

MINUTES
MOAPA VALLEY WATER DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
HELD
THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 2021

| | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| PRESENT: | Randy Tobler Jon Blackwell Derek Campbell | Lindsey Dalley Ryan Wheeler |
| | Joe Davis Lon Dalley Jeannie Poynor | Susan Rose Kiley Bradshaw |
| | Byron Mills Berkley Marshall (Phone) Stewart Bunker (Phone) | Vernon Robison (Phone) Troy Christensen (Phone) |

ORDER OF BUSINESS: At 4:02 p.m., Chairman Randy Tobler 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)**
- 2) **Approval of the Minutes of the previous meeting held December 4, 2021 (For Possible Action)**

On motion of Lindsey Dalley and seconded by Ryan Wheeler, the Board voted 4-0 in favor to approve the minutes of the December 4, 2020 meeting.

Jon Blackwell came in at 4:10 PM

- 4) **Approve the modification to the Hydrant Meter Policy (For Possible Action)**

Berkley Marshall, Troy Christensen, and Stewart Bunker were at the meeting to talk to the Directors about this agenda item.

Randy feels more comfortable with gathering some more information. He spoke with Stewart today and he thinks that we need to look at all of the options on the table and see how this affects the District & those who are using the hydrant meter program. He thinks it has a little more issues than what he had thought of so he would like more time to look into this.

Lindsey Dalley agrees with Randy that there's definitely more information, but he sees there's two issues on this item that need to be dealt with. What is the cost of that issue to the District? We don't know the revenue. We don't have that information right now. The other issue is should the District maintain access to arena owners and holders for dust control? Staff recommends only using hydrant meters for firefighting/training and dust control for construction purposes only. He thinks there's a certain rural culture that's in play here and he's been to plenty of meetings where he attended a meeting and the people had pull it. He would like to see a discussion on one of those two issues. Should the board support a hydrant policy for arena owners? He doesn't think we have that information right now to be sure about that, but he thinks there's at least enough to have a discussion should the board support a continued hydrant policy for arena owners or not. We could leave the cost issue for a separate meeting.

Joe said that part of the reason we're looking at this is that we have an individual that said he was going to sue the District because a fire hydrant failed. One of the things that's an issue is cost of service. We started looking at that policy because the hydrants that the District uses are not designed to have water in them all the time. They are a dry barrel that's not supposed to have water in them except when they're in use. There's always been a special case when a house is under construction that they would use a hydrant but it's a limited time. Back in 2006 the board made a special concession to allow arenas to continue to use fire hydrants for dust control. At the time they made the motion it was a \$30 application fee that was supposed to be subject to rate increases. When you go back and read the original motion, it's kind of confusing. Maybe they meant that the cost of service that was associated with the hydrant meter was supposed to be escalated like the base rate for all of the meters that were out there but that wasn't the way the motion read. Increases were never applied to that fee. What happens is an individual would come in and fill out an

application and pay the \$30 application fee. The \$30 covers the employee to go out and inspect the truck and to do the processing of the application and then we would install the hydrant meter and inspect it. The cost of that service has gone up. That \$30 fee is paid twice a year. Once when they get the hydrant meter and again at six months when the meter has to be moved to another hydrant. They pay \$1 a day to have the meter on the hydrant and they pay the highest tier on the water usage. Basically, what is happening is we have the hydrant meter out there that's the same as any regular water meter and it has to be read every month and the hydrant has to be inspected. Those costs that are associated with the individuals out there that have hydrant meters and individuals that have 5/8" meter that has a \$40 base fee every month plus the cost of the water they use. In reality what's really happening is you're being offered a 3" connection for \$30 a month in order to keep dust control down for a horse arena. Thru the years we've always looked at cost of service to maintain everything in our system and this is something that's flown under the radar. It's never had an increase. The original concept that we were looking at was a base rate for a 3" connection is \$277/month which is not feasible for an arena. You're being offered a 3" connection for \$30/month to keep dust down for a horse arena. What's a figure that would be amenable? That would double the monthly rate. The costs instead would be \$60/month plus water used. Then we would be able to recoup some of what's out there. When you look at it from a staff's standpoint, fire hydrants are the #1 worst thing that can cause cross contamination. Anything that causes cross contamination that you can eliminate is better so eliminating this type of cross contamination is good. We could put backflow preventers on every fire hydrant meter but the problem with that is we're looking at another \$2,500 investment to put it on there so we'll have to recoup that cost.

Chairman Tobler said that he doesn't have enough information to have a discussion. He would like to look at the fiscals and know a little more about their concerns. He would also like to hear the publics concerns. He thinks this is part of the lifestyle out here. He thinks it's important, but he also thinks he has to balance the District's expenses and make sure that we are viable and independent, that water can be safe, and he thinks there can be a solution that can be worked out that everyone can be happy with. He feels like we're having a discussion with not a whole lot of information to go off of. He puts himself a little to blame. Joe had talked to him about this and it seemed real simple at the time but these issues came up. He spoke with Stewart and after talking to him this brought up some other points to talk about. He's just not at a point right now.

Ryan Wheeler said that he's with Randy. The neighbors around him have arenas, and they use water for dust control and for watering other things. As this has come to light, he agrees with Randy. He thinks we need more information from the public and we need to preserve our rural lifestyle, so he agrees with Lindsey and Chairman Tobler about that. There are some issues about preserving the water in the lines and making sure that it's safe and at the same time doing what is fair and equitable to maintain a rural lifestyle as well. If we were to make some changes, we would have to give some advanced notice so they can put in sprinklers, piping or whatever they want to do to continue watering their properties.

Berkley Marshall said that they could learn how to shutoff the hydrant meter so there wouldn't be any water left in them. It should be pretty easy to do.

Troy Christensen said that there are quite a few arena's out here and that's probably why some people choose to live here.

No action was taken. It will be on next month's agenda.

3) Temporary Extended Covid-19 Sick Time (For Possible Action)

Joe explained that with Covid-19 the employee rights that came out from the Federal Government created a special set of rules between April and December 3, 2020. Basically, with all of the quarantine requirements, if you think you came in contact and you need to be home the quarantined times were 14 days and 10 days at that time. Now it's 7 and 10 days. We had an individual that had tested positive and he ended up staying home. He fell under the program and we paid him sick time. That expired on December 31st. We've had two other individuals that tested positive and one of those individuals asked if we were still going to follow this policy. Joe explained to him that he doesn't have the authority to continue that on. It would have to be approved by the board. Some of the things that we talked about internally is that because we have the unique time frames associated with quarantine, if we send someone home (one person was positive and one wasn't) both had to stay home until the quarantine was over. It's a unique situation with the time frames that we are required to stay safe. It's also a unique situation with the fact that we work so

close together in order to make sure that the water is flowing and all these other things that we have to make sure that all these other things happen with an essential employee out there that maybe it's an extenuating situation that we need to look at. As Joe explained to the employees that we would put it on the agenda and see what the board would like to do. There are some requirements that we can make sure that we stay safe and we can continue to make the water flow. We rely on every individual that works here. That bad thing about the original plan was that it had requirements in there that we had to pay but we could never ask for verification if the person tested positive or not so there was rampant abuse of the system before because employers couldn't ask employees that question. Those requirements are no longer in the plan. Luckily, we haven't had anyone abuse it the policy.

Lindsey explained that there was an article in the Journal of American Medical Association that talked about a minute analysis of lots of studies and found that 18% of systematic individuals transmitted the virus to their family. .7% of a systematic individuals may have transmitted the virus to their family members. That's a huge number difference. The idea is that a systematic carriers can run around and spread the virus around is a very low probability. It's a 1700% drop between systematic and a systematic. That information has come to light. Unfortunately, that goes against the political narrative of the crisis. Looking at the hard data that tells me as a board member is that we don't have the crisis a systematic that we thought we had but we still have to live with government regulations, public perception, and we have to have a policy that shows that we're trying to protect the public and all of those are still valid. Those are political issues not medical issues.

Jeannie explained that the guy that called and said that he was exposed over the weekend and he didn't feel good so he went in and took the test and had to wait for the results. He asked if he had to be quarantined. The answer is yes. If you don't feel good, stay home. If he gets a positive result he can come back 10 days after he starts feeling symptoms. If he starts feeling symptoms on the 3rd he can come back to work on the 13th. He doesn't have to take another Covid test.

If you've been exposed to the virus but you have no symptoms you can go and get a test on the 5th day of your quarantine. If you get a negative test on the 5th day, you have to be out no less than 7 days.

Joe said that we really get scrutinized because we're essential. Originally the guideline was 80 hours but now it's 7 and 10 days so he's looking at rolling those back to 7 & 10 days. We're doing a lot of things to protect our employees.

There was a lot of discussion on this item.

On motion of Randy Tobler and seconded by Jon Blackwell, the Board voted 5-0 in favor to approve the Temporary Extended Covid-19 Sick time which would go from January 1, 2021 to July 31, 2021. It would give employees 40 hours of additional sick time for a Covid-19 related illness per CDC guidelines with no loss of the two personal days. The employee must get a Covid-19 test for Covid -19 exposure and we must send them home.

5) Policies & Procedures Manual Update (For Possible Action)

Joe said that we made some adjustments to the Policies and Procedures Manual because there are a lot of inconsistencies in it. One of the biggest one's we have is that we utilize the term "meter purchase or meter installation". When we did that, customers assumed they owned the actual meter, so we've changed the terminology so that we're using the term "service connection" as the standard. Basically, the edits that are in there are the terminologies for meter connection to service connection. We also removed all of the verbiage that pertained to the old standby service so that went away. We updated the residential and commercial rate scales. We had them in the policy manual, and we cleaned them up so basically, we're acknowledging the fact that we're getting rid of the old format so the new format will be in there. We updated the overage scale which once again it's just cleaning up how it looks. We removed the verbiage pertaining to the recovery of the installation of the backflow devices. Only the monthly \$5 fee for the backflow is in the policy. We also clarified the markup on the over the counter sales, and materials for line extensions. The policy read that if someone needed a line extension, we would mark it up 30%. It was unclear so we wanted to make sure that was addressed. There are going to be more sections that need to be cleaned up.

The Water Dedication Ordinance is the biggest policy we have in there. There is a lot of verbiage in it that needs to be cleaned up. Byron is probably going to be doing some work on this policy.

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

- Election of Officers

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| General Manager/Administration | Randy Tobler (1 year) |
| Personnel & Office/Computers | Derek Campbell |
| Equipment & Physical | Jon Blackwell |
| Capital Improvements | Ryan Wheeler |
| Water Rights/Resources | Lindsey Dalley |

On motion of Lindsey Dalley and seconded by Jon Blackwell, the Board voted 5-0 in favor to approve the above mentioned committee assignments.

- Litigation (Closed Door Session)

- Other Related Water Rights Issues

None

10) Personnel

None

11) Approval of the February 11, 2021 Board Meeting

The General Consensus was to have the next board meeting on February 11, 2021 at 4 p.m.

12) Public Comment (Maybe limited to five minutes)

None

13) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.