



**Sun Valley General Improvement District
Board Meeting Minutes of
September 08, 2016**

Board Members Present:

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

Board Members Not Present:

Staff Present:

| | |
|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Darrin Price | SVGID, General Manager |
| Jon Combs | SVGID, Public Works Director |
| Erin Dowling | SVGID, Customer Service Supervisor |
| Jennifer Merritt | SVGID, Administrative Assistant |
| Maddy Shipman | SVGID, Legal Counsel |

Other Members Present:

| | |
|---------------|----------|
| Bonnie Weber | Audience |
| Earl Douglas | Audience |
| Carmen Ortiz | Audience |
| Michael Rider | Audience |

The meeting of the Sun Valley General Improvement District was called to order by Chairperson Ainsworth at 6:00 pm in the Sun Valley District Administrative Building, 5000 Sun Valley Blvd., Sun Valley, NV.

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

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

Item# 2. Pledge of Allegiance.

Led by Trustee Barstow

Item# 3. Public comments for items not on the agenda.

None

Item# 4. Motion to approve the agenda.

Treasurer Elliott requested to postpone agenda item 9 until the next meeting for timing purposes.

Vice Chair Severt made a motion to approve the agenda as amended. Treasurer Elliott seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Item# 5. Certify posting of the agenda.

Jennifer Merritt certified posting of the agenda.

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

Treasurer Elliott commented on a recent Washoe County Planning Commission meeting and how a commissioner acted when the audience applauded. A commissioner was upset about the applauding and called for a 5 minute recess. Treasurer Elliott stated applauding at a Washoe County meeting is considered a big no-no unless it is precipitated by a commissioner. Following the break the District Attorney informed the commission that calling a break because the audience was applauding is not legal according to the Open Meeting Law. The only time a board can enforce such a rule is if it is listed on the agenda that applauding is prohibited and the applauding rule would apply to everyone including board members.

Item# 7. Discussion and motion to approve accounts payable and customer refunds for September 08, 2016.

Treasurer Elliott gave a brief report of the accounts payable for September 08, 2016.

Treasurer Elliott made a motion to approve the accounts payable for September 08, 2016 in the total amount of \$429,587.74. Trustee Barstow seconded the motion. After discussion the motion carried unanimously.

Treasurer Elliott gave a brief report of the customer refunds for September 08, 2016.

Treasurer Elliott made a motion to approve the customer refunds for September 08, 2016 in the total amount of \$1,519.58. Vice Chair Severt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

There were no public comments.

Item# 8. Discussion and motion to approve board minutes of August 25, 2016.

Treasurer Elliott was disappointed that his comments were not included in the minutes regarding the District's support of law enforcement. During the presentation Treasurer Elliott commented how half of the community loves law enforcement and the other half hated law enforcement.

Vice Chair Severt made a motion to approve the board minutes of August 25, 2016 as submitted. Secretary Reinhardt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

There were no public comments.

Item# 9. Discussion and direction to staff on proposed Electronic and/or Non-Electronic Message Display Marquee.

Postponed

Item# 10. Discussion and consideration regarding whether or not to seek legislation increasing Trustee compensation.

Mr. Price reported Trustees compensation is set by Nevada Revised Statute 318. The compensation has not been amended in a long time. He stated in order to have the General Improvement District compensation increased; a bill draft request would have to be sponsored by a legislator who represents General Improvement Districts during the upcoming legislative session.

Ms. Shipman stated after reviewing the current Nevada Revised Statute 318, it states that any General Improvement District is allowed up to \$600 in compensation per month and for General Improvement District's with three or more powers are eligible for \$750 in compensation per month. She is unaware as to how many powers each of the Nevada General Improvement Districts hold, but Sun Valley General Improvement District and Incline Village General Improvement have three or more powers. It would require a legislative change to increase the monthly compensation.

Chairperson Ainsworth inquired how the District Board would vote for an increase in compensation, if passed by legislation, because she was under the impression that no board member can vote for an increase for themselves. She recalls that a board member would not be eligible for an increase in compensation until after the board members were reelected after the compensation increase was passed by legislation.

Ms. Shipman stated it is up to the individual Board(s) to vote for an increase on their own compensation, providing the legislation passed the bill to increase compensation. The statute states that each member of the board must receive the same amount of compensation, if a majority of the members of the board vote in favor of an increase, the increase may not become effective until January 1 of the calendar year immediately following the next bi-annual election of the District. She stated the next bi-annual election is two years from today.

Treasurer Elliott stated for the record, he is not asking for a raise for the Sun Valley General Improvement District Trustees or himself at this time. He stated during the last legislative session, there was a bill that was passed that increased the compensation for various elected officials similar to General Improvement District Trustees and he was surprised that General Improvement District Trustees were excluded from that bill. He stated it seems like the District is always concerned about the cost of living for the District employees, but the Trustees are maxed out and will continue to be maxed out for a considerable amount of time.

Treasurer Elliott stated he spoke with three elected officials regarding a potential Bill Draft Request for increase in compensation for General Improvement District Trustees. After speaking with them, they are only allowed several Bill Draft Requests and they don't want to use it on such a request. They would support it if it was able to be attached to another Bill Draft Request.

Vice Chair Severt stated she is not in favor of the District supporting an increase in compensation. She stated after researching compensation for the Nevada Assembly and Senate, they currently make less than a District Trustee.

Treasurer Elliott made a motion to direct staff to see if any other General Improvement District boards would be in support of pursuing an increase to board member compensation through the legislative session. The motion died for the lack of a second.

There were no public comments.

At 6:35 pm the Public Meeting closed for a Public Hearing

Item# 11. Discussion and possible action to approve the following District Rules and/or Regulations:

Chairperson Ainsworth read into the record the Order of Procedure for the District's Public Hearing. Secretary Reinhardt provided proof of publication for the Public Hearing.

Mr. Price gave a brief report on the following amendments.

A. Amend Rule No. 2 providing updates to Contract Limitations and Additional Water Requirements to include Exhibits and possible adoption of new water right allocation schedule.

Mr. Price reported staff is requesting to adopt water right allocations similar to Truckee Meadows Water Authority. The District is a wholesale customer of Truckee Meadows Water Authority and the District mirrors some of their practices. Other changes to Rule No. 2 include attaching the District's Boundary Map, District Water Right Policy, and Water Right Allocation Schedule.

There were no public comments.

B. Amend Rule No. 3 providing update to Application of Service.

Mr. Price reported changes to Rule No. 3 are minor edits to match the Service Application.

There were no public comments.

C. Amend Rule No. 4 providing update to Notice from Customers.

Mr. Price reported staff is recommending accepting electronic notices from customers in addition to written notices.

Secretary Reinhardt inquired if staff will continue to provide written response to customers.

Mr. Price responded, if the District receives a request by email, staff will respond by email. If the District receives a request for information and no email is provided, staff will mail any correspondence to the address that was provided with the original request.

There were no public comments.

D. Amend Rule No. 8 providing updates to modify section title from "Landlord's Standing Order Agreement" to Landowner Standby Agreement".

Mr. Price reported changes to Rule No. 8 is a simple change to the title name of an agreement referenced in the rule, from "Landlord's Standing Order Agreement" to Landowner Standby Agreement".

There were no public comments.

E. Amend Rule No. 19 providing updates to Non-Registering Meters.

Mr. Price reported under Rule No. 19 it explains the testing of meters and adjustment to bills regarding meter errors. Under Non-registering Meters it states, "When it is found that the error in a meter is due to some cause, the date of which cause can be established, the overcharge or the undercharge will be computed back to but not beyond such date at the discretion of the Board." Staff is requesting to change the discretion from the "Board" to the "General Manager". Mr. Price stated there are very few billing adjustments needed due to a meter error, also if it was up to the Board's discretion, it could take up to several weeks to make such adjustment because the Board only meets twice a month. He reminded the Board, if a customer was not satisfied with the General Manager's decision, that customer has the right to appeal to the Board and the Board can make the final determination.

Treasurer Elliott stated he wants to make sure customers always have the right to appeal to the Board.

There were no public comments.

F. Amend Rule No. 20 to clarify service line conversion requirements for multi-unit single metered premises.

Mr. Price reported last year the Board authorized to form a committee to review District Tariff Rule No. 20 regarding multi-unit single meters. The committee had several meetings and made a final recommendation to the District Board, those recommendations were approved by the Board earlier this year. Those recommendations include a broader definition on what is eligible for single meter for a single family dwelling with a multi-unit and when such multi-unit is required to be converted to individual meter. He requested clarification regarding the interpretation of who would be responsible for monthly billings. The proposed changes state, "The responsibility for payment of charges for water and/or sewer service furnished to premises using a joint meter for several residential and/or non-residential uses is the responsibility of the owner of the real property. Where there is an existing joint meter serving residential or non-residential customers and the improvements are located on separate legal parcels owned by different persons, all owners of the parcels are jointly and severally liable for the full charges despite the fact that the bill is sent to only one of the owners".

Secretary Reinhardt stated she believes the rule clarifies who is responsible for the bill; it states the landowner is responsible for the bill.

Mr. Price reported per the committee minutes, the landowner is to be responsible for the monthly bills. He stated the last sentence of the proposed changes could potentially be miss-interpreted because it states, "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." He does not think the current edits reflect the intent of the committee's recommendations specifically saying the bill must be in the landowner's name. It looked permissive to him because it says, "resident and landowner" and that is what he is seeking clarification on.

Ms. Shipman stated it is to be assumed that the landowner would be occupying the main residential unit; therefore the bill would be in the landowner's name. In the event that the landowner was not the primary occupant in the main residential unit, the bill would be mailed to the address designated by the landowner or to the person in the main residential unit. She thought it was understood by the committee that the landowner is ultimately responsible for the bill or whoever was living in the main residential unit would be responsible.

Mr. Price thanked the Board and Ms. Shipman for the clarification. He wanted to make sure he fully understood who would be responsible for the bill prior to staff sending out notification to various landowners requiring them to change the service into their names.

Chairperson Ainsworth stated she assumes the landowner can designate who shall get the bill, this would include property managers.

Ms. Shipman responded to Chairpersons comment, the designation of where the bill should be mailed is covered in the Rule where it talks about joint ownership. She believes it is the last sentence that staff was concerned about because it says and/or.

Ms. Dowling reported anytime there is a change or someone new signs up for service they are subject to a \$30 account setup fee. If the Board wants to follow through with notifying the various landowners and require them to put service in their name, she inquired if the Board is going to follow procedure and charge the setup fee or absorb the fee.

Ms. Shipman responded if the Board would like to discuss and consider absorbing the \$30 account setup fee, she recommends it be brought back as a separate agenda item since it was not a part of the formal Tariff Hearing Notice.

After further discussion it was suggested to amend the following sentence to state, "Individual billings shall not be supplied to additional residents, tenants, or occupants of joint metered residential property since the resident of the main structure/property owner is fully responsible for payment of such bills."

There were no public comments.

G. Amend Rule No. 21 Reinstallation of Disconnected Service Fees, to possibly eliminate after-hours option or to increase after hour's installation fee from \$20 to no more than \$60.

Mr. Price reported the District is not recuperating costs for after hour installations for disconnected services. The current reconnection fee for disconnected service is \$40. If a customer requested for reinstallation after hours the customer is subject to a \$40 reconnection fee and an additional \$20 for after hour's fee making it a total of \$60 that is collected by a Service Technician at the time of reinstallation.

Mr. Price reported several years ago the Board adopted a policy that pays a Service Technician that is on-call, a minimum of two hours of overtime. If the Service Technician responds to a call, they get an automatic two hours overtime, if they receive another call within those same two hours, they don't get an additional two hours, they only get time spent if it goes over the original two hours.

Mr. Combs responded to Mr. Price's comment, if a Service Technician responds to a call they get automatic two hours overtime. If they respond to any other calls within that two hour period, there is no additional pay. If they respond to a call that goes past the original two hours, then they are only paid for additional time spent, not another two hours. He stated he prepared a cost estimate of how much it cost the District to respond to a call after hours. The average cost to make one service call based on the two hour minimum (wages and equipment) is \$150 to perform one reinstallation after hours.

Ms. Dowling stated the regular reconnection fee anyone would get charged for being disconnected for nonpayment is \$40. If the payment is made after 4:30 pm and throughout the evening until the next business day, the District charges an additional \$20 after hour's fee. These fees plus the customers past due amount would be collected prior to reinstallation. These fees also apply to holidays and weekends.

Mr. Price clarified why the District charges after hour's fees after 4:30 pm. If a Service Technician has to respond to a service call after 4:30 pm typically they are not finished until after 5:00 pm.

Ms. Shipman reported staff is only requesting for consideration increasing the after hour's fee from \$20 up to \$60.

Mr. Price reported another option for consideration is eliminating after hours reinstallations for nonpayment disconnects, and have the customer wait until the next business day, unless the customer deems it as an emergency. The only concern he has is what classifies as an emergency, because he doesn't want the Service Technician determining if it is an emergency or not. The customer could claim it is an emergency because they have children, because they need to shower before work or because they have a medical illness. He inquired with Ms. Dowling how many times a customer is notified before they are disconnected for nonpayment.

Ms. Dowling responded a customer is mailed their original monthly bill that specifies when payment is due. If a customer fails to pay by the due date a late notice is sent out the next business day from the original due date. The late notice specifies what day the customer has to pay to avoid being disconnected for nonpayment. The customer also receives their next monthly bill that also includes a highlighted message reminding them of their past due balance and must pay by date to avoid being disconnected.

Mr. Price reported staff inquired what other water utility policies are regarding reinstallation of water for nonpayment. Majority of the other utilities make their customers wait until the next business day for reinstallation of water and do not perform "any" after hour service calls. He stated the District has always provided outstanding customer service to all of its customers. He does not have a problem with continuing providing outstanding customer service, but the impacts to the District's budget has not been looked at for this particular service. He stated the biggest impact regarding the proposed changes for reinstallation for nonpayment disconnected customers is those customers that are repeat offenders and are shut off every month.

Ms. Shipman reported she does not recommend any determination be made by a District employee what is considered an emergency should they receive an after hour request. The staff should not even question what the emergency is or the severity of the emergency because it could potentially put the District in a vulnerable situation. Staff

provided the Board two options to pick from, to either continue with after hour installations or have the customer pay for it, or to eliminate after hour service calls.

Mr. Combs stated he will support whatever the Board decides. He has always had concerns regarding the safety of the Service Technicians performing after hour service calls in adverse weather.

Vice Chair Severt inquired if customers can have their accounts flagged not to shut off water if they have medical issues in the home even if they are subject to nonpayment disconnect. She also stated she is concerned if the customer was disconnected on a Friday that the customer could potentially be without water for two days, even three days if it was a holiday weekend.

Mr. Price responded, yes if the customer has a medical issue and provides the District with a medical note stating the customer must have water, the customer's account is noted and staff verbally speaks with the customers to make payment arrangements.

Ms. Dowling responded the District schedules its nonpayment disconnects typically on a Wednesday allowing the customer enough time to pay their past due amount prior to the weekend. The District also rarely performs nonpayment disconnects the week of a three day weekend.

Treasurer Elliott stated he was concerned regarding the District being empathetic to its customers, but he thinks the District is preserving that quality. He agrees with Maddy it should not be up to District staff to determine what classifies as an emergency. He believes the District bends over backwards for its customers.

Audience member Mr. Rider believes the customers who get themselves into a situation of not being able to pay their bill are usually having issues with poverty. He believes if the District continues to work with customers showing compassion to their situation and provide them an option to have their water turned on, if needed, for an emergency, he thinks it is an equal balance for the District and the customer.

Audience member Ms. Ortiz inquired if the District allows for payment arrangements in the event a customer was not able to pay their bill and needed more time.

Ms. Dowling responded staff goes above and beyond to assist the customers especially before the water has been shutoff. As long as a payment arrangement has been made prior to the shutoff, staff can work with the customer. It becomes more difficult making payment arrangements after the water has been shutoff, not to say the District couldn't make a payment arrangement, but it would depend on the circumstance. Payment arrangements are only made during normal business hours.

At 7:19 the Public Hearing closed and the Board reconvened to the Public Meeting.

The Board took the following action:

Secretary Reinhardt made a motion to amend Tariff Rule No. 2 as presented. Vice Chair Severt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chair Severt made a motion to amend Tariff Rule No. 3 as presented. Treasurer Elliott seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Treasurer Elliott made a motion to amend Tariff Rule No. 4 as presented. Trustee Barstow seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Vice Chair Severt made a motion to amend Tariff Rule No. 8 as presented. Secretary Reinhardt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Treasurer Elliott made a motion to amend Tariff Rule No. 19 as presented. Secretary Reinhardt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Secretary Reinhardt made a motion to amend Tariff Rule No. 20 as presented with the following edits to the last sentence, remove "and the" and replace it with "/" and replace "are" with "is" as recommend. Vice Chair Severt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Secretary Reinhardt made a motion to amend Tariff Rule No. 21 with option one as presented, increase the after hour's fee from \$20 to \$60 for nonpayment disconnects. Chairperson Ainsworth seconded the motion.

During discussion Trustee Barstow stated he is in favor of eliminating after hour's reinstallations. He commented on audience member Mr. Rider's comment; it will be very difficult to come up with additional funds to have their water restored if the customer is already suffering from some kind of financial hardship. He believes a customer will have to borrow money to have their water restored and then they are put in another situation of owing someone else money.

Secretary Reinhardt responded the customer always has a choice when to have their water restored. In some cases a friend or family member shows compassion to someone and gives them the money to have their water restored.

Ms. Merritt responded Secretary Reinhardt is correct, the customer has the option to wait until the next business day to have their water restored to avoid having to pay the after hour's fee.

Mr. Combs provided clarification, if a customer was disconnected for non-payment; they have the option to have it restored during business hours or after hour's. The customer will only be subject to the \$40 reconnection fee if during normal business hour's. If the customer elects to have their water restored after hour's, they will be responsible to pay upfront the \$40 reconnection fee, \$60 after hour's fee, and their past due balance. The after hour's fee alone will act as a deterrent for most customers.

*Following discussion the motion carried by the following;
Ayes: Treasurer Elliott, Secretary Reinhardt, Vice Chair Severt, and Chairperson Ainsworth
Nays: Trustee Barstow*

Item# 12. Adoption of Resolution Amending Sun Valley General Improvement District Tariff, said amendments to be effective as of October 10, 2016.

Secretary Reinhardt made a motion to adopt Resolution 1603 approving amendments of the September 8, 2016 Tariff Hearing and approving amendments effective as of October 10, 2016. Chairperson Ainsworth seconded the motion.

During discussion audience member Mr. Douglas inquired if the Board just approved a rate increase for water.

Chairperson Ainsworth responded the Board did not increase the water rate.

Mr. Douglas requested for clarification what was approved in the Tariff Hearing. He also inquired how the District would notify customers of a potential rate increase.

Mr. Price responded there was no discussion regarding a rate increase to water or sewer. The Board amended several District Rules to match its daily procedural practices. The only fee that was increased pertains to customers who are disconnected for non-payment. Those customers will be subject to an increase if they request to have their water restored after hour's. The District must publicly notify all of its customers for any Tariff Hearing. Should there be a rate increase, the District will publish the notice in a local paper, display it on the District's website, front lobby and Facebook page. The District would also place a message on the customers' bills and potentially provide an insert notifying its customers of a Tariff Hearing regarding any rate increase.

After further discussion the motion carried unanimously.

Item# 13. Legal report by Maddy Shipman.

Ms. Shipman reported on applauding in public meetings. She is not sure if it has to be in writing notifying audience members that applauding is prohibited. She does believe there is a general requirement that members should not engage in activities that will disrupt a meeting. Applauding continuously throughout a meeting could potentially be considered disruptive.

Item# 14. Field report by Jon Combs.

Mr. Combs reported on the following items;

- The District's water storage tanks are scheduled to be cleaned next month.
- The field crew is preparing for a leak detection.
- He recently met with NV Energy regarding the proposed electronic messaging display marquee. The verbal estimate he received from NV Energy is only a couple of hundred dollars to bring power to the proposed site towards 7th Ave. The biggest expense will be construction of the sign pad.
- He thanked the Board on behalf of the field crew; they are very appreciative of the Boards support.

Item# 15. Office report by Erin Dowling.

Ms. Dowling reported on the following items;

- Staff has starting planning for the upcoming Veteran's Day Celebration scheduled for November 12, 2016. Washoe County has agreed to provide the breakfast once again.
- She has heard from numerous customers complimenting the District staff, office and field, for the outstanding Customer Service the District provides.
- She thanked staff for working together and covering each other during the summer months when employees take vacations.

Item# 16. Manager's report by Darrin Price.

Mr. Price reported on the following items;

- He reported the City of Sparks received a request to annex a portion of property located on Highland Ranch. The property will be annexed in as agriculture, following the annexation there will be a potential request to rezone it as residential and/or general commercial for future development.
- Staff continues to work with a potential developer regarding the Ladera Ranch project.
- Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission recently approved \$100,000 to continue funding cloud seeding. An additional \$200,000 will be funded by Truckee Meadows Water Authority. Cloud seeding is the process where silver nitrate is put into clouds in attempt to make precipitation fall. Cloud seeding used to be funded by the State, but now is paid by other agencies. He stated he suggested to the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission to have ski resorts and other water utilities help fund cloud seeding since they benefit from it too.
- Western Regional Water Commission recently approved to continue as a commission. Several board members of the Western Regional Water Commission testified of the validity of the commission and why it should exist.
- George Ball the District's former engineer recently retired from Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission.
- The Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility continues to replace old equipment; this is contributing towards some of the expenses that the District pays to the City of Sparks. The Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility has a master plan project that they are currently working on becoming more energy efficient. These energy efficiencies will provide a savings on daily operating expenses.
- The City of Sparks is applying for refinancing of their bonds for their wastewater loans. He will negotiate with the City of Sparks for any savings to also be passed through to the District based on its proportionate share of the treatment plant.

Item# 17. Public Comments.

Audience member Mr. Douglas commented on cloud seeding. He suggested using drones to help with cloud seeding.

Audience member Ms. Weber announced her candidacy for Nevada State Assembly for District 27. She stated her district covers majority of the Sun Valley community. She was Sun Valley's prior commissioner and she reported on the various projects she assisted with for the Sun Valley community.

Audience member Mr. Rider reported Sun Valley Cal Ripken recently appointed their new board members. Their next board meeting is September 9, 2016 at 6pm. He reported he is a newly appointed Sun Valley Citizen Advisory Board member. He was proud to report all of

the Sun Valley Citizen Advisory Board members were present for the Washoe County Citizen Advisory Board training. He also commented on the increase to the after hour's fee for nonpayment disconnects. He encouraged the District to announce the increase because that is a significant impact to some customers.

Item# 18. Board Comments.

Treasurer Elliott reported the original Ladera Ranch Subdivision project was presented to the Sun Valley Citizen Advisory Board. The Sun Valley Citizen Advisory Board provided various comments and recommendations regarding the project and hopes that the new developer will do the same. He reported he will be attending an upcoming Planning Commission and he recalls reading something on the agenda that allows for minimal discussion between audience members and board members under public comments. He reported the graffiti on the fence located on west 5th Ave. is starting to be removed. He reported that he is a part of the Nutrition Subcommittee for the Washoe County Senior Advisory Group. He also reported on his involvement with customers who were disconnected for nonpayment. He stated anytime a customer calls him to complain that they were shut off for nonpayment, he always asks the customer if they called to make a payment arrangement and majority of the time the customer never asked for a payment arrangement. He always encourages customers to call the District to request for a payment arrangement to avoid being disconnected.

Trustee Barstow reported based on the action taken tonight during the Tariff Hearing; he anticipates seeing an increase in the Food Pantry distribution line.

Item# 19. Future Agenda Items.

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

- Discussion regarding Electronic/Non-Electronic Messaging Display Marquee
- Review of the final layout of the fall PipeLine
- Marketing update by Nancy Eklof
- Discussion regarding graffiti waiver being distributed in local schools
- Review of District credit/debit cards and electronic check transaction fees

Chairperson Ainsworth would like to discuss how the District can assist customers with a Free Dump Program, similar to past Dump Pass Voucher Program.

Secretary Reinhardt would like for formal approval of the Board waiving the \$30 setup fee for customers with multi-units, requiring the service account being placed in the name of the person who is responsible for the main unit per District Tariff Rule No. 20.

Trustee Barstow requested discussion regarding a possible electronic waste recycling day.

Vice Chair Severt requested an update on single stream recycling/garbage franchise agreement update.

Item# 20. Adjournment.

Secretary Reinhardt made a motion to adjourn at 8:06 pm. Chairperson Ainsworth seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Approved by the SVGID Board of Trustees on September 22, 2016.

Minutes Prepared by:
Jennifer Merritt, Administrative Assistant