

Public Comment

May 18, 2021



To: County of Santa Barbara Board of Supervisors

From: Jonathan Allcock Jr.

Subject:

Thank you for your time and service to Santa Barbara County. I have the following comment:

1. Regarding Agenda Item A-7 (Contract with Andruess/Podberesky law firm)
 - a. There is no posted Third Amendment for review and without a public record of the amendment, I contest the signing of any agreement for the safety and transparency of Santa Barbara County Residents.
 - b. Through the Board, I request that the law firm provide a Work Log and relevant working papers.
 - c. As the public information stands, I contest the amendment in its entirety given the following:
 - i. Facts
 1. Extending the contract until approximately 18 months from today.
 2. Increasing the budget \$450,000 to account for "staffing changes" according to Board Agenda Letter. What does this actually mean?
 - a. The letter continues "increased discovery and motion activity" being the driving factor for this increase.
 - ii. Response
 1. I am not aware of the specifics of the case but after 3 years, how much more "discovery and motion activity", could there possibly be?
 - a. Assuming the law firm has exhausted the entire \$850,000 they have already been allocated, at the hourly rates of \$500 for principal attorneys, \$325 for staff attorneys, and \$175 for paralegals, the increase of \$450,000 would employ a full-time paralegal nearly until the end of 2022 when the contract ends or a staff attorney for almost 1400 hours or even the principal attorneys for 900 hours.
 2. The county has not even gone to trial, and are considering spending over \$1,000,000. Was settlement ever considered?
 3. Despite the highly specialized litigation subject matter alluded to in the few publicly available documents, I am still failing to see how this case has consumed so many billable hours and needs that many more even before trial has even begun (and I assume a 4th amendment!).
2. Regarding Agenda Item A-11 (Budget Amendments)
 - a. Allocate a budget to for a consultant and working group pursuant to Government Code 31000 and relevant subsections to review and provide suggestions on amending the MLUDC to eliminate inconsistencies, redundancies, conflicts, and for environmental

concerns especially those related to sustainability including water conservation related to screening requirements, and other landscaping plan specifications.

3. Regarding Agenda Item A-11 (Additional 80 hours of paid leave for County employees)
 - a. I contest this agenda item entirely if it does not also apply to teachers, law enforcement, and county parks employees.
 - b. The extra 80 hours or 112 for fire professionals does constitute a gift as:
 - i. It was NOT apart of their original contract and therefore they have not earned it and therefore have not earned it and it is a thing outside of their agreed upon contract. By definition a gift is “a thing given willingly to someone without payment”. Essentially it is a tip on top of their existing employment contract regardless if it helps retain employees.
 - ii. Additionally, if the compensation plan is not commensurate with similar roles in other jurisdictions out of the state or in the field in which the professional practices then it could lead to a violation of Government Code 20636 related to “payrate”.
 - c. I contest the additional 80 hours of paid leave which may require temporary replacements or to increase staff hours and potentially pay overtime.
 - d. As a solution, I request that the Board consider a 3.84% (2 weeks / 52 weeks per year) pay raise county wide up to the maximum pay schedule allowed for job classification.
 - i. If you want to maintain employees help them more effectively pay their bills instead of giving them an additional 2 weeks of paid time off. It will cost the county less in efficiency loss, and help avoid additional labor shortages and overtime.
4. Regarding Departmental Agenda 1 (COVID-19 Updates)
 - a. I request that the board consider being one of the early adopter counties for COVID-19vaccination.com, an emerging project to assist in the education, scheduling, and tracking of COVID-19vaccinations. It is my understanding the project will launch in mid-June 2021.
5. Regarding Departmental Agenda 6 (ADU’s and JADU’s) and updates to MLUDC
 - a. Treat existing legal non-comforting structures (especially ones only non-conforming due to setback) existing as of January 1, the same as “Converted” ADU’s without having to convert into an ADU allowing that same property to maintain an SFD
 - b. Have 1 definition of Seismic retrofit
 - c. Use the same definition of set back measurement and whether eaves are included are not for both SFD and ADU’s
 - d. Make setback limitations for ADU’s the same as converted ADU’s where only fire safety is the root of the concern versus a specified number of feet.
6. Allow Satellite dishes that send AND receive to be exempt for permits so Santa Barbara County is Starlink compatible.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Allcock Jr.
Montecito Resident