

MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 3, 2022
Incline Village General Improvement District

The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Incline Village General Improvement District was called to order by Board Chairman Tim Callicrate on Wednesday, February 3, 2022 at 6:00 p.m. via Zoom.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE*

The pledge of allegiance was recited.

B. ROLL CALL OF TRUSTEES*

On roll call, present were Trustees Tim Callicrate, Sara Schmitz, Michaela Tonking and Matthew Dent. Trustee Kendra Wong joined the meeting in progress at 6:35 p.m. Members of Staff present were Director of Finance Paul Navazio, Director of Golf/Community Services Darren Howard, Director of Human Resources Erin Feore, Diamond Peak General Manager Mike Bandelin, Director of Information Technology Mike Gove, Parks & Recreation Superintendent Shelia Leijon, and District General Counsel Joshua Nelson.

C. INITIAL PUBLIC COMMENTS*

Aaron Katz said I'll be presenting written statements to be attached to the minutes of the meeting and these statements to be included in the minutes. As they keep telling you, it's everything your vaunted staff to everything. This proposed pricing policy is absolute garbage. We need no policy. Staff knows fully well what the Board has told them to do. Breakeven or positive cash flow at every recreational facility. No discounts, no giveaways, no voodoo accounting, which fails to report capital expenditures or debt service, no Rec fee subsidies, no phony internal services transfers, no phony central services transfers, no reducing of our pricing to give away the nonprofit or employees. No reducing in pricing that compete with private sectors. You either operate these facilities revenue neutral or positive cash flow after all expenses. And if you can't deliver, you need to get rid of staff or stop running these money losing businesses. It's that simple. And if you won't do your jobs and for staff to operate that way, you're as bad as they are. Let's go to the budget workshop. More garbage. We've been over this for years. If staff won't share every line item expenditure they propose, then how do you know what they're proposing? And if you don't know what they're proposing, how can you possibly give them a blank check to spend whatever they want on whatever they can concoct? And how can you allow staff to represent that they need to Rec fee to subsidize the operation of these businesses? When they've used the money to

build up slush funds? They called fund balances and all of our funds, and you know this, do your jobs and say no. Present a line-item expenditure for every proposed expense or refuse to rubber stamp their budgets. It's that simple. Finally, the additional dwelling units; you haven't even been charging 1709 Lakeshore, and I brought to your attention two dwelling units you're not charging for on Cottonwood, and what do you do? Nothing. How about doing your jobs for once? And by the way, it's not just the Rec fee; it's the sewer in the water fees we are now subsidizing. Thank you.

Yolanda Knaack, Incline Village resident, said I have been following Policy 15.1.0 for a while. And I noticed this is the first time that you'll be voting on it. And it doesn't include the section where the whole Board of Trustees will vote upon the applicants to the audit committee. I was wondering if that could be reinstated in the policy. I think it's very important to have that delineated. Thank you very much.

Judith Miller said first on the pricing policy, there will never be any incentive to reduce costs or look for efficiencies when you essentially state that the facility fees have to equal the cost minus the user fees. User fees are somewhat controlled by the market. So if costs increase, the facility fees the only place they could be made up. Pricing strategy seems not to change anything. Talk about Groundhog Day. I thought you were going to base pricing on the pyramid. So individual services like golf, ski, and tennis, probably two would eventually not require subsidies perhaps phased in over a couple of years. But for golf, it looks like the non-golfers will not only continue to subsidize the golfing picture passholders but also their guests. Other than the beaches, golf is, to my knowledge, the only venue to have a guest rate. The guest rate to golf is so capital intensive, that expecting all the homeowners to pay for those huge costs in addition to a substantial portion of the operating costs; it's just not a fair proposition. Spending roughly a third of the Rec fee on an individual sport that should be 100% cost recovery is a misuse of public funds. Why not use that \$2 million a year to build and maintain a warm water pool? But don't take my word for it. For once, go out to the voters ask them what they want and what they want to stand on it. For golf, get a third party who run the courses at breakeven or get rid of them. Lastly, the Ordinance 7 Committee was supposed to recommend a guest policy. If the Board approves this policy tonight, make sure that it won't be construed as the definition of guests for beach purposes. And please modify the language about groups and they're discounted rates that could be so low as all they cover is direct cost. I thought there was a discussion about IT in the budget section it talks about central services. The calculation doesn't seem to include it. What happened to that? How will we ever be able to gauge the performance of our venues? How will we ever be able to know if outsourcing might be a better option? On another note, I saw posted on social

media that a local resident's sweet golden retriever was viciously attacked by a non-resident's dog at the beach. Our GM told me recently that the study for a system to control beach access in this year's budget hasn't even been started. So how can there be anything in next year's budget to actually work on this high priority project? By the way, what happened to the community outreach for the dog park that we've been promised since last October? Thank you.

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (for possible action)

Trustee Schmitz requested to move the Audit Committee Charter 15.1. off of the Consent Calendar and onto General Business for some minor revisions. Chair Callicrate stated that will be moved to be the first item under General Business.

E. REVIEW OF THE LONG RANGE CALENDAR (for possible action)

District General Manager Winquest reported that our next scheduled meeting is February 9 with several items on that agenda. He said District General Counsel Nelson's non-profit rates is still a moving target on discussions regarding the pricing policy; that may come back on the 23rd or the 9th. Snowboard equipment replacement will either be 23rd or the 9th. Everything else will be on the February 9 meeting. The agenda for the 9th will be out by tomorrow morning, 9 a.m. and the packet will be out on Saturday. We have the budget workshop on the 23rd. We hope to bring key rates for golfing facilities and effluent pipeline and pond lining updates as well as mid-year budget update.

Trustee Dent said we need to reschedule August 10. He said he thinks we should have the review of the General Manager on June 8 given we only have two meetings. We have the automatic renewal of the contract on July 1 and if something comes up, we have a back-up date. General Manager Winquest stated we did know you weren't available on August 10 so as it gets closer, we will discuss moving that meeting. He asked if Trustee Dent wants to have the General Manager evaluation ready by that meeting. Trustee Dent said he thinks that would be in the best interest of the Trustees and Staff because it's a three week to a month process from when we get information and preparing packet and get feedback. If we wait until the 29th, we will run into the same issue we ran into five years ago with the former District General Manager and he doesn't want to repeat history. General Manager Winquest said I will have our HR Director reach out to the Board in early to mid-May with all the information so we'll back up the entire process a month with the goal that the actual evaluation will occur on June 8. And that way, if there are any lingering effects, we still have one more meeting before July 1. Trustee Dent said I like the idea of a backup meeting. Trustee Schmitz said down in the parking

lot, for some reason, we stopped recording the date that things got added to the parking lot. I think it's important because it helps us to understand how long things have been sitting there. If we could please have the District Clerk get the date for some of the missing items. I think Trustee Dent made a really good suggestion. I'm wondering if we need the same sort of thing with Ordinance 7 so we have lead time. We have our summer beach season starting. We have to put a date out to say any changes to Ordinance 7 have to be put on our calendar on this date and hopefully our Attorney will fall in line otherwise we will miss another season. Can we put that on the calendar so we have a timeline to deal with Ordinance 7? District General Manager Winquest said the draft recommendations are currently in the hands of special counsel; we expect to have all of his feedback by Monday. The goal will be our final meeting late next week, or early the following week with the committee to finalize, and then call a special meeting. Once we have everything finalized, and we have a date that we're actually delivering to the Board, we'll set a timeline. There's a public hearing involved with changing the ordinance. I believe we need to have it all wrapped up by mid-April.

Trustee Schmitz said the sixth one down says "review service levels" And in tonight's presentation, there is a lot of discussion about service levels. And it seems as though we really don't have a clear definition of those. And we did say golf would be the first; can we work on getting some defined service levels and some defined metrics, and maybe start with golf so that we can create a template to be used for the other venues. District General Manager Winquest said we are giving you a presentation of service levels. I think you're right, though. I think people have different opinions of what that term means. We can certainly have that discussion. We brought that up last year about starting with golf, and there hasn't been much discussion about it. The Board needs to drive what the expectation is. And if that's what the Board wants, then we're absolutely prepared. We have internal performance metrics that we all use to budget. Trustee Schmitz said we'll just table that for now but will bring this up during that part of the presentation later tonight. And when will we be getting an update on the Tyler implementation? District General Manager Winquest said we'll be getting that out to the entire Board and include it in my General Manager report. Board Chairman Callicrate said we need to make certain as we get later into the year for these meetings that we don't have a conflict on high holy days of the three main religions. We had that issue Rosh Hashanah, or Yom Kippur. As we get into March and April, I think that there are potentially some conflicts. If we could just do a cursory review to make sure that we don't have anything that is conflicting with any of the religious holidays.

F. REPORTS TO THE BOARD* - Reports are intended to inform the Board and/or the public.

F.1. TREASURERS REPORT – Requesting Trustee: Treasurer Michaela Tonking

Trustee Tonking said we have the check roll and walked through them with Finance Director Navazio last week before the last meeting. I have received all of the months of procurement charges and will have that for our next Treasurer's report. Staff is working with the bank on learning how the cards worked this year and what they can do better with the program. She said I hope to attend that meeting and provide a quick update. They are moving forward with Tyler and asked questions as they start to roll in like the Chart of Accounts and all the other material. The other one was internal controls. District General Manager Winqest sent out an email about hiring a consultant to look at some of our controls and then we will also be examining some of our policies and controls.

Trustee Schmitz said when I was treasurer, one of the things that we were striving to do was to publish a sanitized Procurement Card report online. And when I say sanitized, I mean, without individual's name is because that would be not appropriate. And I'm wondering if that effort is still moving forward? Or if maybe the report that you are doing, is that something that could be posted and made available just like the bill pay information? Trustee Tonking said maybe we can make it be more of an overall report. So instead of going into the granular, like the procurement card approach is, I feel like that's a little bit harder to do, but we can. I can talk to you about some of the different buckets we could put things into and see if that meets your vision of what you're thinking of in a report, and then maybe we can get like a little three-page memo that then can be posted. Trustee Schmitz said there's been concern in over the years, but not so much lately, and effort to try to be transparent; the Procurement Card report is another form of bill pay, and it would be nice to be able to be transparent and share that information. Trustee Tonking said we can do something like that and put into buckets that fall under the chart of accounts to make it very clear. I like that suggestion.

G. CONSENT CALENDAR (for possible action)

G.1. SUBJECT: BOARD POLICY FOR APPROVAL – AUDIT COMMITTEE, POLICY 15.1.0

*Recommendation for Action: Review, discuss and possibly take action to approve Board Policy 15.1.0, Audit Committee. (Requesting Trustee: Treasurer Michaela Tonking) – **MOVED TO GENERAL BUSINESS ITEM H.0.***

H. GENERAL BUSINESS (for possible action)

H.0. SUBJECT: BOARD POLICY FOR APPROVAL – AUDIT COMMITTEE, POLICY 15.1.0

*Recommendation for Action: Review, discuss and possibly take action to approve Board Policy 15.1.0, Audit Committee. (Requesting Trustee: Treasurer Michaela Tonking) – **MOVED FROM CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM G.1.***

Trustee Schmitz said I think that the memorandum that is attached to this agenda item is very helpful. It does a great job of laying out the background. And in the discussion section, it nicely walks through what happened on what date. At the very end of this report, first paragraph, it doesn't have quite the same accurate information. The very last sentence should be clarified to say the second Board appointed at-large members seat - it's not the second there's three, so it's really the third Board appointed at-large seat on the audit committee remains vacant. And it also doesn't reflect that Trustee Dent has now been re-appointed to the audit committee. If we could just get the very ending of this brought up to-date and accurate, I think it does a really nice job of capturing all of the facts and the timeline. If that change could be made to the memorandum so that we have it out on the website for future reference, I think it would be very helpful.

Board Chairman Callicrate asked District General Counsel Nelson if we would still be able to adopt it this evening with the changes or do we need to re-agendize and bring it back. District General Counsel Nelson said we can make these changes and if the Board wants to adopt tonight.

Trustee Dent said there a public comment regarding this policy 15.1.0. And I think it has to do with the information on page nine of the packet; the first paragraph and how Trustees and members at-larger are appointed. I want to check with legal counsel to confirm that's how the language is stated in here when we're referring to Trustees, we're assuming the Board of Trustees and not the two Trustees on the audit committee. District General Counsel Nelson confirmed and said I believe it's Policy 3.1 where there is a specific reference to the Audit Committee; that all

appointments to these committees are made by the full Board of Trustees. Trustee Schmitz said I noticed the comment too; I think it would be helpful in that very second sentence to say, 'by the Board of Trustees' and 'appointed by the Board of Trustees,' because we just don't want any misconstrued assumptions there. And I think that would help. Trustee Tonking said it says it on page ten, first bullet point. It says at-large members shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees. Trustee Schmitz requested to add Board of Trustees to the other two places.

Trustee Schmitz said I commend Trustee Tonking for her efforts and support and putting all of this together because when you start having three and four people redlining a document, it can be a huge challenge. At the bottom of page nine, where it says 'at-large members shall be independent,' at the very ending of the that paragraph, it used to have a list of qualifications below it which is now moved over under page ten. I think that we should strike the ending that says, 'and the at-large members suggested qualifications,' just nix that because it's addressed on item ten. And the things that are beneath this, it isn't about qualifications. It's about other stuff. I think it just got missed. That was my only those are my two comments. And based on public comment and Trustee Dent's comment, I think we can just clean it up to make it very clear.

MOTION: Trustee Schmitz moved that the Board of Trustees approved policy 15.1.0 with the changes identified here this evening and in addition to make additions and corrections to the memorandum to have the accurate up-to-date information in the memorandum. Trustee Tonking seconded the motion which carried unanimously 4-0. Trustee Wong was not in attendance.

Trustee Callicrate thanked Trustees Tonking, Schmitz and Dent.

H.1. SUBJECT: BOARD PRACTICE FOR APPROVAL – BUDGETING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT, DISTRICT-WIDE PRICING FOR PRODUCTS AND SERVICES, PRACTICE 6.2.0

Recommendation for Action: Review, discuss and possibly take action to approve the new Board Practice.

Director of Finance Paul Navazio said last year, it was identified as either a need or an improvement to try to craft a pricing policy to guide the setting of prices and fees for district services across all venues. As noted in the background section, there is language currently in Policy 6.1 that basically references that the district will adopt the process in a manner in which fees and charges are set through the

budget process. And with the adoption of a formal practice to support policy 16.1, that's the objective here. We discussed kind of a framework for pricing policy last November; we brought the first draft of the pricing policy for discussion at the December 10 meeting and based on feedback that we received, we have revised the draft, which begins on page 18 of your board packet. I would note that right behind it, beginning on page 25 is kind of the redline version to show the changes that were incorporated into this draft from the version shared with the Board back in December. I would just note that in the board memo under the discussion section on page 17, I'll highlight these. We modified the memo for this item after the rescheduling of this meeting based on feedback that we were receiving on some specific aspects. We wanted to highlight that the two areas where staff continues to receive some feedback and at times some conflicting feedback which has to do with the definition section. It was also noted during a public comment on whether the pricing policy should define guests or residents or picture passholders because we use that terminology throughout. And whether that's defined in this policy or Ordinance 7 or some other policy document, our goal is just to ensure that there's clarity in the policy, so there's no ambiguity. Any feedback from the Board on that would be helpful. Also, there was comments about incorporating definitions or making sure the Board is comfortable with the definitions of full costs and operating costs that are in here. And finally, some comments regarding the administration of the policy. It's to clarify what fees the Board intends or wishes to formally approve on an annual basis. And there are some fees that staff believes were absolutely appropriate for the Board to review and approve but not necessarily all the fees. We want to make sure that the Board is comfortable with kind of how the administration is drafted so that it's clear what authority the District General Manager and venue managers have to set fees consistent with the policy versus what policy or what fees, particularly the picture passholder fees that would continue to come to the Board for approval. We just call that out in the memo. Based on feedback, we'll either modify again and bring it back, or see what the pleasure is of the Board.

District General Manager Winqest said there wasn't an expectation necessarily for the Board to approve this evening. What we are trying to do is gather feedback. We believe this is based on feedback from the Board. We are prepared to take feedback, do a quick turnaround, get the policy updated, and then have in front of you on February 9. Our staff is currently working on developing preliminary budgets and this policy helps dictate and guide what we are going to be doing with a lot of the pricing and our revenue projects. The pricing policy is important, and we're excited to be coming to some closure on this issue. We had several public comments about tennis and golf. I believe what we brought is what the Board has discussed. I know there is a lot of scrutiny and discussion and concern of the

overall performance of golf. Staff has been taking direction over the years as far as what cost recover is supposed to look like. We have a unique opportunity to set this in stone and staff is ready to comply. I know that our golf committee has made it clear that they are ready to roll up their sleeves with us once the pricing policy has been developed to help Darrin and me as we move forward with how we set fees. Over the years, tennis has been on the individual community benefit category on the pyramid. If the Board does not see tennis in that category, then there needs to be discussion and further direction because that is consistently how we budgeted for tennis overall. That is an area where we are looking for feedback this evening. Thank you, Director of Finance Navazio and Trustee Wong, for working on putting these together.

Trustee Schmitz said I read these policies very closely and I had very detailed feedback and the District General Manager and the Director of Finance asked me not to share my feedback with them but to cover it at a Board meeting. So if you're willing to allow me to walk through some things, I've got detailed notes of some suggested changes. And if you are willing to allow me to do that, I would like to just at least walk through it. I think it's more important that we all just have a dialogue because I want to make sure we are on the same page. Trustee Schmitz said on page 25, and the title of it, this is not District-wide Pricing. This is community services and beach pricing. I will go through this document and typically wherever it says 'District-wide,' I will request that that gets changed to Community Services and Beaches because it's not District-wide. It doesn't include Utilities. The objective, the first bullet point says 'the facility fee.' But some programs are funded by the general fund. In this objective, the very first bullet point, I'm not sure that we should reference the facility fees at all, because sometimes it's not. That was somewhat of a question. Ensure that revenues including charges for services, and applicable fees are sufficient to cover. Because sometimes it's not the facility fee, some of these things are coming from general? District General Manager Winquest said currently its minimal, but as we've been discussing, potentially moving forward, helping community programming or parks. I think we could see an increase in those.

Trustee Schmitz said on page 25, the fourth bullet point, I think instead of saying 'provide flexibility to management,' it should really say that this is establishing conditions. I think what we're really doing is establishing conditions for management to modify the pricing during the fiscal year. I recommend that we change that from providing flexibility to establishing conditions. Underneath definitions, my suggestion there was that we try to use terms that are in our budgets, so that we have ease of understanding. If there's subtotal titles, or maybe we create them. I think it would be helpful that these terms tie two lines of our

budget so that we clearly know what exactly we're talking about. I think we need to add definitions for 'qualifying group,' because that's used that term is used. I don't know what that means. I think we need to define that. And then we talk about cost centers and profit centers. And I think those things also should be identified so we understand what it is we're talking about. On page 26, the title '3.0,' uses the word 'district wide,' and my recommendation is it's 'community services and beach.' And then the first paragraph, there's a red line where it says 'parcels' and it crossed out dwelling units. It's both. So that needs to be corrected because we address it based on parcel and dwelling units. And then this the paragraph that's right after it, this second paragraph should just simply state pricing for 'picture passholders and others' is defined below. In reality for our pricing policy, we only have a 'picture passholders and others.' There's not enough to start using 'nonresident' and 'resident.' It's either your picture passholder, or you're not for pricing, with the exception of 'guests,' which is at golf only. I think that this paragraph could just be made so much simpler by just saying 'picture passholders and others' defined below, instead of using the words, 'customers' just say 'nonpicture passholders.' And then when you get over into 3.3, just say 'picture passholders,' because that's the discerning factor in our pricing. You're a picture pass card holder, or you're not. District General Manager Winquest said I recommend putting the word 'IVGID' in front of picture passholder because people are equally as confused by the term passholder as well. Then on 3.1. This is non picture passholders instead of customers because our pricing has already said that with the exception already. Then 3.1.3., remove 'customer,' as it applies to daily rates charged for programs and services. You don't need the word 'customers.' Management is authorized to use dynamic pricing. We just don't need that there. I'm trying to remove terms that cause us to get confused. Because this is underneath the heading of non-picture pass card holders, it just says 'as it applies to daily rates charged for programs and services, management is authorized to dine dynamic pricing.' So you don't even need that. My question for all of us; because only the only place 'guests' are used for our pricing is golf, should guests be underneath golf? I just wanted to bring it up that the only place we have a guest rate is golf. District General Manager Winquest said that is accurate. One of the things that we've been discussing internally is why golf has guest rates. I'm a little concerned about only putting in golf if we decided to create guest rates at other venues. I think for consistency, the District should probably look at that. If you're present with your guests at tennis, you have a different rate than a public member who just walked up. Consistency is going to be important moving forward. We can leave it the same and have golf be the only place that has the word 'guest,' but I'm hesitant to only put it in there. Trustee Schmitz said that makes sense, and I have no issue. The only thing is that we have a mistake in here. Because guests rate

only applies when accompanied by a picture passholder or provide punch card. That is inaccurate. So that actually needs to be corrected.

Board Chairman Callicrate asked how she would feel about getting together with the general manager and director of finance and sharing the concerns and going through the document, and then we bring this back on the 9th. That way, you're able to make abundantly clear the areas of your concern, which are all of our concerns. You've taken a lot of time to do this; I want to make sure that your information is accurately shown in the document so when it comes back to the Board, we can see the finished document. I'm having a tough time keeping up and doing some editing. I want to make certain all of these changes get worked into the document, and then it can come back to the Board. Then we can have a brief discussion if there are any necessary last-minute changes and then adopt the policy.

Trustee Schmitz said I have no problem doing that chair; I had offered to do that. I'm not trying to alter any of the meaning grossly. But what I'm trying to do is button it up, tighten it up. And I think that sometimes perhaps, the general manager gets pressure from other trustees that I'm taking too active of a role and that these things need to be discussed by the Board. And I'm more than happy to help. But understand that I don't want to be perceived as a trustee trying to push things. Board Chairman Callicrate said that's a valid point and a fine line. We don't want to come across as trying to individually direct our general manager or his staff because that isn't our role. But I think that taking an opportunity, like you have, as long as it doesn't substantively change what has been worked on to this point. It's just buttoning it up. I don't have an issue with that.

Board Chairman Callicrate stated for the record that Trustee Wong joined the meeting 10-12 minutes ago.

Trustee Tonking said, what if Trustee Schmitz did what Trustee Wong did with Policy 15.1 and added your red lines and any comments on what you were thinking, and then it can just be put in there. And then we can discuss the big arching issues if there's anything wrong, but it's a little bit hard to follow.

Trustee Wong said I like Trustee Tonking's suggestion. I am fine giving District General Manager Winquest and Director of Finance Navazio the authority to make changes, especially editing changes that don't substantively change the policy. And then anything that they think would substantively change the policy would be discussion points at our next meeting.

District General Manager Winquest said I had discussed some of this with Trustee Schmitz, and I agree with her, and I had already gone in and made some edits to it. I didn't haven't had the opportunity to go through everything with her. My response as far as discussing it with the Board was exactly what Trustee Wong just mentioned and what Trustee Schmitz brought up. There's no issue with the grammatical, simplifying the language. If there's anything substantive in the policy, I believe that the collective Board should discuss those together to provide direction to staff. We have no problem doing exactly what Trustee Tonking has requested. The challenge that we're going to have is that these packets going out Saturday. If we want to get it on the agenda, there needs to be some work done tomorrow, which we're happy to try to do. Worst case scenario, if we need a little more time, we get it back on the agenda for February 23. It all just depends on where the Board lands tonight with some of the more substantive type items are in the policy, more mostly related to cost recovery at each one of the venues because that's some of the direction that we need sooner rather than later so we can start inputting all our revenue numbers and putting together pricing recommendation for the Board.

Board Chairman Callicrate said if you need the additional time; ideally, we get it done by the next meeting. But if it doesn't, it makes it on the following agenda with all the necessary edits and no substantive changes. And if there are any, then we discuss them when we move forward.

District General Manager Winquest said it's important for us this evening that the Board discusses the cost recovery portion of the policy provides feedback.

Director of Finance Navazio said we're fine cleaning it up a little bit. It's good that it's an iterative process because we're getting different feedback now that you're seeing it in writing then the last time you saw it. So I think taking the time to get it right is helpful. Indra mentioned the turnaround time, I thought the packet was going out like tomorrow morning. So if we have more time tomorrow, we'll work through that. And I just concur with Indra that if we're looking for clarification, buttoning it up, adding clarity, then absolutely we can work on that. When we get into some of the substantive stuff, it becomes a little more challenging, and we'll bring those back. On another note, I'm probably one of the newest members of the district and trying to assist with this policy. But on this issue of guests, if you would on 3.2. I mentioned this briefly to Trustee Schmitz earlier today, I think it's true that golf is the only venue with a guest rate right now. District General Manager Winquest noted that some of our internal discussions are whether to standardize pricing and potentially add guest rates. The language in 3.2.2, just to be clear, was drafted with the idea that actually, at the beach, it's restricted access for picture

passholders and guests, but there a 'guest' can show up with a punch card and get into the beach. So maybe the beach is a different animal altogether related to definitions. I was trying to be consistent across all of the venues. You're either with your picture passholder or have a punch card, it was just in reference to if you're at a golf course. And if you're with a picture Passholder and you're going to the beach, you don't need to be a picture passholder to gain access and pay the guest rate. I just wanted to clarify was that the thinking behind the wording in that section.

Trustee Schmitz said that was part of why I thought guests should be moved to golf because, you know, does someone read this and then interpret something for the beaches, but I think we should make sure that we don't undo something for the golf course. And that is that a guest is someone who is accompanied by a picture past cardholder. Anything related to the beaches, which is over on page 30, we should be careful not to make specific references about how the beaches work because of Ordinance 7; I think we might be wise to just basically identify to Ordinance 7 it relates to the beaches.

Board Chairman Callicrate said I agree with everything Ordinance 7 has. We have to have consistency among and between our policies so that we're not going afield. I think our Director of Finance and our District General Manager and you can hammer this out, and I appreciate you agreeing to do that apart from this meeting because we have a lot yet to dive into. Thank you, Trustee Schmitz, for putting in the time and energy you do and finding all of these things. And I think that when this policy comes back to the Board for the final review, it's going to be absolutely lockstep. Perfect. So appreciate your hard work on this.

Trustee Schmitz said I have a couple of more substantive things that I'd like to at least bring up. I believe that there are couples' memberships at the rec center that I don't think we have anywhere else. I think we should look at what type of pricing we have across all of our venues and make sure that we have consistency. And if we have to remove couples' membership, we have to evaluate the impacts. The other thing is, with the discounts underneath 3.4, on pages 27 and 28. I don't have an issue with any of these things, but I think it would be good if we added something that is 3.4.4 that basically says the Board will be provided a quarterly report on things related to the discounts; so that we're at least we're informed we know what's going on. And if we have questions, concerns, or issues related to the policy, we will at least be bringing those things to our attention on a quarterly basis. So that would be a recommendation I would have for an addition.

Board Chairman Callicrate said I think that you have the opportunity to work with our District General Manager and Director of Finance to absolutely bring those

forward. Those are not earth-shaking. But they are valid concerns. And I appreciate you bringing that forward.

District General Manager Winqest said I just wanted to comment on that; we do have a couple of memberships at the golf courses, tennis, and the recreation center. So I just want to clarify that. And I do understand the point. And then I wanted to go back to Section 4.5 of the beaches. None of the recommendations from the committee will impact any of these. But I believe that as we start defining some of these terms, I think Ordinance 7 should be the driver to many of these terms. And that's why the Director of Finance mentioned that one of the big things is bringing these definitions in. Depending on the timing of when we update Ordinance 7 formally and revise it, we may have to bring this policy back for some minor cleanup based on some of that. I don't think we should be overly concerned about approving a policy at the next meeting or the following meeting. Knowing that we may have to bring the policy back for some minor modifications.

Board Chairman Callicrate said that's where you as a District General Manager and your team will bring back at the appropriate time what you feel is important to address at that time.

H.2. SUBJECT: FY2022/2023 BUDGET WORKSHOP #2 – REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE FOLLOWING:

- **Baseline FY2022/23 Budget Assumptions**
- **District-wide Issues and Budget Considerations**
- **Fund/Venue Specific Issues and Budget Considerations**
- **Baseline Budget (Preliminary) Service-Levels/Outcomes**

Recommendation for Action: Review, discuss and provide direction to inform ongoing development of the District's FY2022/23 budget. (Requesting Staff Members - District General Manager Indra Winqest and Director of Finance Paul Navazio)

Director of Finance Navazio provided a PowerPoint presentation. In response to Trustee Wong's request, Director of Finance Navazio spoke about the baseline budget and adjustments based on COVID. The budget, actually, in 2021, I would say, had much more of a COVID. Sort of adjustment to it. Because we were really looking at, you know, very clear need for, you know, restricted access, unsure about, you know, what that was going to look like. And so we went through these different scenarios, and with the Board's help, landed on some real, you know, curtailment of services. I think, with respect to the current year budget, the fiscal

year 2122. There's a little bit less of that with what I think has happened. And Indra, you can chime in if need be. I think what's happened is that we have our budget is still was fairly robust. But you know, the actuals will be below budget, because vacant positions, for instance, have maintained make vacant if we didn't need to hire them. A lot of the venue and services are driven by seasonal, temporary and part-time. So I think in this year's budget, the impact of COVID is more in the kind of actuals than in the budget. To answer your question more directly, all of the permanent full-time positions are have been built into this baseline, whether they're filled or vacant. The temporary staffing hours we have built-in essentially an assumption that we're going to have, you know, at least a return to new normal. So there's not a lot of COVID sort of cutbacks built into this. Some venues are expecting pent-up demand, like weddings and things like that, to come in. So not only is that a really good question, but in some of the documentation that we provided in the backup, the baseline budget will show some significant increases from last year's actuals. And that's because of the COVID factor, but less so comparing budget to budget.

Trustee Schmitz said I think it is going to be hard to swallow a 20% water rate increase, so that might not be a valid assumption. I'll be interested to know what would be driving our water rates up by 20% in the world. I understand the sewer side because of the effluent pipeline and the pond, but what in the world is driving water? And I don't think that it's wise for us to go in with an increase for charges of services that's below the inflation rate and below the percentage that we have to increase wages to keep up with the cost of living and retention the rest of it. I think that those things might need to be tweaked as assumptions. And I think that it's very premature to be talking about facility fees because we haven't yet understood what projects are being carried over from next year that potentially impacts our ability to take on capital projects this year. And we have ski way in as a capital project in this fiscal year, which we've never the Board hasn't approved that to spend down fund balance for that, and not in this fiscal year. Until we clearly understand where we are with our current fiscal year's projects and how many of them will get pushed into next year for a variety of reasons, that has to be understood before we start even talking about what additional projects we could include. That has a significant impact on the facility fee. I think we need just to park the thought until we understand where we are going with a facility fee.

Director of Finance Navazio said I think the Staff would agree. I would say that, for that reason, we've, we're just keeping it at its current rate until we go through that and whether that's sufficient or can be adjusted. When we get into the discussion, it'd be our recommendation, like we have done in the last couple of years, that we're not just looking at one year when we're looking at the facility fee, but what

would be the appropriate facility fee to fund the needs, particularly when we look at the capital plan. We're doing multi-year planning for a reason. But yes, all we're saying is we didn't zero out the facility fee, we didn't increase it, we're just leaving it as is until we get further in the process. Your point is well taken, Trustee Schmitz.

Trustee Schmitz asked for clarification regarding the food and beverage PowerPoint slide. She said was there something you were trying to inform us about relative to food and beverage? Director of Finance Navazio said this is a staffing summary that has been used for the last several years in the budget. We included this in the adopted budget. There have been times when marketing and food and beverage were listed separately from these items with the past boards. The point of this slide is that the 2.8 marketing staff and the 33.2 food and beverage positions are included in this list of 268. But at times, we've been asked to show food and beverage and marketing separate. We're just pulling it out to highlight it. It is not in addition to. Because for instance, the food and beverage staff are included in the two golf numbers related to champion and mountain and clearly in the facilities. A number of the food and beverage positions are there. We also have food-beverage folks budgeted in the ski and beach funds.

Trustee Schmitz said the number here for facilities is 11.8. When you and I were looking at the metrics section pages, facilities were only listed as 1.4 FTE, so what's going on with 11.8 versus 1.4? Director of Finance Navazio said we would touch on this during the facilities. Because 1.4 is permanent year-round staff. And that there's 10.5 FTE in temporary hourly folks that are in the budget to support the events at facilities.

Trustee Schmitz said I just want to bring clarity to the subject. On page 74, for facilities, it has FTE as only 1.4. It might only be for the banquets and things, so I guess the food and beverage is the differential to 11.8. Director of Finance Navazio said the slide you're referring to the facilities should say 11.8 because in golf and beach, we're including the seasonal, part-time food and beverage on those slides. Trustee Schmitz said you and I talked about it on page 74 for services provided; it doesn't even reference food and beverage. It seems like there's a little bit of confusion about facilities. Director of Finance Navazio said I would agree, so we will need to clean that up because there is almost \$800,000 of salaries and wages in the facilities fund. That's a lot more than the 1.4 positions. It's supporting the 11.8. So, 10.3 of those is hourly folks for the events. District General Manager Winquest said we'd look at this, but I think it's also because I believe that both Staff members time is allocated to other cost centers, but I'm not 100%; we will take a look at this before bringing back the next round on this one.

Trustee Wong said I'm just on a couple of points you asked for feedback on. I would probably start at 6% in the baseline budget on the cola and rates because we know the Social Security cost of living adjustment was 6% for 2022. And all economic indicators indicate that this is a trend that's probably going to continue for at least the next 6 or 7 months, especially with the Fed contemplating increasing interest rates. And then, on your other point related to the reserve policy, I think if your team creates a plan to get to the required reserves necessary over two or three years, I think that's appropriate. And I think that kind of dovetails with your comment about planning the recreation fee, not just looking at a year in a silo, but looking at a plan going forward and our longer-term capital projects.

Trustee Schmitz said on your bullet point under budget flexibility, you talk about considering contingency funds for major projects. I'm not sure what you mean by that because we have our new reserve policy, and to me, that was the purpose of having a reserve policy. So are you proposing that we establish some contingency fund in addition to that? And if so, how and what are we going to be using for a target? Director of Finance Navazio this is something that isn't necessarily recommended, but we're looking at and would like feedback on. The current budget included a contingency in the general fund as noted here. I think \$100,000 with the District General Manager's contingency. This is also for things that will come up during the fiscal year that weren't necessarily contemplated or budgeted. And, of course, the option always is to come back to the Board for a budget augmentation action. It is not uncommon, particularly in your utility fund with \$13 million, to have kind of a similar contingency. It's slightly different from the reserve because this would be appropriate. It would be in the budget. It provides some flexibility before having to go back and necessarily amend the budget. And we may be doing more of that. Particularly with community services and beach, now that we've moved into enterprise funds, it's easier to come to the Board to do budget augmentations when needed than when we were under governmental special revenue funds. When we look at the overall budget, particularly non personnel, if we're comfortable that we've built in some conservative assumptions about inflations and costs increases, less of a need for contingency, but if we have to tighten the budget and reduce every line item, then we may want to add a contingency so that there isn't like a cushion in every line item, necessarily, but that there's some ability to address unforeseen needs or on expected increased costs within the approved budget.

Trustee Tonking said I was just going speak a little bit towards that capital reserve policy target. And I think what I've seen, at least with at the school district level, and a lot of states I've worked in is trying to get it across in like a three to five years knowing that depending how big of an increase it is starting to like level off that to

get it. I think that makes the most sense. It's something that we should do as a policy target. Director of Finance Navazio said I'll just add a comment there. And this is just kind of anecdotal. But in some reserve policies that I've actually adopted in other jurisdictions, there is language in the policy that says if there's any time we dip below the target, the plan and goal is to restore it in the next cycle. But that's if you're, for instance, within 5%. If something happens and you are 10% or 15% below the target, that's when you might want to phase it in over more than one year. We're starting below a 5% or 10% delta, particularly in the utility fund. I would agree with your comment. It's built into the policy that if we go below it, we will restore it unless it's a significant amount, and we're kind of starting there with a couple of these funds. Trustee Tonking said that makes a lot of sense and agreed.

Trustee Dent said I would agree with an approach like that. I like the idea that there is a certain threshold. Perhaps it does take longer than a year. He said I have a couple of questions about potential bonding and construction costs going through the roof, especially when it comes to the price of oil and just lead times on materials. The example of our Ski Way project could be more like a six or seven dollars million projects right now with how high the cost of oil has gone up just in the last year. So, from a bonding standpoint, and given an election year, and hypothetically speaking if this Board were to pass a large bond much higher than a \$10 million threshold mark. If we wanted to go out to the voters for approval of that, what is that process like and how soon would we have to get started? And I don't expect you to answer today, but I think it's something that we should think about giving we do have several large projects coming down the pipeline and something that we need to probably start moving on now.

Director of Finance Navazio said we would need to get together with Staff and others based on when we would need them. When we have a project on the drawing board, and even if it's fairly well defined and scoped, we will have cost estimates, and if we're going out for a bond, there's always a risk that the bidding climate or other costs go up. One of the things that I would be recommending, almost in any event, is it's not uncommon that, particularly for, say, a pipeline project over multiple years that if we proceed with a significant component of that being bonded, we would be structuring it as a series of bonds so that you have authority to go up to X-million, but you don't issue them right out the gate. You issue what you need but have a little bit of headroom. You're not committing to the actual amount of bonds when you're authorizing it; you're issuing bonds based on what you need to fund the project. And if you don't need to issue the bonds you don't, but you certainly don't want to be short at the end of the day. Trustee Dent asked if Staff would report back to us on that process and give us an update in

maybe future meetings this month? Or how long will it take? Director of Finance Navazio said I think we can turn something around quickly. And the timing is good; my sense is that the first decision point for the Board on bonding is likely to be for our utility projects. So, we have the utility rate study and the plan next week. And we'll look at what the funding plan might look like. And based on feedback from the Board at that meeting, we would want to come back with the timeline on at least the utility bond, but we can incorporate potentially beaches or community services. But I think the utilities will be the driver at next week's discussion will inform timing and size. So, in March or early April, we can bring it back as one of the workshops.

Trustee Dent said we would get into the utility project, effluent pipeline, and utilities' pricing at the next meeting, but I brought it up in the past; I think it's time to stop collecting on the \$2 million on the project. And I think that allows us to get creative with potentially catching up our reserves given there is a significant amount of money we're collecting off of every utility bill every month, going towards one specific project. So potentially there's a way to restructure that where maybe over a one- or two-year span depending on how that all comes out, we can adjust those pots the money's coming in from. And then capital projects, it seems like every year we do you have several capital projects that rollover, carryovers and some years, it's a million and a half dollars, some new year's, it's a million. It always seems like a million dollars that we're carrying over or more. And I just want to know how we get more accurate with that number from the standpoint of not necessarily needing to budget for something if we're not going to be doing it because there is a significant amount of money that we plan to spend don't use. If we could figure out a way to simplify that process and get a little more accurate about what we can actually attain in our short construction season. It seems like we could eliminate almost a million dollars off our budget every year because we're not going to spend it. Director of Finance Navazio said I think others have raised that same point. We're looking internally. It's great to put all the needs and fund them, but our capacity to deliver a sizable capital plan is challenged. And then you mentioned with our construction season, there are times when bringing something back two or three times before we're ready pushes us into a new construction season. We can all work together on number one, focusing on the higher priority projects and making sure that those stay on track, and then be mindful of our capacity and bandwidth to deliver some of the projects. Some of the stuff is on a case-by-case basis, but we can look at that. This is a good discussion to carry into the February 23 discussion when looking at a 22-23 capital plan. By the way, when we present that information to you on the 23rd, you will also have the second quarter CIP popular status report, and we're also hoping to give you a preview of where we might be, come June 30. We'll have some numbers to put to that.

District General Manager Winqest said that over the years, there have just been too many projects, and I understand why it happens. I understand by case basis, but I have talked to our engineering team about that, given some direction there, and made it clear that we need to factor in bandwidth as we're building our five-year plan. We have a lot on the horizon as far as priority projects. I've given direction to the Engineering Manager and the team. There are projects that you don't think you have the bandwidth to tackle. It doesn't mean that it won't necessarily be in the plan. Or we may need to go the CMAR route and go a different direction to get outside help if we want to continue accelerating some of these. It's a great point and something that we are currently discussing and have room for improvement.

The Board took a 15-minute recess and reconvened the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

District General Manager Winqest and Director of Finance Navazio continued the Powerpoint presentation.

Trustee Schmitz said a quick point of clarification. Will the past investment earnings be reallocated into the community services deposited funds? Is that going to shift because that would be moving from the general fund into community services that would help the restricted fund balance? And then I want to know, if you can explain, is the reason why services and supplies are the reason for the large growth because we are now putting capital maintenance in under services and supplies? is that's what's driving that number to be up substantially? Director of Finance said, let me answer your second question. It's both a combination of building in inflation and, yes, the expense items from the capital. So the answer is yes. Your first question, as we've discussed this year with the audit committee, is that we're allocating interest earnings based on the pool cash concept instead of what fund is invested in what security. And that's what we're planning to do going forward. Based on a different methodology, we are currently not planning on going back two- three- four years to figure out the interest earned reallocated. We've discussed changing the methodology, we've changed it for this fiscal year, and we will be going on a going forward basis. I can work with our Controller, to bring back to you what the impact would be to see how significant basically going to the general fund. The Board could decide to allocate general fund balances to other funds to help them out, regardless of the reason. Still, we've made the change this year, and we're continuing going forward.

Human Resources Director Erin Feore provided an update regarding labor challenges and strategies.

Trustee Schmitz said one thing that I still would like us to consider as a Board and as a District is the shifting of venues programs available to the public, not with any sort of restricted access. Parks come to mind that they be funded by the General Fund instead of the Recreation Fee. I still think that is a direction that we should at least try to consider moving. District General Manager Winqest said that regarding the community program, I'd remind you that 85-90% of the participants in our community programs are IVGID passholders. So, community members primarily use them, and 85% of our Recreation Center members are also IVGID pass holders. I think Parks are where we see the most use from the public. That'll be discussed.

Director of Information Technology Michael Gove provided an update regarding Information Technology budget priorities.

Trustee Wong said I don't know to what extent this is possible, and I know it's definitely not possible in this upcoming year or even probably in the next year. But can we dream big and come up with one card that would get you access to everything? That would be your Diamond Peak Season Pass, beach access, and give you your discount, and that would be your picture pass? Director of Information Technology Gove said we absolutely can. That's our goal. That's what I'm trying to do with the software consolidations. Unfortunately, it's kind of a step-by-step process. We've made leaps and bounds and getting the current software's which, I believe with smaller expanded functionality, can get us that ability to have one identification, whatever it may be, if it's an RFID; if it's an app. I want Trustee Wong to be Trustee Wong at the beaches and in the same exact database that's up at the ski resort. But it's also a huge plus for everybody else for us in tech; it makes the support scope that we have so much simpler. We are there; we're going there. And that's a big part of why I say we need direction from you guys; we'd like to start at the ski resort and bring an RFID there that starts the process that gets the systems in place, then we move on to the beaches, then we start talking the Rec Center. We were already in a conversation about golf. We keep chiseling away one step at a time to get through these systems. And each one of them has its own challenges and their own custom things that need to be overcome to get through those challenges. Trustee Wong said we have diverse venues. I love that you are on Board and figuring out how to weave all of that together and make them all talk to each other. In terms of the Zoom meeting, I feel like whatever we can invest in making these zoom meetings more functional with a one on the fact that we are going to be back in person down the road. And we eventually want the ability to do hybrid meetings because we've always had Trustees that travel. We've always had Trustees that need to call in. I would view a permanent virtual meeting

as temporary because eventually, we want to get back in person, so I would look for a solution that would give us the best hybrid solution possible. Director of Finance Gove said that the complexity and cost will ultimately come from those hybrid meetings.

Trustee Schmitz said regarding RFID, we have to get there, we should be there already. We're behind. Let's do it. I feel we start with replacing our picture pass cards with RFID cards that can be turned on and turned off for different venues linked to a credit card. But ultimately, it would be a replacement of our picture pass card with new technology. We need to do it. It'll help Diamond Peak from a staffing perspective to have that technology. As it relates to the Livestream, I personally would rather meet in person. I think it's really wonderful to have the public engaged through the Zoom process. Whatever is needed, we just need to try to embrace it and make sure that we're doing what's right for the community as a whole.

Trustee Tonking said I would echo Trustee Wong and Schmidt's points on the RFID. For the meetings, I think getting the hybrid model that Trustee Wong was speaking of is vital. I know a lot of organizations that do it now, and it's just a great asset that can be used in the long run. And I know it's a very expensive cost, to begin with, but I think it's something that we can utilize, hopefully for a while.

Trustee Dent said I love the idea of RFID; throw it out to Diamond Peak, and then restrict our access that our beaches more than a few months a year that we currently do that. Regarding upgrading our technology, I think our zoom technology is much improved from having to call in. It's a disaster anytime anyone asked to call in. As far as these ongoing kinds of hybrid meetings, I don't think those are going to go away. It allows us another way to all get-together and have a meeting. If there are opportunities that we should be investing in, by all means, please bring those forward, but also know that we are hopefully we're not on Zoom forever. It's nice to have the opportunity.

Board Chairman Callicrate said I concur with my colleagues. Director of Finance Gove and I have spoken at length about this. And we are so far afield from where we should be. I know that you and your team and the district are working diligently, and I'm looking forward to 24/7, 365 in the beaches RFID access, including credit card, as Trustee Schmitz mentioned. He said he hopes this will give you direction.

Director of Public Works Brad Underwood provided key considerations for the Public Works budget.

Trustee Schmitz said I'm assuming the \$2 million has that been removed from your baseline budget for the effluent pipeline? It is not in your line item for charges and services? Director of Public Works Underwood said that's correct. That's not within the rate study as well. District General Manager Winqwest said we would be discussing that more when we talk about the rate study and the budget process. Director of Finance Navazio said to add one thing to Director of Public Works Underwood's and Trustee Schmitz's comment, not only are looking to adjust the utility charges in line items for the \$2 million but the capital plan to show the actual expenditure for the pipeline and pond lining project. Not just a \$2 million a year funding stream, but actually what the funding commitments will need to be. We are at the point where we need to come up with the financing plan for that project.

Director of Golf/Community Services Darren Howard provided budget considerations and priorities.

Trustee Wong said I just want to elaborate on that last point that Director of Golf/Community Services made because this is a recommendation coming straight out of the golf committee. The impetus of the conversation is that if you're we're looking at a standalone golf course that wasn't run by IVGID that any food and beverage generated would essentially contribute to the operations of the golf course. We all know people have gotten married at golf courses. There is some component of weddings that would be good to move into the overall operation of the golf course. For the weddings, specifically at golf, not necessarily Aspen Grove weddings or other areas of our properties. But in theory, you're able to charge more for those events and that should provide more of a discount to our residents in terms of their golf. The recommendation coming from the golf committee, while we recognize that going full bore and getting all of the facilities activities that relate to the golf course included in the golf budget may be a bit extreme. I've been on the Board for seven years now, I think we've changed how we've evaluated food and beverage, how we've allocated, and where we've grouped food and beverage, four times and that's just in the time that I've been on the Board. If you want to know why there's an inconsistency there, it's because the Board has changed its mind several times. Coming out with a golf committee, the recommendation is to include the food and beverage activities related to golf functions, especially those coming from the golf clubs. Director of Golf/Community Services Howard said I don't think many people will realize that the golf staff is a big component of all of our weddings, especially our outside staff and our starters and rangers. They have to block off golfers as they make the turn, as they finish. There is a big part of the golf staff that's actually helping with the weddings.

Trustee Schmitz said I just wanted to ask that when we have metrics in the future, can we have more metrics? We don't have any comparison of the revenue per round, so we can't see how we are doing compared to the past, and just even profit and loss information on the golf shop on the other services offered. I think it would be helpful to have a dashboard of the performance of all of the services related to each of the venues.

Trustee Dent said I'm going back to the golf staff used for weddings. Is there a way for the District to charge that time to that wedding? To capture those costs? Is there a way to put some of that time into that? If our golfing staff is spending time where those costs should actually be accumulated underneath the cost for that wedding, it seems like we should be able to capture that and interact with that a little bit differently. Director of Golf/Community Services Howard said that's a great point. We are looking across the Board in our facilities department to see how everything's getting charged out within all of our staffing levels and expenses.

District General Manager Winqest said, addressing Trustee Dent's point; we can allocate Staff in many different ways. However, I think what Director of Golf/Community Services Howard's getting at is there's a fair amount of revenue and business that occurs in food and beverage at the golf course due to the golf course existing on that property. I think the District needs to stop toggling back and forth on budgeting for food and beverage. Trustee Wong is 100% correct. The reason why it's so confusing is that there's just been this lack of ability to just decide and stick with how we budget for food and beverage revenues. I understand that people in the past have thought that we're trying to hide the bottom line in golf; it's just not the case. Like, just, for instance, our golf clubs spend a tremendous amount of money at the golf course. But the golf course, the golf club, is not receiving that revenue. And of course, all the expenses related to that would also be there. So that's what we need to discuss as we move forward. That will simplify things; if the District decides they don't want to put it in the golf fund, I would not recommend that. I think we have an opportunity to create a really solid hybrid where the food and beverage are occurring. So I would really urge that is a big-ticket item that we need to get right. We will continue to have that conversation as we move forward.

Trustee Wong said I know we've changed at least four times since I've been on the Board. Can you just pull together all the different ways we've classified food and beverage? If it was summer, it all went to golf at one point in time. If it was winter, it all went to Diamond Peak. But then the events that Aspen Grove was going towards golf. And so, I think that was the impetus for the first change. But can you kind of put together a list of all the different variations we've gone through

and then can you brainstorm with the Senior Staff what makes what will make sense for you guys and make sense for you guys to track. District General Manager Winquest said absolutely, we're already working on this and I think we'll be happy to bring what our professional recommendation would be as far as how we budget.

Trustee Schmitz said I don't quite understand the last bullet continued care and maintenance to existing infrastructure. I just don't understand it related to food and beverage. District General Manager Winquest said I think it's related to facilities overall. And I think that's just a reference to where we've got some serious issues with the Chateau that we need to identify based on a lot of the value engineering that occurred for that building. We're just emphasizing that there are some infrastructure issues, and we're going to be looking into this. That's why I said we're going to be budgeting for entire buildings and conditions and needs assessment for probably not only the Chateau but some of the other venues. Director of Golf/Community Services Howard said if you remember the past summer, the issues with the kitchen? Trustee Schmitz said I get confused about what's in facilities and in buildings and the food and beverage. I'm confused as to why that wouldn't be in buildings. Director of Golf/Community Services Howard said it's just the overall care and maintenance of the Chateau. Some of those expenses are shared. Director of Finance Navazio said I would also add that the maintenance division is an internal service even though we have a building. The work they do is charged back to the venues. So ultimately, it's the venues and programs in the facilities that are bearing the costs and need to address the cost recovery piece.

General Manager Diamond Peak Ski Resort Mike Bandelin highlighted priorities and considerations for the Diamond Peak Ski Resort budget.

Trustee Schmitz said that as it relates to your capital improvement budget, I know that you have the shuttle buses to be replaced on the five-year plan. I think it would be helpful if we had some ridership data to understand the use of those shuttle buses. Gas is expensive; employees are expensive. I think that would be helpful information. I feel that expending money to upgrade that Lake View chairlift and make some improvements at Snowflake Lodge once we have the lease dialed in with the US Forest Service, those things have more value for the customers than repaving the parking area. General Manager Diamond Peak Ski Resort Bandelin said we could talk a lot about capital or priorities and hope to get a lot of feedback as we did a little bit tonight from the Board when we come back on the 23rd because there are probably going to be some adjustments. Because we cannot hire CDL drivers, our particular shuttle units require a passenger endorsement, air brake endorsement, and commercial driver's license; we would entertain the thought of moving to a 14 passenger van-like system versus having a CDL driver. So those

will be all good comments and suggestions that we can talk about at the capital meeting on the 23rd. Trustee Schmitz said my last question, your last bullet point on the page, which said community events. When we talked earlier today about our pricing policy, did our pricing policy adequately cover and give you parameters for these community events? General Manager Diamond Peak Ski Resort Bandelin said I believe so. When we talk about community events, there's not much pricing associated with it. There are not that many. A community event would be like our community or Passholder barbecues that we do at the beginning and end of the season or Ullr fest or dummy downhill. There's not really any pricing associated with it. Our community events don't really pertain to a fee of admission.

Board Chairman Callicrate said it's tough for all the venues, especially you guys with the season as it is, and trying to retain and recruit employees because it's so expensive to live up there. I've talked with some folks up at Diamond Peak who are doing a great job. And please share with your employees that were pretty happy and pretty proud of what you're able to provide up there despite the challenges with electricity, lifts, and facilities and still have an awesome product. So keep up the great work.

Superintendent of Parks & Recreation Shelia Leijon reviewed priorities and considerations.

Trustee Schmitz asked when the beaches are open to the general public, are the costs related to maintaining the beaches charged to parks? Or are they still charged to the beaches even when the restricted access is not enforced? Superintendent of Parks & Recreation Leijon said within the parks budget that some of the parks maintenance is charged directly to a beach parks budget. So it's in the 390 fund. It is charged to the beaches; they actually make a budget separately for beaches. But they divide out their time based on where they're providing the service. So yes, it is charged to the beaches.

Board Chairman Callicrate said thanks to the Director of Finance, the team, and all the venue managers. The last couple of years and this year's budget, the costs going up so much inflation, it's going to be a real challenge. I want to thank my colleagues for all their hard work and for diving in and doing homework outside of the Board meeting and tonight's meeting, the questions you raised, and the feedback you've given. That's critical so that the District General Manager and his team can move forward and address the issues we brought up tonight. Thank you on behalf of the Board for your hard work.

I. FINAL PUBLIC COMMENTS*

Yolanda Knaack said that it was a good meeting. I want to mention the District General Manager's comment about looking to Washoe County for some money. They currently only give us 35% of our taxes back. The other thing I thought was important was Trustee Dent's comment that we should survey to make sure all the residents are on board with getting the bond.

J. ADJOURNMENT (for possible action)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Misty Moga
Acting District Clerk

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 Aaron Katz – Written statement requested to be included in the written minutes of this February 3, 2022 regular IVGID Board meeting – Agenda Item H(2) – 2022-23 Budget Workshop #2 – Staff's admission the Recreation ("RFF") and Beach ("BFF") Facility Fees are invalid special taxes

Submitted by Aaron Katz – Written statement requested to be included in the written minutes of this February 3, 2022 regular IVGID Board meeting – Agenda Item C – Public Comment – It's nearly everything our wonderful Staff do – here, Staff's failure to provide notice to those who've requested Board meeting packets that those materials are available for pick-up

WRITTEN STATEMENT REQUESTED TO BE INCLUDED IN THE WRITTEN MINUTES OF THIS FEBRUARY 3, 2022 REGULAR IVGID BOARD MEETING – AGENDA ITEM H(2) – 2022-23 BUDGET WORKSHOP #2 – STAFF’S ADMISSION THE RECREATION (“RFF”) AND BEACH (“BFF”) FACILITY FEES ARE INVALID SPECIAL TAXES

Introduction: For some twelve (12) or more years I have been criticizing much of our senior staff as: lacking competence, being deceitful (i.e., concealing material facts from the Board and the public), being grossly over compensated and over benefited, and more than willing poster children for “the IVGID culture.”¹ And now we have another example. Staff’s admission the RFF/BFF are nothing more than invalid² special taxes. And this is the purpose of this written statement.

Here Staff Propose Budgeting For the *Given* of RFFs/BFFs the Same Way They Propose Budgeting For the *Given* of *Ad Valorem* Taxes: Staff admit that this “budget workshop has been prepared to review and discuss...revenue and expenditure *assumptions* being used (by staff) to develop the District’s FY2022/23...budget.”³ Staff’s revenue assumptions appear at page 41 of the 2/3/2022 Board packet⁴. Before they even consider budgeted expenditures, the reader will see where staff have assumed the given of *ad valorem* tax as well as facility fee revenues.

Staff’s expenditure assumptions appear at page 42 of the 2/3/2022 Board packet⁵. As the reader can see, those assumptions are based upon the given, in part, of RFF/BFF revenue. Therefore rather than adopting a RFF/BFF based upon its need to subsidize overspending, expenditures are budgeted based upon the availability of a given RFF/BFF.

Staff’s Proposed Expenditures Are Not Based Upon Evaluation of the District’s Responsible Needs But Rather, a Surcharge to FY2021/22 Budgeted Expenditures Disingenuously Labeled “Baseline:” Staff’s admitted “Goals for FY2022-23 Budget Process” start with its “develop(ment of) initial Baseline Budgets for all District Operations.”⁶ What exactly are “baseline budgets?” According

¹ A culture where un-elected staff care more about themselves, their colleagues and select “favored collaborators” than the public they were hired to serve.

² The only taxes a general improvement district (“GID”) is authorized to levy are *ad valorem* taxes (see NRS 318.225). In other words, a tax determined by applying a tax rate to assessed valuation (see <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/advaloremtax.asp>).

³ See page 32 of the packet of materials prepared by staff in anticipation of this February 3, 2022 Board meeting [“the 2/3/2022 Board packet” (https://www.yourtahoeplace.com/uploads/pdf-ivgid/Packet_-_02-03-22.pdf)].

⁴ This page is attached as a part of Exhibit “A” to this written statement.

⁵ This page is also attached as a part of Exhibit “A” to this written statement.

⁶ See page 38 of the 2/3/2022 Board packet.

to Wikipedia⁷, “baseline budgeting uses current spending levels as the ‘baseline’ for establishing future funding requirements and assumes future budgets will equal the current budget times” some estimated increase such as the “inflation rate.” Insofar as the District’s budgets are concerned, this means applying some percentage “growth” to current budgets. This means that “the Congressional Budget Office defines the baseline as a benchmark for measuring the budgetary effects of proposed changes in federal revenue or spending, with the assumption that current budgetary policies or current services are *continued without change*. The baseline includes automatic adjustments for inflation and anticipated increases in program participation. Baseline, or current services, budgeting, therefore builds automatic, future *spending increases* (and)...tilts the budget process in favor of increased spending and taxes.”⁸ This means that whatever the current wrongs, waste, RFF or BFF, they are guaranteed to be replicated.

Moreover, This Identical Type of Baseline Budget Was Presented by Staff Last February 24, 2021 For FY2021-22⁹: Which represents additional evidence that “baselining” off the current FY2021-22 budget would be wrong. https://www.yourtahoepace.com/uploads/pdf-ivgid/F.2.2_-_Budget_Workshop_Presentation_022421.pdf

Until Staff Come Forward With Each and Every Line Item Proposed Expenditure, the Board Needs to Reject Any Proposed Budget: I’ve asked for this type of transparency for years, and it has never been provided. Time and time again staff have made expenditures never expressly budgeted. And their answer always is such expenditures are permissible because they’re “related” to the purposes for which the fund to which they have been assigned was established. Well this isn’t a sufficient explanation because if staff can spend revenues for essentially any purpose, why the need for budgeted expenditures?

My E-Mail of February 3, 2022: On February 3, 2022 I e-mailed the Board to alert members to the fact that without compelling staff to produce an express line by line item summary of proposed expenditures, it is a waste to adopt any budget proposed by staff¹⁰. After all, if staff can spend the revenues budgeted by the Board, how does the Board know what it is budgeting? Or whether it is necessary or proper?

Conclusion: So there you go. Again! Incompetence, indifference, laziness and arrogance. The public deserves a zero based budget. That is, one “in which all expenses must be justified for each new period. The process of zero-based budgeting starts from a ‘zero base,’ and every function within an organization is analyzed for its needs and costs. The budgets are then built around what is needed for the upcoming period, regardless of whether each budget is higher or lower than the previous

⁷ Go to [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baseline_\(budgeting\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baseline_(budgeting)).

⁸ Go to <https://www.cagw.org/content/baseline-budgeting>.

⁹ Go to https://www.yourtahoepace.com/uploads/pdf-ivgid/F.2.2_-_Budget_Workshop_Presentation_022421.pdf.

¹⁰ That e-mail is attached as Exhibit “B” to this written statement.

one.”¹¹ But this is count <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/z/zbb.asp> er to staff’s interests. They prefer one which perpetuates the status quo. That is wasteful over spending involuntarily subsidized by local parcel/dwelling unit owners’ RFF/BFF.

If the reader listens to staff and detractors, the finger of blame is going to be pointed at me. But as the reader can see, in this instance (as well as most others), blame falls squarely upon staff. So let’s call a spade a spade. What do you intend to do about Board members? Given I predict nothing, now you the reader who maybe never see what I and others see have a clue as to what’s wrong here in river city. Which explains this written statement.

And You Wonder Why Your RFF/BFF Which Pay For This Incompetence and Waste Are as High as They Are? I’ve now provided more answers.

Respectfully, Aaron Katz (Your Community Watchdog), Because Only Now Are Others Beginning to Watch!

¹¹ Go to <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/z/zbb.asp>.

EXHIBIT "A"

Revenue Assumptions (FY22/23 Baseline)

	10 yr	5 yr	1 yr	FY2021/22	FY2022/23
Ad Valorem Taxes	4.9%	5.3%	4.6%	10.0 %	4.0%
Charges for Services	6.1%	11.7%	(4.0%)	3.0%	5.0%*
Utility Charges	4.2%	2.8	(1.8%)	8.0%	Water 20% Sewer 10% Solid Waste 5.3%
Facility Fees		Flat \$830 per parcel		\$780 per parcel	\$780 per parcel
Internal Services					5.0%
Fleet					5.0%
Engineering					<3.8%>
Bldg. Services					7

Expenditure Assumptions (FY22/23 Baseline)

Baseline Growth Assumptions		FY2021/22	FY2022/23
Full-Time Salaries and Wages	COLA	4.0%	5.0%
	Merit	3.0%	3.0%
Part-Time / Seasonal Hourly Pay Rates		\$10 – \$15	\$12 - \$18
Fringe Benefits			
	Medical	10%	6.0%
	Dental / Vision	10%	5.0%
Professional Services		Flat – unless multi-year with CPI adjustment	
Services and Supplies		Flat	5.0%
Insurance		5%	5.0%
Utilities			
	Water / Sewer	8%	18.0%
	Electricity / Gas / Communications	3%	5.0%
Central Services Cost Allocation		6.7%	4.9%

EXHIBIT "B"

Re: I Keep Telling You it's Essentially Everything Your Incompetent Staff Do - EVERYTHING! And Now it's Agenda Item H(2) for February 3, 2022's IVGID Board Meeting - the So Called Budget Workshop

From: <s4s@ix.netcom.com>
To: "Callicrate, Tim" <tim_callicrate2@ivgid.org>
Cc: "Dent, Matthew" <dent_trustee@ivgid.org>, "Wong, Kendra Trustee" <wong_trustee@ivgid.org>, "Schmitz, Sara" <schmitz_trustee@ivgid.org>, "Tonking, Michaela" <tonking_trustee@ivgid.org>, <ISW@ivgid.org>
Subject: Re: I Keep Telling You it's Essentially Everything Your Incompetent Staff Do - EVERYTHING! And Now it's Agenda Item H(2) for February 3, 2022's IVGID Board Meeting - the So Called Budget Workshop
Date: Feb 3, 2022 5:09 PM

Chairperson Callicrate and Other Honorable Members of the IVGID Board -

I keep telling you it's essentially everything your vaunted staff do. EVERYTHING! And here we go again; all at local parcel owners' expense (because staff don't give a damn about local property owners), and all for the direct benefit of staff and their special interest favored collaborators. A budget workshop that each of you know is absolutely worthless. And why? Because in the end staff spend the revenue we budget on anything they want whether/not expressly budgeted.

Let's review:

Indra REFUSES to provide a line item summary of proposed budgeted expenditures. Because he refuses the public has absolutely no idea what expenditures have been budgeted, whether they're necessary, whether they're accurately estimated, and whether we should be making them at all. Because of this refusal, throughout the year I and others question where an expenditure has been budgeted (such as for Board therapy with the Mathis Group), and the answer becomes we haven't budgeted. Or we have but we haven't budgeted enough.

Normally I and others would be pointing to NRS 354.626(1) and accusing staff of unlawful conduct: "No governing body or member thereof, officer, office, department or agency may, during any fiscal year, expend or contract to expend any money or incur any liability, or enter into any contract which by its terms involves the expenditure of money, in excess of the amounts appropriated for that function, other than" exceptions which are not relevant to this discussion. "Any officer or employee of a local government who willfully violates NRS 354.470 to 354.626, inclusive, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

But then staff will retort that even though a particular expenditure has not been expressly identified in the budget, it has been "appropriated." So the public has nothing to complain about!

What do you mean "appropriated for that function?" Take a look at NRS 354.482. There we learn that "Appropriation means an authorization by a governing body to make expenditures and to incur obligations for specified purposes." Now take a look at NRS 354.529. There we learn that "Function means a group of related activities aimed at accomplishing a major service or regulatory program for which a governmental unit is responsible."

Okay. What "major service(s)" does IVGID provide? Well general government, utilities, recreation and the beaches. So staff take the position that it doesn't matter what the expenditure actually is. If it is assigned to a fund which reports "related activities," and enough revenue has been budgeted to pay for it, voila it has been "appropriated."

Let's take that Mathis expenditure as an example. Even though it wasn't expressly budgeted, isn't it "related" to the

general governmental functions of the Board? Well of course it is! So as long as staff assigns this expenditure to the General Fund, it has been appropriated even though you and I think otherwise. And similar for every other expenditure staff incur.

Let's take the pond liner project staff told us had been completed several years ago for \$788K assigned to the utility fund. Even though we later learned this project hadn't even been started, and the money had been spent on other vital expenditures assigned to the Utility Fund (meals for our Public Works staff because they had had a tough week), the \$788K had been appropriated because public works meals on the pond liner is "related" to public works meals on everything else they do.

Are you starting to get the picture.

So as long as staff can concoct the argument that a particular expenditure is somehow "related" to recreation, and it is assigned to our Community Services Fund, voila it has been "appropriated" even though staff NEVER told the Board or the public the expenditure it was part of the budget for the Community Services Fund. And as long as staff can concoct the argument that a particular expenditure is somehow "related" to the beaches, and it is assigned to our Beach Fund, voila it has been "appropriated" even though staff NEVER told the Board or the public the expenditure was part of the budget for the Beach Fund.

So here's what staff is really telling the Board and the public insofar as the budget is concerned. As long as our expenditures are less than the revenues which have been budgeted for a particular fund, and staff can concoct an argument that they're somehow "related" to the purpose for that fund, they have been appropriated and they're proper! Which means the revenues budgeted for those funds can essentially be spent on ANYTHING whether or not staff have told the Board and the public what they intend to spend budgeted revenues on!

Well if staff can simply make up any expense they want to make up, whether or not expressly budget at this or any other "workshop," WHY EXACTLY ARE WE GOING THROUGH THIS WASTEFUL PROCESS. Simply budget for \$X.00 amount of revenues, and let staff send it on anything they want to spend it on. This is the mentality of some of the people in our community, like Bob Lyons, who think they know more that they really do. They openly admit that they DON'T care what staff spend the money on as long as the golf courses look pretty and staff don't spend more than the gross amount budgeted.

Or look at the lies staff have been advancing for the last five (5) or more years. They come up with a phony budget which makes it look like they're going to spend all of the revenue they've budgeted on "vital" projects which HAVEN'T been shared with the Board or the public. And just to make sure they have enough money to spend, they assess all local property owners a Rec Fee. Which is more than they intend to spend. Which by design leaves unspent money left over at the end of the year which rather than being returned to the local property owners who paid the money, goes into a slush fund for future unappropriated, unbudgeted, unidentified, unnecessary expenditures! This slush fund is called "fund balance." And just look at your fund balances. They have grown massively in the last five (5) years. How did this happen? Staff assessed a much larger Rec Fee than the recreation expenditures it actually made. And the same with the Beach Fee insofar as beach expenditures are concerned, and the same with both the Recreation and Beach Fees insofar as General Fund expenditures are concerned. And that's exactly what is happening here. And why?

Because staff have a hidden agenda to buy the Parasol building for new administrative offices even though it isn't on our 5 year CIP. And they have a hidden agenda construct an Incline Beach restaurant even though it isn't on our 5 year CIP! And they have a hidden agenda to construct a \$5M+ dog park even though it isn't on our year CIP!

So there you go. What an incredible waste of time and effort. Either just admit that staff have the authority to make up whatever expenditures they want to make and keep your mouth shut. Or refuse to allow staff to make any expenditure

which is not expressly disclosed here and now, short of returning to the Board and obtaining express approval therefore.

If you people don't know what you're actually budgeting to spend the money on, then how can you possibly adopt any budget? Either pass a RESPONSIBLE budget or in essence pass none at all. And you can accomplish the latter simply by rubber stamping everything staff present here and now. RUBER STAMP!

Respectfully, Aaron Katz

WRITTEN STATEMENT REQUESTED TO BE INCLUDED IN THE WRITTEN MINUTES OF THIS FEBRUARY 3, 2022 REGULAR IVGID BOARD MEETING – AGENDA ITEM C – PUBLIC COMMENT – IT’S NEARLY EVERYTHING OUR WONDERFUL STAFF DO – HERE, STAFF’S FAILURE TO PROVIDE NOTICE TO THOSE WHO’VE REQUESTED BOARD MEETING PACKETS THAT THOSE MATERIALS ARE AVAILABLE FOR PICK-UP

Introduction: For some twelve (12) or more years I have been criticizing much of our senior staff as lacking competence, being deceitful (i.e., concealing material facts from the Board and the public), being grossly over compensated and over benefited, and the willing poster children for “the IVGID culture.”¹ And now we have another example. Staff’s failure to comply with the Open Meeting Law (“OML”) insofar as providing members of the public who have requested the same, with notice their Board packets are available for their physical pick-up. And this is the purpose of this written statement.

NRS 241.020(8)(a): states that a public body is required to provide supporting material on any matter to any member of the public who has requested such materials in anticipation of the meeting of a public body governing board that is provided to members of the public body, *at the same time* it is provided to members of the public body. NRS 241.036 instructs that the failure to comply with this requirement *voids* any Board action taken at the meeting. I submit that supporting materials cannot be provided to anyone unless staff actually notify recipients that those materials are available for their physical pick-up. In fact staff typically recite on the face of those materials they have “sent e-mail notification” to such recipient(s)².

The Board Packet For the January 26, 2022 Meeting of the IVGID Board: was apparently made available to Board members sometime prior to Saturday, January 22, 2022 at 7:45 o’clock A.M. Although Board members were presumably notified that the packet was available for their pick-up sometime beforehand³, I was not.

My E-Mail of January 22, 2022: at 8:33 o’clock A.M. is part of the e-mail string between the Board and myself on this subject matter, and it is attached as Exhibit “B” to this written statement. As the reader can see, I brought the omission to the attention of the Board and GM asking that the January 26, 2022 Board meeting either be cancelled, or that no action be taken by the Board thereat. I

¹ A culture where un-elected staff care more about themselves, their colleagues and select “favored collaborators” than the public they were hired to serve.

² The face page of those materials left for my pick-up, which recite as is represented, is attached as Exhibit “A” to this written statement.

³ I say “presumably” because when I arrived at the District’s Administration Building I saw that only three of five Board packets were sitting adjacent to the front door. In other words, two sets of packets were missing because they had presumably been picked up. Now how could they have been picked up unless Board members had been informed they were available for their pick-up?

also asked that the Board do something insofar as its incompetent staff are concerned given the cause of the problem was staff.

My E-Mail of January 26, 2022: at 12:03 P.M. is part of the e-mail string between the Board and myself on this subject matter which is attached as Exhibit "B" to this written statement. There the reader can see that I reminded the IVGID Board that if it went forward with that evening's meeting, and if it took action on any matter, I would file an Open Meeting Law ("OML") complaint.

Staff's Cancellation of the Board's January 26, 2022 Meeting in Response: At 2:37 o'clock P.M. on January 26, 2022, the day of the subject Board meeting, staff e-mailed out cancellation of the meeting⁴.

Conclusion: So there you go! Incompetence, indifference and arrogance. And by public employees no less. And then where wrongs are brought to the attention of staff and the Board, how do they respond? What an incredible waste of time and effort in this instance. And as a result of whose acts? If the reader listens to staff and detractors, the finger of blame is going to be pointed at me. But as the reader can see, in this instance (as well as most others) blame falls upon staff. So let's call a spade a spade. So what do you intend to do about Board members? Given I predict nothing, now you the reader who maybe never see what I and others see have a clue as to what's wrong in river city. Which explains this written statement.

And You Wonder Why Your Recreation ("RFF") and Beach ("BFF") Facility Fees Which Pay For This Incompetence Are as High as They Are? I've now provided more answers.

Respectfully, Aaron Katz (Your Community Watchdog), Because Only Now Are Others Beginning to Watch!

⁴ Evidence of that e-mail cancellation is attached as Exhibit "C" to this written statement.

EXHIBIT "A"

NOTICE OF MEETING

The regular meeting of the Incline Village General Improvement District will be held starting at 6:00 p.m. on January 26, 2022 via Livestream/Zoom.

Public comment is allowed and the public is welcome to make their public comment either via e-mail (please send your comments to info@ivgid.org by 4:00 p.m. on January 26, 2022) or via telephone (the telephone number will be posted to our website on the day of the meeting). The meeting will be available for viewing at <https://livestream.com/accounts/3411104>.

In addition, if a member of the public wishes to hear, observe, participate in and provide public comment at the meeting, using Livestream/Zoom, they may do so by coming to the Boardroom at 893 Southwood Boulevard, Incline Village, Nevada. In accordance with the Governor's Emergency Directive, all those in attendance will be required to wear a mask. Thank you, in advance, for your compliance. A notification of this attendance would be greatly appreciated by telephoning the District Clerk at (775) 832-1207 or sending an e-mail to info@ivgid.org. We appreciate your help with this process. (Reference is made to Assembly No. 253)

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE*

B. ROLL CALL OF TRUSTEES*

C. INITIAL PUBLIC COMMENTS* - *Unless otherwise determined, the time limit shall be three (3) minutes for each person wishing to make a public comment. Unless otherwise permitted by the Chair, no person shall be allowed to speak more than once on any single agenda item. Not to include comments on General Business items with scheduled public comment. The Board of Trustees may address matters brought up during public comment at the conclusion of the comment period but may not deliberate on any non-agendized item.*

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (*for possible action*)

The Board of Trustees may make a motion for a flexible agenda which is defined as taking items on the agenda out of order; combining agenda items with other agenda items; removing items from the agenda; moving agenda items to an agenda of another meeting, or voting on items in a block.

-OR-

The Board of Trustees may make a motion to accept and follow the agenda as submitted/posted.

E. REVIEW OF THE LONG RANGE CALENDAR (*for possible action*) – **page 3**

F. REPORTS TO THE BOARD* - Reports are intended to inform the Board and/or the public.

1. Treasurers Report – Requesting Trustee: Treasurer Michaela Tonking – **page 4**

- A. Payment of Bills (*For District payments exceeding \$10,000 or any item of capital expenditure, in the aggregate in any one transaction, a summary of payments made shall be presented to the Board at a public meeting for review. The Board hereby authorizes payment of any and all obligations aggregating less than \$10,000 provided they are budgeted and the expenditure is approved according to District signing authority policy*)

G. CONSENT CALENDAR (*for possible action*)

1. **SUBJECT: BOARD POLICY FOR APPROVAL – AUDIT COMMITTEE, POLICY 15.1.0**

Recommendation for Action: Review, discuss and possibly take action to approve Board Policy 15.1.0, Audit Committee. (Requesting Trustee: Treasurer Michaela Tonking) – page 5 - 16

Incline Village General Improvement District

Incline Village General Improvement District is a fiscally responsible community partner which provides superior utility services and community oriented recreation programs and facilities with passion for the quality of life and our environment while investing in the Tahoe basin.

893 Southwood Boulevard, Incline Village, Nevada 89451 • (775) 832-1100 • FAX (775) 832-1122

www.yourtahoeplace.com

NOTICE OF MEETING

Agenda for the Board Meeting of January 26, 2022 - Page 2

H. GENERAL BUSINESS (for possible action)

1. **SUBJECT: BOARD PRACTICE FOR APPROVAL – BUDGETING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT, DISTRICT-WIDE PRICING FOR PRODUCTS AND SERVICES, PRACTICE 6.2.0**

Recommendation for Action: Review, discuss and possibly take action to approve the new Board Practice – *page 17 - 32*

2. **SUBJECT: FY2022/2023 BUDGET WORKSHOP #2 – REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE FOLLOWING: – page 33 - 125**

- Baseline FY2022/23 Budget Assumptions
- District-wide Issues and Budget Considerations
- Fund/Venue Specific Issues and Budget Considerations
 - Staffing
 - Baseline Budget (Preliminary)
 - Service-Levels/Outcomes

Recommendation for Action: Review, discuss and provide direction to inform ongoing development of the District's FY2022/23 budget. (Requesting Staff Members- District General Manager Indra Winquest and Director of Finance Paul Navazio)

I. FINAL PUBLIC COMMENTS* - Limited to a maximum of three (3) minutes in duration.

J. ADJOURNMENT (for possible action)

CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF THIS AGENDA

I hereby certify that on or before Friday, January 21, 2022 at 9:00 a.m., a copy of this agenda (IVGID Board of Trustees Session of January 26, 2022) was delivered to the post office addressed to the people who have requested to receive copies of IVGID's agendas; copies were e-mailed to those people who have requested; and a copy was posted, physically or electronically, at the following locations in accordance with Assembly Bill 253:

1. IVGID Anne Vorderbruggen Building (893 Southwood Boulevard, Incline Village, Nevada; Administrative Offices)
2. IVGID's website (www.yourtahoeplace.com/Board of Trustees/Meetings and Agendas)
3. State of Nevada public noticing website (<https://notice.nv.gov/>)

/s/ Susan A. Herron. CMC

Susan A. Herron, CMC

District Clerk (e-mail: sah@ivgid.org/phone # 775-832-1207)

Board of Trustees: Tim Callicrate - Chairman, Matthew Dent, Sara Schmitz, Kendra Wong, and Michaela Tonking.

Notes: Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; combined with other items; removed from the agenda; moved to the agenda of another meeting; moved to or from the Consent Calendar section; or may be voted on in a block. Items with a specific time designation will not be heard prior to the stated time, but may be heard later. Those items followed by an asterisk () are items on the agenda upon which the Board of Trustees will take no action. Members of the public who are disabled and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting are requested to call IVGID at 832-1100 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. IVGID'S agenda packets are available at IVGID's website, www.yourtahoeplace.com; go to "Board Meetings and Agendas".*

EXHIBIT "B"

Re: I Keep Telling You it's Essentially Everything Your Incompetent Staff Do - EVERYTHING! And Now it's the Board Packet For Next Wednesday's (January 26, 2022) Board Meeting - Follow Up

From: <s4s@ix.netcom.com>
To: <ISW@ivgid.org>
Cc: "Herron, Susan" <Susan_Herron@ivgid.org>, "Callicrate, Tim" <tim_callicrate2@ivgid.org>, "Dent, Matthew" <dent_trustee@ivgid.org>, "Wong, Kendra Trustee" <wong_trustee@ivgid.org>, "Schmitz, Sara" <schmitz_trustee@ivgid.org>, "Tonking, Michaela" <tonking_trustee@ivgid.org>
Subject: Re: I Keep Telling You it's Essentially Everything Your Incompetent Staff Do - EVERYTHING! And Now it's the Board Packet For Next Wednesday's (January 26, 2022) Board Meeting - Follow Up
Date: Jan 26, 2022 12:03 PM

Hello Indra -

Thanks for answering my e-mail request of January 22, 2022 below.

Where is the evidence staff notified me that my Board packet for tonight's meeting was available for my pick up similar to the notification given to Board members?

The fact you've provided nothing evidences the fact I was provided with no notification.

Therefore I remind you and the Board that this evening's Board meeting is in violation of the Open Meeting Law ("OML") to the extent the Board intends to take ANY action. So if the Board chooses to go forward with tonight's meeting, and it intends to take ANY action, I will be filing an OML complaint.

Just so everyone knows ahead of time.

Thank you for your cooperation. Aaron Katz

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Jan 22, 2022 8:33 AM
To:
Cc: Herron, Susan , Callicrate, Tim , Dent, Matthew , Wong, Kendra Trustee , Schmitz, Sara , Tonking, Michaela
Subject: I Keep Telling You it's Essentially Everything Your Incompetent Staff Do - EVERYTHING! And Now it's the Board Packet For Next Wednesday's (January 26, 2022) Board Meeting

Hello Indra and Board Members (I have cc'd them with this e-mail) -

So where's the Board packet for next Wednesday's meeting?

Was it made available to Board members? Were Board members informed that the Board packet for next Wednesday's meeting was available for their pick-up? And if so when (how about answering this one Tim)?

Why do I ask?

Because even now, I have received no notice that the Board packet is available for my pick-up at the District's admin offices.

Not that I must back up anything I say, but NRS 241.020(7)(c) states that "upon any request (and I have made request), a public body shall provide, at no charge, at least one copy of...any...supporting material provided to the members of the public body for an(y) item on the agenda."

NRS 241.020(8)(a) states that "a copy of supporting material required to be provided upon request pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection 7 must be...made available to the requester at the time the material is provided to the members of the public body...if the supporting material is provided to the members of the public body before the meeting."

I submit that making materials available to Board members and members of the public who have made request encompasses notification that said materials are actually available for their pick up.

Where's the notification Indra? Did Ms. Herron notify Board members? Did she neglect to notify me? Did she notify me and for some reason I didn't get the e-mail? Am I going to get another one of Ms. Herron's disingenuous sincere apologies for not providing me with notification?

You people (staff) are deplorables insofar as the public is concerned. So I am going to return the favor.

Since any violation of the OML voids any action that is taken thereat [see NRS 241.036 which states that "the action of any public body taken in violation of any provision of this chapter is void"], please cancel the meeting set for next Wednesday and re-notice it after notifying the Board and members of the public who have requested that the packet of materials for that meeting be made available to them is available for their pick-up.

If staff and the Board don't like my request, then how about addressing the root of the problem because it isn't me? I have a problem that the agenda for next Wednesday's Board meeting wasn't published until yesterday (Friday) morning. Yes it was technically timely by the skin of staff's teeth. Nevertheless, the failure to make the Board packet for that meeting available to me only adds insult to injury and INCOMPETENCE or indifference!

And BTW since I suspect what staff's response is going to be, I went to the District's admin building this morning at about 7:45 A.M. And I saw that the Board packet for next Wednesday's meeting was sitting out for 3 of the 5 trustees, as well as me. On the face of the packet left under a rock for me were the words "Aaron Katz (will pick up/SEND E-MAIL notification)." Where's the e-mail notification Ms. Herron?

Thank you for your cooperation. Aaron Katz

EXHIBIT "C"

IVGID BOT Regular Meeting CANCELLED for Jan. 26, 2022 at 6 p.m.

From: Incline Village General Improvement District <sah@ivgid.org>
To: <s4s@ix.netcom.com>
Subject: IVGID BOT Regular Meeting CANCELLED for Jan. 26, 2022 at 6 p.m.
Date: Jan 26, 2022 2:37 PM



NOTICE OF MEETING

The regular meeting of the Incline Village General Improvement District will be held starting at 6:00 p.m. on January 26, 2022 via Livestream/Zoom.

Public comment is allowed and the public is welcome to make their public comment either via e-mail (please send the comments to info@ivgid.org by 4:59 p.m. on January 25, 2022) or via telephone (the telephone number will be posted to our website on the day of the meeting). The meeting will be available for viewing at <https://www.zoom.us/j/9259226918>.

In addition, if a member of the public wishes to hear, observe, participate and provide public comment at the meeting, using Livestream/Zoom, they may do so by sending to the Boardroom at 893 Southwood Blvd., Incline Village, Nevada. In accordance with the Governor's Emergency Directive, all those in attendance will be required to wear a mask. For more information, for your compliance, a notification of the attendance would be greatly appreciated by telephoning the District Office at (775) 832-1201 or sending an e-mail to info@ivgid.org. We appreciate your help with this request. (Reference is made to GED 2020-005)

- A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE*
- B. ROLL CALL OF TRUSTEES*
- C. INITIAL PUBLIC COMMENTS* - District citizens may appear at the meeting to present comments on items on the agenda. Public comments will be limited to 3 minutes per person. Comments will be heard in the order they are received. Public comments will be heard in the order they are received. Public comments will be heard in the order they are received.
- D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (for possible action)
 The Board of Trustees may make a motion to approve the agenda as presented or to amend the agenda. The Board of Trustees may make a motion to approve the agenda as presented or to amend the agenda. The Board of Trustees may make a motion to approve the agenda as presented or to amend the agenda.
- E. REVIEW OF THE LONG RANGE CALENDAR (for possible action)
- F. REPORTS TO THE BOARD* - Reports are intended to inform the Board and/or the public.
 - 1. Treasurer's Report - Requesting Trustee: Treasurer Michaela Tanking
- G. CONSENT CALENDAR (for possible action)
 - 1. SUBJECT: BOARD POLICY FOR APPROVAL - AUDIT COMMITTEE, POLICY 15.1.0
 Recommendation for action: Review, discuss and possibly take action to approve Board Policy 15.1.0, Audit Committee. (Requesting Trustee: Treasurer Michaela Tanking)

Board Meeting Cancelled

[Download Document](#)

01/26/2022 IVGID BOT Regular Meeting Agenda



Incline Village General Improvement District | 893 Southwood Blvd, Incline Village, NV 89521

[Unsubscribe s4s@ix.netcom.com](mailto:s4s@ix.netcom.com)

[Update Profile](#) | [Constant Contact Data Notice](#)

Sent by sah@ivgid.org powered by



Try email marketing for free today!