

**NORTH CENTRAL FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
REGULAR BOARD MEETING
THURSDAY, JANUARY 26, 2017
5:30 P.M.
MINUTES**

1. CALL TO ORDER

District Board Chair Mr. Ken Abrahamian called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m.

Roll Call

Board Members Present: Mrs. Cheryl Belluomini, Mr. Keith Koligian, Mr. Ken Abrahamian and Mr. Rusty Souza. Mr. Nonini arrived a few minutes after roll call.

Also present were Fire Chief Kerri Donis, Mr. Ken Price, and Mr. Joe Barcelos.

2. INVOCATION AND FLAG SALUTE

The invocation was led by Mr. Barcelos and the flag salute was led by Chief Donis.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments

4. CONSENT TO AGENDA

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of Regular Board Meeting of December 15, 2016.

Motion: To approve the minutes of December 15, 2016, as submitted.

Moved by: Mr. Koligian, second by Mr. Souza

Mr. Abrahamian:	Mrs. Belluomini:	Mr. Koligian:	Mr. Nonini:	Mr. Souza:	Vote:
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	5/0

6. PRESENTATIONS – CORRESPONDENCE – REPORT/FIRE CHIEF

A. Fire Chief General Update

1) December Incident Report – Information only

Chief Donis mentioned the District experienced a slight decrease in call volume in 2016 at 4,450 calls versus 2015 when the District had 4,687 calls.

2) General Updates – Information only

Chief Donis mentioned the Fire Department will have a class graduating from drill school shortly and there are some promotions occurring right now in the department. The Department has been investing in a lot of training, mostly company drills and training for department staff.

7. BUSINESS MANAGER REPORT

A. Board Member Best Practices Workshop

Mr. Barcelos mentioned a workshop coming up on February 9, 2017, to be held at the Clovis Veteran's Memorial District. The workshop is titled "Board Member Best Practices" and is free to all SDRMA members of which the District is a member. Mr. Barcelos explained a little about the subject of the workshop.

B. American Ambulance Request for Station 47

Mr. Barcelos mentioned just yesterday, American Ambulance Maintenance Supervisor informed him the stove at station 47 is not working. This stove was just repaired a few weeks ago but is having the same problem again. The stove is very old and unreliable so American asked if they could purchase a new stove for the station.

It was the District Board consensus to allow American Ambulance to replace the stove at station 47.

Chief Donis reported American Ambulance Manager Todd Valeri called her to say the ambulance crew at station 45 has decided to stay at this station for now.

8. FIRE CODE ORDINANCE NO. 2016-01

A. Review answers for questions and concerns addressed by the District Board regarding sections of Fire Code Ordinance No. 2016-01

Mr. Barcelos called the District Board's attention to the memo in their packet from Chief Semonious addressing the questions from the board at last month's meeting regarding certain sections of the fire code ordinance.

The review and discussion for this item consisted mostly of the following questions and answers

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked Chief Donis how would you define a bin box and what was the intent of this section. For example, are you talking about an empty raisin bin and if that were in a stack does this requirement apply to a stack of empty raisin bins. Mr. Abrahamian mentioned for example, you don't need a large area to go over 5,000 square feet of bin boxes especially if you stack them two high and they might be stacked for just a few days. I don't know if the intent was for recycling places that might have large stacks of empty bins that could be a fire hazard as opposed to a rural farm that one day might have a large stack and the next day the stack is gone. A raisin bin is four feet by four feet, so if you had twenty bins one way that is eighty feet and you have ten bins going the other way that is forty feet so you have a stack of 3,200 square feet. This is not a lot of bins so it doesn't take many more bins to go over 5,000 square feet.

A: Chief Donis replied I think if you look at the code, the State code calls out combustible materials which also include wood products. So the bins themselves are combustible and they are going to be identified as falling in that category. I think what the Fire Department has done here is by defining these products and their storage quantities of 5,000 square feet, we have provided for more storage area. Bin boxes are already considered combustible materials and exterior storage and the fee is a one-time \$57 lifetime fee and this has been in the code cycle for many years.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked so for example maybe you have a smaller stack that is 2,000 square feet stack and 100 yards away you have another 2,000 square feet and another 2,000 square feet stack 100 yards from this one. You have a total of 6,000 square feet but it's not in one area. Does the requirement address the total square footage or the square footage in one location?

A: Chief Donis replied I believe it is total square feet. Regardless I think we are missing the intent, the intent is to be sure people are aware of what is stored, how it is stored, and to make sure there is proper separation in the storage piles to mitigate an emergency.

Q: Mr. Souza asked who is going to enforce the spacing is right on these piles. Because the farmers will have a pile of bins up for a while and then they are moved to another location. What is the purpose of even charging a fee if you are not going to monitor it.

A: Chief Donis replied the fee covers the cost of providing the service to go out and let the permit holder know the reason why we want to separate the piles to be safe.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked if the state code is 5,000 square feet or is 5,000 square feet a little more restrictive.

A; Chief Donis replied the California Fire Code sets the requirement for operational permits, the State sets the threshold.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked if this is an amendment being carried over from the current fire code.

A: Mr. Barcelos replied yes, this amendment was carried over from last code cycle.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked do you know what the original square footage was according to the code.

A: Mr. Barcelos replied in the last code cycle the threshold was 5,000 square feet and this cycle it is being changed to 4,999 square feet.

Q: Mr. Souza asked, if I understand this correctly Chief Donis, what you are saying is if there is a farmer that has five twenty acre parcels of vineyard and they have 1,000 square feet of bins on each different location that equates to 5,000 square feet and they would be required to get a permit.

A: Chief Donis replied I would say it would be at each location.

Chief Donis mentioned I thought the question originally was does section 105.6.48 of the California fire code set the requirement for operational permits and the question I thought at the time was, how this affects my quantity of bin boxes. So we went back and said yes they fall into the category of combustible material but the quantity would have to be over 5,000 square feet and the fee is a one-time permit fee of \$57. The fee is not intended to financially burden any business but to properly set up for safe and effective mitigation if an incident should occur.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked where the memo says this local additional section provides for non-permit required limits. Is that something we added or something that is in the California Fire Code. Or why would it say local additional section?

A: Mr. Price replied it is shaded blue as a minor change that may include new requirements so it is a little vague as to who imposed the requirement.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked Mr. Price so when you see this language does it seem like it was added, or is it new to the California Fire Code or is the District adding it to the code.

A: Mr. Price replied when I see it, it doesn't give me enough information to give me that insight. It just characterizes it as a minor change that may include a new requirement. A requirement doesn't really say whose the requirement is. Is it the State or is it a local addition.

Q: Mr. Souza asked so if a person has 5,000 square feet of bins out there it is their responsibility to call the fire department to say I have 5,000 square feet of bins, come out and do an inspection. Or does the department drive by and see these bins and pull in, take a measurement and provide an operational permit. I'm just curious about the whole validity of this, I know the intent but it appears to be unmanageable. It is like the District is here to grab \$57 from property owners and we will never see them again about the issue.

A: Chief Donis replied there is no intent for any fire inspector to be driving around looking for the opportunity to write a \$57 permit. I think as things go forward or if we were to happen upon something, we would have a duty to act, but I don't see this as something we are going to seek out.

Mr. Souza mentioned this is going to be part of the fire code and it is going to be enforceable but most farmers around here that have bins don't have the fire code or know they need to comply with it.

Q: Mr. Souza asked how will farmers know whether they are complying or not if they are not aware of the code requirements. I'm just saying if we are going to implement this we need to make it so it reaches out to everybody and I don't know how the District can do that.

A: Chief Donis replied if we need further clarification on this particular section of the code the Fire Department can provide it. We can adopt the code as presented and the Board can always come back and amend the code. After looking at this if we discover this section 105.6.50 to be a local addition and the Board wants to eliminate it, then we can go back and eliminate it.

Mr. Price mentioned his concern with not adopting this section is we don't really have sufficient information at this time as to whether or not 105.6.50 is a state requirement or a local addition. If it is the intent of the board to adopt the fire code tonight then I would suggest keeping this section in the code and we can clarify whether this is a local addition to the code and then the Board can revise this section by amending the code.

Chief Donis mentioned if I am reading this right, section 105.6 through 105.6.48 of the California Fire Code sets the requirements for operational permits. The

additional amended section of 105.6.50 defines items that are typically found in the agricultural industry. So to me, and I am not sure, it looks like this is an additional definition for providing further clarity of what would be categorized under meeting an operational permit. Mr. Price mentioned it calls this a local amended section, so that would suggest to me, again it's a little vague, but it would suggest to me that this is a local interpretation of the State code. So if this is the case, the Board could adopt the code without this section. But again, we are just relying on this vague interpretation in the memo.

Mr. Abrahamian mentioned since we don't know how this section was added we should include it now and then find out more about it. After the Board receives more information we can amend it again if we have that ability. To move this along unless other board members want to discuss this further, I think this would be a section to mark and follow up with Chief Donis and perhaps we amend it if there is the support to do that. It was the board consensus to leave this section in the code, get more information and if needed, amend it at a future meeting.

Q: Mr. Koligian asked if the information in the memo requiring 1,000 gallons per minute for forty-five minutes for a non-sprinklered 5,000 square foot metal building used for agricultural purposes is correct.

A: Chief Donis replied yes.

Q: Mr. Koligian asked what do you think that would cost.

A: Chief Donis replied \$50,000 to \$60,000 or more.

Mr. Koligian mentioned according to the statistics you provided, the average loss in a building like this is \$21,000.

Mr. Koligian mentioned why would the District ask a property owner to spend that much money, wouldn't they be better off taking the loss and having the building insured than spending \$50,000 on a building that might not ever have a fire. This requirement is prohibitive. The property owner would have to put in maybe a thirty horse power well to supply that much water and when you dig a well today you are looking at another \$50,000 or \$60,000 and that is before you even pay for a required water storage system. No one is going to put up a \$30,000 building and spend another \$60,000 to put in the required water flow for this building. No one is going to do this, its cost prohibitive.

Mr. Koligian mentioned in the memo the point is made if you have sprinklers in a 5,000 square foot building the demand would be 405 gallons per minute.

Q: Mr. Koligian asked if the 405 gallons per minute is for the same 45 minutes. Because in the last year due to the water table going down, I've put five wells in and just the pumping and the developing of the well going down to three or four hundred feet is a lot of money. I mean probably closer to \$50,000 for putting in a well and that is not talking about a storage tank. The sad part, you put all that stuff in, the fire department will then say that you have to have an alternate form of electricity in case the fire starts in your panel then it's not worth anything if the pump won't start. I can understand if you are downtown or in an area where there is just building after building that is used for storage but when you have a

single building in the middle of eighty acres, how is that going to affect anybody but the person that owns the building. It doesn't make sense to me.

A: Chief Donis replied part of the concern is you can't pick and choose. It can't be applicable to certain commercial buildings but not applicable in other areas of the District.

Mr. Abrahamian mentioned maybe that is part of the confusion, when you use the term commercial building. I think what Mr. Koligian is saying is you can have a storage building where you put your product or your equipment and it is not the same as a processing facility or something where you have people going in and out. To me, a commercial building is like an almond facility where you have people going in and out.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked Chief Donis when you use the term commercial, are you just talking about a large building or an actual building used for commercial use.

A: Chief Donis replied, commercial occupancies, an occupancy that is listed as commercial.

Mr. Abrahamian mentioned this goes back a few years when there was an ag exempt designation and we don't have that designation anymore. I had a chance to talk to someone at the County today to ask them about the ag exempt designation and they are trying to look at it in a practical manner. But they were also looking at the intent and so I think that is what this board wants to do too. I think that either the 5,000 square feet or the 7,500 square feet threshold was something we may have adopted when we had the ag exempt designation available.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked if the state requirement for having a building sprinklered in a rural area is 12,000 square feet and is an S-2 occupancy classification mentioned in the state code.

A: Chief Donis replied I cannot confirm if it is 12,000 square feet and I don't know if it is limited to S-2 occupancies. I hear your point completely but there are cases or situations where people say the building is going to be a storage shed for their equipment and then they end up having people working in the building. And so now you have employees or workers in a compromised facility that wasn't intended to have people working in it. And so it's a way of trying to afford a protection, a fire life safety protection through fire sprinklers and obviously a storage tank to support that. I understand your point if it is in a rural area, but you can't build that same type of occupancy down the street and take advantage of the loophole here if you were to not require sprinklers.

Mr. Abrahamian mentioned when you use the word loophole, to me that's someone that knows the rules and they are getting around it but they are not breaking the law. In this case if it is a loophole then they are doing something in violation of some code.

Mr. Koligian mentioned if there are people working in that building and there is an accident, that is a violation of the code and the building owner is going to be responsible. If you are not supposed to have people working in there and you make the agreement when you go sign the permit that you are not having people working in the building, the person that does this is going to be morally and financially responsible for this. I don't want to change the whole Fire District code and dictate moral decisions to people.

Q: Mr. Souza asked what if this ordinance was adjusted to where a farmer or rancher is working his own product on his own property that this would not apply to him. Make it apply to only commercial operations meaning an almond hulling processing facility, cotton gin or a raisin packing facility. For example, a farmer on the west side started out small doing his own vegetable processing and packing with a small cold storage and then there was a need where more people needed this done. So the farmer put in more cold storage and buildings and so he was required at that time to put in water storage for fire flow because he went to commercial processing other people's crops besides his own.

A: Chief Donis replied we can make the amendment more strict but could allow for it to not impact the farmer or rancher with their commercial operation up to a certain threshold.

Q: Mr. Abrahamian asked did you say if they are a commercial operation?

A: Chief Donis replied yes, assuming it is a commercial operation.

Mr. Nonini mentioned if you can define this section in a way like Mr. Souza said, as long as a person is working his own equipment and his own product grown on his own property. This person is not for hire in doing his daily operation. Mr. Koligian added I think a person that brings tractors in from neighbors to fix them on his property, I consider that a commercial operation. But if I work on my own tractors that is just my farming operation, it's not bringing in anyone else's equipment and I'm not bringing in any laborers to do the work other than my own operation. I think a person should probably meet those restrictions if he is doing work for other people other than his own. I can set up a fruit stand on my property as long as I sell the product that is produced on my farm. I don't have to have a permit. I have a right to sell anything I want as long as it's grown on my property.

Chief Donis mentioned so if we leave it the way it is but then have an exception to meet the examples you have given, we could make it more strict and define it better. But the concern is that if we allow it to happen on a farm that same commercial building built right out here can be built without any fire protection system and they are going to start employing twenty people and there could be a fire there and we have no fire protection system in there to help mitigate it.

Mr. Souza mentioned but when there is a construction project, the applications come to the fire department for review and comment so you are going to know what their intent of their business is going to be. If a person puts up a building for agricultural use and it's for storage of products produced on that person's farm you will know that as well.

Mr. Abrahamian pointed out if we look at the code on page seventeen (17) it says under exception one. All occupancies less than 7,500 square feet located in an area outside the LAFCO sphere of influence urban growth boundary area for the cities of Fresno and Kerman or the community of Biola, which are not ambulatory facilities or S-2 occupancies that do not meet exception 3 below. Again I thought it was 12,000 square feet and we may have changed that because the ag exempt designation was eliminated. I don't know if we can find that out for the future, but that would address some of the issues. This exception addresses buildings in a rural area not a building over in the City of Kerman or within the LAFCO sphere of influence. If they are in a rural area its less likely they are going to have a commercial facility with employees working in an assembly or packing line. I do agree there could always be somebody that abuses or doesn't follow the law and gets around the requirements. So I think this is another section we've talked about in the past and again not to hold up the entire fire code but it is one I would like to get more information on.

Mr. Koligian mentioned if the state threshold is 12,000 square feet I would accept that but I don't want to take it down to a small building like most of the buildings we are talking about on a farm or a ranch. It is just not cost efficient for the square footage you are getting.

Q: Chief Donis mentioned set aside a building on a farm. Do you want the district to allow 12,000 square foot commercial buildings that don't have any fire protection system?

A: Mr. Abrahamian replied if we are not talking about a farm, let me give you an example. There is a nursery that went through the county permit process because they are moving from where the high speed rail is supposed to go. They are moving to another property they have in the district and because they are going to have the public in their new building, they are going to have a large building maybe not 12,000 square feet but large enough that they are going to have to have water storage or whatever is required. Now even if it is less than 12,000 feet I'm not saying this building is in an agricultural area and it is less than 12,000 square feet he shouldn't have to have sprinklers. This building is definitely a commercial use and they had to go to the County for the permit to allow for a conditional use permit I believe it is. So it is clear what the building will be used for and so they will have to meet all the commercial building requirements.

Q: Chief Donis asked so that I am clear, you want the requirement for commercial use where there are going to be employees and patrons.

A: Mr. Abrahamian replied another example is a church building that say is 6,000 square feet. They are going to have people in the building. Any building where the public will be present or a building will be used for commercial use. I guess I don't think of a farm as a commercial operation but I guess it is. I want to make sure we don't have different definitions for the building.

Chief Donis mentioned all that being said, I hear what you are saying and I will take this back and see if we can come up with something else that fits with what has been discussed.

Chief Donis mentioned the last item on this memo regarding the \$1,000 permit threshold. The Fire Department talked to the County and they just updated their master fee schedule. This \$1,000 permit fee would require an excess of \$81,000 of damage to trigger a \$1,000 permit fee. While we can monitor the County permit fees, these fees are usually raised at a minimal amount.

Mr. Koligian mentioned it's not just the fee.

Q: What if the \$81,000 drops all the way to \$40,000 for the same \$1,000 permit? If next year the county says the fee is still going to be \$1,000 but the threshold for the damage is going to be \$30,000.

A: Chief Donis replied I see what you are saying, but historically that has not happened. However, hypothetically, let's say it does, this board has the authority to come back and amend this section.

Mr. Koligian mentioned the requirement is triggered if the fire is in the kitchen. Shouldn't it be if there is any fire in the whole house? It kind of sounds like if it's not triggered in the kitchen, this section doesn't apply. I really believe if a person has a fire in the house, I don't care if it is in the living room, it's the opportunity to put in sprinklers at that damage level. I would like it written where any fire in any part of the house would trigger this requirement.

Mr. Abrahamian asked if there were any more questions and having none moved on to the next agenda item.

9. PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF FIRE CODE ORDINANCE NO. 2016-01

A) Action item – Conduct public hearing and adopt Fire Code Ordinance No. 2016-01.

Mr. Abrahamian opened the floor for Public Hearing on Fire Code Ordinance No. 2016-01 at 6:42 pm.

There was no one from the public at the meeting. Mr. Barcelos mentioned no comments were submitted by the City of Kerman or the County of Fresno on the Fire Code Ordinance after their thirty-day review period.

Mr. Abrahamian closed the floor for Public Hearing for Fire Code Ordinance No. 2016-01 at 6:43 pm.

Mr. Abrahamian mentioned the questions have been answered and discussed some of the issues addressed by Chief Donis in the previous agenda item. Chief Donis will provide further information requested by the District Board at the next meeting. Mr. Abrahamian asked the District Board if they had any more questions or would like further discussion regarding the Fire Code Ordinance. There were no more questions so Mr. Abrahamian called for a motion.

Motion: To adopt Fire Code Ordinance No. 2016-01 as presented.

Moved by: Mr. Souza, second by Mrs. Belluomini

Mr. Abrahamian: Mrs. Belluomini: Mr. Koligian: Mr. Nonini: Mr. Souza: Vote:
Aye Aye Aye Aye Aye 5/0

10. RESOLUTION NO. 17-01 REFINANCING OF DISTRICT PRIVATE PLACEMENT LOAN

A) Action item – Consider and adopt Resolution No. 17-01 approving the form and authorizing the execution of certain lease financing documents in connection with the refinancing of a lease agreement executed by the District in 2010 to finance its payment obligations to the Fresno County Employee’s Retirement Association.

Mr. Barcelos mentioned Jeff Land and Lizzie Emerson with Brandis Tallman are here tonight to answer any questions on the refinancing of the District’s Private Placement loan and the resolutions being presented for adoption at tonight’s meeting.

Ms. Emerson called the Board’s attention to the staff report in their board packet. She asked the Board if they had any questions from the report or on the refinancing documents.

Mr. Abrahamian asked Ms. Emerson to update the Board on the progress of the refinancing and what actions need to be done at tonight’s meeting.

Mr. Emerson started with a recap explaining the District locked in an interest rate with JP Morgan Chase back in October. The treasury rates in October were at 1.85 percent and now the treasury rates are currently at 2.51 percent. The District saved a lot of money by locking in the interest rate when they did back in October.

Ms. Emerson continued by explaining since October our firm has brought on Bond Counsel and they have drafted a few documents for Board approval this evening as well as a new policy that every agency is required to adopt as a debt management policy.

Mrs. Belluomini asked if all agencies have to adopt this debt policy. Mr. Land replied yes, all agencies looking to issue debt. Mr. Land explained back in September Senate Bill 1029 was enacted that among other things requires issuers of debt obligations after January 1, 2017, to adopt a local debt policy. This is a blanket requirement for all public agencies. The Bond Counsel brought on board for this transaction drafted the policy that meets all the requirements in the new statute.

Mr. Price mentioned he reviewed the policy and has no concerns and agrees with Bond Counsel that the District is required as a debtor to adopt a debt management policy pursuant to the change in law.

There were no more questions so Mr. Abrahamian called for a motion. Mr. Price recommended a separate motion be made for each Resolution.

Motion: To adopt Resolution No. 17-01 approving the form and authorizing the execution of certain lease financing documents in connection with the refinancing of a lease agreement executed by the District in 2010 to finance its payment obligations to the Board of Retirement of the Fresno County Employees' Retirement Association.

Moved by: Mr. Nonini, second by Mrs. Belluomini

Mr. Abrahamian:	Mrs. Belluomini:	Mr. Koligian:	Mr. Nonini:	Mr. Souza:	Vote:
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	5/0

11. RESOLUTION NO. 17-02 – DISTRICT'S DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICY

A) Action item – Consider and adopt Resolution No. 17-02 approving the District's Debt Management Policy.

Some of the discussion and questions for this item were conducted during the discussion of the previous item. No further discussion or questions were made so Mr. Abrahamian called for a motion.

Motion: To adopt Resolution No. 17-02 approving the District's Debt Management Policy.

Moved by: Mr. Nonini, second by Mrs. Belluomini

Mr. Abrahamian:	Mrs. Belluomini:	Mr. Koligian:	Mr. Nonini:	Mr. Souza:	Vote:
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	5/0

12. SMEAL APPARATUS CONSENT TO ASSIGNMENT DOCUMENTS

A) Action item – Consider and approve Board Chair sign the Consent to Assignment of Contract documents from the Smeal Fire Apparatus Company.

Mr. Barcelos called the District Board's attention to the announcement in their packets announcing Spartan Motors acquisition of Smeal Fire Apparatus. The District received this notice earlier this month along with the Consent to Assignment to Contract documents for the District to review and sign. Staff has been working with Scott Beck, a sales representative with Smeal Fire Apparatus on the purchase of the two new water tenders and three new fire engines.

Mr. Beck informed staff Spartan Motors has acquired Smeal and will use the same factory and in most cases the same personnel to manufacture the District water tender and fire engines.

Mr. Price mentioned by signing the Consent to Assign documents, the District does not give up any rights that the District had with Smeal to Spartan. The District is simply consenting to the assignment of the contracts.

Mr. Barcelos explained there are two consent forms because the District has two separate contracts, one for the ordered water tender and one for the three fire

engines. Mr. Price explained this is an assignment of everything in the contract including all your warranty rights and their obligation to provide the equipment in the same condition.

There were no more questions or discussion so Mr. Abrahamian called for a motion.

Motion: To approve and authorize District Board Chair to sign both Consent to Assignment of Contract agreements from the Smeal Fire Apparatus Company.

Moved by: Mr. Koligian, second by Mrs. Belluomini

Mr. Abrahamian:	Mrs. Belluomini:	Mr. Koligian:	Mr. Nonini:	Mr. Souza:	Vote:
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	5/0

13. OLD BUSINESS

A. Consideration and Approval of Disbursements List for December 2016.

There were no questions.

Motion: To approve the December 2016, disbursements from the West America general account in the amount of \$46,860.40.

Moved by: Mr. Nonini, second by Mr. Koligian.

Mr. Abrahamian:	Mrs. Belluomini:	Mr. Koligian:	Mr. Nonini:	Mr. Souza:	Vote:
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	5/0

B. Review and Acceptance of Monthly Financial Reports

- 1) Fresno County: Cash Balances – All Funds – No Comments
- 2) Budget Report: YTD Expenses Compared to Budget – No Comments
- 3) Revenue and Reimbursement Report – No Comments
- 4) P G & E Report – No Comments

14. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no comments

15. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A) Next Regular Board Meeting: Thursday, February 23, 2017 at 5:30 p.m.

16. CLOSED SESSION

- A) CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION – Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9: One Case

Closed Session Report: No action was taken in closed session so there is nothing to report.


17. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: To adjourn the meeting at 7:55p.m.

Moved by: Mr. Nonini, second by Mr. Koligian.

Mr. Abrahamian:	Mrs. Belluomini:	Mr. Koligian:	Mr. Nonini:	Mr. Souza:	Vote:
Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	5/0


Cheryl Belluomini, Board Secretary
North Central Fire Protection District


Date