

Public comment.

To the MOFD Board,

I have previously asked you to engage in more fire prevention activities. We all recognize that fuel reduction is key.

I request that these two suggestions be placed on the agenda.

1. You could offer to remove any DEAD OR DYING pine tree for free. You have the funds to do this even if a tree service needs to be hired. Many residents probably consider the expense excessive and put it off - but would accept it if it was free.
2. You could consider extending this to other trees, including live pines and eucalyptus for residents with limited funds.
3. You could hire a crew who could do the required fuel reduction work for free in cooperation with the lot owner. Many residents cannot physically do the required labor to take advantage of the chipper service, especially for steep lots, and some cannot afford to hire a crew.

If you are serious about removing fuel loads then you should implement these two suggestions rather than burden the residents with difficult tasks and fines. I guarantee effectiveness.

Thank you,  
Charles Porges

**From:** [Jonathan Goodwin](#)  
**To:** [Holbrook, Marcia](#)  
**Subject:** Comments for Tonight's Board Meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 19, 2022 2:01:40 PM

---

Good day, Mrs. Holbrook.

Please be kind enough to read my comments at tonight's board meeting. I did this hurriedly and would mind your correcting any simple typos.

Thank you.  
~Jonathan Goodwin

#### Item 6

I offer a tip of the hat to the new board president. I'm sure that my old friends Marian and Charlie are very proud of you. I wish you all the best in your new duties.

#### Item 7.2

Item 8.7 shows the the presiding officer spoke in favour of following established traditions at the same time he violated longstanding and widespread parliamentary procedure, viz., the chair always entertains a motion, the chair never makes a motion. No other public agency would do this, nor has this agency ever done such a thing before, to my knowledge.

- a) Why was this allowed to occur without legal counsel pointing this out?
- b) Does this action invalidate the vote? (I doubt that it does, but feel the question should be raised to emphasise the point.)

#### Item 9.2

I feel the board should adequately prepare itself for such a meeting by first forming an ad hoc committee to review the matter to determine what are the overall, underlying and apparent matters which would be addressed at this meeting. The board should be clear beforehand what it feels would be in the best of interest of the district and of the public which created said district.

Naturally, the board could simply depend upon staff to summarise this information, but in my view, with all due respect to all staves and all governing boards, this approach can prevent board members from duly exercising their mental apparatuses. I believe a subcommittee report would be very helpful in this instance.

#### Item 9.4

- a) Specific to public comment on items NOT on the agenda, last month's arbitrary reversal of the district's de facto policy regarding whether or not questions from the public should be answered during public comment period shows that clearer guidance is needed. In my view, specific should be addressed in summary fashion so as to save staff time down the road. After all the district board enjoys very, very limited public exposure and should not shirk from immediate transparency. On the other hand, this should be an opportunity for presentation, not for discourse.
- b) Regarding "workshops," the same need for clarity was abundantly obvious the last time the district board thought it held one. The term meant nothing specific, therefore, guidance should be provided.
- c) I feel a member of the public should be allowed a personal point of privilege when parliamentary rules are being overlooked or violated (something which seems to happen from time to time at these meetings) unless the board would feel overly threatened by the oversight.
- d) Section 2.5 should bring us into the era of electronic communication and address emails.
- e) Sec. 3.7 "not" should be "no."
- f) Sec. 3.8 This should more clearly state the role of Parliamentarian for reasons which should be obvious by now.
- g) Sec. 5.5 At last October's meeting it was shown the the presiding officer needs more specific guidance about how to handle the consent agenda than is given here. I would suggest doing what every other agency does and first ask if any board member wishes to pull an item, then asking if any member of the public wishes to do the same.
- h) Sec. 7.5 There is an evident need to inform the chair that it is permissible to allow a public speaker to finish the thought s/he is expressing when time runs out.

Lastly, in sum, I would thank staff for doing their due diligence on this matter. Maybe I'm wrong, but it looks like a lot of painful work went into this particular item.

#### Item 9.7

The district is long overdue for a party.