

**SANTA YNEZ COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT**  
**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Board of Directors  
**FROM:** Loch A. Dreizler, General Manager  
**DATE:** August 16, 2023  
**SUBJECT:** Discuss the interview hiring process for an attorney to serve as District General Counsel.

**Recommendation:** Review and discuss the interview hiring process for an attorney to serve as District General Counsel.

1. **Alternative Motion #1:** I move that the Board choose the Ad-Hoc Committee Option to make the final selection for the District's Legal Counsel. Staff to coordinate with committee members on the most convenient date. Schedule interviews with the three law firms already chosen by the Ad-Hoc Committee.
2. **Alternative Motion #2:** I move that the Board choose the Special Meeting Option to make the final selection for the District's Legal Counsel. Staff to coordinate with Board members on the most convenient date. Schedule interviews with the three law firms already chosen by the Ad-Hoc Committee

**Policy Implications:** In July, the Board approved creating an Ad-hoc Committee for reviewing the Request for Proposals (RFPs) for General Legal Counsel. The committee consists of Directors Beard and Van Pelt.

**Fiscal Implications:** There are no anticipated changes in expenses for the District with the understanding that legal costs vary from year to year.

**Alternatives Considered:** None

**Discussion:**

The process included sending out RFPs to multiple individual law firms and on the CSDA message board in early June of this year. Seven firms responded to the RFP, with all seven firms shown on the following page.

The Ad-Hoc committee (Directors Beard and Van Pelt) met on August 3 with legal counsel (Rick Battles) and General Manager to review the RFPs. With guidance from legal counsel and the General Manager, the committee selected 3 law firms to proceed to the interview for final selection. The three law firms selected will be discussed in the Closed Session. The committee also discussed two options for the interviews:

1. Consider the Ad-Hoc committee interviewing the three selected law firms and bring the final selection to the Board for approval.

2. Have a Special Meeting in September; the entire Board would interview the three selected law firms and then approve the final selection.

Both options have different types of benefits:

3. Ad-Hoc Committee Option
  - a. Additional flexibility in organizing meetings with fewer schedules to coordinate.
  - b. The interviews would be more informal compared to a five-member Board.
  - c. Consensus with the Ad-Hoc committee may be more easily achieved.
4. Special Meeting Option
  - a. It would allow the entire Board to play a role in the final selection.
  - b. The interviews would feel more formal compared to an Ad-Hoc Committee.
  - c. Multiple perspectives could offer additional insight into the final selection.

## Legal firms that responded to the RFP (no particular order)

	<b>Firm</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Individual Representing the Firm</b>
01.	Price, Postel & Parma	Santa Barbara	Mark S. Manion
02.	Slovak, Baron, Empey, Murphy & Pinkney	Costa Mesa	Robert L. Patterson
03.	Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo	Irvine	Jeffrey A. Hoskinson (Nate Kowalski)
04.	Burke, Williams & Sorenson	Irvine	Chad W. Herrington
05.	Hollister & Brace	Santa Barbara	Peter L. Candy
06.	White Brenner	Sacramento	Nubia Goldstein
07.	Liberty Cassidy Whitmore	Fresno	Shelline K. Bennett