



Sun Valley G.I.D. Board Meeting Minutes of March 13, 2014

Board Members Present:

Sandra Ainsworth	Chairperson
Garth Elliott	Vice-Chair
Margaret Reinhardt	Secretary
Joseph Barstow	Treasurer
Susan Severt	Trustee

Board Members Not Present:

Staff Present:

Darrin Price	SVGID, General Manager
Mike Ariztia	SVGID, Public Works Director
Erin Dowling	SVGID, Customer Service Supervisor
Maddy Shipman	SVGID, Legal
Jennifer Merritt	SVGID, Staff

Others Present:

Jim Ainsworth	Audience
Linda Elliott	Audience
Vicky Maltman	Audience
Michael Rider	Audience
Glenda Walls	Audience
Catherine Hansford	Hansford Economic Consulting

The meeting of the Sun Valley GID was called to order by Chair Sandra Ainsworth at 6:00 p.m. in the Sun Valley District Administrative Building, 5000 Sun Valley Blvd, Sun Valley, NV.

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

Board members present; Treasurer Barstow, Vice Chair Elliott, Chairperson Ainsworth, Secretary Reinhardt, Trustee Severt. A quorum was present.

Item#2. Pledge of Allegiance.

Led by Trustee Severt

Item#3. Motion to approve agenda.

Secretary Reinhardt made a motion to approve the agenda. Vice Chair Elliott seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Item#4. Certify posting of agenda.

Jennifer Merritt certified posting of agenda.

Item#5. Public Comments for items not on the agenda.

Vicky Maltman commented she still has a problem with the District's new billing statement. She does not like the fact if she has a credit balance that the credit balance appears in the highlighted past due box. She has heard similar complaints from other District customers. She also

commented if the District is paying for a service, the District should receive the service it wants and not what the vendor wants.

Item#6. Trustee/Manager's announcements, request for information, and statements relating to items not on the agenda.

Darrin Price, General Manager, announced Washoe County Department of Water Resources and Truckee Meadows Water Authority will be having a Joint Meeting to discuss the potential merger on Wednesday, March 19, 2014 at the Sparks Council Chambers starting at 11 am.

Vice Chairperson Elliott stated he recently traveled to Sacramento, CA and was pleased to see minimal amounts of graffiti in comparison to the amount of graffiti in the Truckee Meadows. He stated he thinks that Sacramento is doing something right and he would like to contact whoever is in charge for the Sacramento graffiti abatement program so he can learn from them.

Item#7. Discussion and motion as to payables and customer refunds for March 13, 2014.

Treasurer Barstow gave a brief report of the accounts payable and customer refunds for March 13, 2014.

Treasurer Barstow made a motion to approve the accounts payable for March 13, 2014 in the total amount of \$469,245.27 with discussion. Vice Chair Elliott seconded the motion. After discussion the motion carried unanimously.

Treasurer Barstow made a motion to approve the customer refunds for March 13, 2014 in the total amount of \$1,325.51. Vice Chair Elliott seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Item#8. Discussion and motion to approve minutes of February 27, 2014.

Vice Chair Elliott stated for clarification regarding his statement on agenda item 11, "He drove through Sunrise Villa's development and noticed at the end of each road there was illegal dumping at one time; since then the development closed off the end of each road with concrete blocks and it stopped the illegal dumping."

Vice Chair Elliott made a motion to approve the minutes of February 27, 2014 with the clarification noted. Treasurer Barstow seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following; Yea: Treasurer Barstow, Vice Chair Elliott, Trustee Severt, and Chairperson Ainsworth – Abstain: Secretary Reinhardt.

Item#9. Discussion and motion to approve water rate analyst/consultant.

Darrin Price, General Manager, stated Mr. Collins withdrew his proposal for consideration due to upcoming scheduling conflicts. This leaves the Board with one proposal from Hansford Economic Consulting for consideration. He stated the Board has the option to eliminate some of the line items from Ms. Hansford's proposed scope of work.

Catherine Hansford with Hansford Economic Consulting stated her proposal is a draft proposal. She included all the elements that she would typically provide with a rate study. She stated her proposal is subject for negotiation. Based on the listed tasks/items for her scope of work, she would suggest eliminating two tasks/items; eliminate Scenarios / Sensitivity Analysis for Rates and Fees and the other is Comparison Rates and Connection Fees Analysis. Eliminating these two tasks/items would decrease the proposal by \$3,530.00 making the new total cost proposal \$16,050.00.

Mr. Price recommended having an outside analysis to perform an audit of the District's rates. The District has an independent audit performed every year to make sure the District's accounting practices are in line. As mentioned at a prior meeting, it is very prudent to have utilities bring in an outside consultant once every four to five years to make sure rates are where they should be.

Vice Chair Elliott thanked Ms. Hansford for her class she taught at Truckee Meadows Community Collage regarding rate structures. He stated he winced pretty hard at \$19,000.00 and will wince a little less at \$16,000.00; he was hoping it would be less. He also stated if he had a crystal ball in front of him on the way this is going to go, if the District approves this, Ms. Hansford is going to say that the District is charging too little for its water and Mr. Price will suggest to raise the water rates. Mr. Elliott stated he already has it figured out so the District does not have to spend \$16,000.00 and thanked Ms. Hansford for her time.

Secretary Reinhardt agreed with Mr. Elliott's comment.

Audience member Vicky Maltman stated she has no objection of the type of work that Hansford Economic Consulting does. She stated every time she comes to a District meeting, the District is spending, spending, spending and staff is always reassuring everyone that it is ok because it is in the budget. As she once said at a prior meeting, the District is not the United States Government; the District does not need to spend its full budget in order to get the same budget the following year. She stated with the increases to everyone's pay, she is very much against the District Board spending any amount of money to have someone from the outside come in and say, you are not charging enough. She feels the District customers are paying too much right now.

Secretary Reinhardt made a motion to not hire an analyst at this time. Vice Chair Elliott seconded the motion. After some discussion the motion carried by the following; Yea: Treasurer Barstow, Vice Chair Elliott, Secretary Reinhardt and Chairperson Ainsworth – Nay: Trustee Severt.

Item#10. Review of request for proposal for lobbyist services with direction to staff to proceed.

Darrin Price, General Manager, provided a draft proposal for lobbyist services for consideration. At a prior meeting the Board directed staff to develop a Scope of Work for Lobbying Services and proposed options. If the draft proposal is approved by the Board, Mr. Price will solicit qualified lobbyist to submit proposals for review and consideration. He stated the draft proposal has been reviewed by Ms. Shipman. He referred to the bottom of the Scope of Work proposal, the draft proposal requests for two submittals for consideration. Contract #1 – contract is anticipated to be a six-month contract commencing January 1, 2015 and ending on June 30, 2015. The other Contract #2 – contract is anticipated to be a two-year contract commencing January 1, 2015 and ending on January 1, 2017. He stated after speaking with Ms. Shipman, he would like to modify Contract #2 start date to July 1, 2015 through July 1, 2017 to potentially get two legislative sessions out of the contract if approved.

Vice Chair Elliott stated he spoke with all of the agencies that were approved by the Board to be used for comparison. He inquired with the other agencies what they do regarding a lobbyist; none of them at this time hire a lobbyist. He stated Incline Village General Improvement District had a lobbyist but she quit. Incline Village General Improvement District is considering adding lobbying duties as part of the General Manager's position when they go to fill the position. In the interim Incline Village General Improvement District is utilizing the Nevada League of Cities for their lobbying services. He stated he cannot support approval of a lobbyist at this time. The only way he can support a lobbyist is by making cuts from other areas within the District's budget.

Secretary Reinhardt inquired if the District requests for proposals by putting it out to bid, is the Board committing itself to hiring a lobbyist.

Ms. Shipman responded the proposal is only to look at a professional service contract and reviewing qualifications.

Secretary Reinhardt stated she does not think that the District needs a lobbyist.

Treasurer Barstow stated he likes the suggestion that was made to modify the two year contract proposal in efforts to get two sessions out of the contract.

Mr. Price stated if the Board is only looking to receive reports on what is happening during a session, there are agencies that can provide an update report only. He stated for clarification, Incline Village General Improvement District lobbyist Ms. Mary Walker did not renew her contract when the lobbyist contract expired. Until such time that Incline Village General Improvement District hires their General Manager, because their General Manager hires the lobbyist. He also stated that Nevada League of Cities will represent the District, but they also represent thirty to fifty other agencies. The Nevada League of Cities will not represent the District on a specific bill; they will represent the various agencies on general bills that have the potential to affect all the agencies and not just one.

Vice Chair Elliott responded that Mr. Price is correct about Incline Village General Improvement District lobbyist. However, after speaking with Incline Village General Improvement District, he was told that they are considering adding the lobbying responsibilities as part of the General Manager's position and no longer outsourcing that responsibility. He stated out of all the years that he has sat on the District Board he has listened to the sporadic reports given by the District's lobbyist, Mr. Hillerby and never recalls him saving the District money in any way. He stated he could be wrong and anyone can show him proof that Mr. Hillerby has saved the District money.

Trustee Severt commented on her concern; most lobbyists work is done prior to a legislative session and in the committees before a bill is sent to the floor. She has sat in the audience during a District board meetings and has heard reports given by both Mr. Hillerby and Mr. Price. They have reported how they were tracking a bill(s) that appeared completely innocent, but would have affected the District in some way even if it is a procedural change to the District's daily business. She also stated having a physical presence at the legislature is needed to track thousands of bills on behalf of the District, especially during the final days of a session, when everyone one is trying to add-on to an existing bill. She would like to at least look at lobbyist proposals and review their qualifications in case the District needs to hire a lobbyist. She is not ok with saying a lobbyist is not needed at all.

Vice Chair Elliott commented anyone is welcome to call the same agencies that he spoke with regarding the need for a lobbyist. These agencies are similar to the District and some have other responsibilities. They all feel that it is not necessary to have a lobbyist. He relies upon those in the industry that have formed an opinion that is 180 degree from the District's.

Audience member Vicky Maltman commented the District has spent more than enough money this year. She inquired how many bills from the thousands of bills that were introduced would have actually affected the Sun Valley General Improvement District. She inquired how much money was saved out of the money that was spent for having a lobbyist monitoring bills. If there is no substantial savings, she does not see the need for a lobbyist. She also inquired how much it would be for lobbyist services starting at the time of Bill Draft Request being written and having someone monitor them to determine if there are any potential problems, then consider extending the contract if needed into the legislative session.

Treasure Barstow inquired what does the District pay to the Truckee Meadows Water Authority.

Mr. Price responded the District buys all of its water from Truckee Meadows Water Authority.

Treasure Barstow inquired if anything that was changed to or by Truckee Meadows Water Authority, could it affect the District.

Chairperson Ainsworth responded that anything that happens to Truckee Meadows Water Authority has the potential to affect the District.

Mr. Price gave a brief example how Truckee Meadows Water Authority affected the District. When Truckee Meadows Water Authority was being formed the District had Mr. Hillerby represent the District because the formation of the authority included legislative action. With the assistance of Mr. Hillerby's representation there was a \$900,000 savings to the District during the formation of the authority. He stated could the Board could choose to not have representation or consider utilizing one of the other groups and receive legislative updates only. He wants to make the Board understands the difference between receiving a report and having someone at the legislature talking to individuals and committees how a proposed bill can affect a utility, the District and/or the Sun Valley community.

Secretary Reinhardt stated Mr. Price has attended the legislature in the past and has been registered as a lobbyist. She thinks he has done a good job staying on top of the bills and is comfortable continuing having just the General Manager representing the District.

After further discussion Trustee Severt made a motion to approve the Scope of Work as presented for lobbyist services with one correction; change to Contract #2, change start date to July 2015 through July 2017. Treasure Barstow seconded the motion. The motion carried by the following; Yea: Treasurer Barstow, Trustee Severt, and Chairperson Ainsworth – Nay: Vice Chair Elliott, Secretary Reinhardt.

Item#11. Presentation and discussion regarding District's Non-Payment Disconnect Process.

Erin Dowling, Customer Service Supervisor gave a presentation regarding the District's Non-Payment Disconnect process and provided copies of the District's billing statement and late statement for informational purposes only. Ms. Dowling stated the District has four billing cycles; on a weekly basis the District bills for one cycle, prepares late notices for another cycle, and disconnects for non-payment for another cycle, this is on a rotating cycle. She gave a step-by-step presentation showing how the District notifies the customers of their due dates leading up to potential disconnect. From the time that the District mails a bill, the customers are given 20 days to pay their bill until it is consider late. If a bill is not paid by its due date, the District prepares and mails a late notice the following day notifying the customer that they must pay their bill by a specific date or they will be disconnected for non-payment. The customers are now given an additional 22 days to pay their bill before they would be disconnected for non-payment; in total a customer is given a approximately 42 days to pay their bill before the District disconnects a customer for non-payment. During those 42 days the customer receives another monthly bill showing the customer their past due amount, their new bill amount and also reminds the customer of their must pay by date and the scheduled disconnect date. She reminded the Board the District bills in the rears and does not pre-bill for anything; the customer already had used the water by the time the District bills for the service. She also reminded the Board that all of the fees and rules that govern what the District does are in the District's Tariff that is approved by the Board of Trustees and staff implements the rules.

Treasure Barstow inquired if the late notice is mailed separately or with the customer's new billing statement.

Mr. Price responded each billing statement and late notice statement is mailed separately. The customer is notified by the District on three separate occasions of their due date and notification of disconnection for non-payment. He stated once a customer is late, that customer now requires special attention and the District has to do an extra mailing to the customer. This causes extra time and resources by District staff, dedicated to monitor all customers who are late, leading up to disconnect day.

Ms. Dowling continued with her presentation and stated the District has a total of 6,000 customers of which 76% of the customers pay their bill by the due date on the billing statement. The other 24% are customers who received a late notice; 90% of the customers who received a late notice pays by the must pay by date or make a payment arrangement to avoid being disconnected. This leaves 10% of those customers that received a late notice to actually be disconnected for non-payment. The District disconnects between 24 and 50 (which equals to 2.4% of the total 6,000 customers) customers for non-payment, per week. She noted the District does not disconnect customers the week of Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Treasure Barstow inquired if a customer makes an arrangement after they receive their late notice is the customer still assessed a late fee.

Ms. Dowling responded yes, each customer that is past due is assessed a 5% late fee of their current past due balance whether or not a payment arrangement has been made on the account.

Vice Chair Elliott inquired by the District outsourcing the billing service, hasn't it or should it have been constructed to handle some of the extra steps to dramatically decrease the steps performed by District staff.

Ms. Dowling responded the District only outsources the printing and mailing of the billing and late notice statements. Prior to the data file being sent to BDS for printing, the District's Billing Representative still has to look at each of the accounts for accuracy and for any special notes on an account. BDS only has access to the data file that is sent over for printing and mailing, they do not have access to the District's Springbrook system.

She continued with her presentation and stated a common question the District receives from customers is why they are charged a \$40 reconnection fee if their water had not been turned off yet. The answer to that question is per District's Tariff Rule #21 III.B. states, "if payment is made after the last day for payment (must pay by date) prior to disconnect and the services has not been disconnected but the Service Technician has been dispatched to perform the disconnection the customer shall pay a \$40 service connection fee". The \$40 service reconnection fee was implemented to cover costs that are associated with the additional duties by both the office and field staff on disconnect days.

Mr. Ariztia reminded the Board that when a customer is disconnected for non-payment, the customer already used water for two months without paying for it.

Mr. Price responded for clarification, the District bills each month for water, sewer, and recreation.

Ms. Dowling continued with her presentation and stated when a customer does not pay by their must pay by date, office staff has to review all accounts scheduled for disconnect to see if any special payment arrangements have been made on the account. Staff has to create individual service orders for each account to be disconnected, additional time spent with the customer

taking payments, explaining reconnection fees, and sometimes escalating to management when needed. Once a customer pays their bill, office staff generates a new service order to have services restored at which time is called out to the Service Technician to ensure a timely reconnection. In some cases the customer may pay their bill prior to actually being disconnected, and office staff will inquire with the technician if the particular customer has been disconnected yet and notify him that that customer paid and to remove them from the disconnect list. The final step is to close out all service orders that were generated to disconnect and reconnect for each individual account. On disconnect days the On-Call Service Technician's day revolves around the disconnection and the reconnection process. An increase in communication takes place between the technician and the office all day long to ensure timely reinstallation of service. Throughout the day the technician is noting on all of the service orders for disconnects and reconnects.

Mr. Ariztia also stated it is typical that the technician will make two trips per customer on disconnect day; once to disconnect and other to reconnect. Sometimes during the reconnection process the technician notices that the customer left a faucet on and then has to leave a tag on the customer's door stating he could not restore service because they noticed water is still running. Once the customer receives their notice, the technician is dispatched for a third time to turn the water on again. That is just a portion of the individual attention a customer receives.

Ms. Dowling stated the District offers an after hour's reconnection, anything submitted after 4:30 pm; this service is \$60.00 (regular \$40 reconnection fee plus \$20 after hours). Both Truckee Meadows Water Authority and Washoe County Department of Water Resources do not offer after hour's reconnection. Their policy is same day reconnection within business hours only, or the reconnection is schedule for the following day.

Vice Chair Elliott thanked Ms. Dowling for her presentation and stated it was slightly different from how it was explained to him by a customer. He would like to review the disconnect process during an upcoming tariff to make it the disconnect process a little friendlier. He stated he has some concerns regarding refunds of customer deposits. He reminded everyone the Board has final authority, and appreciates the front office letting the customers know if they are not satisfied with a policy to discuss it with the Board. He agrees the District has to collect for those who are disconnected, but he also thinks the District needs to be compassionate for some of the customers because of the economic times.

Mr. Price stated majority of the customer who are disconnected for non-payment are repeat offenders each time.

Mr. Ariztia stated Vice Chair Elliott has brought up at prior meetings as a representative of a landowner that the deposit doesn't always cover the final balance. He stated the longer the District extends courtesies on a account, the past due amount continues to grow and sometimes becomes greater than the deposit. This potentially harms the landowner to cover the cost that the deposit won't cover.

Trustee Severt inquired how many of the 2.4% of the disconnected customers are reconnected and how many of them are never reconnected. She also inquired what percentages of the reconnects are performed after hours.

Ms. Dowling responded based on one disconnect cycle on average of five customers are not ever reconnected. The District keeps the account in active status for ten days after it has been disconnected for non-payment. After ten days the account is closed out and the deposit is applied towards the final bill. These accounts are traditionally tenants who have moved out and forgot to request disconnect of service or tenants who skipped out on their landlord. She also responded

that on a disconnect day, 95% of the customers pay to have their water restored during regular business hours and the other 5% are after hour's.

Audience member Vicky Maltman inquired about customers who are still on wells and inquired how the District monitors well customers and make sure well customers are not supplying water to neighbors.

Mr. Price responded the District has Tariff Rules regarding well owners. All of the well owners that are within the District's boundary are connected to the wastewater system. In the event a well owner becomes delinquent with the District, the District has the ability to plug the customer's sewer line. He stated there are approximately thirteen well customers so it makes it easy for field staff to monitor them. He also stated the District has specific rules regarding the resale of water.

Mr. Ariztia responded all of the customers on wells has a meter installed on the well so the District can properly assess the well customer's sewer usage.

After further discussion Chairperson Ainsworth thanked Ms. Dowling for her presentation. She also directed Ms. Dowling to continue to offer to customers that they have an option to speak with the Board of Trustees regarding any of their concerns.

Chairperson Ainsworth requested a 10 minute break at 8:09 pm.

Item#12. Review and discussion regarding results of the Web Payment Survey with possible direction to staff.

Erin Dowling, Customer Service Supervisor provided copies of the Web Payment Survey results for review. The results show that majority of the District customers who took the survey want to access their account and be able to pay their bill online. She stated one of the questions on the survey was what is the maximum amount a customer is willing to pay to make a payment online. The results show that majority of the customers don't want to pay a transaction fee followed by customers stating that they are ok with continuing to pay the existing \$1.00 transaction fee the District already charges for the use of credit/debit cards. Ms. Dowling stated staff is requesting any direction from the Board with how to proceed regarding web payments online.

Secretary Reinhardt stated the results speak for themselves.

Vice Chair Elliott stated he does not think there would be a huge subsidy by other customers if the District was to implement online payment option. He stated it is unclear how much subsidizing there would be if any, because nobody knows exactly how many customers will utilize the online payment option. He suggested that the District to figure out a way to mitigate subsidizing and get it reduced. He also stated by offering the online payment feature it will free up staff time.

Ms. Dowling responded Vice Chair Elliott is correct, the District will not know exactly how much the expenses will be until the feature is implemented and customers are utilizing it. When she consulted Springbrook regarding the feature they provided a few options. One of the options is the customer pays for the feature by paying an approximate 3% transaction fee added onto the customer's payment. The District would still have to pay a monthly fee which of \$0.05 per active account. Springbrook estimated if the District was to offer this feature and only 10% of the customers utilized the feature and the District paid all of the transaction fees it would be approximately \$0.20 up to \$0.25 per active customer. If more customers utilize the feature the cost goes up. She also stated the savings in staff time if the feature is implemented would be offset with staff reconciling online payment batches every day.

Chairperson Ainsworth inquired what are the recommended online payment options and what are the associated fees.

Ms. Dowling responded there are two options to consider through Springbrook utility billing; utility costs and non-utility costs. Non-utility cost is when the customer pays all the costs. Utility cost is when the District pays for all of the fees and no longer charges the current \$1.00 transaction fee, merchant fees could be negotiated. The District would be responsible for paying a transaction fee of approximately \$1.50 up to \$2.00 per transaction, depending on the amount of payment. The District would be also responsible for paying a monthly fee of \$0.05 per active customer that equals out to approximately \$3,600.00 per year. She stated if the District outsources the online payment to BDS who currently prints and mails the District's monthly statements; BDS offers a revenue neutral program. The revenue neutral programs costs are 2% to 3% per transaction and are paid by the customer. The District would be responsible to pay a \$125.00 monthly maintenance fee and a onetime set up fee of \$1,400.00. If the District went with BDS using their utility discount, there is no transaction fee to the customers. The District would be responsible for each transaction fee at a reduced rate; the District is still responsible for the monthly maintenance and the onetime set up fee. She stated the District currently offers multiple payment options, customers can pay in the office during business hours, drop payments in the drop box located in the front parking lot, pay by credit/debit cards over the phone, arrange to have auto withdrawal from their bank accounts on their due date, or pay online through their bank with no transaction fees.

Trustee Severt inquired if the \$1.00 transaction fee the District currently charges the customers who pay with their credit/debit cards covers the District's cost or is a portion of it subsidized.

Mr. Price responded when he performed the analysis several years ago, the true cost to cover expenses was a little over \$2.00 per transaction. At that time the Board felt \$2.00 was too high and approved a \$1.00 transaction fee to assist with recovering some of the cost.

Audience member Michael Rider commented he pays all his bills online, the only one he cannot pay at this time is his water bill. He stated he calls in his payment and does not mind paying the \$1.00 transaction fee because of the convenience. He stated this is the 21st Century nobody wants to make a special trip to pay a bill. He understands that majority of the customers who participated in the survey don't want to pay a transaction fee to pay with their credit/debit cards, but he pays transaction fees for a lot of his bills when he pays them online. He thinks that once the District implements online payment feature, customers are not going to mind as much paying a transaction fee and it potentially can lead into paperless bills saving the District on printing and mailing expenses. He strongly feels that an online payment feature is needed and customers should pay for this feature.

Audience member Vicky Maltman stated the 95% of the customers who participated in the survey do not represent 95% of the District's total customers. She would like to start hearing real numbers instead of percentages. She also stated it might save the District money by implementing online payments having the customers pay the transaction fees and the District paying the annual fee. She also inquired how many people in Sun Valley, not including Highland Ranch residents, have computers. She stated if 3,600 customers came in and paid their bill with a credit/debit card today, it is still costing the District over \$3,600.00. She thinks the District should implement the online payment feature since that is what the customers keep asking for. She personally pays her bills through her bank and it doesn't cost anything.

Audience member Jim Ainsworth stated he does not believe in subsidizing and thinks the use of the credit/debit cards should reflect the full cost associated with the service. He agrees the District

should continue to promote all the payment options that are available for customers to choose. If a customer wants to continue to pay with their credit/debit card then they should pay for the convenience.

Additional discussion ensued regarding transaction expenses. Staff was directed to continue promoting customers of the District's current payment options. Staff was also requested to bring back actual costs from the District's current merchant service and compare them with how much the District has collected from the \$1.00 transaction fee that is collected from customers that use their credit/debit cards.

Item#13. Review and discussion regarding results of the Customer Satisfaction Survey with possible direction to staff.

Erin Dowling, Customer Service Supervisor provided copies of the Customer Satisfaction Survey results for review. She stated that District staff has met with some of the Trustees regarding some of the comments and then grouped the comments into categories. Staff has determined the District needs to answer and educate customers based on the majority of the comments received. She stated staff can utilize the District's newsletter, website, and the front lobby monitor to provide information to the customers. Ms. Dowling stated that when a customer calls or comes into the office and asks questions or express their concerns, staff takes the time to answer their questions.

Mr. Price stated he was pleased with the Customer Satisfaction Survey results; he contributes the results to District staff professionalism.

There were no board comments or public comments for this item.

Item#14. Financial report by Bill Short.

None

Item#15. Legal report by Maddy Shipman.

None

Item#16. Field report by Mike Ariztia.

None

Item#17. Manager's report by Darrin Price.

Darrin Price reported on the following items;

- He attended the Washoe County Commission meeting; they had discussion regarding the merger between Truckee Meadows Water Authority and Washoe County Department of Water Resources.
- He gave an update on the Gepford Park project; the building has been demolished and staff is currently working on prepping the pad for the new building. He continues to work with the engineer and Community Development Block Grant regarding the new bidding process.
- The Give Kids a Boost committee will be having their first planning meeting. He stated he will make the request to the committee to continue having the event at the Sun Valley Community Park.
- He shared a customer comment he received via voice mail. The customer was appreciative of the message on the District's billing statement notifying customers of the free tax service that was offered by the Family Resource Center.

- He stated staff will be working on the District's 2014/2015 budget and will be presenting the tentative budget to the Board at an upcoming meeting in April.

Item#18. Public Comments.

Vicky Maltman commented April 19, 2014 is military kids' day and there will be an Easter Egg Hunt at Rancho San Rafael Park. A mother daughter tea event is scheduled for May 17, 2014; volunteers are welcomed to assist with preparation. She also commented another bowling fundraiser has been scheduled for September 20, 2014.

Michael Rider requested the District to consider waiving the advertisement rental fees for sponsorship banners for the Cal Ripken Baseball League. He stated majority of their fundraising efforts is contributed from concessions sold. Since the league won't have a concession building this year the other option for the league to fundraise is through sponsorship banners.

Pastor Joseph Barstow commented on March 21, 2014 the Food Pantry will be having a benefit concert at the Sun Valley Landowners Building starting at 7 pm. Admission is only \$5.00 with a donation of 2 cans of food or \$10.00 without a food donation. He reported the Food Pantry purchases its food from the Northern Nevada Food Bank and recently the price of food has doubled and in some cases tripled. He also reported the Nevada Food Bank received the National Humanity Inspiration Award and Northern Nevada Food Bank received a total of \$75,000.00.

Item#19. Board Comments.

Secretary Reinhardt commented she liked Trustees Severt's request to form an internal committee regarding review of health insurance options that was discussed at the prior meeting. She stated after reading the minutes, it sounds like Trustee Severt's suggestion fell flat and Secretary Reinhardt would like the Board to requester an internal committee.

Ms. Shipman responded she recalls the suggestion that was made was to form an internal committee to review reports on insurance options. What Ms. Shipman indicated at the prior meeting that the internal committee would be subject to the Open Meeting Law and the meetings would have to be noticed. At which time Mr. Price announced that a board member is welcome to attend the monthly employee meetings to provide any reports regarding insurance benefits. Ms. Shipman stated she did not recall any board members not interested in the idea; it was a matter of how to implement the committee.

Trustee Severt responded she does not think her idea is dead. She plans on attending the next employee meeting and presenting her idea to the District employees then report back to the Board with the potential of requesting a future agenda item for the formation of an internal committee.

Secretary Reinhardt would like to see Trustee Severt continue with her idea for an internal committee to review of health insurance. She stated review of the District's health insurance benefits is long overdue.

Vice Chair Elliott commented he was appointed as the District's alternate representative for Pool Pact. He stated he is able to attend the conference an inquired if he should register for it. He also stated he would like to have monthly updates provided to the Board from Nancy Eklof in person or via report for those times she can't attend the meeting. He also suggested having the monthly marketing meetings held during the board meetings.

Trustee Severt reported the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District Sierra Fire Blue Ribbon Committee will be meeting March 18, 2014 at 1:30 in the Washoe County conference room in

building C. The committee will start going over the draft report the committee is preparing. She stated all reports are available for review on the www.washoecounty.us/tmfpd/brc.

Item#20. Future Agenda Items.

Darrin Price reported the following items will be on the next agenda;

- Presentation by Washoe County Regional Parks regarding updates to the Sun Valley Regional Park Master Plan.
- Presentation by Regional Transportation Commission regarding the Sun Valley Boulevard Corridor Study.
- Review of the District's recreation season.
- Review of the District's Spring Pipeline articles.
- Request to approve William Short to conduct the District's 2013/2014 audit.
- Scada equipment upgrade request.
- Consideration of scheduling a budget workshop.
- Request from Washoe County Commissioner Jung regarding Nextdoor.com

Trustee Severt requested discussion regarding the District's billing statements with alternative options that will address some of the District's customers concerns. She stated her request can wait until the first meeting in April.

Vice Chair Elliott requested discussion regarding consideration of a 360° Evaluation for the General Manager. He also requested discussion regarding the District's Salary and Wages Comprehensive worksheet.

Ms. Shipman requested Vice Chair Elliott to speak with Mr. Price regarding his request for salary and wages to figure out what exactly Vice Chair Elliott wants to be discussed as an agenda item.

Item#21. Adjournment.

Secretary Reinhardt made a motion to adjourn at 8:32 pm. Chairperson Ainsworth seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.