

MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
OF THE MONTECITO FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

Held at Fire District Headquarters, 595 San Ysidro Road, August 24, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.

The meeting was called to order by Director Powell at 2:00 p.m.

**Present:** Director Powell, Director Sinser, Director van Duinwyk, and Director Venable. Fire Chief Hickman, and District Counsel M. Manion were also present.

- 1. Public comment: Any person may address the Board at this time on any non-agenda matter that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Montecito Fire Protection District. (30 minutes total time is allotted for this discussion.)**

There was no public comment.

- 2. TIME CERTAIN: 2:00 p.m. Presentation by Tom Fayram, Deputy Director, Santa Barbara County Water Resources Division regarding El Nino predications and potential flooding impacts in the District.**

Mr. Fahram and Division Chief Kevin Taylor presented information relating to Santa Barbara County Water Resources Division and District preparations for El Nino predictions and potential flooding impacts in the District. The presentation is available upon request.

The Board took a recess at 2:37 p.m., and reconvened at 2:43 p.m.

The Board took no action.

- 3. Public Hearing on Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Station 3 Site Acquisition and Construction Project.**

Director Sinser stepped down from the dais. Dan Gira of AMEC presented a PowerPoint on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Station 3 Site Acquisition and Construction Project, answered questions and reviewed the proposed schedule for certification. The presentation is available upon request.

The Board had the following questions and statements:

Director vanDuinwick:

- What is the authority and expertise behind the report?
- How open is this report to challenge?
- Do you sense there are areas that are controversial?
- The MGMO has a fragment of a sentence that states that the Montecito Growth Management Ordinance (MGMO) can be moved aside if the conditions are met at any time regarding traffic, fire, water, sanitary services, and you point out that this is one of 4 conditions. Is it correct that points are given if they are within the response zones, but if the applicant does not meet 19 points, the point value is irrelevant?

Mr. Gira stated that the DEIR focuses strongly on the areas that were brought up in the first version, and there have been significant changes in the agricultural analysis as well as project alternatives including the no project alternative. Additionally there is particular attention to growth inducement analysis. It is a thorough, detailed analysis which was reviewed by senior AMEC staff as well as District Counsel. If the applicant does not meet 19 points, it does not matter. Applicants have not hit 19 in over 10 years. Therefore the MGMO does not appear to be slowing / regulating the pace of growth at this time. The potential of reaching 19 could exist if the Jackson Ranch were subdivided in the future, and the DEIR discusses this. The construction of the station is just one of several factors that regulates growth in eastern Montecito.

Director Powell:

- Relating to page ES-4 of the executive summary, how are the effects on wildlife quantified for the “no project” alternative under CEQA?
- When is the deadline for Board input on the DEIR?

Mr. Gira stated that it is difficult to quantify this, but there could be episodic structural fires or wildland fires that are outside of the current response times. It was important to highlight in the DEIR that the District completed AMEC study and the Citygate Standards of Cover which both show that the east end of the District is underserved. It is credible to say that the no project alternative creates the possibility that there would not be the same level of protection as in other parts of the District, but this is not quantified. It is important for the Board to make sure the DEIR reflects each Director’s independent judgment. If the Board has recommended changes, they should be submitted sooner, rather than later, but the Board has up until the document is certified to make recommendations.

Director vanDuinwick:

- Are there any restrictions on the use/conversion from agricultural to public service? You noted that there is no Williamson Act in affect.
- Does Highway 192 present any obstacles?

Mr. Gira stated that input from the County transportation engineer and traffic consultants who performed the original traffic study, and both indicated that there are no changes in traffic proposed in the eastern end of the District.

Director Venable:

- Traffic on the weekends has increased substantially, and he finds that they have no change in the traffic flow to be surprising, particularly with the potential freeway construction.

Mr. Gira stated that the traffic counts do not reflect this. He added that has completed over 25 EIR's for the County of Santa Barbara, and he wrote the Santa Barbara County agricultural impact guidelines as well as the County traffic thresholds, so he is very familiar with how they operate. He also worked on the Montecito circulation element as a County planner.

Mr. Gira stated that this project would be converting approximately 2.5 acres of "prime soils." To his knowledge, there has never been an EIR in Santa Barbara County that has identified the conversion of anything less than 10 acres of agricultural lands as having a significant impact.

Powell:

- Please explain more about the historical resource evaluation on the project.

There was a Phase 1 archeological resource survey completed, which was periodically tested and nothing was found.

Director van Duinwyk:

- How vulnerable is the drainage next to property?

Mr. Gira stated that there is limited watershed, but it could pick up minor overflow from Romero. It is not typically known to flow, and it was not considered an issue.

Public comment:

Graham Lyons stated that he represents Petan Company, and has no specific comment at this time. He asked to confirm receipt the previous communication sent from Mr. Jackson and stated that they will provide written comment before the deadline.

The Board took no action.

Director Sinsler returned to the dais.

#### **4. Discuss and determine interview and selection process for appointment of new Director.**

The Board discussed the process for interviewing and selecting the new Director to fill the vacancy created by Director Keller's resignation. The Board recommended that each Director submit questions to the Administrative Assistant or the Fire Chief no later than September 4, 2015. Staff was then directed to forward all questions to President Powell, who would review the submittals and determine the final list of questions to be used for the interview process.

The Board took a recess at 3:38 p.m. and reconvened at 3:43 p.m.

**5. Report from the Finance Committee:**

Director Sinser reported on the following items:

**a. Consider recommendation to approve July 2015 financial statements.**

On a motion made by Director Sinser, seconded by Director van Duinwyk, the Board unanimously approved the July 2015 financial statements.

**b. Review PARS OPEB Trust Program statement for FY 2014-15.**

The Board took no action.

**c. Review draft Final Budget for FY 2015-16.**

The Board took no action.

**d. Consider recommendation to approve Resolution 2015-08 Establishing Appropriation Limits for the 2014-2015 Fiscal Year.**

Ms. Gil reviewed the process and necessity of approving this resolution.

On a motion made by Director Sinser, seconded by Director van Duinwyk, Resolution 2015-08 establishing appropriation limits for the 2014-2015 fiscal year was approved by the following roll call vote:

Ayes:	P. van Duinwyk, G.B. Sinser, J.A. Powell, and J. Venable
Nays:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	None

**6. Report from the Personnel Committee:**

Director Venable reported on the following:

**a. Review Committee's progress on developing performance appraisal for Fire Chief.**

The Board took no action.

**b. Consider recommendation to delegate approval of the following and future job descriptions to the Fire Chief:**

- i. Battalion Chief**
- ii. Captain**
- iii. Engineer**
- iv. Firefighter/Paramedic**
- v. Firefighter**

Chief Hickman reviewed the new employee development program which necessitated changes in the job descriptions. The personnel committee felt it would be appropriate to delegate the authority to approve these, and future job descriptions to the Fire Chief.

On a motion made by Director van Duinwyk, seconded by Director Venable, the Board unanimously approved delegating approval of the proposed and all future job descriptions to the Fire Chief.

**7. Approval of Minutes of July 22, 2015 Special Meeting.**

On a motion made by Director Venable, seconded by Director Sinser, the Board unanimously approved the minutes of the July 22, 2015 Special Meeting.

**8. Fire Chief's report.**

The Fire Chief reviewed the letter from Petan Company expressing their unwillingness to sell; letter of appreciation from Mr. Bagdasarian; CSDA request for participation on committees; and the current mutual aid responses to the northern California fires.

The Board took no action.

**9. Board of Director's report.**

Director Powell and Director Sinser reported that they attended the CWPP workshop presentation at the Montecito Planning Commission.

The Board took no action.

**10. Suggestions from Directors for items other than regular agenda items to be included for the September 28, 2015 Regular Board meeting.**

Director Sinser made a motion to add discussion of alternative options for a third station to the September 28, 2015 agenda. The motion failed for lack of a second.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.