



## Legislation Text

---

**File #:** 17-00067, **Version:** 2

---

HEARING - Review the arbitrator's opinion and award (revised on remand) dated August 28, 2016 as to Awards 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13 (previously known as Awards 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12) in the matter of arbitration between Nomad Village Mobile Home Homeowners and Nomad Village Mobile Home Park pursuant to Rule 23 of the Mobilehome Rent Control Rules for Hearings and Chapter 11A, Section A-4 of the Santa Barbara County Code, Second District, as follows: (EST. TIME: 1 HR.)

a) Make the following determinations as supported by the findings;

i) Find that the Arbitrator abused his discretion and remand Award No. 5 to the Arbitrator for findings about the useful lives of the items subject to amortization and in light of remanded Awards No. 7 and No. 8;

ii) Find that the Arbitrator did not abuse his discretion and affirm Award No. 6 related to specific items of incurred costs in the amount of \$62,145.55;

iii) Find that the Arbitrator abused his discretion and remand Award No. 7 to the Arbitrator for adequate findings that identify which professional fees are awarded and how the professional fees are properly categorized as a cost of capital improvements or capital expenses;

iv) Find that the Arbitrator abused his discretion and remand Award No. 8 to the Arbitrator for adequate findings that identify which professional fees are awarded and how the professional fees are properly categorized as a cost of capital improvements or capital expenses;

v) Find that the Arbitrator did not abuse his discretion and affirm Award No. 9;

vi) Find that the Arbitrator did not abuse his discretion and affirm Award No. 12; and

vii) Find that the Arbitrator did not abuse his discretion; however, remand Award No. 13 to the Arbitrator for recalculation in light of remanded Awards No. 7 and No. 8; and

b) Determine that the proposed action is an administrative activity of the County which will not result in direct or indirect physical changes in the environment and is therefore not a "project" as defined for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under State CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(5).

COUNTY EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION: POLICY