



GOLDEN GATE

Fire Protection District

P.O. Box 843

Golden, CO 80402-0483

(303) 279-3538

www.goldengatefire.org

Golden Gate Fire Protection District Meeting Minutes 16 June 2022

1. Preliminary

1.1. Location/Call to order: Sheila Carlon called to order the regular meeting of the GGFPD Board at 7:00 pm at the Grange, 25201 Golden Gate Canyon Rd, Golden, CO.

1.2. Welcome audience

1.3. Pledge of Allegiance

1.4. Roll call indicated a quorum was present with Sheila Carlon, Deb Curlee, Niffy Ovuworie, Dave Kinnard and Steve Green. Chief DiFeo was delayed due to an emergency call.

1.5. Additions and Deletions to the Agenda:

1.5.1. **Motion #1** by Steve Green to add two public comment periods at the beginning and the end so people don't have to wait 2 hours and can respond to what they want to respond to. 2nd by Niffy Ovuworie. Discussion: Sheila asked if this should be added to new business or added to the preliminary. Dave noted that if you want to change the agenda as a discussion item, we add this as a new agenda item and Steve can lay out his thoughts, or as Sheila noted, we can abandon the agenda and discuss it now. Steve suggested discussing this after the approval of the minutes. He's not set on this; it's just a suggestion. Dave explained the rationale that we were getting into prolonged periods of public discussion and questions which were getting addressed in the bulk of the meetings, so the Board decided to put public comment at the end. After a couple meetings, public feedback was positive. Sheila corralled the discussion that there's a motion to add another public comment section, yet to be determined where. Vote 5 yes. **Motion passes.** When we get to new business, we can decide where it should go.

1.6. Conflict of Interest Acknowledgment:

1.6.1. Sheila noted someone wanted this acknowledgement removed. It's a good idea to keep it in, especially for quasi government board meetings. **Motion #2** by Niffy Ovuworie to retain the conflicts of interest acknowledgement for the duration of this board. 2nd by Deb Curlee. Discussion: Steve never heard anybody say they have one. Deb felt it was pretty common. Vote: 5 yes. **Motion passes.**

2. Minutes

2.1. Approval of [May] 2022 Meeting Minutes. **Motion #3** by Sheila Carlon. 2nd by Dave Kinnard. Discussion: Deb inquired about Dave's financial report questions from April and where they would be reflected. Dave noted that the record-keeping and categorization issues were resolved. Steve raised concern that the thank you letters were opinion pieces and should not be included in the minutes. Additionally, he felt they should be labeled as such. Sheila said they were reflected as thank you letters from that individual. Niffy declared a point of order that this was not opened for debate and made a **Motion (#4)** to discuss how we produce minutes and ratify them before they're published as a general procedure. 2nd by Dave Kinnard. Vote: 5 yes. **Motion #4 passes.** Niffy recommended that any statement that's made at a board meeting be reflected in the minutes as verbatim as possible, i.e. any text or letter

read or referenced should be entered in the minutes. At a minimum the person should be identified up front which implies that what follows is that person's opinion, and possibly include a statement that it's that individual's opinion and does not reflect the opinion of the board. Sheila noted that the board has traditionally put community member letters in the minutes. Steve's point was that he wants it clearly labeled. Niffy asked if it would help to identify that a member is either board or public. Sheila believed role call identified board members but we could do better identifying public members during public comment. To Niffy's comment, Dave noted that minutes don't have to be a transcript. They should reflect the topic discussed and decisions made. On Zoom it's hard to identify a person so make sure to identify who's who. Sheila noted we also don't want to make minutes so difficult it takes a week to get this done. SDA suggested that minutes should not be a transcript but record the major actions, not the minutiae of all the discussion. Steve noted the minutes have been quite vague in the past and there should be a balance. We don't want a transcript, but we do want details. Niffy reiterated his point of how do we decide what goes in the minutes, how verbatim it is, what's a minute and how do we approve it as a board before they get published? Sheila noted that in the past, the board secretary recorded the minutes, reviewed them and distributed it to the board members for review noting that it's already been reviewed by the secretary. Dave noted that instead of 1.5 pages of action, we now have a transcript. If anything, we currently tend to the long side, partially in response to Steve's concerns. Dave prefers getting away from the transcript and note key points only. Terri Costeldia observed that Admin has captured minutes accurately, summaries are good even though Terri's letters were not attached but they were summarized well. Dave corrected that his letter of gratitude was from him, not the board. Deb disagreed with Steve that the minutes are not inclusive. She typically takes copious notes and has not found anything missing from the meetings that she's attended. Steve corrected that it was earlier boards. Dave noted that if anything does get missed, the review process is such that there's opportunity to make corrections and comments. Julie Ramstetter asked if that was part of the voting and Sheila noted that everyone has the option to edit. Niffy pointed out that we need to decide what letters get included and who decides this. Dave suggested looking at the process of the letter issue, irrespective of what it says, what do we include? Sheila noted that we don't get many letters so perhaps we evaluate as they come in and decide whether we summarize or attach them. Sheila thought we should table the discussion after we evaluate these minutes. Deb commented that items that are raised in a meeting get lost and never addressed in the next meeting. How do you solve that? Steve noted it's a continuity issue. Sheila reviews the minutes and adds them as a draft agenda call to all board members. Motion to approve [May] 2022 minutes. (Noted the typo in the agenda that April should be May.) 2nd by Dave Kinnard. Vote: 5 yes. **Motion #3 passes** to approve May 2022 minutes.

3. Reports

3.1. Treasurer's Report

3.1.1. See <https://www.goldengatefire.org/minutes-and-financials/> for financial reports.

3.1.2. Open issues/summary of discussion:

3.1.2.1. Sheila noted there is no treasurer and asked if anyone had questions that Admin might be able to answer.

3.1.2.2. Steve asked about stipends compared to LOSAP. He would like to review the point program policy. Niffy wanted to know why it's not posted on the website rather than sending documents to board members. It's in the department policy manual. Dave explained this program supports FFs who respond from out of district to help cover their transportation expenses. These are quarterly amounts.

- 3.1.2.3. Steve asked what is IAFC? International Association of Fire Chiefs.
- 3.1.2.4. Steve asked about 2 payments made to employees-- Admin forgot to run payroll for herself last month.
- 3.1.2.5. Steve asked about line 140 Prepaid expenses. This is our prepaid insurance.
- 3.1.2.6. Steve asked if LOSAP was listed in our assets. It's currently \$0. Dave explained that we used to carry LOSAP deposits year to year and invest them and when a FF retired, that asset gets paid out. It's now paid on a yearly basis so it doesn't hit our financial position.
- 3.1.2.7. Steve wanted more explanation on credit card balances. Chief explained it's the cumulative amount of credit card bills that have been paid on those cards. Dave noted it was the accountant's decision 4 years ago to present it this way. Dave agreed it's confusing with no period noted. Niffy asked if we operate in fiscal or calendar years. Calendar. Steve noted there's no beginning date, only ending date. Chief will check with the accountant.
- 3.1.2.8. Steve asked what is 31016 Tabor reserve of \$2100. Dave explained that state mandated a certain percentage of tax income has to be set aside as a TABOR reserve.
- 3.1.2.9. Steve asked about 440 Grant Revenue: we have not received any but are we expecting \$5000? Chief explained we plug that in every year.
- 3.1.2.10. Steve asked about deployment expense from the Marshall Fire. This is what we paid FFs for their per diem/pay. We have not received this money from the State, yet.
- 3.1.2.11. Steve asked about 515.1 Building and Improvements but there's also 614.51 Repair and Maintenance. Chief explained this is the Capital Expenditure category vs. maintenance category. Steve asked what was the \$6160 for? Part was the architectural drawings (\$5500). Will need to review the books to recall what the other charges were for. Dave noted that the benefit of internet connections is the ability to look this up for meeting efficiency.
- 3.1.2.12. Niffy noted that for the categories that keep getting asked about we should make changes or have attachments to the reports.
- 3.1.2.13. Sheila noted that we get reports prior to board meetings to ask questions so we are prepared to answer questions.
- 3.1.2.14. Steve asked about the county treasurer fee. Dave noted it's a state budgetary requirement. It doesn't come to us. Admin breaks it out for bookkeeping.
- 3.1.2.15. Deb asked on Transaction list 531.22 expenditure. What's the credit card auto pay? It's our balance we pay every month. We autopay so we are never late.
- 3.1.2.16. **Motion #5** by Niffy Ovuworie to recognize our FFs who attended this board meeting. 2nd by Deb Curlee.
- 3.1.2.17. Dave thanked Steve for the good questions and the additional eyes scrutinizing things.
- 3.1.2.18. Dave asked about Election expenses. These expenses will be noted in next month's financial report with one check ready to be signed tonight.
- 3.1.2.19. Dave asked about firefighting foam purchase but in reference to the dangers to the water supply and testing for PFAS. Chief explained this new stuff is environmentally friendly.

3.2. Chief's Report

- 3.2.1. See <https://www.goldengatefire.org/minutes-and-financials/> for report.
- 3.2.2. Open issues/summary of discussion:

- 3.2.2.1. Our Physician Advisor, Dr. Soriya, is leaving EMS after 8 years and Chief will update who our next advisor will be.
- 3.2.2.2. Discussion on Station maintenance. Gerrit Verschuur volunteered to take a stab at it. Steve suggested we pay someone to do it. We can add this to next year's budget.
- 3.2.2.3. Deb asked how shift work requirements work. 24 hours/month. We used to have a resident FF at Station 82. Are we advertising for a new resident? Chief explained we have not advertised for a resident, only FFs, and from that, we ask if they want to become a resident.
- 3.2.2.4. Julie Ramstetter asked about the shift work program and if it's possible to set it up so that we always have FFs available to respond to calls. Chief explained that FFs schedule their shifts the month before. The problem is that not everyone does shift work and in addition some are recruits and can't do shifts without seasoned FFs. This is why we are remodeling station 81 because everyone lives in district 1. Julie asked if there's not enough to cover 24/7. Chief replied there's not even enough to cover 8/5. Julie asked if there are statistics over the past 4-5 years showing our busy times. Chief implemented a software program to track statistics. Julie asked if it would behoove us to figure out a way to try and juggle a schedule that would reflect busy times. Chief explained it would be tough to do because the reality is that the weekdays and afternoons are our busiest days when our FFs are at work. Chief noted we've tried many things, citing Fairmount FD as an example before they went combination.
- 3.2.2.5. Deb asked about the community cistern fund and the inspection Chief just completed. They contributed to the cistern fund but on the budget it's \$0. Chief explained this fund has \$10K but the auditor, not the accountant, wanted it in the general fund. As a condition of that house's certificate of occupancy, they need that certificate of contribution. Niffy asked who was making this decision. Chief explained the fire chiefs. Niffy declared a point of order that we can't speak over each other. Niffy wanted to understand if the board authorized the previous chiefs to levy a fee on home builders of \$5K towards a community cistern fund. Chief said we adopted the fire code but there's also JeffCo's driveway and private road standards. The board can amend the fire code to that standard: if you cannot meet that standard, you can 1) contribute to the cistern fund, 2) put in a cistern, or 3) put in a fire sprinkler/alarm and the chief or fire marshal could pick one of those as alternative compliance. When Chief started, he realized the cistern was not doing the homeowner any good. He evaluated this inconsistency and decided that sprinklers would be required moving forward. Niffy asked if this was recorded which would benefit Chief so there's no argument about it. Steve noted the roadway access gave the ability of each district to change what the county was asking because the mountains are unique. So, they did give latitude and that is up to this board, but it's not written in stone. Chief disagreed. This board made a resolution to that standard. There's no latitude to change slope, etc.. We have amendments that provide for other options if you can't meet the standard. Steve disagreed.
- 3.2.2.6. Gerrit asked the Chief about his driveway that is off, if his choice is one of the options. Yes, depends on the square footage of the remodel, then the addition would have to be sprinkled with a firewall in between. Would that require adding a cistern? No, a water tank with 20-minute flow rate based on gpm.
- 3.2.2.7. Steve asked, as of 6/11/22, we have 43 incidents, a lot are dispatched or canceled, etc., are all those counted as incidents which appears to inflate numbers? Niffy asked

what's the criteria of "incident." Chief said any dispatch that we respond to. Steve noted that it could be an incident in Timberline as mutual aid or auto aid, so the 43 incidents are a soft figure. Steve wanted to make a point that there should be a uniform criterion for reporting incidents. Niffy said Chief is not trying to change the definition of the incident and asked Steve if he wanted coding or clarification on "incident." Niffy asked Steve if he's making a point or taking action. Steve's concern is the lack of a uniform method of reporting what is happening in our district. So is the increase in the change in the definition or are there really more incidents? Sam Patton noted that every dispatch where a FF runs out of his house to respond to a call is an incident. Steve noted that Marshall Fire is a good example. Niffy noted if we are called out for mutual aid, that reflects all the other districts who respond to us as mutual or auto aid. Steve's point is that the calls are not accurate.

- 3.2.2.8. Dave mentioned that we average 3 FFs to a call when it should be closer to 6. Is 3 a good number? Chief said if it's a basic medical call, that's fine but when it's a rollover or back country rescue, or carrying someone out of a basement, it's not. Dave asked if we were to hire a full time paid FF, what is the pay/benefits impact on our \$195K budget? \$60K/year each if not more. The problem is that most paid FFs will get bored up here. Steve quoted Chief's email, "the lack of calls in GG fire district is a driving factor in losing shift volunteers." Is that good or bad? It's bad. Steve asked, so we want more calls? Isn't it a goal to have a safe low-call district? Julie Ramstetter asked if it's the nature of the beast for emergency services, but all we can do is figure out how to mitigate it.
- 3.2.2.9. Deb asked about the status of the Baby Doe rental. Are they still trying to get permits? Chief noted the last correspondence with the county was discussing wildfire education with the owner and putting up some signs. It's still not approved.
- 3.2.2.10. Deb asked if Admin enters data in both Target Solutions and Emergency Reporting (ER). Target Solution is more state certification-based training. ER is how we track our personnel as well as our incident reports.
- 3.2.2.11. Steve asked for a POC for driveway standards. Planning and Zone.
- 3.2.2.12. Steve commented about safety and merging and the hiring of FFs. This is the rural mountains not suburbs, so most people accept increased response time. Chief corrected it's not increased response time; it's personnel. We are lacking in personnel responding. If the board/community is happy with this situation that's up to the community/board but as a chief, it's not acceptable.
- 3.2.2.13. Sam W. inquired what controls the board has in place for how far we go for mutual aid, citing the Marshall Fire distance, the number of FFs pulled for the Marshall Fire and the district being left uncovered. Chief corrected that we didn't go until the next morning because we couldn't get FFs to cover the district because everyone was at work. We don't go anywhere without ensuring the district is covered. We had an in-district crew and shift workers. And board supports GGFPD going to local incidents. We also make revenue. Niffy asked for a point of clarification: who makes the decision on where FFs go? The Chief does, not the Board. It's an operational decision. Sam W. asked with only 3 people responding to calls, how do you make sure that when you pull 3-4 people out that this district is covered? Chief explained we have FFs commit, These are surge requests: 1-3 day local assignments. Niffy asked if we could publish this as a policy so there's no question on it in the future. Julie R. pointed out this is a hiring issue for the chief and not necessarily a policy issue. Julie suggested a newsletter would be a good way to broadcast this

information. Niffy explained newsletters cost money, need editors, writers, etc. Chief clarified that calls are unplanned. The Marshall Fire was a planned incident.

- 3.2.2.14. Deb asked about the signage, the flag. Those will need to be redone since our logo has changed. Niffy asked that we add it to the agenda for next month. Table it to discuss the flag situation. Terri noted that it's painted on Station 83. Chief said that he has asked the GGAC for help with station 83 to do some remodeling and Mary responded that it needed to specifically support FFs directly in the form of equipment and gear. GGAC replied they do support FFs.

3.3. Community Organization Reports

3.3.1. Auxiliary

- 3.3.1.1. DeeDee explained the GGAC mission, by-laws, and examples of their previous support.

- 3.3.1.2. GGAC put together snack packs to include phone numbers for contact if FFs need anything.

- 3.3.1.3. DeeDee asked Chief to introduce all the FFs.

- 3.3.1.4. DeeDee asked Sam to let her know what the stations needed.

3.3.2. Grange

- 3.3.2.1. Terri Costeldia noted the hydration drive pulled in about 58 cases and thanked Sam for coordinating it.

- 3.3.2.2. Canyon cleanup will be Sunday June 26th.

- 3.3.2.3. Promoting Lookout Alert to get the word out and get the community to sign up.

- 3.3.2.4. Internet at the Grange in discussion and will know next month.

4. Old Business

4.1. Web Review/Maintenance

- 4.1.1. Deb Curlee was concerned about updating the website. Sam Patton and Admin typically updated the website. The website is set up and we oversee it and there is an annual fee to host it. Niffy does his own website and will do it for free for the fire department, although we still have to pay for hosting. Deb is concerned about keeping it updated. Niffy asked whose responsibility is it to maintain it? Niffy volunteered to be the webmaster.

5. New Business

5.1. Board Members: Election of Officers

- 5.1.1. Sheila explained we need to decide on offices and briefly reviewed roles and responsibilities. We need a President and President of the Pension Board. SDA says you must have a President, Secretary and Treasurer appointed by the next meeting. Vice President's role is not mandatory.

5.1.2. Nominations for President:

- 5.1.2.1. Dave Kinnard nominated Sheila Carlon to serve as president for her remaining time and stated her qualifications for this position as justification. Sheila accepted the nomination. Steve started to ask Sheila questions. Niffy declared a point of order that we are doing nominations.

- 5.1.2.2. Niffy nominated Deb Curlee to be president: In previous conversations, he had initially asked Deb to be Vice President to learn from Sheila but there was a distinct message that the community wanted to go in a different direction with the leadership of this board. Sheila was fantastic in her knowledge and in serving her community. In nominating Deb, he is also asking Sheila to be Vice President to help the new board be successful. Deb would be honored to serve as President and serve the community that elected her.

- 5.1.2.3. Sheila provided a written ballot for the board members to vote on the office of President.
- 5.1.2.4. **Motion #6** by Sheila Carlon that nominations cease and move to vote. 2nd by Niffy Ovuworie. Tally: 3 for Deb Curlee for President. 2 for Sheila Carlon.
- 5.1.3. Nominations for Vice President: Deb Curlee nominated Sheila Carlon. Sheila declined. Deb nominated Dave Kinnard who declined. Niffy accepted the position of Vice President. Deb asked if there were other nominations for Vice President. None heard.
- 5.1.4. Deb asked for nominations for the position of Secretary. Niffy nominated Steve Green who accepted. Steve noted there was discussion that he might be Treasurer but wasn't sure his computer could handle the programs. He noted we are paying an accountant \$350/month. Niffy interrupted and called a point of order that we are in the process of nominating board positions and can't discuss anything else.
- 5.1.5. Deb Curlee nominated Dave Kinnard for the position of Treasurer. Niffy noted he would work with Dave and would assume it in the future. Dave noted he has one year left. Dave would have nominated Sheila but it doesn't make sense for a one-year person to learn a new role so Dave accepted the position of Treasurer.
- 5.2. Board Member Vision Statements
- 5.2.1. Steve Green agreed with what's been stated—that the community wanted change. Transparency has not been as good as it could be. The direction we're headed is not what the community wants. He is grateful for everyone that volunteers but the past board ceded responsibility and management of the district out of their hands which resulted in the situation we are in now. Three new board members is a statement that the community wants change. There is a mandate from the community to change.
- 5.2.2. Sheila Carlon said she has lived in this district for 23 years, served on the board twice, both times being appointed to fulfill somebody else's terms and then elected by ballot. During her time, the FD has had the same challenges and board after board has done nothing to address those issues, which are recruitment and retention, obtaining grants, fire and emergency response times, purchasing/maintaining equipment, and having only part time Chief and administrative personnel. The Chief and old board were poised to correct this by sharing resources with Timberline. They initiated a study group, with district residents included, to research best practices from other departments, and then a smaller group convened to meet with a Timberline board member and their chief. An IGA was developed prior to this for training since we lost our training personnel and didn't have funds to pay someone a salary to do this. A grant was awarded to the 2 departments for recruitment which was also addressed in the IGA. Further movement for resource sharing was put on hold until after board elections. As a member of the district and the board, it's important to note that members must not act out on their own opinions but must consider what's best for the entire district. She would like for GGFPD to thrive without any assistance from neighboring departments but realistically knows that's not possible. With our \$205,000 budget, we don't have enough money to pay a full time Chief or a FF and an administrative person and still maintain equipment. One truck costs more than our entire budget. She likens our situation to the healthcare industry. Some of the rural hospitals can't survive anymore and don't you think that the people that live in those rural areas want their hospital to function and be able to go to it? Almost all rural facilities have merged with larger systems so they can gain access to employees, equipment, and other resources. In fact, some of the larger hospitals in the Denver area are merging with other hospitals just so they can keep their lights on. While she would

- prefer to have our department maintain its history and commitment to serving its residents, she doesn't believe our model is sustainable. She noted we have three choices: we do nothing, we raise taxes, or we enter into a resource sharing agreement with Timberline. It's time to begin talking to Timberline about moving forward with us. Our FFs have already formed collegial relationships with Timberline and they work well together. We must be the board that actually does something to ensure our district stays protected and safe. We also need to ask the FFs what they need because it's our job to support them so they get what they need to do their jobs.
- 5.2.3. Niffy Ovuworie stated there are ostensibly 3 choices and the community has voted towards how we maintain independence of our fire district. So, we can either do nothing, assess the community for understanding what is the level of support and response the community wants, and then figure out how we achieve that. We can raise taxes; we can look at the study and join TFPD in some sort of agreement, or there are some other options to explore. But at the end of the day, his goal is to reflect what the community has asked for and deliver the best level of service we can within the confines of what the community desires.
- 5.2.4. Deb Curlee said she appreciates the work the study group put in, however, she believes it was a self-fulfilling prophecy. They decided on a goal and that goal was to move us closer to Timberline. The study was going to reflect comparing a 10 station district to a 3 station district which never worked for her. She believes the community voted her in and the community wanted change and wanted autonomy with our district like we used to have. Mutual aid from all the districts is wonderful; auto aid is wonderful; but we need to work harder. We need to fix our own house.
- 5.2.5. Dave Kinnard stated, the unfortunate truth is that small, well-intended districts of underfunded, underpaid, undertrained FFs is not sustainable and they are collapsing across the state and nation. Asking someone what type of emergency response they want is an interesting question because when you're in the middle of a stroke, and to know the chances of your brain surviving to a meaningful recovery is directly related to the time of response, asking a person if they mind if it takes an hour to get someone to roll in (this is 2022), the answer is it makes a big difference. It saves lives. It improves quality of life, and in terms of people moving into the district with expectations of safety and health, of FFs giving their all with current functional equipment, a lot of support, safety, ability to do good, ability to learn, training on multiple calls, not spending a weekend cleaning the engine with nothing to do. That's why small rural fire departments have condensed and collapsed. We have a wonderful tradition and a rich heritage that we want to honor, we want to build on, but simply saying that we don't evolve, that we don't acknowledge reality until there's no longer a volunteer willing to spend the time, until patients suffer grievously because of our lack of planning, I view as unacceptable.
- 5.3. Email Communication Policy –
- 5.3.1. Sheila noted given the time, we move to table this to next month. 2nd by Niffy. Vote: 5 yes. **Motion #7 passes.** Niffy stated a point of clarification – do we want to distribute this to the community or just the board? It's on the website.
- 5.4. Firewise/Prevention Activities
- 5.4.1. Dave Kinnard suggested this as a thought request or feedback request. The major disaster threat this community faces is wildfire. A small percentage of our budget goes to prevention. We have successfully made steps in this regard; one was partnering with county on our slash chipping days. This program was discontinued. Brent Roller thought we were screwed by the county. He is working up cost elements to investigate funding

this ourselves. The challenge for Golden Gate is to make a decision for the community: do we investigate this? We would need additional manpower, equipment, transport to support this.

- 5.4.2. Steve suggested buying a chipper. We should handle this ourselves. Niffy suggested we explore options, do a cost analysis, and figure this out. Dave noted with a single chipper it could be a week's worth of effort, noting risks and substantial cost.
- 5.4.3. Chief noted that there are machines up at Elk Creek that burn slash. County may own it. Chief will ask at the next Chief's meeting to investigate this option.
- 5.4.4. Dave commented on the sad irony—the state budget has bloomed but they've pulled back from supporting the individual landowners.
- 5.4.5. Chief noted that the state has a lot of grant money. We could apply for a grant, but we need a forester to write the plan, and this has to be done for every landowner. We could do a mitigation plan for certain property, then it gets sponsored and submitted by the fire department.
- 5.4.6. Steve applied in the past for these grants. He had a \$250K grant proceeding which didn't come to fruition because the board changed.
- 5.4.7. Dave noted that long term there are options that may change the way we finance this. Short term we are out the chipping program this summer. He requested a motion to authorize him to investigate alternatives to the county slash program. **Motion #8** by Steve Green that Dave should investigate alternatives to the county program. 2nd by Niffy Ovuworie. Vote: 5 yes. **Motion passes.**

5.5. Future Meeting Location

- 5.5.1. Steve asked for the meetings to be at the Grange. Internet capabilities/access was discussed. Steve asked if the board could help pay for the internet. Chief noted discussing splitting the internet with GGAC. Niffy noted you can't put a Wi-Fi extender across 2 parcels.
- 5.5.2. Terri looked at Viasat and HughesNet noting they are a commercial zoned lot. Chief asked if the FD subscribed as a public safety issue and shared with the Grange would it be cheaper? Grange is also looking at rural grants. Terri will look into it.
- 5.5.3. Meet at Station 81 next month. Niffy wanted to make sure it didn't contradict what's on the website. Sam Patton commented that the Resolution at the beginning of the year kept it online until further notice. But the calendar shows alternate months. Niffy made a point of clarification, if that resolution is still in effect this entire conversation is moot. Rule states notifications go out 48 hours prior to a meeting. **Motion #9** by Dave Kinnard to hold the July meeting at Station 81. 2nd by Niffy Ovuworie. Vote: 5 yes. **Motion passes**

6. Public Comment

- 6.1. Linda Searcy asked back in 2018 there was a ballot Issue A that was passed about adjusting the mill levy. The basis of that was to recover money they anticipated that the district would not get because of Gallagher. Gallagher was repealed in 2020 so was that ballot repealed too? Deb was going to check with the Secretary of State on this as one of her first actions. Dave explained the remedy under the current resolution could never be executed. The resolution was not null and void but there's nothing for it to act on. If there's a legal nuance, he suggested asking the attorney to look at this. Abundant old statutes are on the books that are archaic and don't pertain and that became archaic the moment Gallagher went away. Niffy noted if there are no funds lost due to Gallagher, we can't raise the mill. Steve noted it doesn't say that. It has loose wording. It basically gives permission to a 5 member board, although it's aimed at Gallagher, it's not exclusive to Gallagher. It gives permission to the board to raise the mill levy. While aimed at Gallagher, it's not exclusive to Gallagher. Sheila

noted that Steve is right in that it didn't refer just to Gallagher; that part of that is more general and related to the resident assessment rate that was decreasing. The year we thought it would decrease more, it didn't. She was at the SDA meeting on Friday and the Governor just signed a bill that is freezing the commercial property tax and lowering the residential assessment rate. It's going to be in 2023 for property tax year, payable in 2024, and going down 7.65. And going back up in 2025 to 7.1 It will drop to 6.7; then in 2024 it will go to 6.8, 2025 to 7.1. Chief explained if the residential rate dropped, we could raise our mill levy to cover what our tax revenue would have been had that residential rate stayed the same. Steve thought it was opportunistic to treat it that way. He had complaints about the whole process but now we are morphing it from one use to another use. It took away the citizens' rights to vote on their own mill levy and gave it to the 5 people sitting up here and there are 1200 people in this district. Niffy reminded this is public comment time. Chief suggested doing some research before having this public conversation. Sheila shared a schedule of the resident assessment rate. Dave gave a heads up that the changes Sheila outlined going from 7.2 to 6.7 that's a 7% decrease in our tax revenue. Dave felt there was room for clarification from our attorney. If there was something else out there, we should address it more formally, if it can be sunsetted because it's no longer relevant and doesn't empower the board to do anything in the future with Gallagher gone. Deb volunteered to look into it.

- 6.2. DeeDee Ramstetter asked about the cistern fund. She thought it was dissolved and subsequently absorbed into the general fund. Chief clarified the homeowner has not finished the house. The \$10K was a requirement for him to build the house. When he finishes his house, he has to contribute another \$5K so there will be \$15K in that fund. That money will be used to build a centralized cistern, location TBD. Moving the money to the general fund was the auditor's recommendation. Dave explained we commingled those funds in investment funds and from the auditor's point of view, rather than create a separate account, and keep track of every individual contribution, it would be better to put it in the general fund. Chief explained that was the only one he did in 5 years and then we got away from that.
- 6.3. Sam Wineland asked whose idea it was to do a community cistern, where would it go and who would it serve. Chief explained that we haven't explored that, not until the last permit is closed out and the contribution made. Once that's done Chief will present plans to the board. Niffy asked who decided that we would create a fund in the first place. A prior board. Steve thought it was a question of fairness. Why does a new home builder need to contribute to what helps everyone in the community? Niffy explained that as things move forward, new home builders must comply with codes old homeowners didn't have to. Chief noted in Gilpin, there's an assessment fee that county commissioners have approved, if you want to build in Timberline district, you have to pay a certain amount of money per square foot up front as an assessment fee that goes to the fire protection district. Other residents have been paying for that infrastructure over all those years, so new home owners have to contribute to the infrastructure up front. This is being done in several places.
- 6.4. Sam Wineland asked if the Board is responsible for all the facilities, and assets of trusts, etc. so how does it work for someone to requisition to get something repaired and how do you go about getting estimates and quotes and make it fair and not just going to one person since the board is responsible for that money. It was explained there is a threshold. If an item is budgeted, and it's a small maintenance issue, it's not coming to the board for approval. Otherwise, the standard procedure is to get 3 bids and present them to the board. Sam W. asked about the contractor work for Station 81. Chief noted the architect did the work practically for free because he's a resident. We received 2 quotes. The expensive part was the

MEP drawings. Chief explained that firefighters are resourceful and work with people they know and trust.

7. Adjournment

7.1. Deb called for a motion to adjourn the regular board meeting. Sheila Carlon so moved, 2nd by Dave Kinnard. Adjourned the regular meeting at 22:01 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board is on July 21, 2022 at Station 81.

END

Minutes approved by the Board on July 21, 2022.