

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
KINGSBURY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 2010**

**CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order at the Kingsbury General Improvement District office located at 160 Pineridge Dr., Stateline, Nevada at 6:00p.m. by Chairperson Hayes.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Hayes led the pledge to the flag.

**ROLL CALL** – Present were Trustees Hayes, Schussel, Barratt, McDowell and Treanor. Also present was Legal Counsel Scott Brooke, General Manager Cameron McKay, Business & Contracts Manager Michelle Runtzel and Operations Supervisor Eric Johnson. Present for a portion of the meeting were Jim Norton and Doug Smith, Brent Farr, David Pulley and Matt Van Dyne of Farr West Engineering and Nick Juvet, Michael Cameron, Josh Theriot, Trustee candidates Dan Norman, Daria Voyt and Jodie Nelson.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** – There was no public comment.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**M-6/15/10-1** – Motion by Barratt, seconded Treanor, and unanimously passed to approve the agenda as presented.

**APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR** –

A. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 20, 2010

**M-6/15/10-2** – Motion by McDowell, seconded Treanor and unanimously passed to approve Consent Calendar Item A.

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD FOR DISCUSSION** – Barratt pulls Item B, page 7, Stationary Engineers 44524, and asks what this check is for? Runtzel explains Medical insurance for some union employees, Management employees and some union members are enrolled in the State medical insurance plan and the rest of the employees are in the union plan. Union members have the choice to enroll in either the State or union plan.

**M-6/15/10-3** – Motion by Barratt, second Schussel and unanimously passed to approve Consent Calendar Item B Claims in the amount of \$601,767.67 as represented on the List of Claims by check numbers 44418 through 44618

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS** – There was no unfinished business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**PRESENTATION BY JIM NORTON OF WARREN REED INSURANCE ON DISTRICT INSURANCE POLICY RENEWAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010/2011** – Jim Norton of Warren Reed Insurance will attend the meeting to make a presentation on the annual insurance renewal. The renewal price of \$51,571.59 does not include a \$4,093.00 premium for pollution coverage.

	Premium	% Inc/(Dec)
FY 2010/11	\$51,571.59	-4%
FY 2009/10	\$53,463.50	6%
FY 2008/09	\$50,635.44	-5%
FY 2007/08	\$53,464.55	-16%
FY 2006/07	\$63,888.64	2%
FY 2005/06	\$62,933.28	2%

Jim Norton introduced himself and Doug Smith, claims manager, and gave a brief presentation. There is no rate increase for 2010/2011; pool is absorbing an 8% increase this year. Our loss experience has been very good over the long period. The GM has been using many of the benefits the pool offers. Doug handed out a brochure that explains some of the services pool/pact offers, governance training, litigation training, risk management grant program (ie schools that wanted to install security systems to watch for vandalism, safety improvements.) average grants are \$10K each, increase services. Treanor asks whether the security is only for schools. No, relative to our security system upgrades or safety issues, fraud prevention, etc. McDowell asks how we can learn more about the grant program; Smith explains we can access the information on the website.

Hayes thought we were going to look at competitive bidding; Kolstad was not interested per the GM. Norton explained last year Travelers Insurance determined they would not be competitive with the pool. They could not match the services and coverage's. Hayes asked about the pool's financial statements and McKay reported they won't be prepared until June 30. They invest in mortgage backed securities backed by Fannie Mae. There is a small concern that the federal government may let Fanny and Freddie fail which would be a concern. They still require the investment managers only purchase the highest rated securities. There are no derivatives allowed for collateralized mortgage securities, they have never had them and never allowed those investments.

Barratt asks how often our operations are evaluated to determine whether everything is covered and current value. Cycle usually begins in December, meet with GM and BCM to review, we can do this quarterly, annually or however often we need. Appraisal is completed every 4 years. All new acquisitions are covered automatically with a clause in the agreement.

Pact is workers compensation only, every two years they go out to bid, KGID is with EICON and our experience modification is .89 which is very good.

Pool is a large casualty property package, all members share coverage; concept is a certain layer of self insurance. KGID are owners of the pool, 120 public entities that participate. There is \$20 million in surplus today if they were to disband tomorrow. They determine what premium is needed to cover the exposure, then allocate amongst the participating entities. All members have the same common coverage, general liability, error and omissions, cooperative effort. They have loss control, and various services all included in our premiums. Norton is a big advocate of the pool.

Dan Norman asked Doug to expand on the entity. They have a board that meets. The board is elected by the participating members. Annual audits by a CPA firm and also have claims audits every two years. There is no state or regulatory entity that oversees the Pool, per Barratt. We received the audited financial statements last year.

McDowell asked about the pollution policy, general liability excludes all forms of pollution; this would cover sewer spills as an example, pollution of a water body.

Barratt asks to see the options with the different deductibles; Doug and Jim will prepare comparisons and provide them next week. We will bring this back to the board.

Barratt is very confident in the pool and Wayne Carlson, not surprised private insurance companies can't compete, and he recommends staying with the pool.

**M-6/15/10-4** – Motion by Barratt, seconded McDowell, and unanimously passed as to accept the insurance proposal by Warren Reed Insurance in the amount of \$51,571.59 for the KGID insurance renewal for the fiscal year 2010/2011 and place this item next month's agenda to review the various deductible/premium schedules.

**REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH REPAIR OF A DAMAGED CULVERT PIPE FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 373 ANDRIA DRIVE, DOUGLAS COUNTY APN 1319-18-310-023**

– On Saturday, May 22, 2010, Mr. Nicholas Juvet, owner of 373 Andria Drive, called in to report his driveway had caved in after our road crew personnel had recently cleaned the culvert pipe on Friday, May 14. The pipe was blocked with debris causing water to flow into and across the roadway near North Benjamin Court. This was the second time in approximately a month and a half that our crews had cleared the pipe. Our on-call water operator, Joe Esenarro, responded to the call by calling Mr. Juvet who stated this was not an emergency. He could still get in/out of his driveway. It was also noted that Mr. Juvet stated there was a sewer pipe a few inches under the asphalt that was exposed but that nothing was leaking and the pipe was not broken. On Sunday, while doing the normal pump runs, Joe went to the property to inspect and found a large hole approximately 4' diameter as well as significant undermining of pavement under the driveway. Joe provided a cone to mark the hole. Eric called me and I confirmed that the integrity of the pipe itself is the owner's responsibility and that KGID is only responsible for maintaining flows through the pipe.

On Monday, May 24, I stopped by on my way to work to inspect the damage and asked James to take the attached pictures. We found that the 373 Andria culvert pipe of approximately 12" was stabbed into the next door neighbors pipe which was approximately 18" pipe which in turn left a gap on either side of the larger pipe of 3-6". When our staff cleaned the line, apparently, the jet-rodder went in between the two pipes and ultimately outside of either pipe, creating the undermine. Staff didn't know this was happening and was unaware until the driveway caved in a week later and we could see the undermine.

Runtzel spoke with Mr. Juvet on Monday and explained that although our crews likely caused this damage, the damage would not have occurred if the pipe was installed correctly to begin with, (ie: same size all the way through, and/or banded together with the neighbors pipe) the pipe is not ours and that we could not be liable for the damage. KGID maintains the flow through the pipe only and did not install nor do we repair driveway culvert pipes. This is because there would not be a pipe if there weren't a home/driveway access, a swale would be maintained. Mr. Juvet advised we would be hearing from his attorney, but later spoke with the GM. Cam advised that he would have to turn this claim into his insurance and that we would turn it in to ours but likely our insurance would deny. After further consideration, I believe Mr. Juvet's insurance would also deny the claim because it is not on his property. The culvert and cave in is located within KGID right-of-way.

The GM explained that Mr. Juvet would have to have repairs done at his cost and see whether insurance would cover it. Mr. Juvet has contracted with F&B Inc. to complete the work and he has asked the Board for consideration on this item. Attached is his letter, two bids and pictures of the damage. Mr. Juvet's bid from F&B is on a time and materials basis. Any consideration should be made only after the final costs are determined.

Runtzel explained that there is a smaller pipe stabbed into the larger drainage pipe under the shared driveway. There was some blockage so Runtzel requested that James and our road crew clear the culvert. It was unknown to us that there were different size pipes and during our cleaning efforts, we undermined the driveway. Runtzel believes there is no question whether we created this void; however, in her history here, our responsibility for culvert pipes is limited to maintaining flow through the pipe and not the integrity of the pipe itself. In this situation, the pipe was not design and constructed properly in our opinion. The same size pipe should have been used across the entire driveway approach. Mr. Juvet received a quote from First General Services of Nevada in the amount of \$1,659.43 but was uncomfortable with them low-balling the bid. He chose to use F& B Inc. who quoted \$2,296.00 on a time and material basis. Mr. Juvet has a \$1,000 deductible with his homeowner insurance.

McDowell visited the site yesterday and spoke with the contractor who told him that the bottom part of the pipe was completely rusted out and essentially gone. McDowell wonders what was going on for the last several years where the bottom of the pipe was missing. Runtzel comments that part of the pipe was not exposed but based on her inspection of the site, there are no doubt we created the damage. It may very well be that his pipe leaked but the void was above the pipe wall which was created by our jet-rodding. Any damage from below the pipe would have been confined to that area under the pipe, not along the sides and above.

Treanor asked if a similar issue occurred further up Andria near Sunflower. Runtzel explained that issue was different because there was a structural issue with the pipe itself.

It was suggested Mr. Juvet get final bill from F&B and bring it back to next meeting for further consideration.

Hayes asked whether his insurance would cover this item, Juvet explains that they may have but he would've had to use their contractor whom he was not comfortable with. Runtzel doesn't think his homeowner insurance would cover this item because it is not on his property; it is within KGID right of way.

Eric commented that there are a lot of other pipes in the area to clean, no visible indicator of excessive debris.

Brooke presumes that the smaller pipe was approved by district at some time because it was an encroachment and now there is a larger pipe that will benefit the district because there is better flow now with the same size larger pipe.

Treanor asked whether this is similar to Ansaldo Acres where our snow contractor has created damage to their roadway. Runtzel explains we are not responsible because we have an agreement in place stating so; the road is in poor condition.

McDowell asked why the on-call person responded by phone and was informed that there was a sewer pipe exposed but was not leaking and he would've felt more comfortable had our on-call responded in person. Johnson explains that the on-call phoned him, we know where the sewer is there because we have to do some work there this summer, and this was not actually a sewer pipe.

We know our sewer is 6' below grade, the customer reported he could get in/out of his driveway safely and nothing was leaking from the exposed pipe. Joe had to complete his pump runs the next morning and visited the site then.

M-6/15/10-5 – Motion McDowell, seconded Schussel and unanimously passed to table this item to next meeting,

**AMENDMENTS TO THE KINGSBURY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT OFFICE**

**LEASE AGREEMENT** – Last year, KGID purchased a line striper to allow our crew to paint the lines on the streets instead of relying on a contractor to do the job whenever they could schedule it. This piece of equipment needs to be stored inside.

We have also looked into the possibility of purchasing salt for our chlorine generators in bulk or by the truckload instead of one pallet at a time from the local grocery store. By having this additional storage area we would be able to save money.

In order to lease the space needed to save money and properly store our equipment, I talked to Josh Theriot of JM Ranches, LLC, and have negotiated the attached lease and lease amendments. Currently we pay \$5,012.39 per month for a total of 3,196 square feet of usable space. KGID would be renting an additional 683 square feet of garage space at the front of the building we now rent bringing this total area up to 3,879 square feet. The total cost of this space will cost \$5,466.40 per month. This is an increase of \$454.01 per month which works out to \$0.66 per square foot for the new area.

It also locks in this price until 2014 without a 3% per year increase which would have brought us to a monthly rent of \$5,477.17 without the additional space.

I feel the rental of this additional space will improve our overall efficiency and save us money at the same time.

These costs have been budgeted for in the new 2010/2011 budget.

The GM reports Josh Theriot is the owner representative of this building. There is a smaller bay available next to our existing space here. We are short on storage area and need to store the paint striper indoors during the winter. At the end of three years with an increase of 3% per year our costs are the same. By leasing the bay we will pay the same amount of lease as we would with the increase over a 3 year period. The additional bay will be very valuable to us. We have chemicals, equipment, welders, etc. McKay thinks it's a great cost savings for us now. Hayes wants us to focus on building something at the ops yard, McKay says that is a ways out still. Josh commented we had a 3-year term with a 3 year option. They recognize the economy has changed, happy with the relationship, would like us to stay longer. They offered to fix the existing lease rate at last year's rate with the addition of the special rate on the warehouse for the additional 3 year term. Utilities are variable, base lease fixed for next 4 years.

McDowell commented on the paint sprayer, he wished the board would have known we would have to store the paint sprayer.

M-6/15/10-6 – Motion by Barratt, seconded Schussel, and unanimously passed to approve First and Second Amendments to the Office Lease effective July 1, 2010.

**WATER METERING PROJECT – PROJECT STATUS UPDATE, ADOPTION OF GUIDELINES FOR SETTING PROJECTED WATER USE RATES FOR USE AS A PUBLIC INFORMATION TOOL ONLY, AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS**

- Action was taken on this item in the meeting held May 20, 2010. In a vote of 4-0 with one abstaining, the projected metered water rate was agreed to be based upon item #2 (Cam's new rate). Billy has requested that this item be brought forward again for discussion when all 5 Trustees are present so the public can be presented one more time with any discussion that may arise.

Also, Billy mentioned that the projected revenue requirements may need to be increased and the rate scenarios recalculated to meet these needs.

My take is that we will be opening this subject up again when we come to positively set these rates after the meters have been installed and at that time we should have a more accurate idea of our needs.

I have included all of the past information from previous meetings in this item for your review.

Hayes asked this come back, he wanted all five board members here and have a chance to voice their opinion. Secondly, never got to the final math of this at the last meeting, wants to be sure we are coming in at target. Wants an idea of where we are at and how the numbers were developed.

Scenario 2 – in last budget, revenue requirements from the customers were 1.9M, Hayes argues that actual could be 2M, thinks it will cost us at least another 100k for our time and costs involved in metering. At the 30% reduction, we are covering 102.94% of required revenues; Hayes thinks this is an appropriate target. The GM states once we set the final rate, we won't know what are revenue requirement will be in two years, he felt 109% of fixed revenue is a comfortable place. He doesn't want to get to tight because we will have to look at it again in two years.

Hayes comments this is our best guess on rates; he wanted all five members present when these potential rates were approved. At the last meeting, Hayes didn't think we got down to the assumptions and financial impacts because the meeting ran so long. He and Schussel are leaving the board and want to have as much influence as possible. Scenario 2 was approved at the May 20, 2010 meeting and he wants to point out that on the last budget we determined we needed an additional \$100k from our residential customers. He states you could argue that would make our total revenue requirements at \$2M, \$100k on loan payments and he argues that we will probably have another \$100k in additional expenses installing and maintaining water meters. Showing the 30% reduction in usage, we are pretty close at \$1,955,853. Hayes feels this is an appropriate target.

McKay comments when we do finally set a rate, we won't know what our revenue requirements will be because there will be a drop in usage, but usually it the revenue will come right back within two years. This will be a hard call to make because we won't know what the requirements will be. McKay doesn't want to get to tight; we will have to look at this again in two years. It's hard to project what next years budget will be. If people start cutting back now based on the spreadsheet, we will have a better idea how the numbers may need to be revised in the future. Hayes thinks the spreadsheet is important for customer use. If we have to change the numbers radically in the future, we will have an understanding of where we started.

Brooke clarifies we have approved Cam's Option, Scenario 2. Option 2 was the originally approved rate in April 2010. We are showing a 10%, 20% and 30% reduction because we don't know what it will actually be or how the district residents will respond.

Schussel comments if customers start taking out lawns the district may have to raise the base rate to make up for the lost usage. McKay replies that right now, people water all they want because they are not paying for it, we likely won't see water running down the road anymore and the next year, water usage will probably increase because people will get used to it. Hayes thinks there will be a reduction because people are paying more, leaking toilets will be repaired that people were as aware in the past. Hayes thinks that the 30% is within the range we need to consider.

Brent Farr notes that the variable revenue should adjust with variable expenses, so that if people use less water, our expenses should also reduce. McDowell asks once the meters are in and we begin charging customers for usage, how often should we be looking at the rates and making possible adjustments? We would probably look at it annually, we can afford to lose one year and makeup the following year, and we have fund balance to cover us.

Barratt states his biggest frustration is that the base rate should reflect the fixed costs and not supplement the variable revenue requirement. He doesn't think this is based on a defensible accounting principal. The zero water users should be paying the fixed costs only and the fixed revenue is supplementing the variable requirement. Hayes argues that the fixed costs should include the amount of cost associated with the ability to provide water on demand. We have to be ready to provide that water as desired. Hayes would include those costs in fixed costs. These costs are included in fixed costs per Runtzel and Farr. The fixed costs revenues are showing 109.45% of the revenue requirement. McDowell asked if the fixed costs have changed in the last 6 months and Runtzel replied they have, she, Johnson, McKay and Farr sat down and went through the financials to fine tune fixed costs. The previous assumptions were 67% fixed and 33% variable and now we are using approximately 75% and 25% as variable costs. Farr points out if we don't have any reduction in usage; we have 109% fixed and 112% variable, its close. Barratt understands this is not the rate, it is an estimate.

McDowell points out that at the last meeting he objected to the term “cheat sheet” and sea’s we are still using it. McKay explains this is a copy of last month’s information and the name has been changed.

Runtzel comments she is on board with Barratt’s opinion, realizing this is not being implemented now it’s not worth making a big issue over it now, but she feels strongly that we need to have a defensible rate for the public and the most defensible rate is one that is 100% of fixed costs. They are fixed; if variable revenues decline it will not impact the fixed revenue. Someone with an average IQ looking at this sheet can see that the non-users are supplementing the higher users. She owns a house with a ton of usage and a condo with no usage so she can see both sides of the fence. She still feels strongly when we get to the point of implementation; we need to set defensible rates. Hayes asks if Runtzel doesn’t feel they are defensible, Runtzel asks why she should pay 10% more for her condo. Fixed rate revenue should be \$1,500,000 not \$1,641,728. Dr. Norman asks how the board will address Runtzel’s concerns with the public. Farr believes that 10% is reasonable and we will have to look at the rates periodically. Hayes would argue that the \$1,900,000 revenue requirement is low and thinks it should be more like \$2,000,000 which will cause the fixed rates to go up anyway. Dr. Norman clarifies that when it comes to implementation in a couple years we will target the 100% mark for fixed costs/revenues, the board agreed.

There was no action on this item.

**APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT FOR GRANT OF PERPETUAL EASEMENTS WITH WHITEBARK HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION ET AL** - This agreement has been under negotiations April 2009 when KGID and Whitebark appeared in court and an order was given in which KGID would receive a perpetual easement for the sum of \$40,000.00. Another \$250 was paid to Clover Valley Lumber Company for their interest in the same easement.

Michelle and I worked closely with Scott Brooke on this agreement and have taken a firm stand on not wavering from the original terms that we drew up. I feel that this agreement is satisfactory for KGID. We have spent a considerable amount of money on legal fees on this matter which should conclude with the signing of the agreement.

I have included all of the pertinent documents with this item.

GM has worked with Scott since April 2009, Whitebark has requested changes several times that we denied. We wanted to be sure there were no loose ends and this will resolve all issues per Brooke. Hayes gave the attending public a brief overview of the issues at this location and history.

**M-6/15/10-7** – Motion by Schussel, seconded Barratt, and unanimously passed for approval of Agreement for Grant of Perpetual Easements with the WHITEBARK HOMEOWNER’S ASSOCIATION, a Nevada nonprofit corporation; JAMES AND GUNILLA DEARKLAND, Trustees of DEARKLAND FAMILY INTERVIVOS TRUST; SCOTT AND SUSAN LORD, Trustees of the LORD COMMUNITY PROPERTY TRUST; MICHAEL AND MANAL BOZARTH, Trustees of the BOZARTH FAMILY TRUST; and JERZY PLASZOWIECKI, (collectively “Property Owners”), on the other hand, for the purpose of resolving for all time the claims referred to herein.

Chairman Hayes called for a brief 10 minute break.

**BOARD REPORTS** – There were no board reports.

**STAFF REPORTS** – Written staff reports were provided by the General Manager, Business and Contracts Manager and Operations Supervisor. The Bookkeeper provided a Cash Position Statement for the month ending May 31, 2010.

**General Manager Report** – The GM reported that we will receive anti-terrorism training on this Thursday. Since January, Treanor reports 17 thefts and break-ins in the Tahoe Village area.

Anytime any digging going on, a USA digs came in on Shady Lane for bmps, turns out our force sewer main was exposed, running pipe directly over our force main to a catch basin. We shut down job. This catch basin would become a conveyance and direct sewer directly to the lake in the event of a force main break. The project was approved through Douglas County and TRPA without KGID knowledge or consent. A similar structure was installed farther north last year over our force main that may need to be removed.

After July 1, we will have RDC come in and evaluate Tank 10A.

There are a number of engineering firms interested in regional water treatment plant. We are doing a feasibility study to determine whether a shared facility is feasible between Douglas County and KGID. There are letters in the correspondence requesting legislative help.

**Business & Contracts Manager Report** – Runtzel updated the board on the status of the metering project in the Kingsbury Village area, the project has begun and we are finding some glitches. V&C did not receive some vital materials and don't seem to be fully equipped with the necessary tools needed to progress the job as smoothly as we had hoped. There is a lot of jumping around but Runtzel believes they will get on a roll once all materials are onsite.

Waterline Projects – Spiess was the low bidder, after we held the preconstruction conference we found that they did not include prevailing wages in their bid, we have approved change orders to accommodate this requirement. The change order amounts along with their bids we still lower than the next lowest bidder. We have not issued the Notice to Proceed yet, we are waiting for the TRPA permit and we just received the NDEP permit conditions. These jobs weren't as critical to get started as the meter jobs; we are trying to get everything done before we start sealing the roads. We will have inspectors on both the metering and waterline replacement jobs and our staff will also be onsite for inspection.

Paving – Barratt asked if Tramway and Quaking Aspen would be paved next year. Tramway was paved last year and Quaking may be done next year pending waterline replacement projects.

McDowell asked if the snow contractor is responsible for damages they create. Runtzel explained if damage occurs within KGID right-of-way, we will deny any claims and we don't hold the contractor responsible. If damage occurs on private property, it depends on whether the damage is negligent. All vehicle damages are run directly through the contractor.

**Operations Supervisor Report** – Hayes asked for Eric to elaborate on peak hour pumping. Eric reports that winter is considered October through June 30, 3 months is considered summer. We have higher consumption in June through October; pumping amounts are likely to be high. The winter rates are harder to meet. In certain places it will be less expensive to pump the water up to the higher tanks and let the water come back down the mountain. Demand charges at the new intertie building are approximately \$1000/mo. The GM reports we will be limiting hours of irrigation with the new ordinances.

Katherine Ct – Hayes asks if we will have problems metering them since it is their waterline, Johnson reports this area is not in this year's project but we will need to figure out how to deal with the situation.

**ATTORNEY'S REPORT** – Brooke doesn't have a report this month and notes Whitebark was the main issue. There is nothing going on with Beach club to Brooke's knowledge.

**ENGINEER'S REPORT** – A written status report was provided to the board. David Pulley.

**CORRESPONDENCE** – The following correspondence was received during the month: 1) Letter from R. Davis disputing the rate increase, 2) Letter from CJ Stevens regard Douglas County Sewer Improvement District's election issues, 3) Letter to Harry Reid from NDEP requesting grant funding for Lake Tahoe Fire Protection, 4) Letter to Shelley Berkley from NDEP requesting grant funding for Lake Tahoe Fire Protection, 5) Letter to John Ensign from NDEP requesting grant funding for Lake Tahoe Fire Protection, 6) Letter to Dean Heller from NDEP requesting grant funding for Lake Tahoe Fire Protection, 7) Letter to Dina Titus from NDEP requesting grant funding for Lake Tahoe Fire Protection, 8) Summary Report of Primary Election results, 9) Douglas County Commissioners Agenda 6/17/10, 10) Email to McKay from Stacy Norbeck at Pool/pact regarding the Service Plan Summary, 11) Email to McKay regarding the 2010 Siebens Binz Tahoe Forum

**ADJOURNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO NRS 288.220 TO DISCUSS LABOR/MANAGEMENT ISSUES** – The Board adjourned to the closed session at 8:48 p.m.

**RETURN FROM CLOSED SESSION**

**DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON LABOR/MANGEMENT ISSUES** – There was no action on this item.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**M-6/15/10-8** – Motion by Treanor, seconded by McDowell and unanimous approval the meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
W.R. Hayes –Chairman

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brett Barratt, Secretary