placed in the San Joaquin Farm Bureau newspaper, as well as Her Life magazine. Contracted radio and electronic billboards began to run “Dump & Drain” ads targeted at homeowners to help keep mosquito numbers down.

In every disaster event, there are unforeseen situations that need to be addressed. As flood waters continued to spread to low land areas, new mosquito development areas emerged. This created a challenge in accessing, documenting and subsequently treating these new locations. Drastic fluctuations in river flows created additional problems regarding treatment. Applying chemicals with varied residual activity became a guessing game. Receding flood areas were treated with residual mosquito control products, only to be prematurely washed away when water was released from reservoirs preparing for additional storms.

In summary, Cx. tarsalis populations surged early in the year due to fresh water sources as a result of increased rainfall throughout SJC. It appears that the high Cx. tarsalis counts may have contributed to an earlier than normal WNV positive human case. The District’s comprehensive efforts resulted in a reduction of the overall Cx. tarsalis population. By week 24, June 11, 2017, the Cx. tarsalis population was back within the normal range for these affected areas.

Ultimately our goal of protecting human health from mosquito-borne disease was accomplished when compared to past yearly comparisons. During the drought year of 2016, 13 WNV positive human cases were reported in SJC. In 2017, 14 human cases were reported in SJC. The District discovered new potential mosquito breeding sites to monitor during future flood events. District staff is now more experienced in handling such situations. Ultimately, we were able to minimize the early Cx. tarsalis populations and protect human health during the 2017 flood event.

The final FEMA project worksheet, with supporting documentation was submitted to Washington D.C. for funding in September, 2017.
Public Outreach

The District’s public outreach aims to inform and educate the public of all mosquito related issues pertinent to San Joaquin County. These issues range from mosquito development and control methods, to the risk of mosquito-borne diseases and invasive mosquito species. To communicate timely and accurate information, we utilize news releases, spray alerts, annual reports, website posting, paid newspaper ads, radio and magazine ads, as well as school presentations and informational booths to accomplish that goal.

The following are the most notable outreach activities the District performed during 2017:

Large scale radio campaigns aim to increase awareness of mosquito development, mosquito-borne disease and invasive mosquito species. The District contracted with local radio stations to run 30 second ads on KATM 103.3, KWIN 97.7, KWNN 98.3 and KQOD 100.1. Also included in the purchase were two Hispanic stations KMIX 100.9, and KTSE 97.1. Partnering with Merced and Turlock Mosquito Abatement Districts, 645 commercials and 90 traffic spots were contracted to run from April through mid-September. The District also contracted to run 398 commercials on a local station KJOY 99.3 and KSTN 105.9 during the same time period. Live interviews were provided on KJOY, KATM, KSTE, KMIX, KTSE.

Special project: Because of the rapid movement of invasive mosquitoes in California, a public education campaign started mid-summer through October. Early detection of Aedes aegypti and Aedes albopictus may help to prevent these mosquitoes from becoming established in San Joaquin County. Radio ads, digital billboards, newspaper ads and magazine publications included the message, “Report Daytime Biting Mosquitoes”.

The District website is posted with all news releases and news alerts for adult mosquito spraying. As a result, we interviewed eight times with radio, newspaper and television. We received several front page newspaper articles, as well as, radio, and television coverage. Frequently, local papers print many of our spray notifications. The District contracts with GovDelivery as an electronic communication platform designed to bring website users to the District’s website, www.sjmosquito.org. GovDelivery gives total control to the end users who can sign up for several types of information as a opt in / opt out service. During the year, seven news releases and 47 spray alerts were sent. The website had 108,138 total visitors for the entire year, which averages 9,011 visitors per month. This is an increase of 43,163 visitors from 2016.

- Third grade students participating in three Ag Venture programs: 58 presentations with 1,486 students in attendance
- Fifth and sixth grade elementary students: 36 presentations with 61 classes in attendance totaling 1,829 students
- Presentations were provided to the Central Valley Association of Realtors, and the Stockton Rotary at the Stockton Country Club.
- 115 contacts were made during the District’s ninth annual mosquitofish giveaway held throughout San Joaquin County
- Educational Booths and Events: Earth Day, Senior Awareness Day at San Joaquin Fair Grounds, Ag Fest and San Joaquin County Fair, Costco Safety Day, and a health fair at Westwood School in Stockton
- The SJC Office of Emergency Services (OES) helped the District to distribute mosquito prevention tips, through social media, during the 2017 floods, as well as the District’s mosquitofish giveaway.
Public Outreach

**SAN Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District**

**AFTER ALL THE RAIN, IT'S TIME TO PREVENT MOSQUITOES!**

**DUMP AND/OR DRAIN WATER AROUND YOUR PROPERTY.**

Look for anything that can hold water for more than a few days. Buckets, dirty, neglected swimming pools, tires, trash cans, and rain gutters are some examples of areas where water stands and mosquitoes develop.

Call the District for free mosquitofish in abandoned pools and ponds.

For help or questions call San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District at: 209.982.4675, 800.300.4675 or visit our website: www.sjmosquito.org

---

**News Release**

**San Joaquin County Mosquito & Vector Control District**

**LOCAL AREA MOSQUITOES TEST NEGATIVE FOR WEST NILE VIRUS**

Date: Oct 5, 2017

Aedes aegypti mosquitoes tested negative for West Nile Virus.

---

**Online Newspaper Banner and Drop-down Ad**

**REPORT DAYTIME BITING MOSQUITOES!**

**EXPAND**

---

**INVASIVE MOSQUITO SPECIES?**

Invasive mosquito species are not native to the area and their introduction is likely to cause harm to human health.

**FACTS:**

- Aedes aegypti and Aedes albopictus are aggressive daytime biters.
- These self-seeking mosquitoes prefer to bite humans both indoors and outdoors.
- These insects feel threatened by cold and dry areas.
- They lay eggs in small amounts of water and are on the surface of containers.
- Once established, these mosquitoes are difficult to control.
- They are potential carriers of diseases such as Zika, Dengue and chikungunya.

---

**Magazine Ad**

San Joaquin Farm Bureau Newspaper
Biological Control

Biological mosquito control is one of the mainstays in protecting the public from mosquitoes and the transmission of mosquito-borne diseases. Biological mosquito control agents include a wide variety of pathogens, parasites and predators. The primary biological control agent used by the District is *Gambusia affinis*, the mosquitofish.

Mosquitofish are small, live-bearing minnows closely related to the common guppy. These fish are a vivacious consumer of mosquito larvae and pupae and can survive in varying water temperatures. Because mosquitofish are surface feeders, they are extremely efficient mosquito predators. A single mosquitofish has been said to consume upwards of 80-100 mosquito larvae per day. They are capable of quickly populating a source if conditions are favorable. The fish are placed in a variety of permanent and semi-permanent fresh water habitats such as neglected swimming pools, water troughs, rice fields, and wetlands.

The District’s White Slough Fish Rearing Facility is located at the City of Lodi’s White Slough Water Pollution Control Facility. The facility consists of thirteen rearing ponds and four above ground tanks. The ponds are capable of rearing 3,500 - 4,000 pounds of fish per year.

![Transferring mosquitofish from ponds to distribution tanks]

### Mosquitofish Planting Sites / Pounds Planted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fish Origination Site</th>
<th>Island &amp; Duck Club Flooding</th>
<th>Wildlife &amp; Ecological Reserves</th>
<th>Sewers, Retention &amp; Private Ponds</th>
<th>Rice Fields</th>
<th>Service Requests: Fish Ponds, Swim Pools, Water troughs</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td>White Slough</td>
<td>763.1 lbs.</td>
<td>524.7 lbs.</td>
<td>37.2 lbs.</td>
<td>690.4 lbs.</td>
<td>100.61 lbs.</td>
<td>48 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Fish</td>
<td>0 lbs.</td>
<td>0 lbs.</td>
<td>5 lbs.</td>
<td>0 lbs.</td>
<td>18.5 lbs.</td>
<td>15.4 lbs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Yr. Avg. 2012-2016</strong></td>
<td>White Slough</td>
<td>1429.6 lbs.</td>
<td>397.9 lbs.</td>
<td>80.3 lbs.</td>
<td>558.6 lbs.</td>
<td>614.48 lbs.</td>
<td>176.2 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Fish</td>
<td>20.8 lbs.</td>
<td>1.8 lbs.</td>
<td>13.0 lbs.</td>
<td>0 lbs.</td>
<td>58.0 lbs.</td>
<td>2.8 lbs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Physical Control

The term physical control refers to making an environmental or physical change to a mosquito-breeding source by physical or mechanical means. Physical control is also known as “source reduction”. Ultimately, physically changing the mosquito-breeding source can make the site less suitable for mosquito production.

Landowners and land managers have a responsibility to minimize mosquito production on their lands and play a key role in reducing mosquito populations throughout the District. The implementation of mosquito prevention Best Management Practices (BMPs) can reduce or eliminate the ability of aquatic sites to produce mosquitoes. BMPs are defined as actions landowners can take to reduce or eliminate mosquito production from water sources on their property in an environmentally and fiscally responsible manner, and to reduce the potential for transmission of disease from mosquitoes to humans.

In 2012, the California Department of Public Health and the Mosquito and Vector Control Association of California updated a manual of BMPs titled “BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR MOSQUITO CONTROL IN CALIFORNIA” which has been adopted by the District and is used as the standard set of recommendations for property owners to reduce or eliminate mosquito breeding sources on their property.

Each mosquito breeding source and property is unique, and the BMPs listed in this manual will apply to some properties, but not others. After evaluating their property, the District works with the landowner to implement applicable BMPs to reduce or prevent future mosquito breeding as well as to manage existing mosquitoes at that site.

Mosquito Control Best Management Practices At-A-Glance:

- Eliminate artificial mosquito sources.
- Ensure man-made temporary sources of surface water drain within four days (96 hours) to prevent development of adult mosquitoes.
- Control plant growth in ponds, ditches, and shallow wetlands.
- Design facilities and water conveyance and/or holding structures to minimize the potential for producing mosquitoes.

Chemical Control

Chemical control of mosquitoes is the application of natural or man-made compounds (insecticides) to reduce mosquito populations to tolerable levels. Chemical control methods are applied to obtain immediate control when physical and biological control methods fail to maintain mosquito numbers below a tolerable level or during an epidemic of mosquito-borne disease when immediate control measures are needed.

The District follows accepted principles of proper pesticide usage which includes: 1) Using pesticides as a last resort to complement biological, physical or natural controls; 2) Applying pesticides in a manner that minimizes harm to non-target organisms; 3) Using pesticides to treat specific sites where mosquitoes (which are causing annoyance or creating a public health problem) are breeding; 4) Applying pesticides selectively to the proper life stage of the mosquito; 5) Applying pesticides in a manner that will minimize personal hazard to the applicator and other persons in the vicinity; 6) Applying pesticides in accordance with federal and state laws and regulations.

The District is signatory to a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for applications of larvicides to surface waters. The permit is granted by the State Water Resources Control Board, which reviews the District's mosquito control activities in local waterways.
Chemical Control

Larvicides may be applied to water in which larvae or pupae are developing. Pastures, septic tanks, irrigation ditches, animal waste ponds, creeks, sloughs, catch basins, treeholes, and roadside ditches are examples of areas the District's technicians regularly inspect and treat to reduce mosquito populations.

Adulticides may be applied as space sprays, mists, or fogs to kill adult mosquitoes and as a residual insecticide on surfaces likely to be contacted by adult mosquitoes.

Herbicides are used to reduce mosquito habitat and provide better access for larvicide treatment, and biological control.

The chart below shows larviciding and adulticiding for 2017 with a comparison to a five year average. For acres treated with herbicide, see the table below the graph.

### Larvicide & Adulticide Applications In Acres Treated

![Graph showing larvicide and adulticide applications in acres treated with a comparison to a five year average for 2017.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table is in acres treated</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larvicide 2017</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>6082</td>
<td>3140</td>
<td>5331</td>
<td>8636</td>
<td>12147</td>
<td>14038</td>
<td>5007</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>2237</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larvicide 5 yr. avg.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>9800</td>
<td>16600</td>
<td>16476</td>
<td>6439</td>
<td>4168</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulticide 2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5825</td>
<td>18775</td>
<td>26397</td>
<td>38447</td>
<td>92089</td>
<td>89236</td>
<td>9822</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulticide 5 yr. avg.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>6181</td>
<td>24690</td>
<td>65232</td>
<td>75313</td>
<td>60077</td>
<td>20869</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbicide 2017</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbicide 5 yr. avg.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legal Abatement

The District incorporates local, state and federal statues to regulate excessive mosquito breeding on private and public lands. Using provisions of the California Health and Safety Code, the District can legally require property owners to reduce or eliminate mosquito breeding when it becomes a public nuisance.

Abatement of mosquitoes generally follows a three step process; whereby, the owner of mosquito-producing land is: 1) contacted and requested to take steps to prevent the occurrence of mosquito development and provided an “Information Sheet”; 2) if corrections do not take place, a “Notice to Comply” is issued; 3) if the condition persists, and the problem is not corrected, the District can initiate legal abatement proceedings per §2060 of the California Health and Safety Code. Fines of $1,000 per day can be levied for non-compliance once a legal abatement hearing has taken place and the property owner refuses to comply.

During the year, twenty-five information sheets were provided to property owners explaining how to reduce mosquito development on their property.

The District provided mosquito prevention Best Management Practices (BMPs) handouts for the reduction of mosquitoes to residential, agricultural, commercial, and industrial property owners. The above handout is available from the District: Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in California - 2012. The BMPs are often handed out upon request, during routine inspections, presentations, and public events.
Ticks & Tick Borne Disease

The most common ticks found in San Joaquin County (SJC) are: the American dog tick, *Demacentor variabilis*; the Pacific Coast tick, *Demacentor occidentalis*; and the Brown dog tick, *Rhipicephalus sanguineus*. The Pacific Coast tick is one of the most widely distributed ticks in California. Occasionally, the Western black legged tick, *Ixodes pacificus* is also found in San Joaquin county.

The District conducts surveillance for ticks in parks and river areas of SJC that are known habitat. Surveillance for adult ticks is typically performed during the months of November through April when ticks are most abundant. *Ixodes pacificus* is the primary species targeted during surveillance due to its ability to carry Lyme disease. During the year, surveillance was conducted along waterways, riparian areas, and foothill areas used by the public for recreational activities. Ticks may be submitted by local veterinary hospitals and the general public for identification.

In 2017, tick surveillance was performed at Camanche Reservoir and Carnegie Park. This year 10 male and 12 female *Dermacentor occidentalis* (Pacific Coast tick) ticks were collected. The District received a public specimen submission of Lyme disease tick *Ixodes pacificus* (the Western black-legged tick), which tested negative for Lyme disease.

Ticks adhere to the felt flag. A historical record of the location, date, and species are recorded. If the tick is a Western black-legged tick, it will be tested for Lyme.

Lyme disease is a serious illness that if left untreated, can have severe long term health complications. Initial symptoms of Lyme disease may include a spreading rash which may be accompanied by fever, aches and fatigue. Possible future complications of the heart and/or nervous system may occur, as well as severe arthritis.
Request for Service

The general public is encouraged to contact the District to request service. These requests generally are either to report a mosquito-related problem, request mosquitofish, inquire about information on ticks, insect/vector identification, or to request a property inspection. There is no charge for these services. San Joaquin County residents can call the District at (209) 982-4675 or 1-800-300-4675 or request service at the District’s website www.sjmosquito.org. The District usually is able to respond within 24 to 48 hours. During the year the District responded to 1,872 service request calls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mosquitoes</th>
<th>Ticks / Other</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>Property Inspection (Pools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY MOSQUITO AND VECTOR CONTROL DISTRICT

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balance - Governmental Funds

For the year ended June 30, 2017

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property taxes</td>
<td>$4,773,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property assessments</td>
<td>3,011,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant revenue</td>
<td>109,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>95,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax relief</td>
<td>94,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements and rebates</td>
<td>56,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues</td>
<td>2,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,143,376</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>4,159,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and supplies</td>
<td>2,992,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital outlay</td>
<td>262,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,417,346</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Excess of revenues over expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess of revenues over expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>726,030</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other financing sources (uses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from sale of capitol assets</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total financing sources (uses)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,900</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Change in fund balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Change in fund balances</strong></td>
<td><strong>737,930</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund balances, beginning of year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balances, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,679,303</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund balance, end of year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund balance, end of year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,417,233</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt from page 15 of the Financial Statements And Independent Auditor’s Report 2017
District Staff - Years of Service as of December 31, 2017

Fishery Staff

John Vignolo - Fish Hatchery Manager, 27 yrs.
Harold Carpenter - Fish Hatchery Technician I, 1 yr.

Field Staff - Northern Region

Keith Nienhuis - Mosquito Control Supervisor, 29 yrs.
Chris Heirs - Mosquito Control Technician II (MCT II) 10 yrs.
Janine Durham - MCT I, 12 yrs.
Sterling Thomas - MCT I, 3 yrs.
Adam Coles - MCT I, 2 yrs.
Greg Edwards - MCT I, 10 yrs.
Julian Ramos - MCT I, 3 yrs.
Norm Hopkins - MCT I, 13 yrs.

Field Staff - Central Region

Deanna Hopkins - Mosquito Control Supervisor, 17 yrs.
Bob Durham - Mosquito Control Supervisor, (Retired 30 yrs.)
Larry Nolin - MCT II, 33 yrs.
Dennis Keith - MCT I, 32 yrs.
Joseph Sarale - MCT I, 10 yrs.
Emily Pope - MCT I - 8 yrs.
Steve Duke - MCT I - 11 yrs.
Josh Diaz - MCT I - 1 yr.

Field Staff - Southern Region

Morgan Bennett - Mosquito Control Supervisor, 9 yrs.
Brian Heine - Mosquito Control Supervisor, (Retired 35 yrs.)
Martin Jucutan - MCT II 4 yrs.
Michael Corrales Jr. - MCT I, 10 yrs.
Richard Domench - MCT I, 3 yrs.
Michael Miller - MCT I, 3 yrs.
Roy Pfeifer - MCT I, 19 yrs.

Laboratory Staff

Dr. Shaoming Huang - Entomologist, 8 yrs.
Sumiko De La Vega - Assistant Entomologist, 4 yrs.
Mary Iverson - Lab Technician I, 19 yrs.
Adena Why - Vector Ecologist, 1 yr.

Management & Administrative Staff

Ed Lucchesi - Manager, 32 yrs.
John Fritz - Assistant Manager, 5 yrs.
Jamie Tuggle - Secretary, 3 yrs.
Aaron Devencenzi - Public Information Officer, 23 yrs.
Emily Nicholas - Bookkeeper / Administrative Aast., 15 yrs.

Mechanic Staff

David Vana - Mechanic II, 22 yrs.
John Moniz - Mechanic I, 8 yrs.
Board Meeting Information

To: Board of Trustees
From: Eddie Lucchesi, Manager
CC: Chris Eley, Legal Counsel
Date: 3/13/2018
Re: March 2018 BOT Meeting, Agenda Item 8

8. REPORT ON DISTRICT’S APPEAL OF THE CITY OF STOCKTON’S PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION TO ALLOW A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A MEDICAL CANNABIS CULTIVATION FACILITY AT 7979 S. AIRPORT WAY

As discussed during the February 2018 regular Board meeting, the District appealed the City of Stockton’s Planning Commission decision to grant a “Conditional Use Permit” to develop and operate a medical cannabis cultivation facility located at 7979 S Airport Way. The public hearing to consider our request before the City of Stockton City Council was held on February 27, 2018.

Prior to the meeting, I mailed a letter to each City councilmember, including the Mayor of Stockton, describing the concerns of the District. Eley and I reviewed the discrepancies found in the City of Stockton Planning Department’s review and recommendation for approval (staff report) to the Planning Commission, and listed noted inaccuracies to present during the public hearing. District Legal Counsel Eley and I presented our case relative to the District’s concerns of this approved “Use Permit” right next door to the District’s facility. Although not formally stated by the Mayor prior to our opportunity to speak before the City Council, we were only allowed three minutes to present our case in defense of our appeal.

Following our quick opportunity to voice our points for consideration of appeal, and following the presentation to oppose our appeal from the applicant, the City Council voted 5 - 1 to deny our Appeal of the Planning Commission’s decision.

Manager Lucchesi and Legal Counsel Eley will provide more detailed information relative to this appeal.

Attachment
INTRODUCTION TO CITY COUNCIL

Hand-outs for City Council. Reference letters provided to the Mayor and City Council.

Reference our Opposition to the project based on information provided by the Applicant and the Planning Department’s review where discrepancies were discovered based on provided information to the District from the applicant and that of the City staff review provided to the Planning Commission. District Legal Counsel Eley will be addressing those concerns.

Chartered in 1945, the San Joaquin County Mosquito and Vector Control District was formed due to the growing concern of encephalitis. In 1955, the District built its Stockton headquarters at its present location on 7759 S Airport Way. The District's headquarters is located directly north of the proposed site. The District's services provide protection to the residents and visitors of San Joaquin County from mosquito-borne diseases such as Western Equine encephalitis, St. Louis encephalitis, West Nile virus, and most recently, conducts surveillance work to detect the arrival of invasive aedes mosquitoes capable of transmitting the Zika virus.

To control these mosquitoes one must understand the timing of control operations to achieve the most effective results. The mosquito control technicians must be available to work hours when mosquitoes are most active. Primarily, the timing for adult mosquito control (flying stage of the mosquito) is completed during dusk and evening hours and early morning until dawn.

Thirty-five employees make up this work force responsible to conduct the comprehensive work that is necessary to achieve our goal of controlling these pests of public health concern. Our operating hours are unique, the field technicians start their work day at 7:00 am and inspect and treat mosquito breeding areas until the end of the work day at 3:30 pm. Monday thru Friday. During the height of the season (May – October), many times technicians return to the work site in the evening to conduct adult mosquito control operations. They report to the District at 6-7 pm and return from their spraying operations around mid-night. Conversely, there are times they are required to arrive at 3:30 a.m. to begin the work day, when spraying in congested urban areas.

Often times this takes place on weekends.

The proposed use to raise marijuana plants right next door is not in the best interest for our District and our employees. The amount of security being proposed for the 7979 S Airport Way location proves there is an obvious concern for an element of crime to transpire. You do not see this type of security implemented at any of the other businesses neighboring our property.

The “proposed” security is to protect the theft of plants on the proposed site, not to ensure the safety of the employees and associated operations of the neighbors, specifically north of the proposed site. The criminal element exists, we have seen and read the brazen efforts from those who have attempted to burglarize or rob these types of operations. This is a new frontier for the City of Stockton, and obviously a concern for the District, because there is no factual data from the city available to conclude the proposed security plan meets a police department standard, when there is no other City operating cannabis cultivation facility to compare to. So this brings forth the following question?

How does this operation affect our operations? Is the proposed security going to provide security at our facility at no cost to the District? If Not, is it fair to the County Tax Payers that the District use the Tax base that supports mosquito control on additional security measures to protect our employees? Should the City allow this type of operation next to a public agency, just because the zoning says it’s allowable? Shouldn’t it be on a case by case basis? Due to the minimum separation requirements (distance in feet) from schools for this type of operation, are we limited on who can visit our facility such as if we were to have a District Open House event, school field trips, or children accompanying their parents when they visit the office to receive mosquito fish?
Fire Departments are visited by teachers and their students. Would the City allow this type of operation next to a City Fire station? Does our operation now become Restricted?

On a side,

When reviewing the ranking results from the recent “Envision Stockton” workshops, the participants voiced their priorities as

1) Increased Safety
2) Less Traffic Congestion
3) South Stockton as the Number “1” area for new development

By allowing this use on this parcel of land, how will future development for the farm land neighboring to the south be compromised? At one time, this area was zoned for Residential; however, according to the minimum separation requirements, no future parks or schools can be developed within 1000’, no churches within 600’, and no new homes within 300’. Now zoned Industrial Limited, it appears re-zoning back to Residential is not an option due to these requirements which could then jeopardize the needs and desires expressed by the workshop’s participants.

It is my job as the District Manager to ensure the safety and well-being of my employees. They complete a job to protect the public’s health from mosquito-borne diseases. As they are doing their job to keep the residents and visitors of San Joaquin County safe from these public health threats, shouldn’t they have the right and expectation to feel safe and free from the threat of becoming a victim of potential crime? And, is it fair that the District’s Public Outreach program could be limited, due to the operations next door to us?

The District’s current and future operations should not be compromised due to the operations and conditions set forth by this proposed project.

I request support for the District’s appeal.

Thank you on behalf of your consideration.
9. REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO DISPOSE OF SURPLUS DISTRICT EQUIPMENT

The District has a quantity of equipment that is considered surplus and available for disposal. The property consists of outdated vehicles and vehicle parts, and other miscellaneous items.

Vehicles considered surplus and proposed to be sold are:

1. #07-47, 2007 Ford F150 4x4, Serial Number 1FTRF14W67KB92520
2. #08-61, 2008 Ford F150 4x4, Serial Number 1FTRF14W18KD25847
3. #08-63, 2008 Ford F150 4X4, Serial Number 1FTRF14W58KD25849

It is recommended that the Board authorize staff to dispose of the surplus equipment with a local auction company, and that the proceeds of the disposal be deposited in the District's General Fund.

This item requires Board action.
10. CLOSED SESSION (Pursuant to CGC §§54957 and §54957.6) 
PUBLIC EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION / PUBLIC APPOINTMENT
Title: Manager

REPORT OF CLOSED SESSION (Pursuant to CGC §§54957.1)

This will be a closed session for the purpose of finalizing the performance of the Manager per District policy # 2170.60 and to negotiate a new employment agreement for the position of Manager.

Re: the performance evaluation of Manager Lucchesi, a year-end report was distributed to the Board for review and discussion at the January 16, 2018 regular meeting. The report was referred to the Board’s Executive Committee for further review and analysis. The Executive Committee presented their review at the February 20, 2018 regular meeting.

Re: negotiations for a successor employment contract between the District and Manager, the current employment contract with Manager Lucchesi expires March 31, 2018. The Board will discuss how to proceed with development of a successor contract using Legal Counsel Eley and the Board’s executive Committee.

Following the closed session, a person designated by the Board of Trustees will provide a report of closed session. Any action resulting from the discussions in closed session must be taken in open session.