

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
KINGSBURY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES
TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 2010**

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order at the Kingsbury General Improvement District office located at 160 Pine Ridge Drive, 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, Barrett and Treanor. Absent were Trustees Schussel and McDowell. 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 Brent Farr and Ralph Wenziger of Farr West Engineering and Trustee candidates Dan Norman, Daria Voyt, and Natalie Yanish.

PUBLIC COMMENT – Hayes reported that Trustee Schussel is in Renown for his lung issue. Daria Voyt appreciated our contact with NDOT to repair the Chimney Rock pavement patch.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

M-4/20/10-1 – Motion by Treanor, seconded Barratt, and unanimously passed to approve the agenda as presented.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR –

- A. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 23, 2010
- B. Minutes of the Special Meeting of April 1, 2010
- C. Minutes of the Special Meeting of April 14, 2010

M-4/20/10-2 – Motion by Treanor, seconded Barratt and unanimously passed to approve Consent Calendar Items A through C, Minutes as written.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD FOR DISCUSSION – Hayes pulled the List of Claims and asked about check number 44309 to Artic Electricians and whether these amounts were included in Capital Outlay in the budget. The GM reports primarily they were for the Generator work that was included in the Budget. On Page 2, check number 44311 payable to Farr West in the amount of \$32, 405.97 for water metering project, what period of time was this for? Runtzel replied February 2010.

M-4/20/10-3 – Motion by Barratt, second Treanor and unanimously passed to approve Consent Calendar Item D, Claims in the amount of 722,646.63 as represented on the List of Claims by check numbers 44302 through 44417

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – There was no unfinished business.

NEW BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE INTENT OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE KINGSBURY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT, TO ISSUE GENERAL OBLIGATION (LIMITED TAX) WATER BONDS ADDITIONALLY SECURED BY PLEDGED REVENUE

– This item was placed on the agenda again at the boards request and was first heard at the March 23, 2010 regular board meeting. This item gives the public opportunity to voice any concerns with the proposed issuance of debt in order to install water meters district wide. This was on agenda at Trustee Schussels request for the next couple of meetings. There is no new information. Hayes comments no one will show up until they are being charged a rate on their water bill and then they'll act like we never discussed this or sent notice. There was no public comment.

ADOPTION OF RISK-BASED SEWER MAINTENANCE PLAN - In late 2008, the TRPA attempted to become a regulatory agency to have oversight of the sewer systems in the Tahoe Basin. They attempted to initiate the realignment of all sewer systems out of Stream Environment Zones, (SEZ) and move them to areas that would not immediately convey any overflows to the Lake. Lahontan Water Quality had given that authority to them on the California side and they wanted to carry that requirement over the Nevada.

In Nevada, the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection is the only agency that has authority over sewer systems, and it does not require a maintenance plan at this time.

The Lake Tahoe Wastewater Infrastructure Partnership (LTWIP) held a number of meetings with the TRPA regarding the moving of sewer lines. The Army Corps of Engineers was brought in and they funded HDR to come up with a solution. With pressure from both the ACE and NDEP, these plans were accepted as a trade off in lieu of a much larger comprehensive requirement to realign all sewer mains out of stream zones and beach setback areas.

In Nevada this plan is voluntary. It was agreed to by the Nevada entities because of the resources and funding given by the ACE and the fact that this plan may become mandatory at sometime in the future without the availability of these resources and financial support.

This plan is a risk based plan which means that by adhering to a preset schedule, (one that is already in place and used by Summit Plumbing and monitored by KGID), the risk of sewer spills will be greatly reduced to an acceptable level.

The sewer maintenance plan is a document that spells out how KGID intends to manage sanitary sewer overflows, (SSO) and eliminate the future risk associated with SSOs through proper maintenance. Most of the information included in the exhibits has been taken directly from our existing contract documents, so there is no conflict with our current procedures.

This maintenance plan will be delivered to the TRPA after approval by the KGID Board of Trustees.

Once the maintenance plan is adopted, it will be submitted to the TRPA.

The GM explains where this document came from, California is run by Lahontan and the Nevada side is controlled by NDEP. California requires a sewer maintenance plan and Lahontan and gave authority to TRPA who wanted to also extend their authority to Nevada. NDEP does not require a sewer maintenance plan. Funding was obtained from ACE to prepare the plan which is voluntary; each sewer entity will provide one to TRPA. TRPA can't hold us to the voluntary plan. One good thing coming from this is a grease trap maintenance plan. This plan can be included in our ordinance updates. CCTV work has standard specifications and this information will tie in with our KGID Board meeting minutes 4/20/10

GIS program.

Dan Norman asked what risk-based means? The Gm explains that you maintain the main to keep the sewer overflows to a minimum. More maintenance lessens risk of overflow. Barratt explains that you look at a global look at potential problem areas and manage maintenance to reduce the risk. Johnson explains with camera work, we identify any areas with enhanced risk. Certain lines don't have problems. Cleaning cycles are determined by capturing data on how much and what type of debris may be in a pipe.

Hayes asked about the high flows reported in March and the GM explains that it is likely due to excessive runoff entering the sewer system. We have included sealing of the wet wells in our budget to help mitigate any infiltration.

Barratt asked if there are any down sides to approving the plan. The GM doesn't believe there is one and believes it is good management practice to have a document to refer to.

M-4/20/10-3 – Motion by Treanor, seconded Barratt, and unanimously passed to approve the Risk-Based Sewer Maintenance Plan for submittal to TRPA.

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 – Board

members received the latest revisions to Options 2 & 3 that were chosen at the March 23, 2010 board meeting as potential future metered water rates. Runtzel prepared a cheat sheet as previously discussed to be sent with monthly billings for metered residential customers. Brent Farr provided the revised water rate revenue spreadsheets and explained that he modified total residential revenue per the latest budget workshop up to \$1,900,000 from \$1,800,000 and reduced variable costs from \$630,000 to \$400,000 per discussions with staff. He also re-worked the water reduction calculations so that all of the reductions are taken from the second and third tiers.

Runtzel explains that Farr was directed by the board to revise the options at the last meeting and he has included an increase in revenues and we separated the fixed and variable costs and made revisions to those allocations. Hayes thought that Option 2 has changed and thought that the top tier of \$4 was not in either options previously approved. Farr explained that he didn't revise any of the tiers. Runtzel pulled the board packet and the email from Farr providing the four options and confirmed that Option 2 included a \$4 rate for the top tier. Farr wants to be sure we are all on the same page and comments Options 2 & 3 were in the middle of the range. Farr had suggested Option 3 as a good place to start. Barratt suggests that we establish our guiding principals in the public hearing, such as we want people to conserve water. Farr acknowledges that we should establish the parameters like the requirement to meet the 2% MHI, discuss the fixed and variable costs, etc.

The GM reports is we look at the cheat sheets, you can see how much you would pay for a certain level of water usage. The sheet was prepared by Runtzel at board direction to provide to customers later this summer.

Farr explains that when looking at the fixed vs. variable costs, we were able to go through our budget and itemize the variable costs and make revisions to our previous assumptions which were based on industry standard. We pulled chemicals and some electricity as an example. We also

adjusted the 30% reduction to primarily come out of the tier 3 usages. Most of the water reduction we will see will be recognized from the higher user. We won't likely see a 30% reduction from condo or low water users. Treanor comments that we were trying to accomplish that the higher user with a lawn using 30-35 thousand gallons will have a smaller increase in their water bill than the lower user who doesn't have a lawn and Option 3 will achieve that and meet the MHI. Barratt comments that by giving the higher user a break then the lower water users are paying more. Treanor replies that under Option 3, if the lower users use 5,000 gallons, the water bill would be \$64.50 versus \$67 that it currently would be under the flat rate. Option 2 rate would be 61.75 for 5,000 gallons used. The difference is \$2.75 between the options for 5,000 gallons. Option 3 is Treanor's preference because she feels it is fairer to both the upper and lower areas. Barratt disagrees that Option 3 it is fairer.

Dan Norman asks if there is a separate rate for the meter and separate rate for water usage after that. Yes, there is a base rate and then tiered rates for usage. We are considering two options tonight.

Option 2, according to Treanor, penalizes someone with an average lawn. If you use 35k gallons, under Option 2, that customer would pay \$157/mo and under Option 3 they would pay \$132 for the same usage. Treanor believes we want to be able to maintain lawns and she doesn't think it is all about the lowest users; it's about applying rates fairly across the board. She believes it's not fair to penalize those with lawns. We still have to reach the \$84.50 for 15,000 gallons per month.

The GM explains that the typical home uses about 5,000 gallons per month in the winter. Treanor looks at this from the homeowner's perspective and if it takes 35k/month to irrigate she believes that Option 3 will be more preferable to the homeowners and that they would be willing to pay the Option 3 rate to keep property values up and maintain their lawns.

Scott Brooke asks if there is a figure out there that represents the average usage to water a lawn. Farr explains that we haven't because people's lawns are different sizes. Hayes believes he could keep his lawn using 30k per month if he's paying attention. Farr agrees that we will see the most conservation and reduced water bills by people paying attention. Customers will pay more, but he has a nice lawn in Reno and only waters three times per week.

Barratt cites minute excerpts from last month, where he commented that his neighbor believes that paying \$53-\$57/mo per condo owner is too much. Farr states Barratt's comments are well taken. In looking at Option 3, we would obtain 150% of fixed costs in base rate revenues, there is somewhat of a subsidy going on. Farr notes that for the district as a whole it may be a good place to start. Hayes acknowledges that he has a reputation for fighting this issue and it's well deserved because he believes it will cost us a couple hundred grand more per year to meter the district. If we look at the 30% reduction number, the revenue is approximately \$2M dollars and there is \$200,000 more than the before water metering budget. If you add the additional 200k needed, it makes it hard for anyone to say anything. In looking at the variable revenue of \$228k, this tells you that the metering is just covering the cost of the water and the fixed revenue is covering the cost to run the system. Hayes believes we are adding 200k at a minimum and closer to \$400k if there is no water reduction.

Hayes doesn't want to kill the people that are over using water and we need to realize there will be savings and people should pay an additional cost for those using water. Treanor doesn't want to require people to do extreme conservation like was done at Roundhill. Barratt questions if the lower users should really pay 150% of fixed costs, this seems like a lot. Runtzel points out that we are looking at 117% under Option 3 and 109% under Option 2 now that the revisions have been

made. Farr acknowledges that this is the debate that goes on, in reality, the Option that shows 100% is the one that is most mathematically correct and is most equitable. We ditched Option 1 which was the most equitable. Farr comments it's tough, now with the flat rate, the low users are subsidizing the high end users. He still recommends Option 3 because he's seen the fallout in the past. We are going from a flat rate to a metered rate. He's concerned that we will have more fallout and public outcry in choosing Option 1 or 2. The condo users will only see a difference of \$1-3 dollars per month and will not likely show up at a rate hearing. Treanor comments at the last rate hearing all of the people were from below and Natalie Yanish clarified that was because they had meters installed and were receiving letter with estimated water bills.

Treanor comments that if we start too low to begin with and have to raise it and that could be a bad thing. If we start in the middle and get a feel for it and we will know how much conservation takes place. Per Farr, right now we don't know a lot. Treanor comments after this summer when everyone in the lower area gets a meter, we will learn a lot. Hayes comments that we are installing meters for specific goals and reasons. We aren't stating to the public that we are redistributing costs in a radical way. Hayes wants to be sure when we go to the public, we express that we are doing this for specific goals and it's not the intent to make radical changes.

Farr reminds the board that ideally we want to choose one of these options with all of the parameters and educational material including a worksheet to show water bills at various consumption amounts and present this information at a public hearing. This will open up dialogue and will help the customers make more informed decisions on their water usage.

Barratt is still concerned and prefers Option 2 because it is more equitable. Will the public be aware of the various Options that we had to choose from? Treanor comments that the Trustees were elected by the residents and if they are unhappy, they can elect another board. Barratt's point is not to give everyone 4 different options, whatever is chosen, the residents will hate. It will keep shifting more towards the high end user. Treanor disagrees. The board will have to choose one option. Yanish comments that she believes Barratt is concerned that the squeaky wheel will get the grease. Either way, the board has to choose an option, doesn't matter which one because the customers won't be happy no matter which option is chosen. This is not set in stone and is for informational purposes for the public at this time. Brooke asks whether there is a practical reason to put two options out. Farr is concerned that there will be confusion by doing so.

Norman comments this is a proposed rate that will be adjusted with experience and is the best estimate at this time of what the metered rates may look like. The actual rates may be higher or less depending on what the higher end users are doing with their conservation efforts. Hayes thought we were giving information so the public won't be blindsided when the rates come out. Normans point is that we are providing the best guess estimate for what the rates will be. Daria Voyt thinks we need to provide the public with conservation methods and information. We also have to stress to the public that we have to meet our revenue requirements and that this isn't just about conservation. Farr thinks we need to be firm at the meeting and provide history of what we've done to get to this point; a good presentation will go a long way. Being prepared is most important to Treanor. Hayes would like to show a range of rates at the public hearing. Barratt thinks when we show the public the constraints and goals we need to meet, hopefully the public will be informed and they will have an opportunity to be heard. Farr acknowledges once people feel heard and they understand, they may not be happy but many will understand this is the way we have to move forward. Farr wants to present only one option to keep it simple.

Norman comments that Johnson commented to him that it's important to install meters to be fair to the entire district and once he heard that he was more understanding. Voyt thinks just like with the road plan, it's important to explain what we've accomplished. The GM thinks we need to pick only one option, acknowledge that it will change, but it provides staff with direction.

Hayes thinks Schussel was mad that we brought Option 3 back because he felt \$2.50 for the top tier was too much. Brooke points out that in order to take action, the board needs three votes, since two board members are absent. Hayes suggests we look at something in between Options 2 & 3. Farr explains if we select Option 2, it provides more room to negotiate and may be a better strategy. If we choose Option 3, there really isn't much room to negotiate.

Treanor comments that we started with 4 Options, then went to 3 Options and then a board member asked for another Option, and finally chose two options. Now we need to choose one option.

Runtzel suggests under Option 2, looking at the tier 3 30% reduced usage at the bottom right side of the page, the total annual revenue in Tier 3 is \$21,295.06. If we were to reduce the Tier 3 rate to \$2.50/1000, the revenue would be reduced to approximately \$14,000, a \$7,000 difference from the \$21k and in leaving the base rate the same at \$53, our total revenues would still be in excess of \$1.9M with a 30% reduction. We would still meet the MHI rate requirement. Barratt likes that idea. Farr sees Runtzel's recommendation, if you go with Option 2 and maybe reduce the Tier 3 rate to \$3/1000, the revenues won't be impacted significantly. Barratt would be okay with changing the Tier 3 to \$3/1000. Hayes agrees Option 2 is closer to the numbers needed. There was some discussion on whether there is a need to hold a special meeting since we are missing two board members but was decided not to do so. Norman suggested that the board hold a vote and if all are in agreement then it's a done deal and if not, a special meeting may be required.

M-4/20/10-4 – Motion by Treanor, seconded Barratt, and unanimously passed to approve the projected water rates, Option 2 with a revision in the top tier #3 to \$3.00/1000 instead of \$4/1000, for residential metered customers, and the KGID Cheat Sheet for use by residents as a tool for calculating their KGID bills once metered, with the understanding that we are not adopting or implementing a new water rate at this time. This is strictly an estimate of water rates for customer use and will be presented to the public at the May 20, 2010 board meeting.

Runtzel will revise the cheat sheet and hide the tier 1-3 columns for ease in reading. We will put a note on the sheet to estimate average usage for a typical family of 4's winter and summer usage.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT AND LETTER FOR METER INSTALLATION TO MULTIPLE CUSTOMERS SERVED BY A SINGLE SERVICE LINE – Brooke provided a

Water Meter Agreement for board consideration with input and criteria provided by staff. The agreement will mitigate issues where multiple properties are served by a single water line and offers that individual water meters will be installed as well as a master water meter, which we propose property owners incur \$500 each towards the purchase and installation of the master meter in lieu of a requirement for the homeowners to bring a new water service line to the district main or form a property owner association.

Runtzel suggested a quick break to allow Trustees to review the agreement provided at tonight's meeting. Runtzel explained this item is coming before the board tonight because we are currently designing two water meter projects and where there are some issues that could be addressed with the proposed agreement. The Chairman called for a 10 minute break.

Also included for board consideration was a draft letter that would be sent to each homeowner outlining the options available? The GM explained that there are some properties who share a single water service line. We have to decide how to meter these properties and there is an option to either meter at the existing shutoffs or to require the homeowner to install new service lines. On Juniper, one service line is serving three homes. We are trying to come up with an agreement where the homeowners will agree to master meter and install single water meters also. The extra master meter cost should be allocated between the three homeowners instead of requiring each homeowner install a new water service line.

In discussions with Brooke, if homeowners cannot agree then at this point we can skip installing meters for these homes. This is a test run and we want to see how it works in these areas before we get to the multi-family units. Runtzel provided a draft letter explaining what the options are and the individual situation. Runtzel explains further that we have a lot of different scenarios going on and different things to consider. These areas are not significantly different than the Tahoe Village and Summit Village areas. We are trying to cover the HOA's multi-family properties. If we require the homeowner to come back out to the water main with a new service or do we acknowledge that we accepted the waterline installations in some cases when the homes were built, therefore, in her opinion, we have some responsibility and maybe should burden some or all of the costs if new service lines are required. This is really going to be a matter of policy on how the board wants to approach these issues.

When the GM and Runtzel met with Brooke on the issues, we considered that the homeowners would pay the entire cost of the master water meters. In looking further, the cost of a 1 1/2" master water meter is approximately \$3,500-\$4,000. We feel that \$3,400 is a lot to share between two people and we think it's a lot to ask of our customers. Runtzel personally believes that KGID has a responsibility to provide the master meters at no cost to the homeowner because we allowed or accepted the existing configurations to begin with. Runtzel notes that she cannot tell the board for certain that we can afford to install master meters where required and individual meters district wide at this point, but based on preliminary cost estimates, she does believe we can do this on the multifamily properties within the new SRF loan budget and should do so.

Brooke clarified that this agreement will not be used on any single family residence that has a single service. Brooke compares the situation to when all properties were on septic and then we required them to connect to the sewer system and now we are requiring all properties to have a water meter. He believes it's very similar. The agreement is designed to take into account that there are differing situations. If they want to have a property owners association then they will not be required to install new water lines. This agreement includes access authority in the event that individual meters are installed on private property but does not require KGID to accept responsibility for the customer side of the water line. The GM doesn't believe that we will get many customers agreeing to this agreement.

Runtzel clarifies to Dr. Norman that under this agreement, instead of the customers sharing \$3,400 for a master meter, we came up with a flat rate of \$500 per customer towards the purchase of the master meter. This amount may not cover the entire cost of a master meter. Barratt confirms that this agreement would be used if an existing building doesn't have an HOA, or it does have an HOA but the customers want individual water meters.

Hayes confirms that the options are; 1) create a property owners association & KGID master meters and individually meters, each customer pays \$500 towards the purchase of the master meter; 2) install a new waterline at the customers sole cost and KGID installs individual water meters for each property or; 3) form a property owners association and KGID installs master meter only. Under Option 2, KGID may have to install new service line to the property line and the customer will have to come back to that point with a new service lateral. The customer would have to either hire contractor or complete the work themselves.

Hayes is concerned that we are encouraging Option 3 and Runtzel explains that the reason why is that ½ of KGID's customers live in multi-family residential units and she doesn't believe the board is prepared to require half of our customers to incur costs to bring new water lines out.

Treanor asks whether we will provide a certain amount of time to come into compliance and get water meters installed. We will address that within the water ordinance revisions.

Barratt likes the concept of the agreement but he thinks some of it is cohesive and he thinks it could be improved. Barratt thinks we should ease the access to the information. Barratt wants to be sure the customers understand what we are trying to do. Barratt thinks that what is being said could be more concise.

Hayes suggests that we change Option 1 so each homeowner pays \$1000 towards the master meter, but under option 2 we provide \$500 in costs towards bringing new service laterals to the KGID line. He thinks that unless bringing in a new water line is less than \$500, they will choose to form a property owner association. Hayes believes we would prefer the homeowners to bring new service lines out. Runtzel reminds the board that when we begin metering TVHOA, SVHOA and LVHOA and if we offer to pay every property owner \$500, and 50% take us up on it, not only are we paying them the \$500 but additionally we are incurring additional costs to install the individual water meters and the overall costs for the metering project will be significantly more than if we master meter only. Runtzel explained further in the HOA's, when you get into a 4-plex up top, the costs to plumb and install individual water meters under the building, the cost for each unit is approximately \$400 per unit versus \$1000-1500 per each individual water meter installed at the right of way. Brooke comments that we can treat the individual homes differently from the multi-family structures. The GM agrees. In the long run, the GM thinks that we should require each of those properties to have separate water lines.

Runtzel point out that in a 4-plex situation, if we require them to bring new 4 - ¾" lines back out, and they are currently served with a single 1" waterline on KGID's side, the District will have additional costs to install a new KGID line and we will be cutting up the new roads. Runtzel acknowledges that we will have to do this in some cases regardless, but we should try to minimize when possible.

Brooke suggests that this agreement is used for the single family homes for this summer's project and if necessary we will revise it to accommodate multi-family properties next year. Johnson explained the Juniper Drive plumbing to the board. The ideal solution to this situation per Johnson is to require new service line installations. Currently, if one property didn't pay their bill, we are unable to shut them off. Barratt asked how much a new waterline installation costs and Runtzel cited a remodel on Sunflower Circle who had to do this and the cost from the back of the house to the edge of right-of-way was \$4,500, the length was approximately 100' of digging. The Juniper case will literally be digging in rock. Wenziger suggests that we provide an exhibit to the KGID Board meeting minutes 4/20/10

homeowners to show the existing conditions and the properties that are served by a single water line.

M-4/20/10-5 – Motion by Treanor, seconded Barratt, and unanimously passed to authorize legal counsel to work with staff to revise and clarify the Water Meter Agreement and proposed letter to be sent to customers.

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 March 31, 2010 as well as financial statements for the same period.

General Manager Report – Barratt asked about AMEC’s request for \$51,000 in additional engineering fees. McKay explained they didn’t provide sufficient supporting information nor did they obtain approval in advance.

Douglas County – street cut policy, all franchisees do not recognize GID’s as an entity overseeing the roads.

Business & Contracts Manager Report – Runtzel explained staff is spending a ton of time on projects which are going out to bid within the next week.

Operations Supervisor Report – Hayes asks about the issues with Lakeside Inn, and Johnson explained that there was an error in the way the meter was calculating usage because the number of dials was incorrectly transferring from the billing system.

Hayes asked about Jason Hudak passing his Grade 3 certification and Johnson explained that he now has his Distribution 3 but not the Treatment 3 yet. Joe Esenarro has his Treatment Grade 3, but not his Distribution 3 yet. The GM reported that Hudak will be an operator-in-training for a certain period of time because he has to have a certain amount of lack experience in the field. He’s showing good initiative to obtain his certifications.

Johnson explained the crew has been busy in the field locating water valves in advance for the metering projects. We are doing that in the waterline projects as well to try to avoid any problems during construction.

We have worked toward making the generators and trailers safer by installing non-skid tread and will still be working on making railings to stand on.

ATTORNEY’S REPORT – Update on Whitebark, waiting for snow to melt so Whitebark can inspect the road and make a decision on whether the road condition is acceptable. Hope to clear this issue up by the next meeting.

ENGINEER’S REPORT – Brent Farr and Ralph briefly went over the progress of the various projects.

CORRESPONDENCE – The following correspondence was received during the month: 1) 2010 Federal Health Care Legislation from Pool/pact and; 2) Thank you letter from customer who received assistance from James Warswick.

ADJORNMENT TO CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO NRS 288.220 TO DISCUSS LABOR/MANAGEMENT ISSUES

ACTION FROM CLOSED MEETING – There was no action on this item.

ADJOURNMENT

M-4/14/10-6 – Motion by Treanor, seconded by Barratt and unanimous approval the meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

W.R. Hayes –Chairman

Attest:

Brett Barratt, Secretary