

## COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

24860 BIRCH STREET, WILLITS, CA 95490

# BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING AGENDA

#### **Board of Directors**

President Rick Williams Vice President Tina Tyler-O'Shea Director Ed Horrick Director Ralph Santos Director Tony Orth

# Tuesday, February 25, 2020

Regular Session - 7:00 PM to 10:30 PM\*

#### A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer will lead Board members and the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **B. ROLL CALL**

1. The Presiding Officer will call the meeting to order and call the roll of members to determine the presence of a quorum.

#### C. ADDITIONS/ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA/REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION

- The Presiding Officer will determine if Board members wish to add an item or make an adjustment to the agenda.
- **3.** Report on closed session (if needed).

#### D. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Board may approve, or amend and approve, the minutes of previous meetings including: February 11, 2020.

#### E. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS - None

**F. PUBLIC HEARINGS** – PUBLIC HEARING on Negative Declaration for the Tank 3 Replacement Project

#### G. REPORTS

From District Counsel
From General Manager – Written report provided

#### H. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Audience members will be invited to speak regarding matters not on the Agenda. The Board cannot act on items brought up at this time. Speakers may be limited to five minutes.

#### I. DIRECTORS' RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

(Responses will generally be brief; directors may call upon General Manager to respond. Items may be placed on a future agenda for a more in-depth response.)

#### J. CONSENT CALENDAR

**5.** Review of Accounts Payable report and authorization to issue checks on or about February 26, 2020.

#### K. AGENDA ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION

- 6. Consideration of Adopting a Negative Declaration for the Tank 3 Replacement Project
- Consideration of Letter to Board of Supervisors Requesting Fiscal Year 2020-21 Proposition 172 Funding Allocations

#### L. CLOSED SESSION - None

#### M. ADJOURNMENT

**8.** The Board will consider a motion to adjourn.

#### **UPCOMING BOARD MEETINGS**

March 7, 2020 – Annual Planning Meeting (1st Saturday in March)

March 10, 2020 – Regular Meeting

March 24, 2020 – Regular Meeting

#### **UPCOMING HOLIDAYS**

Monday, May 26, 2020 - Memorial Day

Last Resolution Adopted: 2019-15 Last Ordinance Adopted: 160

#### **IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT BOARD MEETINGS:**

\*MANDATORY ADJOURNMENT. Pursuant to Section 3.18 of Ordinance No. 93, if consideration of all matters on the agenda is not complete by 10:30 p.m., the President shall adjourn to the next regular meeting, at which time those matters shall be taken up for consideration first. By motion of the Board, the meeting may be extended beyond 10:30 p.m. to a stated time.

RIGHT OF APPEAL. People who are dissatisfied with decisions of the Board of Directors may have the right of review of that decision by a state court. The District has adopted Section 1094.6 of the Code of Civil Procedure, which generally limits to 90 days the time within which decisions of the District's Board and agencies may be judicially challenged in state court.

AGENDA MATERIALS. The agendas for Board meetings contain a brief general description of those items to be considered at the meetings. Agendas and materials related to an item on an agenda (including materials distributed to the Board after the agenda is posted) are available in the District Office, 24860 Birch Street, Willits, CA 95490, during normal business hours (8:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. Monday-Friday) and on the Township Website Home Page at <a href="https://www.btcsd.org">www.btcsd.org</a>.

ADA ACCESSIBILITY. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible and disabled parking is available. If you are a person with a disability and you need related accommodations to participate in this meeting, contact District Office at (707)459-2494 or FAX (707)459-0358. Requests for accommodations must be made by two full business days before the start of the meeting.

## BROOKTRAILS TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS – February 11, 2020 Minutes

The Board of Directors of Brooktrails Township Community Services District met in regular session February 11, 2020 at 7:00 pm at the Brooktrails Community Center.

#### A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

#### B. ROLL CALL

**1.** Roll call showed the following directors present: Santos, Tyler-O'Shea, Horrick, Orth, and Williams. Also present were General Manager Alaniz and Counsel Neary.

## C. ADDITIONS/ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA/REPORT ON CLOSED SESSION:

- **2.** No changes to the agenda were proposed.
- 3. The Board received information and gave direction to Counsel Neary. No action was taken.

#### D. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS:

**4**. Director Horrick moved to approve the minutes of January 28, 2020; Director Santos seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### E. SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS: None

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS: None

#### G. REPORTS:

**From Directors:** Director Orth attended the recent Mendocino County Resource Conservation District meeting as an associate member, a non-700 form position without conflict of interest to the LAFCo and BTCSD Board position. Director Tyler-O'Shea noted that on February 20, 2020 the Sheriff's office will be holding a meeting regarding rural crime.

From General Manager: General Manager Alaniz provided an oral report.

From District Counsel: Counsel Neary provided a brief update on City of Willits sewer discussions.

### H. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

#### I. DIRECTORS' RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT: None

#### J. CONSENT CALENDAR:

**5.** Director Horrick moved to approve the Accounts Payable report of February 11, 2020 and issue payments February 13, 2020; Director Tyler-O'Shea seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **K. ACTION AGENDA:**

- **6.** General Manager Alaniz presented the cost impacts associated with the October 2019 Public Safety Power Shutoff (PSPS). A discussion ensued and Alaniz was directed to send letters to state legislators with information on the impacts to the District.
- 7. Director Orth moved to reschedule the Annual Budget Meeting from April 11 to April 4, 2020; Director Horrick seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### L. CLOSED SESSION: None

#### M. ADJOURNMENT:

**8.** Director Horrick moved to adjourn the regular meeting. President Williams closed the regular meeting

ATTEST:	
	R. Richard Williams, President
Tamara Alaniz Secretary	

# **Brooktrails Township**

COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT 24860 Birch Street Willits, California 95490 Phone: 707-459-2494 Fax: 707-459-0358



**To:** Board of Directors

From:

GM and Staff

Date:

February 25, 2020

## **General Manager Report on Departments**

#### **Fire Department**

- Multiple agencies continue to work together to solve the emergency medical services crisis facing Mendocino County. The Board of Supervisors Fire and EMS Ad Hoc members will be meeting with regional fire personnel to develop a possible sales tax measure to support ambulance service.
- CalFIRE con crews have returned to work on the vegetation management grant, currently working on both sides of Lake Ada Rose.
- Several mutual aid responses
- The Department continues to seek volunteers from the public and is exploring options for bunking volunteers at the station.

### **Utilities Department**

#### **Recreation Division:**

- Staff still awaits notification on the grant application for Prop 68 Parks and Recreation Office of Grants and Local Services was expected in December. The District was notified on November 20<sup>th</sup> that award notification will be delayed until early 2020.
- Performed routine maintenance and trash collection services at active recreation areas.

#### Water Division:

- No rain yet in February, but lake levels and water quality are good and holding.
- Filter media replacement at the treatment plant revealed rotted pipes and fittings between the bottom of the tank and the sprayer bar, which required replacement.
- Tank 3 replacement project planning continues, and some minor grading work was performed at the site in preparation of Spring 2020 activities. The CEQA process is underway for this project.
- Staff repaired several mainline leaks throughout the system.

#### **Wastewater Division:**

- Public outreach on reducing wet wipes to the system includes a flier and bill message.
- Staff performed routine maintenance at the lift stations.
- Sewer jetting continues to mitigate inflow and infiltration impacts to the wastewater treatment plant.

#### Administration

- Staff has begun implementation of an integrated financial/utility billing system for the office.
- GM Alaniz attended the City of Willits' Groundwater Management Plan stakeholders meeting and will
  work with City staff and consultants on ensuring Brooktrails is protected and represented in the plan.
- Staff is implementing the 9,000 g/mo. water usage cap in compliance with water efficiency legislation.

			Checks	EFT		ADMIN	WATER	SEWER	FIRE
Vendor		Service/Product	Inv Amt	Inv Amt	Inv Date	Fund 120	Fund 220	Fund 320	Fund 420
Tamara K Alaniz		Staywell-Medical PAID	\$ 500.00		02/13/20	\$ 500.00			
Tamara K Alaniz		Petty Cash PAID	149.90		02/20/20	35.17	26.01		88.72
Allen's Janitorial		Contract services	170.00		01/31/20	170.00	-	-	-
Alpha Analytical Lab		Water analysis	650.00		02/12/20		650.00		
Aramark		Shop towels/mats	50.00		02/13/20		25.00	25.00	
American Water Works Assoc		Agency dues	445.00		02/14/20		445.00		
Badger Meter		Cell meter alarm	221.61		08/29/19			221.61	
Badger Meter		Cell meter alarm-6	1,002.50		08/30/19			1,002.50	
Badger Meter		Cell meter alarm	222.50		10/30/19			222.50	
Badger Meter		Cell meter alarm	222.50		01/30/20			222.50	
California Dept of Forestry		FD S-231 Engine training	228.00		07/22/00				228.00
SWRCB Acctg Office		Drinking Wtr Prgrm Fees	8,732.90		12/09/19		8,732.90		
City of Willits		% of operating cost	22,000.00		02/02/20			22,000.00	
ERS Industrial Services, Inc		Plant treatment media	39,130.00		02/10/20		39,130.00		
Evidentia Consulting LLP		Contract Services PAID	3,706.50		02/02/20			3,706.50	
Grainger		FD Hose rack	24.08		02/07/20				24.08
Grainger		FD Bolts,elbows, tee, cross	101.43		02/07/20				101.43
Kemgas		4960 Blue Lake Rd-Tank	301.82		02/04/20		301.82		
Kemgas		Propane Tk 2	595.61		02/06/20	59.56	89.34	89.34	357.37
Mission Communications, LLC		2-Svc Pkg Renewal	694.80		01/29/20			694.80	
Pace Supply		Pipes & fittings	483.32		02/05/20		483.32		
Pace Supply		126-Steel pipes	305.37		02/06/20		305.37		
PG & E		Utilities - 29.1 x day avg \$478.71		13,926.13	02/11/20	449.90	10,244.72	2,794.25	437.26
PR Diamond Products Inc		Asphalt/concrete	500.00		02/12/20		250.00	250.00	
Rainbow Agricultural Services		Cement/PVC/nipple/bushing/cap	232.06		02/05/20		116.03	116.03	
Redwood Coast Fuels		Gasoline	317.13		02/10/20	6.34	96.72	96.72	117.35
Redwood Coast Fuels		Gasoline/Diesel	538.07		02/19/20	10.77	164.11	164.11	199.08
Southland Water Technologies		Mission Comm M150 RTU	2,587.27		02/18/20			2,587.27	
State Farm		Insurance	506.39			506.39			
Standard Ins Company		Short & Long Term Disability Ins	866.93		02/20/20	358.80	181.09	181.09	145.95
SWRCB-DWOCP		Recertification T4 PAID	95.00		02/20/20		95.00		
Willits Chambers of Commerce		Membership	533.00		02/04/20	533.00			
Total Cks:	15	TOTALS	\$ 86,113.69	\$13,926.13		\$ 2,629.93	\$61,336.43	\$34,374.22	\$ 1,699.24
		Aggregate Total	\$100,0	39.82					
Added to Preliminary Report		, 199.09410 10141	<b>4.00,0</b>						
		A							
		Approved for payment:	President	, Board of Dir	ectors		G	eneral Manag	er
								_	



COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT 24860 Birch Street Willits, California 95490 Phone: 707-459-2494 Fax: 707-459-0358

Board Meeting PUBLIC HEARING; and,

Agenda Item K-6

btcsd@btcsd.org

**DATE:** February 25, 2020 **TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** General Manager Tamara Alaniz

**RE:** PUBLIC HEARING and Consideration of Adopting a Negative Declaration for Tank 3

Replacement Project

#### **BACKGROUND**

The Tank 3 Replacement Project (Project) has been determined to be a project as defined in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA §15063(a) requires the lead agency on a project to conduct an Initial Study (IS), which shall be used to determine if the project will have a significant effect on the environment. Staff has completed the Initial Study (IS) in accordance with the Public Resources Code requirements and circulated a Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt a Negative Declaration (ND) on the Project.

The NOI was posted and noticed in the Willits News over 20 days prior to the Public Hearing and sent by mail to all adjacent property owners. Two customers provided oral comments to staff on the proposed project: a customer inquired by telephone about the color of the tank to ensure its compatibility with the existing neighborhood; and, a customer came into the office to find out about the project and requested a duplicate copy of the IS. No written comments have been received.

#### **DISCUSSION**

The Project will replace an existing 50,000-gallon redwood tank and failing bladder insert with a 330,000-gallon bolted steel tank. Tank 3 is a lead tank in the distribution system and accommodates a volume of over 200,000 gallons of drinking water supply daily. The replacement tank will be appropriately sized to accommodate its daily supply volume, as well as provide more reliable and fire-safe water storage in a critical location within the distribution system. The Project was included in the Fiscal Year 2019-20 Adopted Budget and has been discussed frequently by the Board at its Regular Meetings.

This Public Hearing is scheduled to allow the public to directly comment to the Board, which comment(s) may be considered prior to adoption of the ND.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Move to adopt the Negative Declaration for the Tank 3 Replacement Project.

#### **Brooktrails Township Community Services District**

24860 Birch St. Willits, California 95490 Phone: 707-459-2494 Fax: 707-459-0358 btcsd@btcsd.org

The <u>CEQA Appendix G: Environmental Checklist Form</u> may be tailored to satisfy individual agencies' needs and project circumstances. It has been used on this project to meet the requirements for an initial study and meets CEQA Guidelines criteria. Substantial evidence of potential impacts that are not listed on this form have also been considered.

- 1. Project title: Tank 3 Replacement Project
- 2. Lead agency name and address:

Brooktrails Township Community Services District

24860 Birch Street

Willits, CA 95490

- 3. Contact person and phone number: Tamara Alaniz, General Manager, 707-459-2494
- 4. Project location: Lupine Drive (APN:098-112-01/39°27'01.6"N 123°23'16.0"W), Willits, CA 95490
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:

**Brooktrails Township Community Services District** 

24860 Birch Street

Willits, CA 95490

- 6. General plan designation: <u>Brooktrails Specific Plan</u> 7. Zoning: <u>PF (Public Facilities)</u>
- 8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Tank 3 is an existing 50,000 gallon redwood tank with an internal bladder that is failing. Tank 3 serves as a lead tank to multiple tanks in the water distribution system. It will be replaced with an approximately 330,000 gallon steel, bolted tank in the same location and tied into the existing pump house. The steel bolted tank is a design build option to be assembled on site.

The location for staging and disposal of excavated soil is located within 1/2 mile of the project site, which significantly eliminates potential impacts from soil transport and disposal. All grading activities will comply with best management practices and the County of Mendocino stockpile management policies.

The project is expected to take three months from grading to final construction and will likely begin in late Spring 2020 as weather permits.

- 9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings: The project site is located in a densely forested, sparsely populated rural residential area.
- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.) None
- 11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun? <u>No traditional or cultural Native American</u> tribes are affiliated with the project site.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.					
	Aesthetics		Agriculture and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology /Soils
	Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality
	Land Use / Planning		Mineral Resources		Noise
	Population / Housing		Public Services		Recreation
	Transportation/Traffic		Tribal Cultural Resources		Utilities / Service Systems
	Mandatory Findings of Significance				
DETI	ERMINATION:				
On th	ne basis of this initial eval	luatio	า:		
			oroject COULD NOT hav		
envir proje	onment, there will not b	eas ora	posed project could have ignificant effect in this cast agreed to by the project prepared.	se beca	ause revisions in the
	find that the proposed p		MAY have a significant eff PORT is required.	ect on	the environment, and
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.					
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.					
			,	January	, 22, 2020
Signa	ature			ate	

#### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and.
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		will not degra			7)
IL AGRICUI TURE AND FORESTRY	light sources	s to the surro	undinas.		

RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources. including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	the project	tural resource t site. There using forest lands	vill be no in	
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	There are no	air quality in	npacts antic	X cipated with
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	this project.			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	t 🗌			X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural				X
Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		o impacts to b with this proje		<u>esources</u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
CELLETEI E9 (	There are no	cultural reso	urces assoc	X ciated with
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:	ne project si	<u>te.</u>		
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				X
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X*	
conapos.				

\*Grading activities will be undertaken in accordance with an erosion control plan and the County of Mendocino Best Management Practices to ensure stability of soil and proper disposal of excavated soils.

		Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impost
d) Be located on expansive soil, as def in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks life or property?	1	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal syster where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	ns				X
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:	<u>.</u>				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions either directly or indirectly, that may ha significant impact on the environment?	ve a				X
gases?	The p signifi the so	icant transpo oils disposal	ties have bee ortation-relate site within 1/2	ed emission 2 mile of the	s by locating e project
	<u>site.</u> <u>I</u> this pi		nissions impa	cts are anti	<u>cipated with</u>
a) Create a significant hazard to the purion or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardou materials?					X
b) Create a significant hazard to the purion or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditional involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	'				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous mater substances, or waste within one-quarte mile of an existing or proposed school?	ials, er				X
d) Be located on a site which is include a list of hazardous materials sites compursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it creat significant hazard to the public or the environment?	piled				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas the or where residences are intermixed with	ne project. A ccordance w	hazardous m MI construction vith best mana ctor and work	n activities agement pr	will be in actices for
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  *Grading activities will be undertaken in account.	ordance with	n an erosion o	X*	and the

County of Mendocino Best Management Practices, which will eliminate the risk of

siltation and substantial erosion.

9

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific	There are	no land use	or planning	X impacts
plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<u>anticipate</u>	d with this pro	oject <u>.</u>	

	Potentially	Significant with	Less Than		
	Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Significant	No Impact	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X	
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X	
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery				X	
site delineated on a local general plan,		no mineral res		ociated v	<u>vith</u>
specific plan or other land use plan?	ine project	<u>site or adjace</u>	rii areas.		
XII. NOISE. Would the project result in:					
<ul> <li>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</li> </ul>				X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X*		
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project				X	
area to excessive noise levels?  *There will be noise introduced from constru	ction activity	durina the pi	roject. This	will inclu	ıde
on-site construction work and vehicles, which	h will only o	perate in dayl	ight hours a	and will n	ot
exceed permissible noise levels. The size a eliminate impacts to the project vicinity.	nd location (	of the project	<u>site will min</u> 11	ilmize or	
			1.1		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:	d			
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension or roads or other infrastructure)?	of			X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	J			X
<ul> <li>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</li> </ul>	No impacts to anticipated w			X are
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				X
Fire protection?				X
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				X
	impacts to pu pject, except t			
W/a	iter to the syst			
XV. RECREATION.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No impacts to project.	recreation a	re anticipate	X ed with this	
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:	d				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				X	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X	
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of suc facilities?	h No significant	impacts to tra	nsportation	X or traffic are	
	nticipated with this project.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:						
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				X		
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	There are no tribal or cultural resources associated with the project, or project site.					
XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:						
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X		
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X*			
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	project. No	ion of a water o significant eated from this	nvironment			

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or anima community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

The project and its construction activities will not degrade the environment, create cumulative significant impacts to the environment or have adverse effects on human beings.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083, 21083.05 and 21083.09, Public Resources Code.

Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21095, and 21151; Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, (1988) 202 Cal. App.3d at 296; Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, (1990) 222 Cal. App.3d 1337; Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka (2007) 147 Cal. App.4th at 357; Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency (2004) 116 Cal. App.4th at 1109; San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal. App.4th at 656.

#### Revised 2016

Additional Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3/ 21084.2 and 21084.3



COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

24860 Birch Street Willits, California 95490 Phone: 707-459-2494

Fax: 707-459-0358 btcsd@btcsd.org

Board Meeting Agenda Item K-7

**DATE:** February 25, 2020 **TO:** Board of Directors

**FROM:** General Manager Tamara Alaniz

**RE:** Consideration of Letter to Board of Supervisors Requesting Fiscal Year 2020-21

**Proposition 172 Funding Allocations** 

#### **BACKGROUND**

In the County of Mendocino adopted FY 2019-2020 Budget, Proposition 172 allocations were reduced by \$76,000, despite an increase in sales tax receipts for Fiscal Year 2018-19. However, city shares of the allocations were added without any outreach or input from other affected safety agencies and despite cities' receipt of Proposition 172 allocations from the state. Although it is within the discretionary authority of the Board of Supervisors (BOS) to adjust this amount annually and in this manner, the District may provide input and send a letter to the BOS prior to budget adoption with our requested funding allocation option for Fiscal Year 2020-21.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Since the Mendocino County Association of Fire Districts (MCAFD) have repeatedly requested that non-city safety districts receive a fair share in the allocation of Proposition 172 funds, the group has recommended that Districts like the Township send letters to the BOS supporting the allocation of any annual increase of Proposition 172 sales tax be allocated to Fire/EMS agencies and not to cities already receiving a portion of the Proposition 172 sales tax revenue from the state.

This request will not increase allocations to cities and is the least disruptive currently available alternative for funding critical Fire/EMS first response service needs. It is important to note however that other revenue sources will still be required to meet this ongoing public safety funding challenge.

Therefore, if the consensus is to send the proposed letter, the request to the BOS will be that they allocate the annual base amount (approximately \$412,000) with increases that account for Fiscal Year 2019-20 additional allocations to cities (approximately \$488,000) plus any annual increase or decrease of Proposition 172 revenues. The request would include adoption of a policy to annually allocate funding in this manner until 25% of available Proposition 172 annual revenues are achieved.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Move that staff prepare a letter for Board President signature to the County of Mendocino Board of Supervisors requesting how Proposition 172 funding allocations and sales tax revenue increases be dispersed in Fiscal Year 2020-21 and future years.

## Options for FY 2020-21 Mendocino County Budget Allocation of Prop 172 Sales Tax Revenues to local Fire/EMS First Response Agencies

#### **BACKGROUND:**

Mendocino County Fire/EMS first response agencies continue to see year-to-year 911 call volume increases. Emergency medical calls are now at 60% to 70% of all 911 call outs for fire service responses.

Proposition 172 Public Safety (Prop 172) half cent sales tax revenues will increase or decrease each year and allocations are annually budgeted by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) as a discretionary fund, yet restricted to public safety service funding.

In the past four years Prop 172 sales tax revenues have annually increased.

Since the early 1990's Mendocino County fire chiefs have requested "a fair share" of allocations of Prop 172 revenues as 911 medical call-out volumes increased, and the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors (BOS) since FY 2016-17 has considered such allocations as part of the annual budget.

In the FY 2016-17 budget year, the BOS first approved an allocation of a portion (\$398,000) of Prop 172 sales tax revenue to the 22 Mendocino County Fire/EMS first response agencies.

The Mendocino County Association of Fire Districts (MCAFD) was formed to help the Mendocino County Fire Chiefs Association (MCAFC) identify additional revenues for local Fire/EMS 911 response and to support volunteer fire service viability for the citizens of Mendocino County.

In that first year of Fire/EMS service Prop 172 allocations, a distribution formula was agreed to by the BOS and MCAFD that used an equal base amount to each qualifying agency plus an additional distribution based upon population. It was also requested that MCAFD would meet each year with a BOS committee to confer during the annual budget preparations to renew our association's budget requests. This year the BOS Fire ad-hoc committee met with MCAFD and MCAFC representatives on January 10, 2020.

In the first year, FY 2016-17, cities that already receive allocations of Prop 172 funds directly from the State distributions were excluded from also receiving a County allocation.

In FY 2017-18, at the BOS' request, cities were added to receive County Prop 172 allocations. An increase of funding (\$90,000) from the County share of Prop 172 was allocated by the BOS to account for the Cities addition. The total allocation of \$488,000 was then agreed to by the Supervisors and the MCAFD membership and adopted as part of the FY 2017-18 Mendocino County budget.

Last year the BOS' adopted budget for FY 2019-2020, reduced (although sales taxes increased) the allocation by \$76,000, yet retained the added cost of the Cities' shares without meeting and conferring about this reduction in funding. The BOS may do so as annual allocations are discretionary.

Since the fire district chiefs have repeatedly requested a "fair share" allocation of Prop 172 funds. MCAFD and MCAFD recommend the BOS consider allocating any annual increase of Prop 172 sales tax revenues for Fire/EMS agencies, until a 25% share is achieved. Although this will freeze allocations to other public safety partners, it would be the least disruptive alternative in building a significant revenue share for critical Fire/EMS first responder service needs this decade. Other revenue sources will still be required to meet this funding challenge.

#### **RESOURCES:**

The Fitch Report was authorized in 2009, then completed and approved by a prior BOS in February of 2011. The report documented the challenges facing Mendocino County Fire/EMS service providers and the lack of Mendocino County assistance. Municipal Service Reviews (MSR) of Fire Districts are also available for review on the Mendocino Local Agency Formation Commission's website and can be viewed to inform Supervisors of the challenges currently faced by Fire/EMS 911 first responder agencies in Mendocino County.

#### **OPTIONS:**

For consideration by the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors, the amounts of annual Prop 172 sales tax revenues for allocation to the qualifying Mendocino Fire District/Agencies, in the FY 2020-21 Mendocino County Budget program.

- 1. Allocate same base amount (\$412,000) and same distribution table as in 2019-20 budget but add/subtract any annual increase or decrease of Prop 172 sales tax revenues. Adopt policy to continue until 25% of available Prop 172 revenues is achieved annually.
- 2. Allocate same base amount with increase to account for City shares (\$488,000) and any annual increase or decrease of Prop 172 revenues. Adopt policy to continue until 25% of available Prop 172 annual revenues achieved.
- 3. Allocate same base amount (\$412,000) per last year's budget to 22 Mendocino Fire Districts/Agencies, using original distribution table that would remove Cities from receiving County Prop 172 shares.
- 4. Allocate additional Prop 172 funds to account for City shares (\$488,000) and maintain last year's distribution table.
- 5. Other options for Prop 172 distributions at the direction of the Mendocino BOS.

NOTE: If voters approve Measures D and E in March, increased TOT tax revenues to Mendocino Fire/EMS agencies will include a 25% allocation to MCAFC to distribute as grants prioritized each budget year to the most critical needs as identified by our Fire Chiefs.

Final Draft by Tony Orth

02.20.2020



COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT 24860 BIRCH STREET WILLITS, CA 95490 Phone: 707-459-2494

Fax: 707-459-0358 btcsd@btcsd.org

February 24, 2020

County of Mendocino Attention: Board of Supervisors 101 Low Gap Road, Executive Office Ukiah, CA 95482

Re: Proposition 172 Funding in Fiscal Year 2020-21 County of Mendocino Budget

Dear Honorable Supervisors,

Kindly accept the Brooktrails Township Board of Directors recommendation for the manner of allocation of Proposition 172 funding in Fiscal Year 2020-21. Your discretionary consideration of Proposition 172 allocation is a critical piece of the ongoing revenue struggles facing Fire/EMS agencies throughout the County and the Township Board of Directors requests that you uphold and appropriately expand the allocations beyond what was provided in the Fiscal Year 2019-20 budget.

Despite cities receiving their own share of Proposition 172 funding from the state, the County allocated additional funding from its own share, which had historically only been allocated to Fire/EMS agencies. We politely ask that this practice not continue in Fiscal Year 2020-21; and, instead those duplicative shares of the County Proposition 172 allocation be distributed to Fire/EMS agencies where they can be better applied to emergency response efforts.

Therefore, your consideration of Proposition 172 revenues allocations to Fire/EMS agencies is requested as follows:

Allocate the annual base amount (approximately \$412,000) with increases that distribute the Fiscal Year 2019-20 duplicative allocations to cities (approximately \$488,000) plus any annual increase of Proposition 172 sales tax revenues; and,

Adopt a policy to annually allocate funding in this manner until a full 25% of available Proposition 172 annual revenues are distributed.

We respectfully request that you consider this option in any and all discussions about Proposition 172 revenues and continue to provide this critical source of funding where it's needed most – in our Fire/EMS agency accounts.

Sincerely,

R. Richard Williams Board President