Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sunshine Fire Protection District July 12, 2016

Call to Order

- The meeting was held at Fire Station #1, 311 County Rd 83, Boulder, CO 80302.
- The meeting was called to order at 7:32 PM and quorum was established.

Attendance

Board Members Present: Sam Mishkin, Alan Kirton, Gene Fischer Board Members Absent: Deirdre Damron, Jim Peacock Others Present: Chief Michael Schmitt

Approval of Minutes

- Minutes from the June Board meeting were reviewed.
- <u>Motion</u>: To approve June Board Meeting Minutes. Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Treasurer's Report

- Treasurer's Report was reviewed
- Motion: To approve Treasurer's Report. Motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Fire Chief's Report

• Fire Chief's Report has been included as an attachment.

Other Business:

- As discussed and decided upon in the June Board meeting, a memo from SFPD was sent to the Boulder County Commissioners supporting the initiative by the Boulder County Fire Chiefs' Association (BCFCA) and the Boulder County Firefighters' Association (BCFFA) regarding the redistribution of the annual Federal Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT).
- The Fire Chief's Report posed several questions to the Board regarding District fire bans and the permitting of recreational fires in the District. In particular the question was raised as to whether SFPD's Adoption Language of the International Fire Code and/or the International Fire Code supports SFPD instituting a fire ban and issuing permits for recreational fires. Although not in the Fire Chief's Report, a related question that was brought up was whether SFPD has the authority to issue permits for slash pile burning. There was some discussion on these issues but the decision was made to table further discussion until we had more Board members present. The fact that Boulder County has issued a fire ban makes is somewhat of a moot point in the short term.

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sunshine Fire Protection District July 12, 2016

Adjournment

• With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 PM.

Attest: <u></u>

Alan Kirton, Secretary



Chief's Report, Board Meeting 07/12/2016

- Engine 4501 participated in the Cold Springs Fire. The revenue generated is \$4,387.50 thanks to Deputy Chief Ballard as he was willing to be the Engine Boss. Following Firefighters were on the engine on either Sunday or Monday: Fred Marmsater, Rick Lansky, George Woodward, Michael Johnson. Other firefighters either participated or made themselves available for patrol in the district: Sam Mishkin, Alan Kirton, Meredith Jackson, Michael Johnson, Sheree Matheson, Derek Lapp, Jonathan Wilder Lavington, Michael Sampliner.
- 2. We worked very closely with 4Mile on patrol and monitoring the fire. I was at ICP in the mornings, during the day and at night, attending briefings and staying informed on fire behavior and movement (as the winds were coming consistently out of the WSW).
- 3. 4Mile Chief Gibson and I are discussing lessons learned and how to improve firefighter distribution among districts in the event of incidents in other districts that affect us indirectly.
- 4. Would like to get firefighters paid sooner than when the state pays us.

<u>Calls</u>

BCFD160609-006050, 6/9/2016 9:35:51 AM, FIASSR-Fire Assist

BCFD160614-006269, 6/14/2016 2:23:39 AM, EMSR-Medical Call

BCFD160619-006495, 6/19/2016 6:07:13 PM, FICONR-Controlled Burn

BCFD160622-006616, 6/22/2016 7:52:57 PM, FIINFR-Fire Information (Fire Ban Enacted)

- BCFD160624-006680, 6/24/2016 9:51:01 AM, FIALRSR-Residential Fire Alarm
- BCFD160628-006847, 6/28/2016 10:21:06 AM, EMSR-Medical Call
- BCFD160704-007093, 7/4/2016 9:06:13 AM, EMSR-Medical Call
- BCFD160704-007114, 7/4/2016 2:28:39 PM, FINONR-Fire Non Structure (truck fire)

BCFD160710-007398, 7/10/2016 7:52:43 PM, EMSR-Medical Call

These are Marshall Honeyman's comments regarding the fire ban (questions for board at bottom):

I. Our authority to enact a burn ban; 2) the permitting issue for recreational burns.

1. Section 307.1.1 of the IFC allows us to ban burns:

307.1.1 Prohibited open burning.

Open burning that is offensive or objectionable because of smoke emissions or when atmospheric conditions or local circumstances make such fires hazardous shall be prohibited.

The IFC clearly gives that authority to enact a ban to the fire code official and Chief. The Board may want this authority but it's not part of the IFC. Maybe the Board want to be consulted or have a veto on the decision—that would need, I think, a resolution by the Board.

As for the coverage of the ban, given that we don't have agricultural burns (and they are exempt anyway), and slash burns are prohibited until there is appropriate ground cover, the main issue is campfires for recreational use or ceremonial fires. So, a burn ban basically states no recreational fires.

Note that the IFC has an appeals section and that was amended in the adoption document. We may want to have exceptions for ceremonial fires but I think that is a slippery slope and we should just ban open fires, period.

II. The recreational burning permit.

I agree that we don't want to be in the business of permitting all sorts of things, although there are several activities that we left in the amendment as worthy of the permitting hassle (e.g., taking SPR-required cisterns out of service).

I interpreted the statement below as allowing us to permit residential burns:

'Notifications, instructions and stipulations of the burn permit <u>and those of the District</u> shall be adhered to' [emphasis mine]

I know that this is a legal issue in terms of what we are authorized to do but the residential permit issue is important, largely as a proactive measure for educating prospective burners.

Without the District permitting process, a person wanting a 'recreational fire' in our District needs to call Dispatch and advise them of the burn. See the quick guide:

http://www.bouldercounty.org/doc/sheriff/burnpermitquickguide.pdf

So far, we've had three applicants and it's clear that in all three cases that our inspections and educational activities surrounding recreational burns made a substantial difference in applicant activity and behavior and, I believe, made our District safer.

The questions are these:

- 1. Does the Board agree that we (i.e., the District) should, as a public safety measure, be able to set burn bans? That is, should we be able to make our own determinations as to the criteria for setting a burn ban? The Sheriff can set a ban; why should we need to wait? Given that the IFC gives us the authority to enact a ban then the Board would need to pass a resolution stating that that part of the IFC is not valid.
- 2. Doe the Board believe that we should issue recreational burn permits? I think that this is one of the most important things that we can do to protect the District in the summer and fall. This process clearly is aimed at residents but it also gives us the authority to extinguish fires by transients, as they won't have a permit. As stated above, it has not proven to be burdensome. The permitting process does two things: a) allows us to educate the applicant as to their responsibility; and b) inspect the fire pit.
- 3. If the Board believes that the residential fire permitting process is useful then does the current adoption language allow us to do so?
- 4. The Board is to represent the District residents and look after their best interests with regard to emergency response and fire protection. I believe that given current events that the overwhelming majority of District residents would supports the permitting process.