Hi Susan,

Below are comments regarding Waste Management I received in an email after the survey went out. He asked they be shared with the Board...

Thanks,
Denise

The board members need to get in a car and follow the Waste Management trucks to determine just how much trash they actually pick up. It will shock you and then add up all the fees for Waste Management. And that, too, will shock you. If we renegotiate the contract with Waste Management you could use a tremendous amount of savings to fund other projects or get them to increase the number of pickups during the summer months. I realize they have to transport the refuse down to Carson City but in Las Vegas the drive to the dump is actually farther away than Carson City is from Incline. And our rates in Las Vegas are about $46 per quarter and they pick up twice a week for every home. We are paying far to much for the services provided. On my street alone, with approximately 8 homes on the street, Waste Management would be lucky to pick up just one home's trash a week. For a total of $69 times 8 you get $552 for maybe 10 to 12 pick ups in one quarter. That would be about $50 for a couple of bags of trash, for the entire street that takes about 3 minutes.

Additionally, someone called and complained about our trash being put out to soon. I had to pay $500 to IVGID because I refused to get a bear box, because they don't work. Bear boxes do not take away the hunger pains of a bear. The boxes act like your mother's cooking of spaghetti, and the garlic is in the air. If the bears can't get into the box do they just go home or do they start breaking into garages? If everyone installed a bear box, which attracts more bears, do you think that would solve the problem or do you think the bears would get more aggressive if they are still hungry and smell the spaghetti close by? Here is a picture of a bear box up the street on Mays last month. I guess the tenant had a problem closing the door. I wonder if they got fined $500 for their trash because they already have a box? I wonder if the same person who complained about me, called and complained about the person on Mays? Bear boxes don't work, they just shift the activity of the bear to another location and attract more bears. The smell the trash left outside for days in a box just allows for the bears to salivate. What did the board think would happen when they advocate for smelly trash to be left outside in a box in the heat that can't be opened by a bear? The stupidity of extorting a $500 check to force people to purchase a bear box to combat bear activity is an indictment of the boards thinking on this issue. Please get rid of this stupid extortive rule. It is counter productive. The answer is more frequent pick ups by Waste Management.

Finally, if the Waste Management company would be required to pick up trash twice or three times a week in the summer you wouldn't have a bear problem. If there were more pickups, no one would be storing their trash in the garage or bear boxes waiting for the next pickup. Tenants who rent on a short term basis who don't understand what bears do, will leave the trash outside even if they are instructed not to do so. The owners don't put trash out early, the tenants do, without the knowledge of the owner. All you are doing with this $500 fine is angering and aggravating the residents of Incline by making them buy an aroma generator for bears.
Summary: Renegotiate the Waste Management contract to reduce the cost to the owners or use the savings for more projects.

Increase the Waste Management pickups during the summer hot months to cut down on bear activity.

Repeal the $500 extortion fee that is a counter productive measure and only serves to force people to buy a device that attracts more bears.

Please pass this along to the board members.

---

Bill O'Donnell
699 David Way
696 Lakeshore

702-340-2455
Susan,
under the public records act I am requesting a copy of the e-mailing list for the CS survey. You may redact those names and addresses of residents who specifically requested their names not be released. I find it odd that many residents, including myself were not included in this survey and if the list of those surveyed is skewed then we might have a survey which has like other surveys released a manufactured predetermined result.
Please place a copy of this request in the next board packet, and give a copy to each board member!

Thank you,
Frank Wright

Sent from my iPhone
From: s4s@ix.netcom.com
Sent: Saturday, April 08, 2017 9:50 AM
To: Kendra Wong
Cc: Horar, Phil; Tim Callicrate; Matthew Dent; Peter Morris; Herron, Susan
Subject: April 13, 2017 BOT Meeting - Agenda Item E8

Dear Chairperson Wong and other Honorable Members of the IVGID Board -

I am giving each of you a heads up insofar as this agenda item is concerned because I am certain none of you know the factual history, and you are about to blindly go down a road you have no power to travel. So rather than treating this agenda item as a precursor for a future public hearing, it should DIE next Thursday.

Although I will provide more evidence on April 13, 2017, here is what you need to know now.

1. The land underneath the Reynolds Non-Profit Center Bldg (2.36 acres) is owned by IVGID.

2. There is a recorded use restriction on this land. When it was acquired that restriction limited use "only for park and recreational and related purposes and for no other purposes."

3. 22 years after the fact and for nefarious reasons, IVGID disingenuously attempted to retroactively modify the property's recorded use restriction to permit use of "only for park and recreational and related purposes and for no other purposes except for the construction of a building for the use of the Parasol Foundation. Parasol Foundation collaborators or the Parasol Foundation legal successors."

4. Although I and others believe this attempted modification was and is invalid, at page 103 of the Board Packet Chairperson Wong discloses Parasol proposes to change its use of the property in violation of this land use restriction.

Given Parasol proposes to violate the use restriction on this land, there really is nothing more to discuss. This restriction is a covenant which runs with the land and is enforceable by all those for whose benefit it was created; i.e., local property owners.

Moreover, the lease with Parasol is quite clear in that the public's land can only be used for the purposes of conducting thereon a Nonprofit Center, and related facilities, activities, seminars, work shops, lectures, and occasional fund raising events. Lessee cannot be used for any other purpose or purposes without the express prior written consent of IVGID. Should Parasol fail to operate the building or significantly reduce its use from what was contemplated in Parasol's Long-term Business Plan, or should Parasol's primary use of the building change for purposes other than as intended, then the property, including all improvements thereon (i.e., the building), shall revert to IVGID's full use and ownership.

This land NEVER should have been leased to Parasol. Thus if Parasol chooses to use the public's land for impermissible purposes, it should rightfully revert to IVGID's full use and ownership without any payment whatsoever.

I understand Brad Johnson is anxious to get his hands on this building to be used as new administrative offices for IVGID. But what he forgets is that the land was purchased with Rec Fee moneys based upon the express representation it would be used for park and recreational purposes only. Let Brad find someone else's property, and let IVGID pay for it with moneys other than Rec Fee moneys.

Like I said, there's really nothing to discuss on April 13, 2017.

Please include a copy of this e-mail in the next Board packet so the public can learn of the use restrictions on this land.

Thank you for your cooperation. Aaron Katz