

---

**SB County Process Improvement  
Oversight Committee  
Draft Meeting Minutes  
July 30, 2009**

---

**Attendees:**

Darlene Bierig  
Jerry Bunin  
Andy Caldwell  
Anne Coates  
Dave Cross  
Elizabeth Farnum  
Tom Frutchey  
Tish Gainey  
Lauren Hanson

Alice McCurdy  
Sharyne Merritt  
Susette Naylor  
Laurel Perez  
Pat Saley  
Ray Severn  
Laurie Tamura  
Leonadi Ward

**I. Introductions**

- II. Review of Minutes – June 4<sup>th</sup>, 2009** – Approved. Pat mentioned that Linda Liu confirmed that they have configured the Citizen’s Access to allow more narrowed down searches by address as mentioned at the meeting.

**III. Updates**

- a. **Supervisors Aides’ Updates** – Elizabeth Farnum mentioned that the Santa Ynez Community Plan is scheduled to go to the Board for approval in mid-September.
- b. **Public Noticing Changes** – These changes were approved by the Board on July 7<sup>th</sup> and go into effect on August 6<sup>th</sup>.
- c. **Agricultural Permit Changes Draft Negative Declaration** – The Draft Mitigated ND was released to the public for review on May 13<sup>th</sup> with four comment letters received. Staff is working on revisions to the Draft ND to address the comments received. The item has not been scheduled for a Planning Commission hearing.
- d. **Ag Preserves & Rural Regional Plans** - Laurie mentioned that the Governor’s budget took all but 10% of the “backfill” funding to counties associated with Ag Preserves. How will this affect new submittals? Also, there is concern in the ag community that Gaviota, the first of the 10 planned Rural Regional Plans, will have people involved in its drafting that are not from the Gaviota community, will result in more text added to the Land Use & Development Code (LUDC) & will fracture the ag areas in the County.
- e. **P&D staffing & other changes with new budget** – There have been some staff reductions & reassignments of staff. A question was asked about the impact of these changes on the process.
- f. **Standard conditions** – The revised condition language has been put into place, but the reorganization by timing isn’t being pursued at this time.

#### IV. Discussion Items

- a. **Continuation of fall 2008 discussion of Informational brochure and/or Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)** – The Committee has discussed ways to improve the information available to applicants at the beginning of the process. We talked about providing an informational brochure and/or FAQs that might address questions such as the following:

1. What do I do first?
2. Which other County departments will be involved in reviewing my project?
3. Should I depend solely on my architect/land use professionals to guide my project through the system?
4. What do I do once I have plans prepared?
5. What is the Montecito/South/Central/North BAR process?
6. How long does the BAR process take?
7. What does the Montecito/County Planning Commission do?
8. What if my project is denied or my neighbors have concerns?
9. What steps occur after approval?
10. “Green” building questions

The Committee suggested that we look at these questions more from the standpoint of someone who doesn't know anything about the process & just wants to do a particular thing, e.g.,

1. How do I build a new home?
2. How do I do an addition to my home?
3. How do I add a garage or carport?
4. How do I add on if I have a septic system?
5. Do I need a permit if I'm going to build a retaining wall or fence?
6. Do I need a permit to demolish a structure?
7. What do I need to do to add a pool or Jacuzzi?
8. How do I add a residential second unit?
9. What do I need to know to do a “green” building? See CEC brochures & mention IBRC review (Innovative Building Review Committee).
10. How do I add solar panels to my property? Provide photos too.
11. Where do you live & are there other considerations (e.g., community plan development standards, etc.).

Suggestions to identify what specific FAQs to ask & answers include:

- Ask North & South County counter staff what are the typical questions they get. Ask them whether handouts are helpful too.
- Ask IT staff about the # of hits for specific informational pages to see what type of info people are seeking.
- Consider some flow charts
- Look for PIT I (early) research relating to what other jurisdictions have done.
- See early PIT info re what makes a good website.

Sharyne offered her daughter's assistance in this endeavor.

- b. **Board comments re Oversight Committee** (ex-agenda) – Dave Cross suggested we talk about the comments the Board made about the Committee when they were reviewing the Grand Jury responses this spring. In particular he'd like us to discuss & set priorities about the following over the next two months or so:
- a. Makeup and structure of the Committee
  - b. Goals of the Committee
  - c. Representation by the Supervisors' offices
  - d. Consideration of time limits for Committee members and items we discuss.
  - e. Providing a historical perspective of the process improvement effort going back to the meeting held in Buellton in 2003 & hosted by Naomi Schwartz & Joe Centeno. The major participants over time, their diversity & consistency of involvement should also be mentioned.
- c. **FY 2009-10 Process Improvement work program** – Oversight Committee suggestions on work items include:
1. **Oversight Committee** - Clarifying roles & responsibilities of the Committee (see IVb above).
  2. **FAQs** & website improvements.
  3. **Beneficial projects** - Look a review process for beneficial projects, e.g., eradication of noxious plants (Pampas Grass, thistles, etc.), mitigation and restoration projects, etc. Related to this, the NRCS erosion control projects that have one stop permitting only apply to the Inland area & consideration should be given to have expedited processes apply to both of these types of projects.
  4. **Green projects** - How to incentivize green projects – Caution may be duplicative of what others are doing – ask Dianne.
  5. **Analyze Tea & Jesusita rebuild processes** as they seem to have worked well & what can we learn to make the process better for all.
  6. **Other departments involved in review process** - Ask select departments to come back to the meeting to talk about changes made since last discussion, feedback, etc. (especially Surveyor & EHS). Related to that, invite John McInnis & new P&D director to the meeting in October to talk about what we're doing & the role of other departments in review process.
  7. **Community Plans & LUDC** – A concern expressed is that the ZORP (Zoning Ord. Reformat Project) resulted in a slimmed down version of Articles I – V, yet now community plans & their implementing ordinances are being added which is going in the wrong direction. Suggested we talk to John McInnis about the CP process, contents & outcomes.
  8. **Conditions** – The Committee would like to be kept informed about these with the overall goal of making them clearer.
  9. **Montecito FARs** – Correct problem where large basements are not included in FAR calculations.
  10. **ZORP/LUDC Options 1 & 2 changes** – Consider spearheading some of these amendments.
  11. **Predictability** – One concern with the process is that planners often don't have a clue what the outcome of a project will be. More clarity & predictability would help.

Pat will send this list to the participants in today's meeting so that we can think about these items & prioritize them at the next meeting.

- d. **“Articles” for inclusion in 4<sup>th</sup> P&D Process Improvement Bulletin** – Continued to next meeting although all agreed that an informative article about the process improvement effort, its history, etc., should be included.

V. **General comments / New items**

VI. **Next meeting & future agenda items – September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2009**