



**Sun Valley General Improvement District
Tariff Rule 20 Review Committee
April 04, 2016**

Committee Members Present:

Dawn McCarthy	Member, Property Manager
Sandra Ainsworth	Member, SVGID Representative
Andy Gebhardt	Member, TMWA Representative
Bennie Duncan	Member, Property Owner
Manual Ruiz	Member, Property Owner

Committee Members Not Present:

Don Jeppson	Member, Washoe County Representative
Sheila Stark	Member, Property Owner

Staff Present:

Darrin Price	SVGID, General Manager
Jennifer Merritt	SVGID, Administrative Assistant
Maddy Shipman	SVGID, Legal Counsel

Other Members Present:

Margaret Reinhardt	Audience
Richard Holcomb	Audience

The meeting of the Sun Valley General Improvement District was called to order by Chairperson Dawn McCarthy at 3:00 pm in the Sun Valley District Administrative Building, 5000 Sun Valley Blvd., Sun Valley, NV.

Item# 1. Roll call and determination of a quorum.

Committee members present; Bennie Duncan, Manual Ruiz, Dawn McCarthy, Sandra Ainsworth, and Andy Gebhardt, a quorum was present.

Item# 2. Public comments for items not on the agenda.

None

Item# 3. Motion to approve the agenda.

Ms. Ainsworth made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Ruiz seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Item# 4. Motion to approve Sun Valley General Improvement District Tariff Rule 20 Review Committee minutes from March 08, 2016.

Ms. Ainsworth made a motion to approve the minutes from March 08, 2016 as submitted. Mr. Ruiz seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

April 04, 2016 Tariff Rule 20 Review Committee Minutes

Page 1 of 4

Item# 5. Review and possible action to approve recommended amendments to Tariff Rule 20 per discussion from March 08, 2016 Review Committee Meeting.

Ms. Shipman gave a brief presentation of the amendments made to the District's Tariff Rule 20 based on the discussion from the March 08, 2016 Review Committee Meeting. She reported on the various amendments;

1. Title change – the Rule relates to conversion of joint and multiple units and resale of water.
2. Clarification to Section I. – Existing Services and Conversion Requirements. The existing rule was not clear and precise. She amended the last sentence to read; “The District in this Rule recognizes that such “one meter for each use” requirement was not always required prior to 1998 but, by this Rule requires conversion to one meter for each use in the future in certain circumstances.”
3. Added additional language under Section I. A. – “Except as otherwise provided in B”. She stated she wanted to only reference “B” in this paragraph to show that there is a separate section for “Conversion Not Required”. She also added the word dwelling to clarify that the Rule relates to dwellings or occupied premises.
4. Added the word “record” to Section I. A. 3. This eliminates any confusion of who owns the property.
5. Section I. A. 4. was removed completely, “Guest Buildings, Attached Accessory Dwellings and Detached Accessory Dwellings shall not be separately metered.”
6. Added a new Section I. B. – “Conversion Not Required
 1. No conversion shall be required under this Rule for single family dwelling units (including but not limited to Detached Accessory Dwellings, Detached Accessory Structures or Guest Buildings) on single family residentially zoned property and receiving water service from the District via a joint water meter prior to 1998. This exemption does not apply to any joint metered property that is or was split, by Parcel Map, Subdivision Map or any other means subsequent to February 12, 1998. (she stated this section eliminates mobile home parks and commercial stores)
 2. Proof of eligibility for exemption from conversion must be provided by the property owner to the District by way of a copy of a pre-1998 County Permit, a pre-1998 aerial photo indicating the joint metered property, a pre-1998 water bill indicating multiple service to the joint metered property or other proof acceptable to the District.”

Ms. McCarthy inquired about duplexes; it is a residential property and considered a single family because it is one unit and not considered a mobile home park.

Ms. Shipman responded without consulting with Washoe County, she does not think a duplex is considered as a single family from a zoning standpoint. It is usually considered some kind of multiple family designation.

Ms. McCarthy inquired if a duplex that was constructed pre-1998, would that property owner be required to install an additional meter.

Ms. Shipman responded she was unaware that there were duplexes within the District Boundary and would like to have the committee discuss how they would like to handle duplexes. Ms. Shipman proceeded with the last amendment to the Rule.

7. Change to Section I. C. – requiring bills only sent to the owner of the property.
“Individual billings shall not be supplied to additional residents, tenants or occupants of joint metered residential property since the resident of the main structure and the property owner are fully responsible for payment of such bills.”

Additional discussion ensued regarding duplexes. Ms. McCarthy gave an example of what a duplex is, a single unit divided into 2 or more living quarters.

Mr. Gebhardt inquired if a duplex could be considered an Attached Accessory Dwelling.

Ms. Shipman responded it shouldn't be a problem classifying a duplex as an Attached Accessory Dwelling, unless you tie in the single family zoning factor the Committee recommended in efforts to avoid not having multi-family zoning designation being able to continue using a joint water meter. She was under the impression that all of the lots that were being considered for no conversion are single family lots.

Ms. Ainsworth commented she believes that all of the duplexes are owned by one person and are used as a rental. In some cases the owner lives in one half of the home and rents out the other half.

Mr. Gebhardt responded per the definition of an Attached Accessory Dwelling that would also describe a duplex.

Ms. Shipman commented she understands the recommendation of the Committee is to include any existing duplexes within the District that is currently on a joint water meter that also meets the other requirements of the revised Rule 20, also get exempted from any conversion requirement.

Additional discussion ensued regarding existing multiple unit properties.

Audience member Mr. Holcomb inquired if the District's Rule 20 was required by the State of Nevada. He requested for clarification if he would have to separate his services on his duplex.

Ms. McCarthy responded, Mr. Holcomb would not have to separate his services for his duplex as long as his duplex was built in 1998 or prior. If Mr. Holcomb should sell his property the “grandfather rule” will stay with the property and the new owner will not have to split services.

Ms. Ainsworth also responded unless Mr. Holcomb builds on the property, then the “grandfather rule” is voided.

Audience member Ms. Reinhardt commented she believes the Rule was written to address everyone's concerns and thanked everyone for participating with the committee.

Ms. Ainsworth made a motion to accept the amended District Tariff Rule 20 as presented. Mr. Gebhardt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Price thanked the committee members on behalf of the District Board of Trustees. He will present the recommendations to the Board during a District Board meeting. Anyone is welcome to attend the meeting.

Item# 6. Public Comments.

Ms. Reinhardt thanked everyone for participating with the Committee and apologized for any inconvenience or anxiety during this process.

Item# 7. Future Agenda Items.

None

Item# 8. Adjournment.

Ms. Ainsworth made a motion to adjourn at 3:22 pm. Mr. Ruiz seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes will not be approved due to the Sun Valley General Improvement District Tariff Rule 20 Review Subcommittee disbanding on April 4, 2016.

Minutes Prepared by: Jennifer Merritt, Administrative Assistant

DRAFT