instructors is out recovering from hip surgery. Staff is doing everything they can but there are a lot of variables.

Q: Will the 2014/2015 budget have that goal in mind.
A: It is the direction Staff wants it to go but if the question is specifically to get to zero in 2014/2015 then the answer is probably not.

Q: The 2013/2014 allocation is $241 for the Recreation Center, $33 for Programs, and $6 for Tennis – what is the 2014/2015 allocation and is there a goal in mind to reduce these numbers.
A: That will be presented in March.

Director of Golf Charlie Kent gave his presentation for Golf which is incorporated herewith by reference.

The following questions were asked and answered:

Q: So if a multi-play pass is purchased, can you still apply that to the 7 a.m. to 11 a.m. time slots.
A: There is no change being made from what was experienced last season. Staff is just introducing the idea of peak time pricing.

Q: If a resident brought a guest to $1 per hole, how would that work out.
A: You could bring your guest and that rate would apply to your guest.

Q: Can the 9-hole round be tested, at the Championship Golf Course, during the off peak times.
A: It is something that could be considered.

Q: Looking forward to having summer activity at Diamond Peak so is Golf looking at cross pollinating with Diamond Peak and activities.
A: Yes.

Q: With the rate recommendations presented, how is Staff planning on handling the fall out or fall off of resident play.
A: By keeping the passes the same, there is no impact to them. The Championship Golf Course needs to be inclusive and with the $1.50 per hole, for nine holes, everyone can afford that rate and it reaches all income levels within this community.

Q: What is high season.

A: Mid-June through mid-September.

Q: How many all you can play passes are sold.
A: Around fifty.

Q: The rate recommendation for the Mountain Golf Course was to stay the same; is this in accordance with the Global Golf Advisors (GGA) recommendations.
A: GGA actually had some recommendations that our rates go down so through some of the websites we use, we feel we are achieving that objective.

Q: You mentioned that twenty new golf courses have opened up, how many are closing, going private, or making changes that help us.
A: We need a few more to close as does this market because everyone is undercutting each other. It was reported, in the past, that the Championship Course had 23,000 rounds. There is only one other course doing that volume and it is a municipal golf course in South Lake Tahoe with the other courses being at 18,000 rounds or less. We are very fortunate and it backs up the benchmarking that GGA did. We have all heard the story about the past and that the golf course did 33,000 rounds but when you couple that with the condition of the course, at 23,000 rounds, it is right where we need to be and while the price increase might cause a little dip, the benchmark range means we can afford that dip.

Q: Schaffer's Mill has gone 100% private; does Staff know of any others that have similar plans.
A: Clear Creek just re-opened last season, they are being aggressive in trying to grow their membership, and they are targeting our community. We are building a new forward tee box which is going along with what other golf courses are offering and this is one of the main reasons that some of our community members go elsewhere because the other golf courses are easier for ladies to play. The Championship Golf Course has a reputation as being a tough course for ladies to play so last season we tested out the forward tee box idea by putting out some markers and the ladies were very excited because they had fun on the golf course. The plan for this season is to continue with the fairway only with those markers and we have a CIP placeholder for the forward tee boxes. Staff would like another year to get a good measurement of usage.

Director of Finance, Accounting and Risk Management Eick distributed a calendar, which is incorporated herewith by reference, and verbally went over it. Trustee Devine asked that the Board be provided with all the times for the workshops as well as the tours. Trustee Smith asked if there was anything that could be moved to after the new General Manager starts because he is going to be responsible for this budget's execution and he wants to be considerate. Chairman Wolfe said it would be a good idea to get him this information so if he is available he can attend. Trustee Smith said that if the Chairman is not going to be here then he would like to suggest picking a date when he is here because some big considerations are discussed. Director of Finance, Accounting and Risk Management Eick said there are three markers to deal with – April 15 the District must file a preliminary operating budget, May 15 we are required to pass a budget and then in June we have some fill in work to accomplish so it is important to note and be aware that the District is working with a couple of time/date certain activities. He has met with our incoming General Manager and he is aware of our budget process and Staff would welcome his participation on the tour. Strategically, Staff picked back to back dates for the tour and workshop but if we need to work something else out, Staff is accepting of that idea. Chairman Wolfe said he would be good with doing the tour on March 27 and then the workshop on March 28. Interim General Manager/Director of Public Works Pomroy said that Staff will work to accomplish that goal. Trustee Smith said that he hopes that the new General Manager will be available.

Hearing no further Board comments, Chairman Wolfe opened the matter for public comment.

Aaron Katz said that he had been keeping track of the number of times that the Board addressed Staff without using their titles and it was twenty one times so how can the Board enforce a policy like this. Chairman Wolfe warned Mr. Katz that he may be ejected from this meeting. Mr. Katz said that this wasn't within his power and that he demanded to be treated with respect as he has a juris doctorate so he would like to be addressed as Dr. Katz. Twenty percent of the people use Diamond Peak and that means the people that are users, in Incline Village, are about ten to twenty percent so the facilities are not for us and that this is evidence of that statement. The Recreation Center model was that Sierra Nevada College came to us and said they were going to use it yet he has heard no capacity to increase and we don't have it because we are giving it away, for free, to employees and

Sierra Nevada College. The Recreation Center shows $864,000 in revenues and he has asked for some public records to show where this comes from but he hasn't gotten them. If Staff is following the GGA report and they are not seeing an increase in rounds, how many years are we going to follow this as this is the message from SE Group - their plan is going to increase revenues.

Trustee Devine said, regarding Diamond Peak, that what he thought was clarified was that it wasn't 20% usage it was 20% of the revenue and that the numbers would be different; General Manager Diamond Peak Ski Resort Wilson confirmed that was correct.

Frank Wright said that he had a hard time with the exchange that took place between Chairman Wolfe and Dr. Katz and as far as the requirement to address Staff by their titles, he would suggest that the public get a list of the titles and then take this up. There is no law or criteria for addressing anyone or demanding that criteria and noted that calling someone Mr. isn't disrespectful but that having Chairman Wolfe disrupt a meeting by calling a recess, without asking the other Trustees, is and he finds it ludicrous. Additionally, he finds it especially ludicrous when the Chairman calls a member of the community a liar and states that they make false statements and that they aren't being prosecuted for that action – that's disrespectful. The Board wants us to listen to them and yet the Board treats us like crap. Stop what you are doing and listen to this community. There was not one item that addressed Staff reduction or the reduction in payment to Staff because we are in a situation where this District relies upon everyone for the Recreation Fee and that bothers him because it is being blown on employee costs.

Judith Miller said that she had a brief comment on the fact that was presented on ski instruction and ski schools providing 18% of the total revenue at Diamond Peak. Recently, there was a Senior Clinic offered and she called to see if she could register and that it was probably the cost that caused some not to participate. Each clinic was $35 which was a good reason to not sign up and if the District is making that much revenue then can't the District offer something more affordable. Ms. Miller said that she would like to find out what the reason was and what the expectation on the participation in that program was.

Trustee Devine said that a comment was made about no mention of reducing Staff and Golf did talk about a reduction in Staff.

Hearing no further public comments, Chairman Wolfe brought the matter back to the Board.

F. PUBLIC COMMENTS*

Frank Wright said that the point has been taken in not remembering titles and Staff is public employees and no one is calling the Chairman your Highness. When addressing Staff as Mr., the public is not showing any disrespect especially when everyone is calling everyone by their first names. Asking for this format is a power trip and the Chairman needs to get off it. Regarding the cost of our venues, they are not making money and Staff is not figuring out ways to cut costs. Cutting costs is an easy way to make money but the District is going to keep having the same costs and who is paying for that – the parcel owners. The Board needs to pay attention to what the bottom line is in each of these venues. They need to understand how much they are losing at each venue, how much has been lost in the past year, and how much will be lost in the future years. The Board needs to look at the numbers and let us know because we are losing money and we all know that. What is the Board going to do to change that loss – nothing because the Board doesn't take corrective action and the rates keep going up and no one is figuring out ways to pay for all this loss. The Board's job is to demand that Staff cut all the losses and then to start to turn some type of profit. Stay the same, no, you need to cut, cut, cut.

Aaron Katz said that this is his opportunity to make observations on the presentations and we have a culture problem with our Staff. The $36,000 on the athletic fields – what is the benefit – the benefit is to the local businesses who get $6.5 million dollars and they aren't paying the Recreation Fee. The recreational facilities are supposed to be here for the inhabitants. On the kayak racks, Staff said we have exhausted our capacity yet there is a kayak rack that someone is using for free which means there is a possibility for additional revenue yet our Parks and Recreation Director has decided to give it to some favored collaborator. He found it interesting when the Director of Golf talked about what represents a round of golf and that is that each tee off counts as a round of golf so when someone pays $1 per hole and they only do one or two holes, it counts so all the results are skewed. All this money for meals – last year when we talked about Food and Beverage, we used to call it Catering.

Judith Miller said that she wanted to echo the sentiment that the District needs a culture change and that we need a different type of change and that is that the IVGID Board of Trustees is not here to listen with an open mind. The public has

asked questions and there has been no response rather there has been just a dead response with no request to Staff to clarify an item. Statements made are treated without respect. Some members of the Board don't respond or respond with name calling. There needs to be a more comfortable setting so please look inward and it was her hope that the streaming video might curb some of this behavior. Why can't the General Manager request investigation and then report back. The criticism should be viewed as an opportunity to improve. Our country has a history of outspoken community members and if we didn't we would still have slavery and women wouldn't have the right to vote. There are many positives that have occurred because someone had the courage to stand up and speak.

G. ADJOURNMENT (for possible action)

The meeting was adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan A. Herron, CMC
Clerk to the Board of Trustees

Attachments*:

**In accordance with NRS 241.035.1(d), the following attachments are included but have neither been fact checked or verified by the District and are solely the thoughts, opinions, statements, etc. of the author as identified below.*

Submitted by Judith Miller: (1 page) IVGID Board Retreat – February 18, 2014 – Public Comment

Submitted by Aaron Katz: (3 pages) Written Statement to be included in the Written Minutes of this February 18, 2012 Special IVGID Board Meeting – Agenda Item C - Public Comment Section – Why are we here?

IVGID BOARD RETREAT - FEBRUARY 18 , 2014

PUBLIC COMMENT

The most disturbing fact surrounding the recent GM hiring process was the revelation that Trustee Simonian had known from very early in the process (likely before the selection process even began) that Mr. Severance did not possess a bachelor's degree. Before the job announcement was published, Mr. Simonian made a recommendation that was rejected by other Trustees that the degree requirement be dropped. Mr. Simonian also acknowledged at the September 25 , 2013 Board Meeting that he knew Mr. Severance both "professionally and socially". There is certainly evidence to suggest that his actions have violated the Nevada Code of Ethics and if that is the case, he should be removed from office.

I think Trustee Simonian owes the public an explanation. Why did he withhold the information from the public and the other Trustees, knowing that a degree was a basic requirement? What is his relationship with Mr. Severance? Was it an ongoing business relationship? Was it a close personal relationship? At a very minimum he should have disclosed his relationship with Mr. Severance before each and every action taken by the Board regarding the GM selection so that the public could understand how this would or would not affect his vote on the matter. In my opinion this disclosure was required by the Nevada Code of Ethics and just his failure to disclose was a violation of the law.

Whether or not a violation of law can be proven, Mr. Simonian has demonstrated that he cannot be trusted by the community and has put his personal interests ahead of the interests of the public. *Public service is a public trust and shall be held for the sole benefit of the people ... (NRS 281A.020).* He no longer deserves the title of Trustee.

Judith Miller

P O Box 3022

WRITTEN STATEMENT TO BE INCLUDED IN THE WRITTEN MINUTES OF THIS FEBRUARY 18, 2014 SPECIAL IVGID BOARD MEETING – AGENDA ITEM C – PUBLIC COMMENT SECTION – WHY ARE WE HERE?

Introduction: This meeting has been noticed to address IVGID's 2014-15 budget. Because what I fear is going to take place is another one of Gerry Eick's "dog and pony" shows where he again "pulls the wool" over Trustees' eyes, I submit this written statement.

Staff Has Demonstrated it Has No Intention of Listening to the Board Insofar as the Budget is Concerned: Didn't we go through this exercise last year? Didn't the Board clearly instruct staff it expected all of our recreational venues, except possibly parks/athletic fields, to operate on a revenue neutral or positive cash flow basis? Didn't staff hear what the Board said?

Currently the Board Budgets to Lose Nearly $7 Million Annually: We've been through this subject many times before. The Recreation ("the RFF") and Beach ("the BFF") Facility Fees represent nothing more than the difference between budgeted revenues from all recreation facilities/activities, and budgeted expenses assigned by staff to those facilities/activities. Combined the RFF/BFF total nearly $7 Million annually, and represent nothing more than the financial subsidy local dwelling unit owners *involuntarily* pay for the *losses* staff racks up year-after-year without impunity.

If You're Staff and You're Actually Listening to the Board, Budgeted Expenses Must be Reduced by $7 Million Annually: it's that simple. Yet I predict staff will present a budget for the Board's approval which *again* calls for $7 Million worth of *losses*! Why? Because staff doesn't care what the Board instructs. Staff has its own agenda and it is predicated upon the fact they and their IVGID colleagues' interests come first, and the public's comes last. If the Board is not going to stand strong and direct staff to come up with a budget which essentially eliminates recreational facility/ program losses, *why exactly are we going through this exercise*?

Even if the Board is Inclined to Accept Some Small Loss Insofar as the Public's Parks and Athletic Fields are Concerned, Budgeted Losses Still Need to be Reduced by at Least $6 Million, if Not More: If the Board is not going to stand strong and direct staff to come up with a budget which essentially eliminates recreational facility/program losses, *why are we going through this exercise*?

Since 82% or More of Recreational Facility and Program Revenues are Spent on Employee Salaries and Benefits, the Budget MUST Slash Employee Costs if There's Any Hope of Operating the Public's Recreational Facilities on a Revenue Neutral Basis: And if the Board and staff are not willing to go down this road, please *don't* pretend you're committed "to develop(ing)...(financially) self-sustaining recreation facilities;"[1] ***BECAUSE YOU'RE NOT***.

Besides Over Paying and Over Benefiting Our Under Utilized Employees, One of the Reasons Salaries and Benefits Are as High as They Are, is Because Staff is Engaged in Tasks Which Have Little to Do With Their Job Descriptions or IVGID's Purpose for Being: Not that IVGID is a municipality, but

Conclusion: Here we have another example of everything that's wrong with IVGID. Staff proposes perpetuating the financial irresponsibility which has plagued our community for decades. In contrast some of us refuse to forget **Trustee Smith's and Hammerel's** "so called" contract with the voters of Incline Village and Crystal Bay[1] ("vote for the united IVGID Trustee candidates who are offering a contract with Incline Village and Crystal Bay"). According to that contract we were told we'd be SAVEd; in other words, both trustees would "hold IVGID management accountable for fiscal... performance...We will...eliminat(e) waste...We will use our successful entrepreneurial business experience to...develop... (financially) self-sustaining recreation facilities...We will minimize the burden of the recreation venue subsidization (i.e., the RFF/BFF) and work to reduce recreation fees."

Additionally, some of us refuse to forget **Trustee Simonian's** representations[2] that under his watch, "the board (w)ould spend money (*only*) where it's needed (and) *not spend money to appease a small group of people in the community*" like our employees!

Finally, some of us refuse to forget **Chairperson Wolfe's** alleged "passion for fiscal responsibility"[3]; i.e., "tough economic times demand that the board *stop raising rates and lower the operating cost of the district.*"

Did you trustees really mean what you told voters before you were elected? If so, you know what you need to tell staff this morning: Bring back a budget which **REDUCES RECREATION EXPENSES BY $7 MILLION ANNUALLY!** And when staff replies it can't without "reducing services," please have the guts to respond "no, with a reduction in employees, salaries and wages" instead because that's really where our problem lies.

And You Wonder Why the RFF/BFF and Our Budgets are Out of Control? I've again provided more answers.

Respectfully, Aaron Katz (Your Community Watchdog Because No One Else Seems to be Watching).

---

[1] See http://www.electjim.org/contract.

[2] See http://www.tahoedailytribune.com/article/20100928/NEWS/100929925.

[3] See interview with the North Lake Tahoe Bonanza (http://www.tahoedailytribune.com/article/20100428/NEWS/100429894).

BILLS

($10,000.00 and Any Final CIP Payments)

		Amount		Department	Program	Project Name, Description & CIP information
	02/19 thru 02/25/2014					
1	Advanced Exercise Equipment	15,882.00		Fitness	Rec	**Fitness Equipment Project** - 1 ea Cross-Trainer Elliptical , 2 ea Upright LifeFitness Elliptical - inv 02/18
2						Project Mgr. - Bahlman, CIP #4886LI1101, Total Contract $15,882.00, Complete to Date 100% this vendor.
3	C.H. Spencer and Company	15,804.00		Trt Plant	PW	**Sewer Pumping Station Improvements Project** - Professional services contract for aeration actuator valves - inv 02/17
4						Project Mgr. - Jenks, CIP #2599DI1104, Total Contract $15,804.00, Complete to Date 100% FINAL this vendor.
5	EXL Media	37,542.65		Mktg	Ski	***$31,942.65*** - Jan 2014 paid advertising media - inv 02/17. ***$5,600.00*** - Jan 2014 Agency fee - inv 02/7
6	US Foods	13,432.44	*			
7				F&B	Ski	***$11,978.44*** - Food purchases, ***$1,163.90*** - Operating purchases and ***$98.80*** Janitorial purchases - inv 02/11 thru 02/21
8				F&B	Catering	***$191.30*** - Operating purchase - inv 02/15
9	USDA Forest Service	11,800.00	*	General	Ski	07/01/13 thru 06/30/14 "Special Use Permit" for Diamond Peak initial annual land use fee - inv 02/19
10	**Sub-Total**	**94,461.09**				
11	**02/26 thru 03/04/2014**					
12	Flyers Energy	10,423.67	*			
13				Fleet	PW	***$5,081.52*** - 1545 gal ULSD Dye #2 Diesel $3.289 per gal - inv 02/21
14				Fleet	PW	***$5,342.15*** - 1496 gal Ethanol 87 (10% Regular) CA @ $3.571 per gal - inv 02/21
15	Hyatt Regency Lake Tahoe	10,665.83	*	Hyatt Sports Shop	Ski	10% of Feb 2014 total sales of $106,658.25 due for Feb 2014 rent as per contract - inv 03/03
16	Nevada Dept. of Transportation	120,331.42		Eng	PW	**SR-28 Crystal Bay Utility Relocations Project** - Professional services project with State of Nevada - inv 12/05
17						Project Mgr - Pomroy, CIP #2524SS1011, Total Contract $1,461,444.41. Complete to Date 100%
18	Southwest Gas	19,170.41	*	All	All	Feb 2014 natural gas charges for all IVGID facilities - inv 02/26
19	**Sub - Total**	**160,591.33**				
20	***Combined 02/25 & 03/04/2014***	**255,052.42**				

Herron, Susan

From: s4s@ix.netcom.com
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 10:26 AM
To: Wolfe, Joseph
Cc: Simonian, Bruce E.; Smith, Jim; Hammerel, Jim; Devine, Bill; Herron, Susan
Subject: "Get it right before signing Waste Management contract"

To Chairperson Wolfe and other Honorable Members of the IVGID Board:

I read with interest George del Carlo's March 3, 2014 "Get it right before signing Waste Management contract" guest column in the online version of the North Lake Tahoe Bonanza (http://www.tahoedailytribune.com/northshore/10446576-113/contract-ivgid-bear-bears). Quoting from the article:

"No waste hauler can provide services in Incline without use of the Sweetwater transfer station. Any contract extension should include IVGID's future acquisition of the site; otherwise the community will forever be held hostage by the owner of that facility, Waste Management.

Under the current proposal, our community will still be handcuffed to WM after 13 years. A better contract must end with the community's ownership of the facility and greater future freedom to invite competitive bids."

As the Board knows, this too is my issue. I have likened our situation to that of the cult movie "Dune;" whoever controls the spice, controls the universe!

So this article got me thinking. How do we gain control of the transfer station without entering into a new trash agreement with WM? And the answer is SIMPLE!

WE TAKE IT.

IVGID has no problem taking nearly $7M annually from local property owners. Why not take the transfer station if in the public good?

Although IVGID likes to deny it is "government," the fact of the matter is that's exactly what it is.

Being "government, IVGID possesses certian powers individuals do not. And one of those powers is the power of eminent domain. What exactly is eminent domain?

Simply stated if government determines it is in the public interest to own private lands, it can elect to take them with or without the private owner's consent. The ONLY issue becomes the acquisition price and given this transfer station is worth next to ZERO without the trash franchise which expires in three years (if the Board doesn't extend it), that's what WM is entitled to.

And guess what? NRS 318.190 provides that "the board shall have and may exercise the power of eminent domain and dominant eminent domain in the manner provided by law for the condemnation by a city of private property for public use." So there's no issue here of IVGID exercising a power it doesn't possess.

So let's agendize this issue for future action, retain a legal expert in this field to guide us in our dealings with WM, retain a MAI certified appraiser who has qualified as an expert witness in condemnation proceedings who will tell us exactly what the transfer station is worth (the Assessor values the land at $817K and the improvements at $800K), and CONDEMN THE TRANSFER STATION.

And when WM balks, let's remind it "that's what being a community is all about."

Respectfully, Aaron Katz

Herron, Susan

From: Wolfe, Joseph
Sent: Tuesday, March 04, 2014 7:51 AM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: FW: Incline Village General Improvement District Support :: Joe Wolfe - Trustee

Importance: High

Correspondence for the files
Joe

From: Erik Fair [fair-ivgid@clock.org]
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2014 10:58 PM
To: Wolfe, Joseph
Subject: Incline Village General Improvement District Support :: Joe Wolfe - Trustee

Incline Village General Improvement District Support :: Joe Wolfe - Trustee

---

Name: Erik Fair
Email: fair-ivgid@clock.org
Phone: 316 Ski Way
Fax:
Street:

City: Incline Village
State, Zip: NV, 89451
Subscribe: Yes
Comments:

I wish to go on record as opposing any ordinance which mandates wildlife-proof trash containers throughout Incline Village. I've lived here full time for the last 12 years and never had wildlife invade my ordinary Rubbermaid trash container after I put it out for trash collection.

It is unnecessary & wasteful to mandate this throughout the Village - not every location has wildlife/trash issues.

User Agent:

Mozilla/5.0 (Macintosh; Intel Mac OS X 10_8_5) AppleWebKit/537.74.9 (KHTML, like Gecko) Version/6.1.2 Safari/537.74.9

Session Data (SID: 85b1eurktmkqcmvqlrql1lbo95):

```
Array
(
    [captchaCompleted] => 1
)
```

Herron, Susan

From: pricese@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2014 11:31 AM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Letter on Ordinance One
Attachments: IVGID_BOARD_LETTER_12_March_2014.doc

Susan: I will be unable to attend the 12 March Board of Trustees meeting as I will be out of town. Please include the enclosed letter in the board package and the meeting minutes. This is the first time I have done this: I hope I am following the correct procedures. Let me know. Respectfully, Steve Price
pricese@aol.com

28 February 2014

From: Steven E. Price
170 Village Blvd. #30
Incline Village, NV 89451

To: Incline Village Board of Trustees

Subject: Solid Waste Ordinance (IVGID Ordinance One)

The Board of Trustees is scheduled to vote to adopt a new Ordinance One at the 12 March 2014 meeting. I believe that a final vote on this ordinance is premature for the following reasons:

- The new General Manager will be involved in a number of procedures, including the appeals process. Are we asking him to make judgments before becoming fully knowledgeable of this issue?

- Adopting the new ordinance prior to a detailed examination of the waste collection agreement by competent negotiators is wrong. Negotiations between a professional negotiator of a waste collection company and a well-meaning staff are not adequate.

- A complete listing of the pro's and con's of this new ordinance should be shown to the trustees and the public. We have had numerous board meetings and most of the statements by the public have been redundant. But, there is not one central document that captures all the key issues, whether for or against.

- There are unresolved questions associated with the requirement to require homeowners and commercials to purchase approved containers.

    - First: Will the ordinance completely solve the bear problem?
    - Second: It is well known that there are those individuals that currently deposit trash/garbage anywhere they can, whether in a container or not. And, they are not always predisposed to completely close containers. Who will solve this issue?
    - Third: There are those that just want to feed the bears and take pictures. How will the ordinance address this issue?
    - Last: Who will take responsibility for homes, garages and cars being broken into once this new ordinance is in place? Will residents be required to purchase "Bear Insurance" to protect themselves financially? To continually accuse homeowners of leaving their doors open is unjust and unacceptable.

I am sure that there those who will say that many of these points are old issues that have already been addressed. I also realize that we elect trustees to make the tough decisions. However, I believe that this ordinance debate is of such magnitude that there are at least two reasons to slow down the process: First, allow the new general manager time to examine this issue in detail. And second, have the trustees consider putting the ordinance concept up for a vote by the community next fall. It is too contentious and divisive to do otherwise. I just don't believe that a group of activists should control our village, no matter how well meaning they may be. Let's take our time and fully examine all the issues.

Steven E. Price
Homeowner/Resident for 22 years

Herron, Susan

From: dcoll27@aol.com
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2014 9:41 AM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: ordinancenew waste/recycling

Gentlemen: I am concerned about the proposed new ordinance as it relates to recycling. We have a home on Alpine View and often have a large amount of recycling, both in the form of blue bags and cardboard. It would not be possible to load this material into a 64 gallon recycling cart in many instances. I am particularly concerned about the cardboard shipping boxes. My suggestion would be to continue to allow both the use of blue bags and the stacking of cardboard without protection on pick-up days. David E. Collins

Herron, Susan

From: David Cowles [bigislandfun@live.com]
Sent: Monday, March 03, 2014 6:48 PM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Solid Waste Comments

Comments on the proposed trash service changes:

Community cleanup dump voucher: The majority of Incline Village residents do not own a pick up truck so would not be able to participate in this service valued at $25. You should drop this from the standard service and reduce monthly costs by $2. If someone needs to use the dump, why can't they just pay the $25? It is not fair to charge all of us for an extra service only some want. Please keep the recurring monthly charges as low as possible.

Ordinance Revisions: while I fully support the need to enforce the requirement to use wildlife resistant containers, the "first offense" fine of $500 seems extreme. There no doubt will be some people who truly did not know the new rule was in effect. An example would be renters who put out excess trash in a plastic bag because it would not fit in the owner provided bear box or WM provided cart. I would recommend $100 for first offense, $500 for the second, and $999 thereafter. I like the provision to make the fines refundable with the installation of a bear box (but some violations will be for locations that already have a bear box).

If you are interested, I have a two can bear box and regularly put out recycling - thank you for getting rid of the "blue bags"!

Thanks for listening!

David Cowles
567 Len Way, Incline Village

Herron, Susan

From: s4s@ix.netcom.com
Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2014 2:17 PM
To: Wolfe, Joseph
Cc: Simonian, Bruce E.; Smith, Jim; Hammerel, Jim; Devine, Bill; Herron, Susan
Subject: Wednesday's Special Board Meeting
Attachments: Projected.Summer.Operation.Financials.2.xlsx

To Chairperson Wolfe and the Other Honorable Members of the IVGID Board:

I don't understand why we're having Wednesday's special meeting.

The agenda for this meeting lists the Diamond Peak master plan. But it says nothing about what proposed action will take place with respect to that plan.

Further, WHO called the meeting? Was it one of you trustees? Was it the SE Group? Or was it your trusted staff because it has an agenda neither disclosed nor shared by your constituency?

I believe clarifying who exactly called this meeting goes a long way in understanding who really is "governing" IVGID. In other words, is this really another staff agenda where the Board becomes its "rubber stamp?"

Be that as it may, the written materials shared by staff in the Board packet reveal staff has little interest in sharing the financial truth with the Board and the public insofar as proposed summer operations at Diamond Peak are concerned.

And the purpose of this e-mail is for one or more of you to force staff to cough up the financial truth so Wednesday's meeting can be productive.

What exactly am I talking about?

Take a look at page 14 of the Board packet. This is an estimate of summer operational revenues, expenses and alleged net profit.

I ask for a detailed disclosure of all the expense items included in the SE Group's $837,317 number.

And to make it easier for staff, I have attached a spreadsheet which lists all expense line items currently included in Diamond Peak's winter operation financials along with blanks to be filled in by staff which correspond to the same line items insofar as summer financials.

I ask that at least one Board member force the SE Group and staff to provide the missing numbers.

And here's why:

Look at my spreadsheet. Last season (because this season will be so dismal), Diamond Peak generated $2.73 Million in gross revenues from its mountain operations (remember, we need to deduct the lack of revenue IVGID reports which represents the discount residents receive). According to the SE Group, it projects that IN YEAR ONE summer operations will generate 87% of that number ($2,383,350). And in year three the SE Group projects summer operation revenues will actually exceed winter's (if you can believe).

So what were Diamond Peak's actual 2012-13 expenses incurred to generate this amount of revenue? Again looking at the spreadsheet we see $2.961 Million. Yet according to the SE Group, we will allegedly be able to generate essentially the same amount of revenue with only 28% of the winter costs!

Yes I expect there to be a handful of cost savings (like snowmaking), but 82%? Do any of you really believe this?

We need the SE Group's actual numbers to demonstrate how fallacious they are.

And I for one would like to see ALL of those numbers.

For instance, what about central services costs our staff deceitfully omits from Diamond Peak's financials?

What about professional fees? Are you seriously telling the public there will be no professional fees expended on summer operations?

What about cost of goods sold? Are you seriously telling the public that just like the Hyatt Sport Shop, the goods and services proposed to be sold during the summer months come with a ZERO cost?

What about marketing costs? Do you really believe that we are capable of generating $2.383 Million in summer revenues without massive marketing costs?

Thanks for at least one of you securing the raw data you require to make intelligent decisions, and maybe now you're starting to see why I've labeled this entire initiative "Fantasyland."

Respectfully, Aaron Katz

Estimated First Year Revenues/Expenses
Diamond Peak Summer Operations

Revenues	Actual 2012-13		SE 1st Year Projections		Notes
Sales	$ 2,729,900		$ 2,383,250		First Year Estimate per SE Group - $22,698/105 Season Day
Concessions	$ 36,400		$ -		
Other			$ -		
Total Revenues	**$ 2,766,300**			**$ 2,383,250**	
Expenses					
Personnel Costs					
Salaries/Wages					2013-14 Budget for Mountain Operations
Marketing	$ -		$ -		
Other	$ -		$ -		
Total	$ 869,500		$ -		
Employee Benefits					2013-14 Budget for Mountain Operations
Marketing	$ -		$ -		
Other	$ -		$ -		
Total	$ 299,000		$ -		
C ervices	$ 303,580		$ -		43% of Community Services Total - Based Upon 64.3 FTEs (Same as Winter Operations)
S upplies					2013-14 Budget for Mountain Operations
Marketing	$ -		$ -		
Other	$ -		$ -		
Total	$ 625,100	*	$ -		
Costs of Goods/Services Sold	$ 235,000		$ -		2013-14 Budget for Ski Fund - No Breakdown for Mountain Operations
Insurance	$ 160,200		$ -		2013-14 Budget for Ski Fund - No Breakdown for Mountain Operations
Utilities					2013-14 Budget for Mountain Operations
Marketing	$ -		$ -		
Other	$ -		$ -		
Total	$ 458,300		$ -		
Professional Services	$ 10,500		$ -		2013-14 Budget for Ski Fund - No Breakdown for Mountain Operations
Sub-Totals	**$ 2,961,180**		**$ 837,317**		
Debt Service					
Current Bond Servicing	$ 1,249,641	*			2013-14 Budget for Ski Fund - No Breakdown for Mountain Operations
New $4.0224M Bond Servicing			$ 483,658		3% Interest, 10 Year Term, No Additional Issuance Costs
Capital Expenditures					
Current Non-Infrastructure	$ 1,098,166	*			2013-14 Budget for Ski Fund - No Breakdown for Mountain Operations
Summer Non-Infrastructure			$ 71,498		Estimated Personal Property
Total Expenses	**$ 5,308,987**			**$ 1,392,473**	
Profit/(Loss)	$ (2,542,687)			$ 990,777	Note Estimated Profit Covers Bond Servicing Costs
Added/(Reduced) Costs to Parcel Owners	**$ 308**			**$ (120)**	

Estimated First Year Revenues/Expenses
Diamond Peak Summer Operations

Total Realistic Expenses	$ -
Total Realistic Profit/(Loss)	$ 2,383,250
	$ (289)

* - Instead of 2012-13's Actual Number, I Have Used 2013-14's Budgeted Number Because Now We Have Marketing Personnel We Didn't in 2012-13

Herron, Susan

From: Jim Smith [Jim.Smith@megapath.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 01, 2014 4:42 PM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Question on garbage pickup under new plan

Many times we leave for travel on days of the week that are not the trash pickup days. We take a bag or two of garbage to the transfer station. Has this been considered in the new plan?

Also, in the new plan can garbage be taken to the dump after big weekends where you will have more garbage than normal and won't fit into the containers?

The yard waste starts too late in the year. In many years a lot of green waste is bagged before early May. Not looking out for a segment of the constituency who does yard work early. What about yard waste at other times of the year?

Seems like the Board of IVGID is over reacting to a problem with this new package. I don't mind the few extra dollars but for our elected officials to do this seems pretty draconian and certainly not what the majority of owners in the village that elected them want. They seem to be reacting to a minority few in the town. This won't cure the bear problem but make it worse. They will really want to break into our houses once this is implemented. They need food and will get it. We are just moving the location from where they got it to a new location. Will IVGID have insurance to pay for claims of house destruction when the bears break into the house for food and the owner has fully complied with the bear box or containers?

Look forward to your answers.

Best Regards

James A.Smith, Jr.
Consultant
MegaPath
F 714.262.4087 **C** 916.599.9556
E jim.smith@megapath.com www.megapath.com
Voice • Data • Security

Privileged/Confidential Information may be contained in this message. It is not for use or disclosure outside MegaPath Inc. without a written proprietary agreement. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message, or agent responsible for delivery, you may not copy or deliver this message to anyone. Please notify the sender as soon as possible and immediately destroy this message and its attachments in its entirety.

Herron, Susan

From: Jim Smith [jsmithivgidtrustee@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 10:23 PM
To: Svata; Herron, Susan
Subject: Re: More detail on Tyrolian Village's WM issues

Hi Susan,

Correspondence received.

Please share this with the Board of Trustees and Interim General Manager as requested.

Jim Smith
Trustee
Incline Village General Improvement District
Email: smith_trustee@ivgid.org
Phone: (775) 298-1128
www.ivgid.org

On Feb 27, 2014, at 9:26 PM, Svata <sk8rs@charter.net> wrote:

> Hi Jim,
>
> Here's what I got from Vojko regarding our issues in Tyrolian Village with WM. Vojko's discussed these problems several times with various people who could supposedly help resolve them, Joe Pomeroy among them, but to no avail.
>
> I understand that our association is not the only one with similar issues, which leads me to believe that we need to go out to bid for trash pickup -- they apparently have a monopoly so can do whatever they like. Please share this information with the other IVGID board members prior to the March 12th meeting. In my opinion, we're rushing into renewing a contract that still has 3 years to run, without investigating other options. Maybe we don't have a choice if they're truly the only game in town.
>
> Thanks for listening!
>
> Svata
>
> -------- Original Message --------
> **Subject:**Re: WM figures & Lila
> **Date:**Thu, 27 Feb 2014 17:24:14 -0800 (PST)
> **From:**Swiss Time <swisstime@sbcglobal.net>
> **Reply-To:**Swiss Time <swisstime@sbcglobal.net>
> **To:**Svata <sk8rs@charter.net>

Hi Svata,

Lila's races started today with GS and she didn't finish the first run. Really soft snow and foggy conditions. SL is tomorrow and she's starting bib 8. I hope she skis her best!

The WM issues go on and on. I'll list a few main ones: complaints about not being able to pick up because of our snow removal (really!?!), complaints about overflowing dumpsters, complaints about dumpsters contaminated with electronics, tires, etc., driver not placing dumpsters back into the enclosure, complaining that they can't pick up because of car parking (Carinthia), leaking dumpster truck compressing garbage and squeezing "juice" on the HOA roadways, complaints about recycling dumpster contaminated with regular garbage, complaints and warnings from WM and IVGID about dumpsters not secured properly, complaints about garbage scattered around dumpsters when bears get into them. There were two or three instances this past year when their main truck was in repair for about a week and garbage was not picked up and dumpsters were overflowing because of that and then we were assessed additional fees. I didn't really understand why WM didn't have a backup truck available immediately and we got nowhere trying to get reimbursed for a garbage problem resulting from their truck problem.

We've had a few meetings with the WM managers, Jim, and different HOA Board members and we discussed all these issues. We were told they would work with us but things seem to be getting worse. I received more complaints and warnings and "fees" from their driver through the WM office since Jim was hired 1.5 years ago than in the previous 13 years combined.

They charge us a $45.18 "fee" every time the driver says a dumpster is "overflowing", including major holidays. They also charge us close to $100 "fee" when a dumpster is "contaminated" and they have to make an extra trip. I don't have the exact number for the last 12 months, but my best guess is that we've paid close to $1000 in such "fees" to WM. There's no way you can see what's on the bottom or the middle of a dumpster...

I've told WM and IVGID Waste Not staff multiple times to provide better and easier-to-use and actual bear proof dumpsters. We'd all be in favor of paying a few bucks extra every month to avoid the garbage hassles and killing bears! They need to make it as easy as possible for residents to use them or they won't be used properly, especially with as many clueless visitors as we get.

Vojko

From: Svata <sk8rs@charter.net>
To: Vojko Lapanja TVA Mgr <swisstime@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 2:59 PM
Subject: WM figures & Lila

Hi Vojko,

Any news about Lila yet? Has she made a run yet? Any preliminary results? It must be really tough for you to be here depending on Margie and internet coverage.... We wish her good luck!

Re the fines TVA gets from Waste Management.... We're going to another meeting with Bill DeVine tomorrow morning and it would be helpful if we had some preliminary numbers to give to him -- I'll send a final letter to the IVGID trustees if you want. Any possibility of getting the average monthly amount they fine us, say f t 6 months (12 would be awesome!) and

generally what their complaints are? You mentioned overflowing dumpsters. Anything else? I think Jim once mentioned that they deliberately come earlier than their scheduled pickup time, so that causes problems; and didn't they want us to move our dumpsters because it was extra trouble for them to maneuver in the current space? Petty things, but annoying! I guess they fine us, because they can -- no competition.

As I mentioned to you on Tuesday, IVGID has it on their agenda for the March 12th meeting, and if we could get a letter to them about a week in advance, it would go into their pre meeting packages.

Thanks much!

Svata

Herron, Susan

From: Jacquelyn Viviano [jsvwindrider@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 9:30 AM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: IVGID Solid Waste Program

Board of Trustees,

We have reviewed the proposed Waste Program. For the most part we find your proposal a reasonable solution.

We would also like to see a yard waste cart provided weekly along with the recycle cart. Over the years we find that we put out six 33 gallon containers of yard waste each week during the snow free season. We are concerned the 72 bags and the truck load voucher will not add up this volume.

We would also like to see a concerted promotion of Bear Boxes rather than curb side containers. The containers, we find, sit out for days at a time.

Thanks for your good work,

Jacquelyn and Sam Viviano
435 Mt. Lake Court, IV, NV 89450
775-831-4421

Herron, Susan

From: Utility OrdinanceComments
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 9:40 AM
To: Pomroy, Joe; Herron, Susan
Subject: FW: Proposed changes to Ordinance #1 Waste Disposal

Good Morning Joe and Susan-
Attached is a comment received on the Solid Waste Ordinance revision. The email is in the Utility Ordinance email box. Thanks!

Samantha Kurashewich, CPPB
Public Works Administrative Manager
Incline Village General Improvement District
1220 Sweetwater Road, Incline Village NV 89451
P: 775-832-1337
F: 775-832-1260
smk@ivgid.org
http://ivgidpublicworks.com/

From: Greg Hoff [mailto:greg@evanspc.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 9:26 AM
To: Utility OrdinanceComments
Subject: Proposed changes to Ordinance #1 Waste Disposal

I am the Project Manager, and one of the General Partners, of the Village Shopping Center. I am in support of mandatory wildlife resistant containers for commercial properties and am in support of regulations enforcing their proper use.

I have read the proposed changes to Ordinance #1 and do have some comments. I understand that Public Works has a difficult job and limited resources to monitor compliance, and that repeatedly returning to the scene of a violation is costly and time consuming. However, from my perspective, the changes to the ordinance place an unreasonable burden on easy targets for dumping, such as my shopping center.

The Ordinance as written has no penalty for violating section 4.1G – "No Person shall place any Solid Waste on the property of another Person... "

I take that back. There is a penalty. It goes to the person who owns the property, the victim of the violation - or vandalism - as it might be. I understand that owning a public space, such as a shopping center, comes with the responsibility to maintain it, which might include the clean-up of third party dumping. However, this ordinance allows the district to send someone by, at any time, and if they get there before I find the refuse, to fine me for potentially something me or my tenants may not have done. While the shifting of a social burden like this to private property owners is a trend in government, the ability to immediately impose a fine, is not, to my knowledge. I cannot think of an instance where a municipality has the power to issue a fine - for something that cannot be proven was perpetrated by the recipient - without a grace period or warning.

I suggest that you do not delete the current paragraph 4.1F. It provides for a reasonable notice and opportunity to avoid the fine.

In addition, the amount of fines are now going to be "subject to change", but with no specified mechanism or public comment or oversight. I urge you to amend the ordinance to allow for a notice period and a specified protocol for the

increase of fines. If you wish to discuss this, my office number is 510-339-8500. My cell is 510-708-6549. I am based in Oakland and while I really don't want to attend this meeting, if you feel it is imperative, I will.

I will also add that from my experience, some staff aren't very good about following written ordinances. I think it's irresponsible to give them even more discretion.

Greg Hoff
Village Center

Herron, Susan

From: jhammerel@gmail.com on behalf of Jim Hammerel - IVGID [hammerel_trustee@ivgid.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 1:29 PM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Fwd: Waste management proposal

Correspondence received.

Jim

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: "Connie Nowlin" <tahoepet@sbcglobal.com>
Date: Feb 27, 2014 1:15 PM
Subject: Waste management proposal
To: "bruce_trustee@ivgid.org" <bruce_trustee@ivgid.org>, "joe_trustee@ivgid.org" <joe_trustee@ivgid.org>, "devine_trustee@ivgid.org" <devine_trustee@ivgid.org>, "hammerel_trustee@ivgid.org" <hammerel_trustee@ivgid.org>, "smith_trustee@ivgid.org" <smith_trustee@ivgid.org>
Cc:

To IVGID board of trustees:

I am fully in favor of and support helping the bears, but do not agree with the proposed trash issue. Let's get the commercial dumpsters fixed first, as well as enforcing and educating others. The decision to give them a 13 year contract is a questionable business practice.

Sincerely,
Connie Nowlin
P.O. Box 5364

Herron, Susan

From: Mark Alexander Jr [markalexanderjr@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 2:32 PM
To: Leuenhagen, Nancy; Herron, Susan; Tavener, Andrea
Cc: Slaughter, John; Misty Bray; Kevin MacMillan; diana.langs@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: water one attachment and one letter to editor

Nancy - Absolutely will do so! Thank you for sharing!!! BTW, I thought the request was straight forward, this being to forward the earlier attachment (as well as this message) to the sitting and alternate IV/CB CAB members for their reference. As I sit on the CAB myself, I don't want to potentially / inadvertently violate the OML.

Susan & Andrea - Can you please respectively froward Nancy's below message to the IVGID BOT & IV/CB CAB's?

Thank you, Mark

Sent from Mark's iPhone
775 772-9128

> On Feb 27, 2014, at 11:51 AM, "Leuenhagen, Nancy" <NLeuenhagen@washoecounty.us> wrote:
>
> Mark,
>
> Andrea forwarded your email to me since we weren't exactly sure what you needed from the Manager's Office/Community Relations team on this request. I am including both the staff report and the video link of the most recent discussion from the Washoe County Board of Commissioners where they discussed the ground water rights in Bedell Flat, Upper and Lower Dry Valley & Newcomb Lake Valley. I would recommend watching the video as it will bring you up to speed on what has transpired so far:
>
> http://www.washoecounty.us/large_files/agendas/011414/18.pdf
>
> http://washoe-nv.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=6&clip_id=1326
>
>
> There has not been action taken yet from the Commissioners on this item. If you would like to share this information to Incline Village GID and the CAB please do so as it's public record.
>
> Sincerely,
>
>
> Nancy Leuenhagen
> Community Relations Manager
> Washoe County
> 775.328.6169 (office)
> 775.772.7930 (cell)
> nleuenhagen@washoecounty.us
>
>
>
> Connect with us:
> cMail: www.washoecounty.us/cMail
> Twitter: www.twitter.com/washoecounty

> Facebook: www.facebook.com/washoecounty
>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: CAB
> Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 8:34 AM
> To: Leuenhagen, Nancy
> Subject: FW: water one attachment and one letter to editor
>
>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Alexander, Mark
> Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 11:09 PM
> To: CAB; Susan_Herron@ivgid.org
> Cc: Bray, Misty; diana.langs@yahoo.com; Kevin MacMillan
> Subject: FW: water one attachment and one letter to editor
>
> Andrea and Susan,
>
> Below is a message I received earlier this morning in follow-up to a phone call I had yesterday afternoon on the subject of Washoe County purchasing additional water rights. As I wasn't aware of the topic, nor did I fully follow what was being conveyed so I asked the caller to prepare a plain English, 'Readers Digest' version, of what they were on about. To that end, below as well as the attached article for the paper is a précis of the authors concern.
>
> I respectfully request that this exchange as well as its attachment be shared with the IVGID BOT and the IV/CB Board members so that they can be informed on this topic. By way of further reference, I understand that contact has been made with the Bonanza newspaper and that they may carry an article on this topic.
>
> The 'bottom line' message I have gathered from my conversation and the below and attached article is that the writer is concerned that IV/CB (as well as other county wide home owner) Washoe County taxes are being directed to this activity while other county services are potentially impacted by reduced funding.
>
> Thank you, Mark
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Diana Langs [mailto:diana.langs@yahoo.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 9:41 AM
> To: markalexanderjr@att.net
> Subject: water one attachment and one letter to editor
>
> Susan Lynn   529 words in the text
> 1599 Wheatgrass Dr
> Reno, NV 89509
> 775-324-6221
> December 3, 2013
>
>
> Editor: Opinion

> Reno Gazette Journal
> Via email
>
> Washoe County purchasing water?
>
> On September 24, 2013, the Washoe Board of County Commissioners had a rather innocuous agenda item #27. It was a contract for an unknown amount with an unknown water rights consultant to appraise the value of water rights belonging to Intermountain Water Supply Ltd. in Dry Valley region north of Reno. A contract was approved for $24,500 with a former State Engineer who did not appear before the County Commission.
>
> There are implications for this possible expenditure of Washoe County funds, and taxpayers need to pay attention. What was not noticed on this agenda item is that this contract with a former State Engineer is leading up to a purchase using approximately $10 million from an undisclosed source - presumably either County water department ratepayers or general fund dollars (county-wide taxpayers). In a county that has experienced exceptional cutbacks in staffing and services, this is an extraordinary expenditure of taxpayer and/or water ratepayer dollars. But what is even more troubling is the seemingly intentional non-public process by which this acquisition may be made.
>
> Water is a complicated issue in Nevada. Decisions such as this need a public hearing. The Commission agenda item had no information or staff report attached to it; however, a copy of the proposed contract was added after the meeting and contained an exhibit indicating a proposed purchase of 3,418.1 AFY at $2,925/AF. The selected contractor and contract amount seemed to materialize out of thin air.
>
> Also troubling is the amount of water that the Commissioners think they may buy. The former Regional Water Planning Commission (RWPC) contracted with the USGS for a two-year study to determine Dry Valley's water resources. The report indicated there might be 800-1200 acre feet of water in Dry Valley that might be used on an annual basis. This was after the State Engineer granted 3,000+ acre feet of water rights, because it's his job to "maximize beneficial use." No one on the RWPC thought there was that much water in Dry Valley. The USGS Report became part of the Regional Water Plan. Later, Intermountain contracted with two DRI hydrologists to do a quick chloride study (supposed to determine the amount of water through a new method) that took about 2 weeks. The RWPC listened to the dueling DRI report, but decided to accept and use the peer-reviewed USGS report for its Plan. These discussions were public, properly noticed, televised on SNCAT, and voted on unanimously by the RWPC. Staff reports and meeting minutes are available through Washoe County Water Resources. Why would the Commissioners spend this kind of money on an uncertain amount of water, and what is the need?
>
> Finally, Washoe County and TMWA have been working towards a consolidation of water service. Why would the Commissioners spend precious funds to acquire water rights at this time? Normally, the private sector provides proven water rights in order to receive a "will-serve" letter from TMWA or the County. To date, developers and TMWA have not purchased Intermountain's water rights, even though Intermountain has been trying for years to sell their "paper water." Agencies have followed the old adage: Let the buyer beware. The Board of County Commissioners should do the same.
>
> Susan Lynn was a former member and chairman of the Washoe County Regional Water Planning Commission for 7 years.
> <WASHOE COUNTY WATER version 1.docx>

Herron, Susan

From: Mark Alexander Jr [markalexanderjr@att.net]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 11:09 PM
To: 'CAB'; Herron, Susan
Cc: Misty Bray; diana.langs@yahoo.com; Kevin MacMillan
Subject: FW: water one attachment and one letter to editor
Attachments: WASHOE COUNTY WATER version 1.docx

Andrea and Susan,

Below is a message I received earlier this morning in follow-up to a phone call I had yesterday afternoon on the subject of Washoe County purchasing additional water rights. As I wasn't aware of the topic, nor did I fully follow what was being conveyed so I asked the caller to prepare a plain English, 'Readers Digest' version, of what they were on about. To that end, below as well as the attached article for the paper is a précis of the authors concern.

I respectfully request that this exchange as well as its attachment be shared with the IVGID BOT and the IV/CB Board members so that they can be informed on this topic. By way of further reference, I understand that contact has been made with the Bonanza newspaper and that they may carry an article on this topic.

The 'bottom line' message I have gathered from my conversation and the below and attached article is that the writer is concerned that IV/CB (as well as other county wide home owner) Washoe County taxes are being directed to this activity while other county services are potentially impacted by reduced funding.

Thank you, Mark

-----Original Message-----
From: Diana Langs [mailto:diana.langs@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 9:41 AM
To: markalexanderjr@att.net
Subject: water one attachment and one letter to editor

Susan Lynn
1599 Wheatgrass Dr
Reno, NV 89509
775-324-6221
December 3, 2013

529 words in the text

Editor: Opinion
Reno Gazette Journal
Via email

Washoe County purchasing water?

On September 24, 2013, the Washoe Board of County Commissioners had a rather innocuous agenda item #27. It was a contract for an unknown amount with an unknown water rights consultant to appraise the value of water rights belonging to Intermountain Water Supply Ltd. in Dry Valley region north of Reno. A contract was approved for $24,500 with a former State Engineer who did not appear before the County Commission.

There are implications for this possible expenditure of Washoe County funds, and taxpayers need to pay attention. What was not noticed on this agenda item is that this contract with a former State Engineer is leading up to a purchase using approximately $10 million from an undisclosed source - presumably either County water department ratepayers or general fund dollars (county-wide taxpayers). In a county that has experienced exceptional cutbacks in staffing and services, this is an extraordinary expenditure of taxpayer and/or water ratepayer dollars. But what is even more troubling is the seemingly intentional non-public process by which this acquisition may be made.

Water is a complicated issue in Nevada. Decisions such as this need a public hearing. The Commission agenda item had no information or staff report attached to it; however, a copy of the proposed contract was added after the meeting and contained an exhibit indicating a proposed purchase of 3,418.1 AFY at $2,925/AF. The selected contractor and contract amount seemed to materialize out of thin air.

Also troubling is the amount of water that the Commissioners think they may buy. The former Regional Water Planning Commission (RWPC) contracted with the USGS for a two-year study to determine Dry Valley's water resources. The report indicated there might be 800-1200 acre feet of water in Dry Valley that might be used on an annual basis. This was after the State Engineer granted 3,000+ acre feet of water rights, because it's his job to "maximize beneficial use." No one on the RWPC thought there was that much water in Dry Valley. The USGS Report became part of the Regional Water Plan. Later, Intermountain contracted with two DRI hydrologists to do a quick chloride study (supposed to determine the amount of water through a new method) that took about 2 weeks. The RWPC listened to the dueling DRI report, but decided to accept and use the peer-reviewed USGS report for its Plan. These discussions were public, properly noticed, televised on SNCAT, and voted on unanimously by the RWPC. Staff reports and meeting minutes are available through Washoe County Water Resources. Why would the Commissioners spend this kind of money on an uncertain amount of water, and what is the need?

Finally, Washoe County and TMWA have been working towards a consolidation of water service. Why would the Commissioners spend precious funds to acquire water rights at this time? Normally, the private sector provides proven water rights in order to receive a "will-serve" letter from TMWA or the County. To date, developers and TMWA have not purchased Intermountain's water rights, even though Intermountain has been trying for years to sell their "paper water." Agencies have followed the old adage: Let the buyer beware. The Board of County Commissioners should do the same.

Susan Lynn was a former member and chairman of the Washoe County Regional Water Planning Commission for 7 years.

WASHOE COUNTY WATER WARS

Why should you care as a Washoe County taxpayer if the Board of County Commissioners decides to purchase uncertificated (paper) water rights at the cost of $9.6 million using your taxpayer dollars? In addition to the initial purchase, the cost of building the infrastructure could run an additional $20-$50 million dollars. The purchase was proposed by Commissioner Weber, with the support of Commissioner Humke, and a $24,500 contract was awarded to a person of their choice for the appraisal of the water rights. This action was taken even though there is no guarantee that the water rights are sustainable or potable.

Additionally, Washoe County is in the throes of getting out of the water business by merging with Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) and transferring their water rights to that entity. Does it not seem odd that with this merger in progress that Washoe County would even consider acquiring more water rights?

The County has cut services to our entire County. The $9.6 million could go a long way to restore more Washoe County Sheriff deputies, libraries and regional parks. The Reno Gazette Journal on February 16, 2014 states Washoe County manager, John Slaughter, said that if the county buys water rights from the general fund it would have to be offset by a revenue increase or an expenditure decrease somewhere else.

Let Commissioner Berkbigler know that as an Incline Village/Crystal Bay taxpayer and resident you do not want your tax dollars spent on water rights that will never benefit you as an Incline Village/Crystal Bay resident. She can be reached at 775-843-0150 or mberkbigler@washoecounty.us

Herron, Susan

From: Dave Hildebrandt [hildeaz99@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 26, 2014 10:42 AM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Comment on Proposed Containerization

I am all in favor of the proposal but one item. I would like to require the issued containers to NOT be visible from the street except on trash pick up day. Let's not junk up our community with thousands of trash containers sitting outside everyone's property every day. Trash day should be the only time we should have to see these. My winter home in Arizona has a similar CC&R and it works beautifully.
Thanks.

Dave Hildebrandt
579 Valley Drive

Herron, Susan

From: jhammerel@gmail.com on behalf of Jim Hammerel - IVGID [hammerel_trustee@ivgid.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 6:16 PM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Fwd: Solid waste proposal

Hi Susan,
Correspondence received.

Jim

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: "John and Aetna" <nicefields@hotmail.com>
Date: Feb 25, 2014 5:35 PM
Subject: Solid waste proposal
To: "joe_trustee@ivgid.org" <joe_trustee@ivgid.org>, "devine_trustee@ivgid.org" <devine_trustee@ivgid.org>, "smith_trustee@ivgid.org" <smith_trustee@ivgid.org>, "Hammerel_trustee@ivgid.org" <hammerel_trustee@ivgid.org>, "bruce_trustee@ivgid.org" <bruce_trustee@ivgid.org>
Cc:

I am writing to ask you to please NOT proceed with the proposed changes to our solid waste contract. While I support efforts to protect our bears, I believe the waste management part of this proposal is not using sound business practices and is not in the best interests of this community or its residents. For many reasons - lack of competitive bids, large increases to our garbage fees, encourages use of plastic bags instead of discouraging, removes existing free opportunity to keep our properties clean of pine needles and thus increases our fire danger, creates problems for our more senior residents such as filling and lifting bags, and creates a storage problem in our garages for the big rolling totes. Please stop this proposal. Or, at a minimum, put it on the ballot and let the residents vote.

Please include this with comments on the agenda for the March 12, 2014 meeting.

Thank you.

John Mayfield
104 pine cone road
Incline village, NV

Herron, Susan

From: Internet email [bw_internet@charter.net]
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 5:28 PM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: New refuse rules

The recycle program at Incline Village has been very successful and many residents, including us, now have a greater need for recycle containers than regular household garbage containers. We usually set several 32 gallon 'blue bags' out on the curb on our recycle day and often must take additional blue bags to Sweetwater between the two recycle weeks. Since blue bags will no longer be allowed to be set out on the curb and a large recycle container will not fit in our garage, it is MANDATORY that WM pick up / dump the recycle container every week instead of every two weeks. This is part of the refuse / recycle program provided in every city we are aware of.

Please provide the physical dimensions (L x W x H) of all the new containers that are now mandatory and available. This should appear in the local Bonanza paper and in your next billing cycle flyer.

The rate information is not clear. The statement about direct billing from WM refers to a 'quarterly' billing. Hence, I assume the refuse pick up costs referenced for each container are also quarterly amounts.

Brent Welling

Herron, Susan

From: Rich Wiebe [rwiebe@charter.net]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 3:25 PM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Fwd: Solid Waste Containerization Proposal Request

I'm told that you are the person to send public comments to regarding the upcoming solid waste containerization proposal.

Thanks,
Rich Wiebe

Begin forwarded message:

From: Rich Wiebe <rwiebe@charter.net>
Subject: Re: Solid Waste Containerization Proposal Request
Date: February 24, 2014 at 3:02:32 PM PST
To: joe_trustee@ivgid.org, nemmerel_trustee@ivgid.org, sevine_trustee@ivgid.org, smith_trustee@ivgid.org, bruce_trustee@ivgid.org

Gentlemen,

I'm curious as to why, after nearly a month, I haven't received a single reply from any one of my elected trustees to the message I sent below.

Can anyone please respond to the concerns of their electorate?

Thanks,
Rich Wiebe
rwiebe@charter.net

On Jan 27, 2014, at 2:13 PM, Rich Wiebe, Technically Inclined <[redacted]> wrote:

Gentlemen,

Regarding the upcoming move towards wildlife-proof waste containers, I am wholly in favor of the ordinance. I would like to ask however that you please insist that Waste Management make the containers available for purchase to residents at a reasonable price vs. indefinitely monthly rental fees from WM.

As an IV resident for 15 years now, and given the specified $8.06 differential in pricing, I would have paid a total of $1,548 (15 years x 12 months x $8.06) in 'rent' for waste containers which I should have been able to purchase for $200 total or less. As I intend to live here for another 15 years as do many IV residents, this is only fair. Our willingness to protect our local wildlife should not provide WM with an perpetual windfall from renting containers which could and should otherwise be made available for purchase to residents who are so interested

Thanks for your consideration,

Rich Wiebe
[redacted]

Herron, Susan

From: Frank Wright [alpinesportss@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 23, 2014 1:35 PM
To: Herron, Susan
Subject: Please add to board packet

Susan, Please add the following "touching letter" to the board packet, Thank you, Frank Wright Crystal Bay

How Touching!
I think the following best describes in business sense how one who normally would be out of business and broke long ago can continue to mount massive losses and still remain in business:

Tell those who are footing the bill for the losses that it adds value to your property Tell those who are footing the bill for the losses that this is why you moved here.
Tell those who are footing the bill for the losses we are under budget. (Double talk for we are losing our ass on our business
ventures)
Tell those who are footing the bill that if we invest another 4 million dollars we will be able to make a profit and pay off all our debts Tell those who are footing the bills that it has been a bad year but our staff has done a wonderful job to keep the massive losses just short of extremely massive We can lose 200,000.00 on a sports shop at the Hyatt, we will tell those who are footing the bill it is marketing, and besides it gives our part time managers collecting a full time salary something to do when their venues close down.
Tell those who are footing the bill when they come to the recreation center that they must pay an entry fee so our staff and college students can use the facility for free.
Tell those who are footing the bill that we need to pave the beach parking lot so we can drive a school bus on it for a local residents work crew.
Tell those who are footing the bill that we need to make more kayak racks to collect more money from those footing the bill to store more kayaks, that way Hal Paris will be able to give more free space and racks to his friends from California.
Tell those who are footing the bill that roller blading on the recreation gym floor doesn't hurt the floor and it actually helps the finish, and besides we want to promote women's roller derby by donating free use of the recreation center so Hal Paris looks good.
Tell those who are footing the bill that "touches" count as money when doing the financial study for the recreation center, if those who are footing the bill drop by the recreation center to find it full of college students that visit counts as a touch. This is called "Hal Paris Touching Accounting"!
All of this is very
touching, don't you think?

Herron, Susan

From: Margaret Martini [margaretmartini@liveintahoe.com]
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2014 8:23 PM
To: s4s@ix.netcom.com
Cc: Wolfe, Joseph; Simonian, Bruce E.; Smith, Jim; Hammerel, Jim; Devine, Bill; Herron, Susan
Subject: RE: What to Do With Staff's Proposed New Trash Ordinance/Agreement w/Waste Management

Hello, please note that Mr. Katz has sent me this correspondence that he has sent to you.
I would like you to read my comments (in red) to his email as part of my resident response and rebuttal. I am sending this to you in lieu of an extended response and instead of reconstructing Mr. Katz's opinion.
Since he has sent this to you, there is no privacy issues and I would hope that you would take my comments into consideration on this matter as I have been more involved than Mr. Katz has in dealing with the issue of trash containment.
However, at the end of this dissertation, there are some very good and financially sound suggestions to resolve this to everyones financial benefit and not just take Joe Pomroy's power point presentation as the only option.I

Margaret Martini

From: s4s@ix.netcom.com [mailto:s4s@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2014 5:28 PM
To: joe_trustee@ivgid.org
Cc: bruce_trustee@ivgid.org; jimsmith@ivgid.org; jimhammerel@ivgid.org; billdevine@ivgid.org; Herron Susan
Subject: What to Do With Staff's Proposed New Trash Ordinance/Agreement w/Waste Management

To Chairperson Wolfe and the other Honorable members of the IVGID Board:

May I politic you concerning the proposed new trash ordinance/agreement w/Waste Management ("WM")? Even if you/I don't see eye to eye on most issues, you're still my elected representative; I'm still your constituent; and since I don't stand to benefit personally on this issue, I would hope you respect the fact that here I'm lobbying for action which is right rather than of pecuniary benefit to me.

The reason this matter will be presented to you on March 12, 2014 is because of the pressure of a small special interest group committed to wildlife resisting all of the community's solid waste (garbage) containers/enclosures, whether/not it will actually address the problem represented, regardless of the cost to each residential customer. This is inflammatory and it is not a small special interest group...the Nevada Department of Wildlife has come to the meetings to support this action...and those guys were also publically dissed by members of our board also. This is a solution to MOST, but you are right..not all, the wildlife issues. This is a step in public safety, public health and welfare, and animal welfare as well as aesthetics in the community not seeing garbage strewn about, or overflowing garbage cans with no lids lining the streets for every day of the week. And the death of wildlife due to garbage attractants. This is not some frivolous endeavor. You have just attempted to shoot down the entire argument for having a safer and cleaner environment in Incline Village, and for the most part the elimination of wildlife attractants. This trash issue is the main problem here followed closely by the human feeding of the animals. THIS IS BENEFIT TO EACH RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMER...for all of the above reasons. It is also a small cost to reduce the human bear conflict that arises in living in a mountain community. Get your head out of the sand (or elsewhere) on this issue. You have not been involved in any of the animal encounters or driven around reporting trash messes. The issue here is the cost that Pomroy and Waste Management have collaborated to monetarily punish the residents for the lack of negotiation ability between IVGID and Waste Management to make this community a better managed mountain community. You are completely and utterly wrong on this statement. If you want information, I can bombard you with it. Do not ever think that this is a small special interest group. This is a representative amount, as many as such with other IVGD issues, of concerned and educated residents of this area.

And BTW, do you understand that even according to Mr. Pomroy's numbers, for November and December of last year, we're averaging less than 1.25 residential wildlife encounter incidents per month? We're proposing going through everything staff suggests for 1.25 incidents per month. This is insane IMO. You are purposefully skewing the issue with

this statement. Granted, we have had a light snow year and the bears are not in full hibernation due to the weather, but using a deep winter month or two is not representative of the residential wildlife encounters. If you truly want to present the facts, do it with the stats of when the bears are most active...late spring and fall going into winter. That is widely published as the time when the bears need an abundance of calories. Then take the heavy tourist summer months when there is an abundance of commercial garbage and residential second homeowners trash that is generally unsecured creating an abundant wildlife attraction...and an abundance of killed bears. So please if you are going to send some data out to the board, or anywhere else, present it in total...skewing data is just the wrong way to establish credibility...and is an issue with some of the other data that you are and have been presented to the board. Hence, the lack of respect that you are getting at some of the meetings I have attended. So NO...this is not an insane IMO...what is insane is your presentment of only the data that supports only your position. People are not amused or inclined to give credibility when the real facts that are needed for a complete data presentment are readily available.

The overwhelming majority of residents I have spoken to on this subject who are actually educated concerning the issue before you, are absolutely against it. And I too am against it.The overwhelming majority of residents that WE, yes, that is a lot more of us out in the community talking to the residents on a one to one basis in the neighborhoods and commercial areas that are affected by the unsecured trash. There are MANY of US that are educated concerning the issue and are ABSOLUTELY FOR it. So if you want to start a petition on this, bring it on. If you are not, then you are just throwing out unsubstantiated data. I AM NOT against it and have been trying to get this issue resolved for 4 years. You of all people should know that staff and management and board members are notorious for not addressing issues for YEARS AND YEARS. I hope that they will consider some of your options at the end of this dissertation. They do have merit.

Notwithstanding Trustee Hammerel, if we're only talking about a couple of bucks a month more to experiment (because that's what these wildlife resistant containers are - an experiment; You only have to go to other communities to see that it is way beyond the experimental stage. They are actually in use...and here in our own community, you only have to look at the two commercial condominiums that are using the wildlife containers to know that they are being effective in reducing the bear activity in their complexes. we don't destroy the favorable franchise agreement we currently have with WM; and we don't lock ourselves into a new WM agreement which "ties our hands" for the next 13 years; This is an absurd statement. If you recall the meeting with Trustee Devine this morning, we have 3 years to figure out a contract...unless the board wants to jump on the string for Pomroy for the 13 year plan.I for one will go along with the program.

Unfortunately, what staff will be presenting to you on March 12 accomplishes all the wrong results I am against. So I urge you to vote no to staff's proposal (especially until it gets it right). Voting against it is counter productive to establishing a program and opening the doors to productive negotiation with Waste Management. So I urge you to vote YES on securing the trash into wildlife resistant containers. The Nevada Department of Wildlife has also asked you to vote yes in this proposal. I am sure that savings can be made in other areas of trash that would make this very feasible and reasonable. Those avenues have NOT been explored

Even if it means "kicking the (wildlife resistant trash) can down the road" for another year or so, I say "kick the can down the road." We've just hired a new GM; one with proven negotiation skills. I agree on this. But vote to have the containers with the caveat that we do not extend any contract with WM..and that we look at ALL options with the new GM being in on these options and negotiation of the WM contract IN THREE YEARS...Yet instead of giving him an opportunity to do a better job of negotiating with WM than "do your magic Joe Pomroy," the matter before you on March 12 will unduly handcuff Mr. Pinkerton into implementing a policy decision he had no hand in creating you can adopt with the caveat that the negotiations will be inclusive of Mr. Pinkerton. And for the next 13 years no less. This would be wrong. It took us well over a year to find and secure Mr. Pinkerton. Why wouldn't we give him an equal amount of time to do what I and others are hopeful he will be able to accomplish once on the job? Isn't this why the Board hired him? I do agree with this assessment of including Mr. Pinkerton. I am sure that with Mr. Pinkertons experience, he would have some good ideas for options also.

If you won't vote to defer this matter and give Mr. Pinkerton a chance, you can very easily accomplish all of your goals to purportedly minimize bear/people contact without throwing the baby out with the bath water. Furthermore, what I suggest will buy us three years to attempt to work out a more comprehensive and long range trash RFP with WM or someone elsel would hope that our public works department , the board and the new GM can figure this out in three years...we should NOT commit to 13 years that is insane; and to take steps to acquire the existing or construct our own solid waste transfer station.There was a ton of staff time wasted on the frivolous trail plan and this is more important in being a general improvement district. We have the land and the location and I am sure (well as sure as one can be in dealing with the trpa) that it would be advantageous to get the eyesore transfer station off of the main town corridor. As I have attempted to make each of you understand, unless and until IVGID controls an Incline Village solid waste transfer station, we have no hope of attracting competitive bidding for our next solid waste franchise agreement. This is a fair assessment of our situation.

Regardless, I suggest we do the following: This suggestion has merit and should be explored.

First, we DON'T need WM supplied recycle containers. When we replace our current solid waste containers with wildlife resistant ones, our current containers will be available for recyclables at no added cost to us. And since WM doesn't propose supplying wildlife resistant recyclable containers, what's the difference in their versus ours? The difference is our trash rates don't have to be increased to pay for unnecessary recyclable containers to provided by WM.
Second, we mandate 32 gallon wildlife resistant containers for all of our residential customers instead of the 64 gallon ones staff is pushing. This size is ridiculous and unwieldy. You should have the option of having as many of the more manageable size if that is your choice. The benefits are at least fourfold: they're less expensive than 64 or 96 gallon totes; they're easier for our senior citizens to maneuver than their 64 or 96 gallon counterparts, especially during the winter months; they actually encourage recycling (if you're only allotted one 32 gallon garbage tote, you're either going to have to pay more for a second or third tote, or you're going to have to be more conscientious insofar as recycling is concerned. In other words, you will have to essentially recycle everything – a good thing for the environment we should be encouraging) and most importantly, they allow us to force WM to service those containers without changing the existing trash franchise agreement.

Third, we (IVGID) provide the wildlife resistant containers to trash customers rather than relying upon WM. I have been informed that WM is purchasing these containers from Randy the steel Tahoe Bear Box guy. Randy's making an unnecessary profit at trash customers' expense; the County or maybe even Placer County, California is making an unnecessary profit at trash customers' expense (in the form of unnecessary sales taxes) and, WM is making an unnecessary additional profit at trash customers' expense. Why pay WM over $1,100/wildlife resistant container over the 13 years Mr. Pomroy proposes, when we can purchase 32 gallon versions ourselves for 10% of the cost? It just makes no sense.I agree with this assessment.

Now the minute we do as I suggest, WM isn't going to be happy. First you've killed the 13 year golden goose Mr. Pomroy has advanced on its behalf WM thought was a done deal.

Second, you've killed the extra $4M plus WM stands to make by supplying its residential customers wildlife resistant totes to rent.

Third, it takes more labor to empty wildlife resistant containers and by retaining the current franchise agreement, WM is obligated to service them. Another negotiation component.

And finally, we will have a piece of leverage we can use to secure the transfer station ourselves from WM.
Next, we request an independent audit of WM's financials. The board should have ordered this years ago and should not delay in ordering this. We learn the truth about its financials and lay it all on the table. I predict this will be embarrassing to WM which means, we will now have a second piece of leverage we can use against WM to secure the transfer station ourselves.

Next, we change **our trash ordinance** this makes more sense than to turn the whole process over to WM for them to have control over. to mandate Yes, the board CAN do that that all customers either have 32 gallon wildlife resistant totes or dumpsters. We don't designate whose responsibility it is to provide those totes or dumpsters. Since under the current trash franchise WM is obligated to supply its commercial customers with dumpsters; and now the law ordinances will have changed so that the only dumpsters permissible are wildlife resistant dumpsters; WM will be forced to provide them to its commercial customers for no additional cost. If it ultimately turns out that providing these 300 or so dumpsters costs WM money which reduces its profit, it can always come back to the Board asking for a higher than CPI increase in costs because it's not making enough money. But then it needs to open up its books which it doesn't want to do. And when that happens, now we will have another piece of leverage we can use against WM to secure the transfer station.This seems like a reasonable strategic plan.
Follow my suggestions and we're left with three outstanding questions assuming you won't vote to defer final action until after Mr. Pinkerton has an opportunity to negotiate with WM (if you vote to defer final action, then you don't need to consider the following outstanding questions):

First, who will pay for the totes? As I have told the Board before, I think I can get the totes delivered here in Incline Village for $120 or less (I'm waiting for an updated quote) including tax (because IVGID pays no sales tax) and shipping per tote. For 3,800 totes, that's roughly $450,000. Since staff is so anxious to give up roughly $125,000 in franchise fees,This is another staff misuse of funds. use this savings to simply purchase them on residential customers' behalves. I understand this only pays $375,000 of the $450,000 cost (over the next three years). IVGID can either kick in the balance or charge the 3,800 customers the difference (which works out to a paltry $20 each)!
If you must charge residential customers, charge them IVGID's actual cost, and amortize repayment over the next two years. That works out to an added $5/month for the next two or less years, and then the rate increase sunsets. This is a

very reasonable fee and one that the residents will most likely support as it is NOT ongoing..and hopefully it WILL sunset unlike the ChateauThis alternative comports with my offer to pay an additional couple of bucks a month if it means conducting our bear experiment.
Second, how and where do the totes get delivered to IVGID for distribution to residential customers? As I stated before, the totes can be delivered on a staggered basis so we're not overwhelmed with a one time delivery of nearly 4,000 totes. Since the totes can be delivered to the Diamond Peak parking lot during the summer months when no one will be using them, space really isn't a problem. A fence with gate and lock can be rented at a nominal cost just like the construction companies doThen charge all residential customers for "delivery" (kind of like Joe Wolfe's statements to Margaret Martini regarding electric vehicle charging stations – "I'm giving you the tote for free Margaret, but you're going to have to pay $10 for delivery") and give customers the option to avoid the charge by picking up the totes themselves. As I explained before, being part of a community will mean that a good percentage of the totes get picked up and staff doesn't have to deliver them.This can also be done in the fall when there is lots of staff down time.
Third, what happens if the totes break? As I explained before, my source will provide a three year warranty against damage or breakage caused by bears. If WM does the damage, it's already obligated under the current franchise agreement to indemnify IVGID for the damage. Why is this never brought up at the discussions.

We purchase 100 or so low cost repair kits for the totes just to have them in stock (there will be no shipping costs involved because we'll be able to transport the repair kits for free along with the totes themselves), and if/when we have to use them because of bear damage, we provide the manufacturer evidence of our warranty claim, and we get reimbursed. Or if/when we have to use our repair kits because of WM damage, we provide WM with evidence and it reimburses us. Quick, easy, inexpensive, and I think it covers all the bases.
So please vote no on March 12 to changing the current trash ordinance and WM franchise and giving our new GM the opportunity to try his hand at negotiating with WM.
If you won't do this, vote NO to extending the current WM franchise and let us purchase our own wildlife resistant totes as I suggest.
Thanks for your consideration of my request. Aaron Katz

Herron, Susan

From: s4s@ix.netcom.com
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2014 5:28 PM
To: Wolfe, Joseph
Cc: Simonian, Bruce E.; Smith, Jim; Hammerel, Jim; Devine, Bill; Herron, Susan
Subject: What to Do With Staff's Proposed New Trash Ordinance/Agreement w/Waste Management

To Chairperson Wolfe and the other Honorable members of the IVGID Board:

May I politic you concerning the proposed new trash ordinance/agreement w/Waste Management ("WM")? Even if you/I don't see eye to eye on most issues, you're still my elected representative; I'm still your constituent; and since I don't stand to benefit personally on this issue, I would hope you respect the fact that here I'm lobbying for action which is right rather than of pecuniary benefit to me.

The reason this matter will be presented to you on March 12, 2014 is because of the pressure of a small special interest group committed to wildlife resisting all of the community's solid waste (garbage) containers/enclosures, whether/not it will actually address the problem represented, regardless of the cost to each residential customer.

And BTW, do you understand that even according to Mr. Pomroy's numbers, for November and December of last year, we're averaging less than 1.25 residential wildlife encounter incidents per month? We're proposing going through everything staff suggests for 1.25 incidents per month. This is insane IMO.

The overwhelming majority of residents I have spoken to on this subject who are actually educated concerning the issue before you, are absolutely against it. And I too am against it.

Notwithstanding Trustee Hammerel, if we're only talking about a couple of bucks a month more to experiment (because that's what these wildlife resistant containers are - an experiment; we don't destroy the favorable franchise agreement we currently have with WM; and we don't lock ourselves into a new WM agreement which "ties our hands" for the next 13 years; I for one will go along with the program.

Unfortunately, what staff will be presenting to you on March 12 accomplishes all the wrong results I am against. So I urge you to vote no to staff's proposal (especially until it gets it right).

Even if it means "kicking the (wildlife resistant trash) can down the road" for another year or so, I say "kick the can down the road." We've just hired a new GM; one with proven negotiation skills. Yet instead of giving him an opportunity to do a better job of negotiating with WM than "do your magic Joe Pomroy," the matter before you on March 12 will unduly handcuff Mr. Pinkerton into implementing a policy decision he had no hand in creating. And for the next 13 years no less. This would be wrong. It took us well over a year to find and secure Mr. Pinkerton. Why wouldn't we give him an equal amount of time to do what I and others are hopeful he will be able to accomplish once on the job? Isn't this why the Board hired him?

If you won't vote to defer this matter and give Mr. Pinkerton a chance, you can very easily accomplish all of your goals to purportedly minimize bear/people contact without throwing the baby out with the bath water. Furthermore, what I suggest will buy us three years to attempt to work out a more comprehensive and long range trash RFP with WM or someone else; and to take steps to acquire the existing or construct our own solid waste transfer station. As I have attempted to make each of you understand, unless and until IVGID controls an Incline Village solid waste transfer station, we have no hope of attracting competitive bidding for our next solid waste franchise agreement.

Regardless, I suggest we do the following:

First, we DON'T need WM supplied recycle containers. When we replace our current solid waste containers with wildlife resistant ones, our current containers will be available for recyclables at no added cost to us. And since WM doesn't propose supplying wildlife resistant recyclable containers, what's the difference in their versus ours? The difference is our trash rates don't have to be increased to pay for unnecessary recyclable containers to provided by WM.
Second, we mandate 32 gallon wildlife resistant containers for all of our residential customers instead of the 64 gallon ones staff is pushing. The benefits are at least fourfold: they're less expensive than 64 or 96 gallon totes; they're easier for our senior citizens to maneuver than their 64 or 96 gallon counterparts, especially during the winter months; they actually encourage recycling (if you're only allotted one 32 gallon garbage tote, you're either going to have to pay more for a

second or third tote, or you're going to have to be more conscientious insofar as recycling is concerned. In other words, you will have to essentially recycle everything – a good thing for the environment we should be encouraging) and most importantly, they allow us to force WM to service those containers without changing the existing trash franchise agreement.

Third, we (IVGID) provide the wildlife resistant containers to trash customers rather than relying upon WM. I have been informed that WM is purchasing these containers from Randy the steel Tahoe Bear Box guy. Randy's making an unnecessary profit at trash customers' expense; the County or maybe even Placer County, California is making an unnecessary profit at trash customers' expense (in the form of unnecessary sales taxes) and, WM is making an unnecessary additional profit at trash customers' expense. Why pay WM over $1,100/wildlife resistant container over the 13 years Mr. Pomroy proposes, when we can purchase 32 gallon versions ourselves for 10% of the cost? It just makes no sense.

Now the minute we do as I suggest, WM isn't going to be happy. First you've killed the 13 year golden goose Mr. Pomroy has advanced on its behalf WM thought was a done deal.

Second, you've killed the extra $4M plus WM stands to make by supplying its residential customers wildlife resistant totes to rent.

Third, it takes more labor to empty wildlife resistant containers and by retaining the current franchise agreement, WM is obligated to service them.

And finally, we will have a piece of leverage we can use to secure the transfer station ourselves from WM.
Next, we request an independent audit of WM's financials. We learn the truth about its financials and lay it all on the table. I predict this will be embarrassing to WM which means, we will now have a second piece of leverage we can use against WM to secure the transfer station ourselves.

Next, we change our trash ordinance to mandate that all customers either have 32 gallon wildlife resistant totes or dumpsters. We don't designate whose responsibility it is to provide those totes or dumpsters. Since under the current trash franchise WM is obligated to supply its commercial customers with dumpsters; and now the law will have changed so that the only dumpsters permissible are wildlife resistant dumpsters; WM will be forced to provide them to its commercial customers for no additional cost. If it ultimately turns out that providing these 300 or so dumpsters costs WM money which reduces its profit, it can always come back to the Board asking for a higher than CPI increase in costs because it's not making enough money. But then it needs to open up its books which it doesn't want to do. And when that happens, now we will have another piece of leverage we can use against WM to secure the transfer station.
Follow my suggestions and we're left with three outstanding questions assuming you won't vote to defer final action until after Mr. Pinkerton has an opportunity to negotiate with WM (if you vote to defer final action, then you don't need to consider the following outstanding questions):

First, who will pay for the totes? As I have told the Board before, I think I can get the totes delivered here in Incline Village for $120 or less (I'm waiting for an updated quote) including tax (because IVGID pays no sales tax) and shipping per tote. For 3,800 totes, that's roughly $450,000. Since staff is so anxious to give up roughly $125,000 in franchise fees, use this savings to simply purchase them on residential customers' behalves. I understand this only pays $375,000 of the $450,000 cost (over the next three years). IVGID can either kick in the balance or charge the 3,800 customers the difference (which works out to a paltry $20 each)!
If you must charge residential customers, charge them IVGID's actual cost, and amortize repayment over the next two years. That works out to an added $5/month for the next two or less years, and then the rate increase sunsets. This alternative comports with my offer to pay an additional couple of bucks a month if it means conducting our bear experiment.
Second, how and where do the totes get delivered to IVGID for distribution to residential customers? As I stated before, the totes can be delivered on a staggered basis so we're not overwhelmed with a one time delivery of nearly 4,000 totes. Since the totes can be delivered to the Diamond Peak parking lot during the summer months when no one will be using them, space really isn't a problem. Then charge all residential customers for "delivery" (kind of like Joe Wolfe's statements to Margaret Martini regarding electric vehicle charging stations – "I'm giving you the tote for free Margaret, but you're going to have to pay $10 for delivery") and give customers the option to avoid the charge by picking up the totes themselves. As I explained before, being part of a community will mean that a good percentage of the totes get picked up and staff doesn't have to deliver them.
Third, what happens if the totes break? As I explained before, my source will provide a three year warranty against damage or breakage caused by bears. If WM does the damage, it's already obligated under the current franchise agreement to indemnify IVGID for the damage.

We purchase 100 or so low cost repair kits for the totes just to have them in stock (there will be no shipping costs involved because we'll be able to transport the repair kits for free along with the totes themselves), and if/when we have to use them because of bear damage, we provide the manufacturer evidence of our warranty claim, and we get reimbursed. Or if/when we have to use our repair kits because of WM damage, we provide WM with evidence and it reimburses us. Quick, easy, inexpensive, and I think it covers all the bases.

So please vote no on March 12 to changing the current trash ordinance and WM franchise and giving our new GM the opportunity to try his hand at negotiating with WM.

If you won't do this, vote NO to extending the current WM franchise and let us purchase our own wildlife resistant totes as I suggest.

Thanks for your consideration of my request. Aaron Katz