

**MINUTES
MOAPA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
HELD
THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 2017**

PRESENT:

Kenneth Staton	Lindsey Dalley
Jon Blackwell	Ryan Wheeler
Randy Tobler	
Joe Davis	Susan Rose
Jeannie Poynor	Lon Dalley
Bryan Mortensen	
Vernon Robison, Moapa Valley Progress	Byron Mills
Joe Phillips, Sunrise Engineering	David Johnson
Clark Hardy	

ORDER OF BUSINESS: At 4:03 p.m., Chairman Ken Staton called to order the regular meeting of the Moapa Valley Water District Board of Directors. The agenda items were addressed in the following order:

1. Public Comment (May be limited to five minutes)

None

2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting held November 17, 2016 (For Possible Action)

On motion of Randy Tobler and seconded by Ryan Wheeler, the Board voted 3-0 in favor to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2016 meeting.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting Held December 2, 2016 (For Possible Action)

On motion of Ryan Wheeler and seconded by Randy Tobler, the Board voted 3-0 in favor to approve the minutes of the December 2, 2016 meeting.

4. Approve the Request from Mr. and Mrs. Clark Hardy and Mr. & Mrs. Bryce Hardy to Move the Water Service from Parcel #041-25-310-006 to Parcel #041-26-312-006, Provided They Have a Clear Title and Pay all Applicable Fees – Clark Hardy (For Possible Action)

Clark Hardy was at the meeting to ask the Board if they would allow them to move their meter from parcel #041-25-310-006 to parcel #041-26-312-006.

Joe Davis explained to the Directors that this meter is on a vacant lot and they would like to move it to a different parcel. It still meets the water dedication ordinance so that's not an issue. Staff has no issue with the moving of the meter since the Hardy's are going to running water thru the meter.

On motion of Ryan Wheeler and seconded by Randy Tobler, the Board voted 4-0 in favor to approve the motion as written which was "Approve the Request from Mr. and Mrs. Clark Hardy and Mr. & Mrs. Bryce Hardy to move the water service from parcel #041-25-310-006 to parcel #041-26-312-006, provided they have a clear title and pay all applicable fees".

Jon Blackwell came into the meeting at 4:05 pm.

Chairman Staton asked Mr. Johnson if he was on the agenda. Mr. Johnson said that he was supposed to be. He had requested to be put on the agenda a month ago. He said that he's 75 years old and a veteran who was going to build a house on Pinwheel Street. He paid \$4,500 to have the water meter installed, a \$1,000 for an NDOT encroachment permit and now unbeknownst to him, he's getting a water bill every month. He's withdrawn his plans to build because of other circumstances. It's a hardship for him to have

to pay for water that he's not using at all. The lot is up for sale and hopefully it will sell right away. He was asking for a waiver on the water bill. He and his wife were going to be moving to Logandale hoping that she could get work as a teacher here but there weren't any openings. She had to take a job in North Las Vegas but with her health condition, she can't survive the drive every day. He's on a fixed income and unemployed at this time. He can't get the building permit approved so he can't build there and because of his wife's health it's not feasible at this time. He asked again for the Boards consideration on this.

Joe said that one of the issues we have is that there is a monthly base rate fee which is on the application for service he would have signed when he signed up for service. That monthly fee pays for the infrastructure that supplies water to that meter and all the others in the valley. It also helps us make our bond payments. If we never sold another drop of water that fee would actually allow us to continue to pay our bills.

Mr. Johnson understands that and that's why he was at the meeting.

Joe explained that we have had others come to us and ask the same thing. Unfortunately, if we do it for one customer, we have to do it for everyone. There could be some options available to him. Joe said he would call Mr. Johnson tomorrow to discuss those options.

5. Update on the Master Capital Improvement Plan – Joe Phillips (For Possible Action)

Joe Phillips was at the meeting to give the Directors an update on the Master Capital Improvement Plan. He had another PowerPoint presentation on where they're at on the plan.

When Joe Phillips came last month, he showed the Directors a map that showed the results of our water systems maximum day demand plus fire flow on the nodes which are on the meters and the fire hydrants. During that conversation he mentioned of the three scenarios the operational scenarios are required by the NV Administrative Code. This particular scenario is the one that is really driving the improvements that they are seeing that are needed for our system. The other one has to do with maximum day demand. We have to keep 40 psi under those conditions. With the average day demand we also have to keep 40 psi in our system. The other two scenarios drive a few improvements but not a lot. This one is really the one that is driving all of the improvements based on our network hydraulic model.

The next page of the presentation was a diagram that is called a hydraulic profile. It lays out and illustrates in a vertical relationship how our system functions based on elevations. The boundary of each of those red lines are called a zone. They show a specific pressure range. Every time a water line crosses one of those lines the pressure has to be reduced or goes thru a closed valve, an altitude control valve or a psv. Every time it crosses one of those boundaries there's a flow control and a system controller. We have 15 different zones in our system. If we look at the hydraulic profile we can see how the water starts up at the end by MX Well, Arrow Canyon Well, Baldwin Springs and Jones Spring and that water works its way down thru the system down to the lower valley which is zone 15. There are five tanks there. Obviously the biggest volume is in the Moapa tanks. The NDOT tank is in zone 7 but it doesn't do much except to be there and receive water. It doesn't feed back into the system so Sunrise doesn't show it playing a part there. One key item is that down in zone 5 there's an intermediate booster pump that pumps water over the high point then it comes back down into our system off the hill in Moapa. This profile is helpful to the engineer in terms of making sure that the model is running accurately and it helps in terms of future improvements like making sure that we don't link zones together that shouldn't be linked and things like that. It also shows how our system is setup today.

So with that background he went thru some of the recommendations they have boiled down to. Most of the things that Joe Phillips wanted to talk about are relative to the distribution system.

The next sheet was on water rights. There's not a lot to do there. We already have a really good integrated water resource plan which was developed in 2014. Some of the other things they have discussed with Joe, Lon and others in terms of what to do with our water rights are:

1. Certificate Arrow Canyon
2. Maintain defensive position
3. Maintain communication with agencies
4. Change POD on MX right to Arrow Canyon, or get perpetual use from USGS
5. Follow recommendations of the 2014 Integrated Water Resource Plan

The source capacity chart was on the next page. Joe Phillips said that source capacity is the ability to get water rights into the system and use them. He showed us this chart last month. The yellow line is the required source capacity 20 years out vs. the existing source capacity that we have. It shows that we have plenty of ability to produce water and feed our system according to what the demands should be. Some of the recommendations that the engineers had were:

1. Upgrade Baldwin/Jones Springs booster pumps
2. Maintain an inventory of critical repair parts for bottleneck infrastructure
3. Install Arrow Canyon Well #3 as redundant supply for loss of Well #1 or Well #2
4. Develop cost efficiencies in or rebuild MX Well.
5. Follow recommendations of the 2014 Integrated Water Resource Plan

On the next page was treatment capacity. Joe Phillips said this is something that he needs to do a little more work on. He understands that the capacity of our current system is adequate for the planning period. In an ideal case we'd have a solution for the water in the Logandale Well. Right now we're mixing it at a 4 to 1 ratio and so their thought is that if there's some cost effective way to treat that water, it would be nice to have another source down here in the lower valley. He doesn't know if there's anything today that would do that. Right now it's a backup well. Maybe some new technology will be developed in the future that could be used there.

We have a waiver on the fluoride from 1989. We want to definitely keep that in place. Joe Phillip's said that they are going to look a little more at the capacity of our existing arsenic treatment to see if there's a break off point where we'll need a new treatment within the next 10 years which he doesn't think there's going to be. He doesn't really see much stuff there to make any recommendations.

Next was storage capacity. This is an area where Sunrise might start seeing some things that they might recommend a little more heavily to. Our total storage capacity in the system is well in excess of what we need thru the planning period and beyond. We have 8.3 million gallons of storage and in 20 years we'll need 2.6 million gallons total storage. The issue is that it's a little more pragmatic because of the bottleneck situation. The bulk of our storage is in the north end and we have 4 million gallons down here where all the demand is.

The next slide showed what happens there. There were two tables; one was part D and one was part E. Part D had emergency reserve calculations. In the NAC it says that when a new water system comes in, the state will require that they have a sufficient amount of water storage to cover their system for maximum day demand plus they ask for another 75% on top of that for emergency storage. On an existing system, the code requires that it's on the best judgment of the system's engineer. With north and south together and the bottom line under D where it says combined, we can see that we have 8.3 million gallons of total storage. With our maximum day demand plus fire, our demand would be 3.4 million gallons per day. Our volume to demand ratio would be 2.46 so our capacity is way above what we would need in total volume in terms of overall storage. Going down to table E, it tells us where we'd be in our 10 year projection. In the north half above the bottleneck we have 4.3 million gallons and we're estimated at maximum day demand plus fire flow to be just under a million gallons a day so our estimate volume to demand is 4.5 million gallons. If we look at the south half, we have 4 million gallons of storage south of the bottleneck. The estimated demand for the future is going to be 3.1 million gallons per day. We have 1.29 as our ratio of volume vs. the demand so we're way under the 1.75 that they would require for a new system. Because of the bottleneck and because of our history, (we had those breaks and our tanks drained quickly) his opinion would be that it's too low in the south half.

The three things that Sunrise Engineering would recommend would be:

1. What emergency reserve factor does the District feel comfortable with?
2. Install a dual line inlet/outlet system at the Logandale West Tank to encourage freshness
3. Continue diligent tank maintenance program

The Current, 10-yr, & SNWA improvements were on the next two slides. The first one is the north half map and the second one is a map of the south half. Joe Phillips said that as a recap, they took all of our system information from our meters, then built it into the model. Sunrise worked with Joe and Lon to get that model updated and got to a point where everyone felt comfortable with it accurately reflecting what

we have in the ground. Then they ran the three pressure scenarios required by the NAC for both the current conditions and current scenarios that we actually have and then with the 10 year growth. The way that works out is that the bulk of the improvements are needed under current conditions because of fire flow. When you run the 10 year scenario, because the growth rate is low, it adds just a few additional small lengths with one exception which he showed on the later map. The first map showed Sunrise's recommendations for the north half of our service territory. The recommendations are the a minimum to get our system to where it will meet the NAC for maximum day demand plus fire flow, under 10 year and current. Then they added on there the requirement that when SNWA starts producing water and sending it thru our system. In the first push we're required to take 3750 gpm and move it thru our system accepted at the Moapa tanks, move it thru our system and discharge it to Bowman Reservoir. In the future we'll be required to move 6200 gpm thru our system. Sunrise started with the current conditions and made the improvements that were key to get that all into code. They then added the 10 year scenario and ran that. There were half a dozen little things that needed to be done plus one line. After that, they ran both of the SNWA scenarios. They did that because the improvements to the current and the 10 year scenarios did almost everything that needed to happen to get the SNWA water thru there. There aren't any additional things. It comes in, it spreads out thru the system and enters Bowman. There's not really anything left to do. Once we do the current improvements, we'll be in good shape. On this sheet, everything that is colored is an improvement that they recommend needs to be done in order to get our system up to code. That's the good news.

The next page was the map of southern half of our service territory. The major improvement that kicked over from the 10 year scenario is the line from the Logandale East Tank. It's a 16" line that runs south. In Joe Phillips mind this is a critical improvement. He doesn't have his head around the affordability yet.

Joe Davis said that 16" is actually cheaper than 14" because the 14" is a special order. We have quite a bit of 14" line in our system.

Fire hydrant improvements were on the next page. Joe Phillips said that he considers these as critical improvements also. In the GIS software, they ran an analysis where they showed a 250' radius around our existing fire hydrant and then picked out places that had structures that didn't have a fire hydrant within 250'. Based on that analysis they would recommend installing hydrants in those locations. They can't be installed right now because most of them are on small lines that won't support a fire hydrant.

One of the issues we asked Sunrise to look at is what improvements would need to be made to support a 1.0MGD user so the next slide was on that. Again there were two slides for this. One for the north end and one for the south end. To figure the improvements out, Sunrise made the assumption that it would be used in an 8 hour shift. You could assume that if they worked around the clock then their flow would be reduced. Sunrise assumed that each one of the green dots is where these 1.0M gallon users would be located. They would pull just under 2,100 gallons a minute to supply an 8 hour shift. Joe Phillips thinks that the 1.0MGD user is a less critical need.

Next page talked about the non-critical small main replacements. These are the other diameter mains that are in our system that aren't critical to meet the current fire flow codes. Their recommendation on these is that in our annual small main replacement program and as something breaks and we go fix it, that we just fix it back with a minimum 6" diameter line but they would lean towards an 8" line. There were slides for this category also.

Joe Phillips said that in 3-4 weeks they should have a rough draft to us for review. They have a lot of these things gathered up. He's not quite sure how they're going to show us all the information because there's a ton of it. They will probably have charts, diagrams, and maps. They will obviously start putting together some financial stuff and see where that comes out. He doesn't really have a feeling on what to recommend on that right now. One thing he does want to do is grab all those critical things and see what we're looking at in terms of one big capital improvement project. In his mind the big capital improvement would be the critical line replacements, fire hydrants, and the emergency reserve tank.

There were a lot of questions and comments from the Directors during the presentation especially regarding fire hydrants. Joe Phillips answered all of those questions with some input from Joe Davis.

Lindsey Dalley came into the meeting at 4:30 pm.

6. Review and Possible Revision of the District's Donation Policy (For Possible Action)

Joe said that when we were talking about some of the donations, the Directors had made a request that after the first of the year they wanted to look at the donation policy.

Randy said that he's always been conflicted because he doesn't think we should have donated to some of the ones we donated to in the past. It's hard to choose who we donate to. We do it for either advertising which he doesn't really see the point of or we do it for good will. If it's a private business and they want to spend their money on that, that's their decision but we're a public utility and some people might think that it's good to be involved in the community but there are those who don't feel that way. He doesn't think that we should do donations anymore. He's fine with donating water because it doesn't really cost us anything. He doesn't want to choose who we give the money to. He doesn't think that public utilities should be doing that. He doesn't see others utilities doing it.

Lindsey Dalley said that he can't disagree with that philosophy but when you get into the actual functioning, the dynamics of the community and the people, it's a legitimate question. We always have to remember that we're a public utility and it's the rate payer's money so we can't be spending it like it's our own. That's why we have a Board. He thinks the other question that needs to be on the table with that is can we, as a water district, serve our rate payers better if we have good will in the community. If we're fighting the community, that's going to end up costing us dollars and headaches. He's not saying that's right or fair but that's the reality when you deal with people so you have to balance that. The only justification for the donation is to try to buy happiness. That's the bottom line. That's an emotional decision. Taking the business analogy, he's not saying that's not a valid point; he's saying that's why we have a Board so we can make those subjective judgments. He thinks we're right speck in the middle of making a subjective judgment. Why does a business choose to donate? What's the criteria? When you look at the dollar and cents, they could offer lower prices if they don't donate but there is a motivation to donate. He looks at that and he would say that there's not much difference between why a business would donate as we would donate. We're after the same thing. It's just that we have to decide what the community will tolerate and want vs. what they don't but there's a threshold which he totally gets.

Randy asked if we see Cappalappa donating.

Lindsey said that Cappalappa isn't a business.

Randy said that they're a non-profit.

Lindsey said that their business is donating. That's what they do.

Randy said that they're still a government quasi organization.

Lindsey didn't think that that was a valid analogy because they're in the business of helping people.

Randy asked if we are in the business of make money on our water or are we in business to provide water to the community.

Lindsey said that he would flip that around and ask what is the purpose of a for profit business, why do they donate and then take that and look at the water district and say ok there's some overlap there. Whenever you get into a public relations issue, there's the intangible that you don't know you have until you don't have it. That's not scientific but that the reality. If you lose it, it cost you a higher factor to get it back then it does if you just maintain it.

Randy said he gets what Lindsey's saying about public relations but on the flipside you're creating negative public relations for those people that don't think you should be spending rate payers dollars and the second point Randy had is that we have so little money going out to people, you'll make some people mad and some people happy.

Lindsey's wasn't saying what the Board should or shouldn't do. He's saying to look at it from just a perspective of why should a public utility be in the business of picking who to donate to? He doesn't think that's the total picture. He's not arguing totally against Randy. He thinks we need to control it. If we're put up against a maximum every year, then he would think it was more critical but we're not. He thinks there's a big gray area there. We need to be aware of that and not think in terms of absolutes.

Randy thinks that our public relations and goodwill is how staff handles problems and how they treat the customers. We're in the business to distribute water. We're not a profit but we do want to be profitable so we can keep the water flowing.

Ryan agreed with Randy that we have better goodwill when people walk in and talk to our customer service reps and when the field crews go out and talk to people about a water leak. There's more goodwill in that than giving someone a \$100 that the community never really sees that we provided to them other than that one person and that one agency.

Byron asked if there was going to be an alternative if we did away with the donations. He said that OPD does the roundup program and he thinks it's a great idea. People can sign up for this program which is all voluntary. If your bill is \$87.32 you can choose to round your bill up to \$88. The extra money goes to the schools. OPD gave about \$1200 last year from the Roundup Program to the schools. The thing about it is that you choose which program you want to donate to at the school.

Joe said that the Roundup Program does have an advantage because the money gets rotate to different departments at the school. It doesn't always go to a sports program.

Byron said that every time that goes out to the schools, the press shows up and does a nice article that OPD and the people donated x amount of dollars to Moapa Valley schools. That's their public relations.

Lindsey said that the argument there is that you start rolling thru various departments, and that's more appealing to him than just having random groups coming in and doling out \$100 to whoever comes in and ask for it. He thinks that we would get more goodwill doing that than we would with the protocol that we have right now. He still makes the argument that attention needs to be paid to the goodwill. We may update our focus on our approach but to just say that we don't donate which we are well within our rights to do and that's a valid business decision but there are other factors that we need to look at. He doesn't want to jump in there cold turkey. It makes him nervous.

Randy wanted to make one observation. His business is at the end of the street so he gets hit up last. He makes a point to ask them who else has donated. The one business that donates more to this community over the last 10 years is Lin's. They are also the ones that get bad mouthed the most. He doesn't know if that's a correlation but that's just what he's seen. They do a ton. They're the first ones on the list and they always do something.

Joe doesn't know if our billing software would even be able to do the rounding up of the bills.

Jon said that he doesn't want to create more work for staff.

Joe explained that there would be a cost associated with it because staff would have to administer the program.

Lindsey said that the \$1000 we have in the donation fund is like less than one-tenth of one percent of our budget.

Randy said that's not the challenge for him. It's deciding where it goes.

Chairman Staton said in a couple of months were going to have kids coming in asking for donations for 4-H projects and for the fair.

Joe said the next month they will be coming in for the Herdsmanship award.

Lindsey said that we're talking about a small amount of money compared to the budget get and so he doesn't see why the stress of it. He thinks the negative flow back is a lot higher than not doing it than by doing it.

Randy said that we keep kicking this down the road so he wants to either kill it tonight or not. His preference is to do away with the policy.

Chairman Staton hates to do away with it all together. He needs to go along with Lindsey on this. He can see Randy's point. He understands what he's saying. It is rate payer's money.

Joe reminded the Directors that the policy is broken into two parts. One is the monetary donation and the other is advertising. There is \$1000 for monetary donations & \$1000 for advertising. Is everyone on the same page that advertising might not be the best avenue in order to spend a \$1000? To Joe it seems like both are on the table.

Lindsey said that it depends on what we're advertising. His only question is when we as a water district need to get information out to our rate payers, is that considered advertising? How do you define advertising?

Joe said we're talking about donating to someone for advertising. It would be like giving someone \$100 to put our logo on their program.

On motion of Randy Tobler and seconded by Ryan Wheeler, the Board voted 3-2 in favor to eliminate the donation/advertising policy. Chairman Staton and Lindsey Dalley voted against it.

9. Director's Preference
- Review Monthly Expenditures

Randy Tobler disclosed that he has an interest in a small business that is on the monthly expenditures list.

On motion of Chairman Staton and seconded by Jon Blackwell the Board voted 5-0 to call a closed-door session at 5:47 pm.

- **Litigation (Closed-Door Session)**
- **Water Rights Discussion (Closed-Door Session)**
- **KB Homes AKA Logandale 20 (Closed- Door Session)**

On motion of Chairman Staton and seconded by Jon Blackwell the Board voted 5-0 to reconvene the open-door session at 6:43 pm.

7. Manager's Reports
Office Manager
Assistant General Manager
General Manager

Office Manager – 1) Jeannie Poynor included the financial dashboard in their packets. She went over the budget report, the financial dashboard and the revenue report. Lindsey asked why cash flows spiked on the cash flow report. Jeannie said that we haven't paid for the chlorinator yet and we don't have any other capital improvement projects going on right now so that's why there's a spike. Joe said that we have the Arrow Canyon Well #3 stuff and also the Gentec generator. Jeannie said that on the upside of things we are up about \$23,000 from where we were last year. Jeannie provided October and November's budget reports since we didn't have manager's reports in December. Everything looks good on the budget. We've got about 42% of the year expended and a few things that are up but overall we're looking good on expenditures and revenues.

Assistant General Manager – 1) Production – Lon Dalley explained that the water produced in November was 60,057,303 gallons pulled from Warm Springs. We didn't pump anything out of Arrow Canyon #1, 43,867,991 was pumped out of Arrow Canyon #2 and 16,189,312 was pumped out of Baldwin. In December we pumped 49,557,313. We didn't pump anything out of Arrow Canyon #1, 49,518,912 was pumped out of Arrow Canyon #2 and 38,401 was pumped out of Baldwin. **2) Arrow Canyon #1 Well Level** – It's the cooler months. He told the Directors that it's kind of deceiving because the top is ground level. The water level is up a little bit because we ran Arrow Canyon #2. **3) Meter Installs** – We didn't install any meters the last two months. 15 meters were installed in 2016. Of those 15 meters, one was a banked meter and one was an upgrade. **4) Lost & Unaccounted for Water** – We're still searching. We did install flow meters in infrastructure that we already have in place. We're trying to compare what the production meter is saying vs. what we get. The flow meters are at the tanks. We have two psv's at the tanks, and one on the 14" line and the 20" line. We also put meters on each one of those. The only thing we won't be catching is the Baldwin line, Lytle Ranch and the reservation but that would be minimal. We had a little bit of loss which was 6%. Some of that can be accounted for because it's coming down the other line. We're still missing 28%. We put the meters on to try to narrow it down.

General Manager- 1) WaterPac Donation– Joe reminded the Directors that we've talked about the WaterPac donation the last couple of months. Joe and a couple of other Directors on the NVRWA Board

had an issue that it was brought up at three different meetings that they wanted to get their Boards to donate to it, then all the sudden they we're told that they couldn't do it. The technicality is that even though we're sending it to a pac, that pac is directly giving money to a reelection fund and we can't donate to a reelection fund so we didn't send any money. **2) GIS Training** – We have Burton Cox and Mason Stratton signed up for ESRI training. With all of the GIS stuff that we do, ESRI is the platform that you work off of. They have great training that's associated with it. This also ties into our traffic control. NV Rural Water was sending out Tatiana to do the majority of our programming. Unfortunately the words got out that she does it so we've been losing the time with her. We need to get our guys trained ourselves. One of the big factors is that everyone's using it now. We need to keep it updated so that's one of the things Mason will be doing. He will also make sure that everything we do out in the field will be put into the system so it's kept up to date. We had a gentleman who lives on Henry Road call and complain that our traffic control wouldn't pass mustard with the county (he's a county employee). Jon had asked Joe if we have anyone certified and we do. It's Brian Greig. Brian's certificate is due to be renewed so we're also going to send Kiley in to get the certification. **3) NvRWA** – The conference will be held March 14th thru the 16th. On the 15th they are going to have training for board of directors. Joe asked if any of the directors wanted to attend that training. There were three that were interested in attending. **4) Nevada Water Bill Legislation** – There are 26 pending BDR's. The majority of those (14-15) are more superficial than anything else. They don't really apply to us. There are five right now that have proposed language and timeframes that are associated with them. They could still be withdrawn by the 6th. The legislatures can still introduce new bills until March 20th. By the 27th the committee bill introductions are over. Around the beginning of March we should be able to get a better grasp of how things are going to go. That's when we will start gearing up for how they're going to affect us. **5) Arrow Canyon #3**- We have Sandra Fairchild doing the environmental work for us on the Lytle prv. She works with BLM all the time doing EA's and other things associated with it. She's doing some of the work for Arrow Canyon #3 and Jason Higgins with Wallace Morris Kline is working on the mapping aspect of the water rights and setting the boundaries for where Arrow Canyon #3 would sit so we can start the process thru BLM to get the application submitted. That application process is extremely long. Both of them have done work for us for quite awhile. They do a good job. **6) Unaccounted Water** – We did get the meters put in at the Moapa Tanks so between the head houses and the Moapa Tanks we are at about the 6% mark which is kind of normal. It can be cleaned up but it needs to be defined. We have meters inside the mining prv. One is new which he relies on, the other is old school technology and he's not 100 % sold on it yet. We're going to move one of the old 8 ones down there to validate the old one. We're experiencing 6% or less loss in the lower valley. It looks like from the data we have that we're losing all of the water somewhere between the mining prv and the Moapa tanks. We've tracked it back three months and that's what it's indicating right now. It's good to know what area it's basically in but it doesn't make sense. However, we're going to move those meters down to the mining prv so we'll know if the mining numbers are good. If so, then we'll be able to find the area it's in. The problem is between the Moapa tanks and the mining prv there's only one prv and that's at the Moapa Park. The problem is it's one of the prv's we've wanted to move because it's out in the middle of a gravel field. They built the park around it. The water saturation in that park is down 13' so our vault is always full of water. We have nothing but issues there. We can't keep the water out. It hard to justify going in there and trying to rip that butterfly valve out and replace it with another one because it's going to take a lot of work. We have to rip out some of the walls and do work on the outside. Bryan talked to Clavvalve to see if there was some way to buffer it but they said it can't be done. We've targeted some areas that cross rivers, cross Meadow Valley Wash, area's that are out in the middle of nowhere to try to find someplace where it could be dumping into the river. That's the only place it could go. The meters that are at the head houses at the Moapa tanks are true meters but the meters at the psv's are insertion meters so there's a buffer in there. It could be a fact that the 6% could just be an offset in the meter because the filters not in there right. They're not as accurate as a regular meter. 6% is pretty dang close though. Instead of trying to spend a bunch of time looking for 6% we're going to concentrate on the Moapa tank and on down. The meters do work and they correlate with each other.

9. Director's Preference
- Review Monthly Expenditures

Randy Tobler disclosed that he has an interest in a small business that is on the monthly expenditures list.

8. Public Comment (May Be Limited to Five Minutes)

None

10. Personnel (Closed-Door)

None

11. Approval of the February 9, 2017 Board Meeting

The general consensus was to hold the December Board meeting on Thursday, February 9th at 4 pm.

12. Public Comment (May be limited to five minutes)

None

13. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm.