

**ROUND MOUNTAIN TOWN BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
DONALD L. SIMPSON COMMUNITY CENTER
650 CIVIC DRIVE, HADLEY SUBDIVISION
ROUND MOUNTAIN, NEVADA
rmtownadmin@gmail.com
THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2017 – 4:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

Members Present: James Swigart, Chair
Roger Morones, Vice Chair
Lisa Davila, Member
Liandra Dutton, Member

Members Absent: Wes Hubred, Clerk

Also Present: Pearl Olmedo, Town Manager
Rebecca Hansen, Administrative Supervisor

Citizens Present:

Teah Court	Payton Brown	Mary Richardson
Sara Sweeney	McKynzee Brown	Andrew Swazey
Tyfini Brown	McKayla Brown	Vangie Barber
Caitlin Swazey	Rob M. Covington	
Candace Brown	Vicky Richardson	



CALL MEETING TO ORDER

James Swigart: Ok everyone it's 4:00 p.m. let's get this meeting started. My name is Jim Swigart, I'm the Chairman.

Roger Morones: Roger Morones, Vice Chair.

Lisa Davila: Lisa Davila, member.

Liandra Dutton: Liandra Dutton, member.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was recited.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT (FIRST)

Candace Brown: For my 5 year stint here, I am going on about 20 years. I am a little conflicted and a little confused on what is going on here. I do have to say I appreciate the fact that everything is going to make sure the pool is going again. As I said earlier, we did do swim team last year even though we didn't have anybody to run swim team, I mean Pearl stepped up to do what she could do, the lifeguards stepped up to do what they could do. My daughter Karissa volunteered to help and the girls and Payton they went and did swim team, we traveled. For everybody that had it, we only had four, and we had 2 from Tonopah and 2 from Round Mountain. We had parents that traveled. We went to Hawthorne, Yerington and Lovelock. So we did have the chance to do all that. So I guess, as being here this long I don't recall anything in being detrimental problems with any of the

kids that were at the pool. They have been supervised for as long as I have been here. Parents have sat and watched and done what they could do, which was their choice. So as I said, 2 out of my four kids worked there, so I know that they had to have been supervised, because I wouldn't have let them go there if there wasn't any supervision or anything like that. They went through everything. So I guess I am a little confused about what is going on here, so I just wanted to say, everybody on the Town has put forth efforts to make sure that all the kids were protected and taken care of and that they had programs to go to and that they were, I mean they did recreation programs all the time during the summer and everything else. Like I said we found dead lizards under our beds when they went lizard hunting and all of that, just for stuff for them to do. So I guess I am just having a hard time as being here for the longest time and have never had any problems of anything of being in danger at any point and time that I know of. I would have hoped if that was the problem, it would have been stepped up and taken care of at that point and time. I guess my confusion is that I am not sure what is going on, but all I have to say is positive things about what has been going on and everything that has been going with the director and everybody else that stepped up and make sure that everything was going on. So I just want you guys to know that my kids are happy and healthy and I am happy and healthy and I just wish everybody else was happy and healthy and everybody else would get along. So Thank You.

Davila: Thank you.

Morones: Thank you Candace.

Swigart: Thank you. Hopefully a lot of your questions will be answered after this meeting.

C. Brown: Thank you.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 13, 2017 AGENDA

Pearl Olmedo: No changes.

Morones moved to approve the April 13th agenda as written. Davila seconded the motion; the motion passed 4-0.

Swigart: This a little bit of a back ground of where we are at. At the last meeting we were at, there were some allegations and a petition brought forward to the Board and the Town Manager. There were allegations that there was some dereliction of duties. I think it was like 2015, there were some serious allegations made, against the hiring process for the Recreational Director. And so talking with the Co-Chair, we decided to have an emergency meeting. What we are deciding on right now, several of these items will be if we want to as a Board to hire a third party, basically it is a law firm, to do an investigation into the allegations that were brought up in the past meeting. So, that is kind of where we are at, just a little bit of the history. Roger do you have anything else on that?

Morones: No. One, thank you, this does not happen without the Town's input, we are here for you. So to know that you have concerns and brought it to us, we are obligated to address those concerns. But keep in mind, good, bad, or indifferent, like it or don't like it, during this process and we will go through these agenda items, our goal for these items, once it is done, it is done. If the findings are everything was up to snuff and whoever they called in, that is why we are going to a third party, we are hoping it puts it to rest and that would satisfy what we have heard, on two levels, because there is two different agenda items here. On a level that happened a few years ago, so we can get down to what it was that really took place, and what happened recently with the hiring. We will talk about these individually, get everybody's take. Before we do anything we would like to hear some obvious last minute thoughts from you on these specific agenda items alone. So we know you guys like to get passionate, we like passion, but let's try to keep it to what we have on this agenda. That is really all I have to say, I appreciate the involvement and this is our way to address your concerns. Lisa?

Davila: Nothing else, well said.

Dutton: Very good.

Swigart: Well said, and always we will treat everyone with respect here.

**DISCUSSION, DELIBERATION, AND POSSIBLE DECISION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2017-01
ROUND MOUNTAIN TOWN BOARD TO AUTHORIZE A THIRD PARTY COMPANY TO
PERFORM AN INVESTIGATION ON THE HIRING OF THE RECREATION DIRECTOR**

Dutton: And we just have these two?

Olmedo: Yes, those two investigation firms.

Dutton: Ok.

Morones: And that would be Spencer and Christensen.

Olmedo: Spencer Investigation is one, and Donald L. Christensen is a law firm. You have got their proposal and their references are attached to each of those.

Morones: Is this one from Spencer recommended by Pool Pact or is it just one that they have used before.

Olmedo: They have both been recommended by Pool Pact.

Swigart: And they were saying that it would be about 10 hours of investigation.

Olmedo: They are hoping. They are hoping, it is probably going to be a day here. Some of these can take place via conversation, so really it is just guesstimating. I would think it depends on how in-depth they want to go, it could be more than 10 hours?

Davila: Did we look beyond any of the recommendation beyond Pool Pact or did we just take their recommendations?

Olmedo: I followed up with it, Lander County has utilized these guys, City of Reno, and firms around Carson have also utilized them.

Davila: So no we didn't look any further than Pool Pact?

Olmedo: With the last minute, due to it, it was hard to even obtain these two companies to send us a proposal. Our issues with Reno and Vegas, there are some firms that are just not willing to travel out here. So these are the ones that responded to our requests.

Swigart: Have you done a, from their proposal, have you done a cost comparison at all?

Olmedo: We can discuss a cost comparison in item #6. This one is just specifically if you are interested in going forward. The cost, well it is right here, one of them is \$90.00 an hour, with a .75 a mile for travel they would discount us to \$70.00 an hour because they received a Pool Pact referral on Spencer. Donald L Christensen is a \$135.00 per hour, with a government current IRS mileage rate at 53.5 cents per mile. And of course it is not including lodging and expenses on both of them, if they have got to stay the night.

Davila: Roger do you have any concern, just a question as somebody, since Pool Pact is already our representative and refers to somebody that is associated with them, that is my concern, is that I believe that the tie is to close in my opinion.

Morones: Yeah. So two things, to hit on # 5, #5 is just to discuss whether we want to move forward before we get into who we are choosing, correct? Lisa to answer your question, somewhat. And here is why, we already have a concern and brought forth the petition. Our goal was to seek a third party unrelated to anything that we have ourselves associated with, one being Pool/Pact. Would I like to see us go outside of Pool/Pact, absolutely, but here is my issue with that, a concern not even an issue. We are so close to getting this pool up and running, and all of this has been thrown on really quick. I don't know if she would have had the time to go outside. Do we still need to? That is what we need to discuss right here in # 5. If we do, then we need to give her the ample time to go outside and really research who these individuals are that can conduct these investigations on a third party basis without being involved. I am certain, and I would hope it wouldn't, that is we did choose one of these two, and people saw that it was part of Pool/Pact or part of Pool/Pact that they would accept it, however, based on what I have seen in the last few meetings, I don't think that is going to be enough to suffice the people as to who we have chosen.

Davila: I agree.

Morones: Something will always be there that says, it is still part of what we do.

Dutton: But how long do we want to draw this out?

Morones: That is the other thing, what do we do now? They want resolution, we are obligated to provide them with a resolution, but it has to be something that all parties agree with.

Swigart: This is a law group, they have an obligation to seek the truth and they have an obligation to be honest and open. Their licensing is on the line if they are not, whether they are associated with the Town of Tonopah or the Town of Round Mountain, or anywhere. Any group of attorneys that have a law firm and they are put in this position to do a job, they can't be swayed one way or the other, and they have to find the truth.

Dutton: So Spencer Investigation is not a law firm, it is just a company, right?

Olmedo: It is just a company correct.

Morones: I don't look at these as working with Pool Pact or ties. At some point they have done work for Pool Pact and come recommended. I mean you hold an investigator and you hold a lawyer and their business on retainer all the time. That doesn't mean they are going to be in your favor, they are going to find out whether you are doing it right or you're doing it wrong.

Olmedo: Just to clarify, they don't work with Pool Pact they work with governmental entities like ourselves.

Morones: Just recommended by Pool Pact, correct?

Olmedo: Just recommended, and the recommendation comes from the cities that are within this pool group. So like I said they put down on their resumes, Donald L. Christensen works with the Reno City attorney, the Douglas County DA, the Nevada Attorney General's Office, so these are clients that they work with. The recommendation ideally comes from the clients they represent or have worked with in the past.

Morones: Let's keep on topic, #5 we have to decide if we are going to move forward.

Davila: My concern is, is there potential bias, that is my concern.

Morones: Valid. So to move forward, # 5.

Swigart: Do we have a motion? Do we have a motion that this should be looked into?

Davila: To approve the resolution, correct?

Olmedo: To approve the resolution.

Morones: So yeah, this motion is to move forward with hiring a third party investigation.

Swigart: Authorization.

Morones: On the hiring of the Recreational Director only. It has nothing to do with any of the actions that have happened prior.

Davila motioned to adopt the resolution 2017-01 to authorize a third party company to perform an investigation on the hiring of the Recreation Director. Dutton seconded the motion; the motion passed 4-0.

Sara Sweeney: Can I ask one questions? When you say not regarding what happened in 2015.

Dutton: There are two separate ones.

Morones: Look at # 7

Sweeney: I saw that, but if you are only hiring to investigate her being hired, is that person going to be informed about what happened in 2015?

Dutton: So that is if we approve the second part.

Sweeney: Ok.

Dutton: So there is two separate parts, we have to keep them separated.

Sweeney: Ok.

Swigart: One is the hiring part, and on is what happened in the past.

Morones: Before we decide on number # 6, can I have that, knowing what we know now, can I have that moved to # 7, because I have other questions regarding specifically the hiring. Are these two firms being looked out for both # 5 and # 7 only?

Olmedo: I would say, yes that they should. It is really up to you guys, you really need to decide that.

Dutton: It only makes sense to hire same person.

Morones: For both?

Dutton: Because they are kind of related.

Olmedo: Kind of tied.

Morones: That is why I want to move # 6 down and not go into who we are going to choose, rather go into if we are going to move forward with # 7 which is what happened a few years ago, that would just make more sense and then we can decide, in other words we are combining # 6 and # 8, because we are going to have to vote twice and obviously if we vote on the first one, then it is the one we are going to use anyway. So I am wondering if we can combine # 6 and # 8 now, skip #6 and move to # 7, to decide if we want that investigation.

Olmedo: You can decide on # 7 if you choose to go for it, then we can bump back to # 6 and we can.

Morones: Then let's go for it.

Olmedo: Because # 6 has to be specific to agenda item # 5

Morones: Because whatever we do for # 6, we know we are going to do for # 7, so let's, I would rather decide to, the cart before the horse. Let's make sure we are going to give them two items, instead of just the one and then redo it. You guys ok with that?

Dutton: That works.

Davila: Yes.

Morones: So # 7 Jim?

**DISCUSSION, DELIBERATION, AND POSSIBLE DECISION TO APPROVE RELOLUTION 2017-02
ROUND MOUNTAIN TOWN BOARD TO AUTHORIZE A THIRD PARTY COMPANY TO
PERFORM AN INVESTIGATION ON THE SAFETY ALLEGATIONS OF THE OPERATION OF
THE INGVRT CHRISTENSEN SWIMMING POOL DURING THE SUMMER OF 2015**

Dutton: Are there cameras in the pool area?

Olmedo: There are cameras.

Dutton: On the pool itself or just in the office?

Olmedo: It is located throughout the facility. The only areas that we cannot place cameras is in the changing rooms.

Dutton: Right, so we have records from them, like video records.

Olmedo: I am not sure how far back they are saved. I am pretty sure a person that is savvy with internet probably could retrieve those files.

Swigart: These allegations were pretty serious that were brought in front of the Board. My question is, is there any records or files or was there any that was brought to the Town Manager. I know it wasn't you at the time.

Olmedo: I spoke with the previous Town Manager, and there was none to his knowledge.

Morones: I have to ask, and this just, if there were issues on that day, that was a few years ago, obviously this should have been taken care of that day. So for us to go back, I'm not sure what it is going to serve one way or the other. If we are already doing an investigation of the hiring process, good, bad or indifferent. My issue with

that is making bad business decisions in hiring and firing in any aspect when it comes to business, shouldn't reflect something that happened 4 years ago, it is just a bad business decision, and we should handle that accordingly. If in fact they are found that they were left unsafely, that should have been addressed by the Board, by the Town at that time when it happened. That they feared for their kids, there was nobody there. I am not sure what purpose it is going to serve to find that out now. We can look at character of people all they want. If we are doing this just to judge the character of an individual, I am not sure what we would benefit from that.

Dutton: I am not sure what we are going to find if we do an investigation on this part here. It was two years. Even if you can find the video, which I doubt, because a lot of times those systems record over themselves after a certain amount of days. It is just going to be one person's word against another, and then how do you dispute that, and then if it is found what are you going to do then. So I don't see how this one will be that beneficial.

Davila: Well I am just kind of thinking, because you know we, all of us. I think I can speak really that we have all been approached and that there have been concerns, I think that part of the reason that this particular situation has arisen, this issue has arisen, is perhaps because of the fact that this person has been rehired, and there was nothing brought up at that time, because the problem was solved, and the particular individual in question was gone. I could be mistaken, if that is not true, by all means, you guys feel free to speak. So I think that is why this has come to the forefront again, is because now it is a concern. So having said that, will we gain anything from it? That is hard to say, it really is.

Morones: It is a tough one.

Davila: It is a tough one, but I believe that is correct.

Morones: Jim?

Swigart: Yes, we are trying to find the truth and seek the truth. Whenever you have a job or position, I have done many, many, many interviews over the last 40 years and had horribly disappointed, dissatisfied, and disgruntled because they felt that they were most qualified candidate. I am not sure if a lot of this came after the fact, after the decision was made or not, but the point is, these allegations are there and why weren't they weren't they brought to the Town Manager? Why weren't they brought to the police department? These were serious, serious allegations. Whether or not they were the truth or not, or hearsay, or you know. Do we need to have a third party to investigate to talk to everyone to get to the truth? I am not sure, but it was brought to the Board.

Morones: Sure, and by no means, we are looking for help, my point is or my issue or thought process here is what purpose is it going to serve. We already have an agenda item whether the hiring process was done correctly, are there findings, for lack of a better term collusion of some sort or something. We have that part taken care of, that is one, we know we are going to address that and see how that turns out and that is recent, that affects us and that affects us moving forward. In our minds we have to separate our feelings from what we look like we want to accomplish. If you feel that you were wronged five years ago, then five years ago would have been the time to address it. Does it carry over? Sure, you wonder if it is ever going to happen again. I get that, but I think that is where the process of having an investigator find out why they were hired, but that is really not going to help, because we are looking at if it was done correctly. So I urge to hear from anybody and what your thoughts are and please by all means, this is, you guys brought this to us. So you have heard our concerns and you have heard out thoughts.

Sweeney: I'm Sara Sweeney and for me they do go hand in hand. I don't care why Pearl hired her, I care why she quit last time and left children in the pool.

Swigart: Were you there when she left?

Sweeney: I was not, but I know people who were.

Swigart: Can you have those people?

Sweeney: She was mistreated when she applied for the job, so yeah. But actually Teah's children were in the pool.

Swigart: So we have witnesses that were there.

Sweeney: And I can hunt for more parents if that is what you want. If that's what you want, if the investigator wants that, I can do that.

Swigart: It would have been nice to have some witnesses that could come in front of the Board.

Morones: Was anybody here that had kids that day?

Teah Court: My child was in the pool, but my mother was with her not me.

Morones: So let's bring it back. At that time she was Recreational Director.

Sweeney: Yes, that is what she is now too.

Morones: Ok, you have got to equate it to any other management system or management personnel. They are the director of that. They hire, whether they are licensed, whether they're kids age 15, 16, 18, they hire lifeguards to oversee the pool and the safety of those kids. If the Recreational Director left, did she pull her employees with them? It is their job to oversee the safety of their kids. Jim as supervisor has multiple people that work underneath him. He doesn't have to be there, because he has entrusted the people he hired to do that.

Sweeney: Does your insurance policy say that?

Morones: Jim, do you have to oversee them at all times? If you decide to leave, do your workers stop?

Swigart: No, we have leads and we have supervisors that are over a group here, over a group here, over a group here, there are 3 different groups and it is my job to check on all of them. If they have any issues that the lead or supervisor can't take care of then it comes to me.

Morones: Now do I agree when she left was the right thing? Absolutely not the right thing.

Swigart: Was a lifeguard on duty there watching the kids?

Morones: And that is what their job is to do, it was not the Recreational Directors job to oversee the pool the kids, their job is to oversee the lifeguards in which they are responsible for. I get it, if my kid was there and we found, and this had happened, it is a whole different scenario. We have to go back and look what was there, if there were lifeguards on duty that day, the kids where covered. The Recreational Director wasn't the one if something was to happen that would be there all the time to jump in that is why she hired the lifeguards.

Dutton: That may be the problem that we would run into, is that even if it was found that she did walk out, if she left lifeguards there.

Sweeney: Like how many? There has to be a number in your insurance policy of how many lifeguards per person.

Swigart: Candace Brown.

C. Brown: We have least 3 that rotate through, if you were to go in there, there is at least 3 if not 4 that rotate most of the time.

Dutton: For the swimming lessons, I know because my kid was in swimming lessons that day. I was not there, but you have to, she always had at least one.

C. Brown: One or two.

Dutton: And in the pool as well. I don't know what happened that day. I know there had to be lifeguards there.

Morones: So Pearl, by law, what do we need for lifeguards at any given time to oversee that pool? Is it similar to a daycare; where so many kids so many lifeguards?

Olmedo: So many kids, so many lifeguards.

Rebecca Hansen: It is in the NRS, it is a pretty high amount.

Olmedo: It is in the NRS, but our practice was always a minimum of 2 on deck and 1 in the office. So we pretty much had 3 lifeguards that rotated out, on deck into the office, on deck into the office.

Dutton: So when this happened it was in the morning at swimming lessons.

Olmedo: Yes correct, and that morning if I am looking back at the files correctly, there was a least 2 lifeguards on duty that day.

C. Brown: I am going to have to step in, I think one of those was mine and I know for a fact that she wouldn't let anything happen at all possible.

Vicky Richardson: Can I just ask a question?

Morones: By all means please.

V. Richardson: So if the lifeguards are there, and I understand that they watch the kids, but if that was the case and the kids were covered and the Pool Director didn't have to be there. Why were swimming lessons cancelled? Because only one of my kids got swimming lessons, the pool director left and then no swimming lessons because we didn't have a pool director.

Dutton: You have to have a pool director.

V. Richardson: So why that day, but you can't forever.

Morones: So take in on an open swim, there is no training involved.

V. Richardson: But it wasn't an open swim it was swimming lessons.

Morones: No, no, that is what I was saying, and I interrupted to completely you go.

Dutton: No it is ok, I was just going to say you have to have the operator to even open the pool. We did not have a pool operator once she quit. So that is when the lady from Tonopah came in, I remember that summer,

and she said she would be our pool operator. She wasn't there all the time, but because our lifeguards were, and she was on paper our pool operator, we could still have open swim. So, when she walked out we didn't have a pool operator.

V. Richardson: So technically the pool should have been shut down right, because she was done and quit.

Dutton: They sent the kids home as soon as that happened, I remember that call.

Tyfini Brown: I do have a suggestion. I have been a lifeguard since I was 14, you have hierarchy in lifeguards, you have the base lifeguard, then you have different levels of certifications, and I know that every pool that I have ever worked in, we had a senior lifeguard. We didn't necessarily have a recreational director. The pool manager was not always there. We had a senior lifeguard who was trained to essentially handle a lifeguard that was freaking out, cause it happens you know, they either go into shock or go into something. So maybe look into something like that, if a lifeguard is actually able to manage the pool themselves. If that just the lifeguard certification is enough to be able to handle that, but I don't know. I am saying from your guy's end, seeing if that a valid.

Court: Can I just say one thing, I think the purpose of why we think both things should be investigated is because the fact that, why was somebody rehired that acted in that manor, so I think that's where the whole circle is, why both things should be investigated, and that is mostly what Lisa said as well is both things go together.

Dutton: So we can investigate just the hiring and include that, without investigating incident itself right.

Olmedo: They have got to be completely separate items.

V. Richardson: I mean for children, I mean the pool is for kids, I would rather spend the money to get the truth like we are supposed to, for the safety of our children, cause who knows what could happen. I mean what is a couple thousand dollars as opposed to a child's life.

Morones: I think Andrew would have something to say about a couple thousand dollars on the books.

Andrew Swazey: What is your backup for saying that they have to be split, what are you referring to?

Olmedo: The resolutions are 2 separate items. One we have allegations that the hiring process was not done correctly, so that is investigating essentially the hiring practices of the Town. The second resolution is safety allegations from two years ago so they have to be separate. Yes they are one in the same, but they are not. One happened this year in 2017, and the other was back in 2015, so we have got to separate the two.

Morones: Sara if you have anything else, we didn't mean for you to go away, we would love to hear from you. I don't want you to walk away thinking they just cut me off.

Sweeney: Just for me as a parent they go hand in hand. To me they do, because she's who is there now, she is who would be watching my children now.

Swigart: Whenever you are doing any hiring, you want to take the most qualified individual, take everything else, most qualified individual. If they are looking at the hiring process of this individual, that should come out in the investigation, whether they were the most qualified. Now the allegations that were made that should come out too.

Dutton: I think the best thing to do, is just do both and we can put it to rest.

Morones: So let me ask the Board, we have 2 different, play out a scenario here. We have two different investigations. The one for 2015 says yes she was wrong and walked out. The one now says there was no problem in the hiring process. Do you think that is going to suffice the people? It sure not, there is no resolution. If they deem that whatever happened back then, the director left and was wrong for doing so, but yet there was nothing wrong in the way the hiring process, other than a bad decision.

Dutton: That is all we can do.

C. Brown: But that was in 2015 it needs to be taken care of, I am sorry but in 2015. If those lifeguards and that director was in the wrong at that time, it should have been brought up at that time.

Dutton: How do you hold someone accountable?

Morones: Yeah, when they quit.

C. Brown: And I understand, then it goes to the next person that stepped in and the next person I am sorry was Pearl that stepped in.

Davila: We can't lose it, we can't lose sight of the fact that this particular thing, it happened, she walked out, there was no you know, but I don't want to lose sight of that because that is a concern.

C. Brown: And I am not saying the concern of anybody's children's safety is wrong. The safety of everyone's children is the very first thing, but the safety of those children should have been brought up right at that point and time.

Olmedo: I have to say, everybody is saying she walked out. No one knows, that is not even true. At that time she was pulled out. The pool was shut down by the prior manager and she was pulled. So I say go ahead with the investigation, if we have to clear the air regarding that, to me it is a waste of funds, but if it needs to be done to appease the public I say go ahead, so that the truth.

Morones: Well, will it though? That goes back to my question.

Olmedo: Will it, but you know, would it be beneficial to the five of you that sit here? Knowing that a third party investigative firm came in and investigated and found the facts. I would like to get down to the black and white, the facts.

A. Swazey: It does give you another avenue though because somebody needs to be fired here for this transgression. Either the person that did whatever in 2015, or the person who rehired her. If one of these resolutions leads to a fire, then at least someone has been held accountable and it doesn't happen again.

Morones: If everything was on the up and up, how can we do that? If we pull investigations and they found nothing wrong on what happened. That the recreational director was not at fault for walking out and was pulled, and they found no evidence in the hiring process, you are telling me, we need to fire somebody?

A. Swazey: Well, if in the event that neither one comes up with anything, maybe not, but in the event that the second one does come up with something, that indicates a bad decision and then you need to take advantage of that opportunity.

Morones: Then that is something that the Board we would certainly have to discuss, we are not there yet. In the event that there is some wrong doing, then we address the wrong doing as it happens. We still have to follow the process. But I agree, obviously if there is some wrong doing on that, my only issue is, if there is wrong

doing on the first one and there wasn't any wrong doing on the hiring process other than a bad decision, you can't fault anybody for a bad decision. We can take care of that on our own, with on an open basis with the one ultimately responsible for that position. But how does a bad decision negate the new recreational person getting fired?

Swigart: Look at the previous work history there is a file, there is nothing in there. There is nothing in there from the town manager that was before Pearl. There is no documentation, there is no police report of this, there is nothing that was brought to the Town Board at that time.

Sweeney: And her file doesn't say that she quit both times that she held that job?

Olmedo: It would be during the investigation that would be founded and reported to you guys.

Swigart: What about in your hiring process, did you review?

Morones: I don't know if we can talk about the personnel, other than Pearl, at an open meeting, just a little caution.

Olmedo: Nope.

Swazey: You are talking about Pearl. You are asking her a direct question. You are talking about a record.

Morones: About an employee that we don't oversee.

Dutton: We can talk about Pearl, not anyone else.

Swigart: No I am not talking about an employee; I am talking about the procedure. I am talking the policy, how you go through, if you are going to promote someone or you're going to hire someone.

Olmedo: We followed through with our processes, yes we followed through.

Swigart: And you look at previous work experience for you. Rehiring is not something that is new anywhere. There people that are rehired at the mine, many, many times, but they always look at the previous work history.

V. Richardson: If she was pulled out, and shut down by the fire marshal or whatever, like in the middle of a swim lesson then why weren't people notified. It sounds like she just up and left, but now they are saying she was pulled.

Morones: The issue is it is hearsay, and even if she was pulled, you are talking to a board that wasn't even involved in that.

T. Brown: So will the investigative services have to go back, I mean are they, they are going to have to, the previous Town Manger and all these other people.

Morones: They are going to have to, they are going to have to do interviews, absolutely, but again.

V. Richardson: The facts are the facts, and if people are happy or mad about it, there is nothing we can do about it, the facts are the facts.

Morones: And that is my issue about it, you have to separate what you want to see happen as to what really happened. You have got to separate that feeling.

Dutton: But I think if we really follow through as a Town Board, and do the investigations. We can present, or they can present what the findings are, and we just need to call it good. If there are consequence that we need to take care of, then we will do it at that time. I think this is the best way to resolve it.

Rob Covington: So was her reason for leaving job abandonment or was it?

Morones: Again, we can't answer that honestly, we can only speculate and there has been a lot of speculation. I would love to say this is why, but we can't.

Dutton: We don't know.

Swigart: Just because of the speculation, I think it needs to be investigated by a third party in my opinion.

T. Brown: Isn't it called a community pool though? So the community is going to be concerned. This investigation will suffice community concerns.

Morones: Oh yeah I mean, look we have to address your concerns. These two are obviously hot topics right. Glad everybody showed up, love the opinions. We have to address it, one way or the other, good, bad or indifferent, we have to address it. If we decided that no, it doesn't warrant it, we've heard and we thought it was the best interest that we didn't, but if we decide that yes, it is the best interest do, then we do it. It is part of the process of making it work for everybody and that is our duty. I mean we were elected, we're not just saying hey go do this, because we think you can do great. We are elected officials of the county, we are appointed by the county. So we are entrusted to have your best interest. So we hear you, which is why we are here and with the same token, you have to trust we are here for a reason and it is your best interest, and you may not agree with somethings that we do, but we are tasked to do it.

T. Brown: So the proposal for the investigative services is the Town's answer for resolution period. In regards to these certain things.

Morones: Would the town be happy if we hired Dan Sweeney to do the investigation of 2 years ago?

T. Brown: No, but I am saying that is the answer, your guys answer hey this is how we think it's going to fix it.

Morones: The only way to make it impartial is to not have anybody directly involved or anybody from this town to conduct the investigation.

C. Brown: So you guys have decided that you are going to do it?

Swigart: No.

Morones: Again, we would rather get all the input we can from you guys as well. Some don't want it to happen; a lot of people want it to happen. This is just a deliberation and a discussion, but no action has been taken at this point.

T. Brown: This is just a proposal?

Sweeney: And if it comes out that she wasn't pulled by the fire marshal, she quit and walked out, then what?

Morones: She quit and walked out. Again

Sweeney: I feel like that was a big lie. She wasn't pulled by the fire marshal, let's be honest.

Morones: Nobody said fire marshal. Nobody said they were pulled by the fire marshal.

Swigart: There is no fire marshal. Dan Sweeney was the Town Manager.

Morones: Yeah, yeah, yeah, Dan Sweeney was the fire chief at the time and the Town Manager at the time.

Sweeney: I don't think anyone physically pulled her out of the building, I think she got mad, went to the Town Board, listened to the comment made at the meeting the night before about her, went back to the pool got pissed off about the comment and left. That is the story I heard from multiple parents. Not caring that there was children in the pool.

Morones: Yeah, and the heard. We have all heard different and that is what we need to find out.

Sweeney: Ok, but I don't think she was physically pulled from the building.

Morones: So, again.

Swigart: I wasn't there.

Sweeney: I wasn't either, but I don't feel like that was true from everything I've heard from everybody else, and I don't think Pearl was in the building either.

Swigart: What we want is facts, we don't want feelings.

Sweeney: I agree that is true, so let's have a good investigator.

Morones: Ok, so we have 2 to look at, again, a lot of minds to me, on a personal level sound made up. You know in your heart, you know in your head what you want to take place. The problem with that is, when these facts come in and they found no evidence or issues of wrong doing is that going, that has to be, I am not even asking, that has to be acceptable to this town. Minds, a lot of minds are already made up, you have got to separate that. Good, bad or indifferent, we hire a third party investigator, should we decide to do so, and we can't hire another one, to say oh we think they are wrong, they missed something.

Swigart: Good point.

Morones: If this happens, this is it. You'll be mad, some people will be happy, some people won't care, but the feeling part has to go away. So we are going to try to do what we need to do for you guys, and to do the right thing. It may not be the right result that you want, but we are going to try to do the right thing.

T. Brown: For both sides. Both sides the community side, the town side.

Davila: There is no guarantee we are going to like the results.

Morones: We may not.

Davila: There is no guarantee.

Morones: Again, we all have personal opinions, what we are doing here, it is not personal it is business. And when we do this, we are closing it, per my statement before this should suffice and end it, and that is our goal. That is my thought.

Dutton: What do you think Lisa?

Davila: I think, just to put it to rest that we do need to make a motion to do this. To go on with both of them, I think that if we don't do it, it is not going to satisfy anybody. I think we need to, I really do, so that it doesn't manifest, it doesn't come back, there is an answer, it's been done and we handled it.

Davila motioned to approve resolution 2017-02 to authorize a third party company to perform an investigation on the safety allegations of the operation of the Ingvar Christensen Swimming Pool during the summer of 2015. Dutton seconded the motion; the motion passed 4-0.

DISCUSSION, DELIBERATION AND POSSIBLE DECISION TO HIRE A THIRD PARTY COMPANY PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION 2017-01

Morones: So now we are back at # 6. I move.

Davila: Can we, before we make a motion.

Morones: Hang on, you will like this one.

Morones moved to incorporate the decision of #6 and #8 to be one in the same. Dutton seconded the motion; the motion passed 4-0.

Olmedo: I am sorry, can we decide on a not to exceed amount, please.

Morones: Sure,

Davila: When that comes to.

Morones: Yep, when we decide who we are picking.

Swigart: We were going to do that anyways.

Davila: I just want to say again there is so much compassion in both of these two agenda items, it is very, very concerning. I just want to say again, I do not believe it would be beneficial to this Board or any member of this town if we went with anybody would who we referred from Pool/Pact, because we are associated. That's, I just don't think it would behoove anybody to do it, and no Liandra I have no answers as to who to hire, cause I know you are thinking.

Dutton: Well, we are limited.

Davila: I understand.

Dutton: Where we are, like not everyone wants to come out here even for a day.

Davila: I understand, but if I were sitting in the audience and I was listening to this, and we wanted to hire somebody that the Town was already associated with, I would have a concern.

Olmedo: We are not associated with any of the law firms.

Dutton: Right.

Olmedo: The recommendation came because.

Davila: Is from Pool/Pact.

Morones: And that is what we have to look to, we have people to look for recommendations. They are not contracted with Pool/Pact, like we are contracted with Pool/Pact.

Olmedo: No they are not.

Morones: Part of our contract with pool/pact is to look for help.

Dutton: And Pool/Pact tells us when we are doing things wrong.

Olmedo: Correct.

Morones: I would have been the same, and they need to understand that these people don't work for the same people we work for, just recommendations. They don't know them from Adam, they just know their history and what they have done for other people on a stance. None of these are under contract with Pool/Pact in any sense. It is difficult. It is a long ways to go.

Davila: I just want known, I just wanted to point that out.

Dutton: I think that Jim had a good point saying if we were to go with a law group instead of just a company, they are held to a high standard. They do take oaths and they have a lot more to lose if they do something incorrect. It is a little more expensive.

Morones: Yes a little more expensive, but what do you get, just a flat out investigator or a law firm.

Covington: Just a question, as far as the office, I don't know how you guys are all working, and I say it was her title that you know. I am just curious, I mean I don't know how many people, is there like a criteria you guys are doing to find the best match for the position of the Director?

Swigart: The hiring and firing and personnel issues are strictly up to the Town Manager. The reason for that being is, if there is an issue that one of the employees has a grievance with the Town Manager, they can go to the Town Board and have that rectified. That is why we have no control over the hiring, firing or personnel issues. The only employee that this Town Board has is Pearl, the Town Manager.

Dutton: We can't even talk about an employee specifically, without informing them ahead of time, having it on the agenda and having it a closed section.

Covington: Ok, I gotch ya.

Dutton: So there are so many rules that we have to go by as well, that is why we can't say a lot about employees. We can only control what, Pearl is our employee and the only one that we are over.

Olmedo: It would just be like, I am sure the majority of you work at the mine, how would you feel if your boss was talking about, let's say one of you were reprimanded, it would be like it should be between you and your boss and that is the thing with the hourly employees.

Covington: Ok, I was just seeing if there was a certain criteria we had.

Dutton: So I am looking at the Donald R. Christensen Law Group. He said that he could do both in 8 hours. Doesn't include travel time I am sure.

Olmedo: That is just the minimum, he is not sure how much in depth he has to go, but I do agree with what our Chair said is he is an attorney, he is held to a higher standard.

Dutton: So that would be a little over \$1000.00, about \$1080.00.

Morones: I don't want his hands tied. I mean, in this about 8 hours, he needs to give it due justice, but we also need to put in a not to exceed. I would agree.

Olmedo: I was thinking about it, I would recommend \$2500.00, if you do the 25 divided by let's say

Morones: Well don't forget to include mileage

Dutton: You are looking at mileage and the thousand dollars for the 8 hours would be about \$1355, so if we were to say \$2500 that would give enough room to, if he needs to do more investigating. He doesn't have to do it all out here right, he can just call people.

Olmedo: He can call people if he needed to.

Morones: It is important that he come out here first, I would hope.

Dutton: I agree, but are you going to be able to get everybody in 8 hours.

Swigart: His findings, his reports, now where will that go. Would that come to the Board?

Olmedo: That will come to the 5 of you.

Morones: So let me ask you this, could we ask you to ask him to present his findings at a meeting with the town here.

Swigart: That is a good idea.

Morones: So we don't have to present that. I mean so if there was any questions.

Davila: I wouldn't see why we couldn't.

Olmedo: I don't see why he couldn't.

Morones: I would rather that, because there may be questions that we can't answer and they want to know. I would advise the people not to hound this guy, he is a third party investigator, and however it may be concerning how he came to his findings and that is totally understandable. I would recommend that the law firm present their findings instead of have us do that for them.

Swigart: I think that is very good idea.

T. Brown: Are his hands tied though on what he is able to discuss HR wise, because if you guys aren't allowed to discuss employee names and backgrounds or whatever. Is that something that he is entitled to do to the community?

Morones: We are hiring him, absolutely.

Davila: Absolutely, he should be very transparent of what he finds.

T. Brown: I think that is just a concern too. We aren't allowed to discuss it.

Covington: So he can go into all the records and stuff?

Morones: It is an act of congress so to speak for us to be able to do that at that level, understand they are not just working for the Town, they are county employees. So it not as simple as a private entity going in and say I want to see records on John Doe, we can't do that, without it being a huge deal, and then we would all get dismissed.

V. Richardson: Can I just make a suggestion that we make the limit to 3 thousand that is like the normal retainer for an attorney.

Dutton: Well if we ask him to come out and present, that is going to be more money as well.

Morones: Recommendation noted, I like it. I mean we're spending your money quite frankly right, so if you all had a thought process in this, this is coming out of your taxes.

C. Brown: So now this money goes toward something else where if something else isn't going to get fixed, like say your roads.

Morones: Well, but we don't fix the roads.

Swigart: The Town has spoken, the last meeting there was a petition, and how many names were on the petition?

Morones: 50, I don't know how many names were abetted but there was 50.

Swigart: And we had several individuals come in front of the Board. This has to be taken care of and this has to be addressed.

C. Brown: And I agree, I completely agree, and it should be taken care of.

Morones: But like any other business, there is contingency and you have to build those contingencies in for stuff like this, you don't know when it is going to go or what you are going to spend or what you are going to carry over. So within budgets, like anything else, there are contingencies built in, now are we going to spend 25thousand dollars of that? We probably don't have 25 thousand dollars in contingencies, but it is not going to happen.

Olmedo: So do we have a dollar amount for # 6.

Morones moved for resolutions of items 2017-01 and 2017-02 we hire Donald L Christensen Attorney at Law with a not to exceed \$3000 for these investigations. Swigart seconded the motion; the motion passed 3-1.

DISCUSSION, DELIBERATION, AND POSSIBLE DECISION TO HIRE A THIRD PARTY COMPANY PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION 2017-02

Action included in prior item.

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE DECISION TO ADVERTISE TO HIRE LIFEGUARDS

Morones: How many lifeguards are we talking here?

Olmedo: We've gone with 5 lifeguards. We have even gone up to 7.

Morones: What do we have budgeted for, for the year? What did we budget for this year?

Olmedo: We have a total of 7 positions in there.

Morones: For lifeguards? Any word on when the pool is going to open?

Olmedo: The pool should be opened; they pushed it back to the first week in May.

Davila: They pushed it back again?

Olmedo: They pushed it back again and we are working on a resolution towards that, we are not happy to hear that.

Morones: Can he be here next meeting to tell us why he is.

Olmedo: Yes.

Sweeney: Is that at his cost or our cost?

Morones: That is what I want to know.

Olmedo: Not our cost. We actually went back and looked at it, and the delays will be on him and we are looking towards deducting, enforcing the \$200 per.

Morones: When did we have it, did we have a schedule open date?

Olmedo: We did.

Morones: Which was?

Olmedo: Which was, the same day we always do, Labor Day weekend.

Hansen: Memorial Day.

Olmedo: Memorial Day.

Morones: Which is, give me a date.

Hansen: The May 29th weekend.

Morones: May 29th was our opening?

Hansen: May 29th is that Monday.

Dutton: Is it usually that late after school gets out?

Olmedo: Yes.

Swigart: School never used to get out quite as early.

Dutton: School is now out May 17.

Olmedo: We were trying to open it before.

Morones: The resolution on him being late is that he understands that he is responsible and there is going to be a monetary value assigned to that.

Olmedo: Oh yes.

Morones: And that it would be deducted from the contract.

Olmedo: We are working on that.

Swigart: Last time he spoke with us, we specifically put in there. Your deadline is this and if there is any other costs that you would be responsible.

Morones: So May 29th, how long do you need to bring lifeguards on board and train them to get them up to speed?

Olmedo: We can usually get them out in a weekend. We hope that we get some of the returning life guards with experience.

Dutton: When do we close?

Olmedo: The pool?

Dutton: Yes.

Olmedo: I would like to remain open longer, I think we should.

Dutton: Like after school goes back?

Olmedo: After school goes back, I would like to see what the consensus is out there. What the attendance would be. If we don't try something new, we won't know.

Dutton: I was just thinking if we don't open until Memorial Day and then if you were going to close it before school starts it is only like 2 months.

Olmedo: I think we should try something different this year.

Davila: What typically are the pool hours, operating hours, from what to what?

Olmedo: Typically, I want to say our lifeguards came in about 8 in the morning and got things rolling, so 9 to about 6 in the evening. So 8 to 9 would be your lap swims, and then it is open swim till 5 o'clock and 5 until 6 would be your lap swim again.

Davila: Since the, as we all know, the schedule has changed up at the mine, and for families to be able access that pool, we need to be looking not just at lap swimming, but open swimming for the families to help facilitate.

Olmedo: A later time?

Davila: Yes, so I think we need to be looking into that, and not, I have heard so much about lap swim. Not every family wants to swim laps, they want to go in, they want to enjoy the pool, they don't want to necessarily want to have to be doing laps. I think we need to look into longer business ours and not having so many restrictions on what you can do at a certain time.

Dutton: Or maybe be even open later. I never got my kids there until after noon.

Olmedo: We have the time to talk about it, I mean we can try some different things this time around. I am for with trying to stay open a little longer. Just so that we can see what the attendance is.

Davila: Polly you have a question or?

Polly Alstatt: I actually just have a comment. You guys hired a director of this facility to be able to do that, so it shouldn't be wasting your time to be able to do that. They should actually be coming in and making a presentation and making changes that would benefit the community, including hours, including programs, including safety measures. You should not be doing that. This person should be qualified to do that. So, I would think that you would want them and invite them, so you would have accurate hours, you have accurate times, you have accurate costs, and you have accurate budgets.

Davila: Thank you.

P. Alstatt: You are welcome.

A. Swazey: I have a question about this agenda item. Is this to authorize Pearl to hire people, if you pass this agenda item?

Morones: Yes.

Dutton: To hire the lifeguards.

V. Richardson: This is my first town meeting, so I just don't know, is this just a standard thing, I mean you need lifeguard rights?

Morones: Oh, for her to hire?

V. Richardson: Do we always have to make an item to make a motion to hire them?

Morones: Yes, it affects the budget. It is a budgeted item, so.

Olmedo: It's the monetary.

Morones: We are approving the allocation of the funds for the budgeted item of the lifeguards.

A. Swazey: I am just concerned because it says possible decision to advertise to hire, not to hire.

Dutton: Well, we have to advertise the positions.

A. Swazey: I am just confused because this sentence just doesn't seem right.

Dutton: How would you word it?

A. Swazey: To hire lifeguards.

Dutton: But we have to advertise to hire them first.

A. Swazey: Then make it 2 separate items. This is mixing two things, which she doesn't like doing.

Dutton: Well we are going to advertise to hire them, she will do the hiring process, and then do we approve the hiring now? I am confused on that.

Morones: No we don't approve the hiring.

Dutton: We are approving the funds to hire.

A. Swazey: I would suggest you table the item until you can create a standard of how you hire, because previously, you guys would approve and then this last time you guys didn't approve and you had a huge problem.

Morones: Because we did it wrong? I appreciate your suggestion, thanks.

Dutton: This is how we are supposed to do it.

A. Swazey: I would suggest that you guys make sure you have a good job description and then also, you guys should be able to create screening and decision criteria for Pearl, she can make the actual decision, but you guys can help stipulate on who gets hired.

Dutton: We are not allowed to deal with any employees.

A. Swazey: That way you guys can gain some control over this out of control manager.

Dutton: But we are not allowed to deal with the employee part.

A. Swazey: You aren't dealing the employee though. You are just creating a document that she uses.

Morones: Appreciate your suggestion. Thank you.

T. Brown: I have a question about the heater. Is it equipped to be a year around pool? It is indoors, so.

Morones: I think it was a heating issue or something.

Olmedo: The building is not heated. The pool is heated but not the building.

T. Brown: Ok.

Swigart: The pool loses money, everybody knows that.

V. Richardson: It used to be year around though right. My birthday is in October and I had my birthday party there, so yes it used to be year around. I don't know how long it's been.

Morones: I would love to see it year around, if it was feasible.

Swigart: The only thing is we need to get more people going to the pool. There was times when there was 4 people.

Mary Richardson: You know I believe if you did better hours, you would have more participation, because hours don't work for me when it is closed for laps.

Sweeney: And I don't think family swim was very often, it was like 2 hours throughout the day, like 12 to 1 and 5 to 6.

Morones: Like open swim?

Sweeney: No, family swim, because the swim team uses it and there is a lot people, the lessons take time up and it is not open during them.

T. Brown: Where does the funding come from for the pool?

Morones: You guys.

T. Brown: Does it come from when you pay to come in or does it come from taxes?

Swigart: Taxes.

Morones: Taxes.

T. Brown: But people still have to pay to come in?

Dutton: They pay, but it is not covering, it is just helping.

Morones: Hi Polly.

P. Alstatt: Again I would like to state, you guys hired an individual that was supposed to be qualified to make the pool money and to make this community money. If they can't do that, it's the wrong person.

Morones: Let me address that and help clear this up for just a second. Nowhere on this agenda are we talking about hours or even tasked her with coming up with new programs at this point. We are barely.

Sweeney: It is in her job description 5 times.

Morones: We are barley getting through the hiring process.

P. Alstatt: But you are bringing up issues, so make sure that you know these should all be met.

Morones: We are listening to your issues, we haven't brought up the thought process of adding or asking to open hours. You guys have and you guys have brought us suggestions. The only thing we are tasked with at the point in time is a decision to advertise to hire lifeguards. There is no agenda about pool hours or extending the pool, we don't know if she does have it, maybe she does, but we have never tasked her or asked her to show it to us.

P. Alstatt: And Roger that is why I am stating it, you shouldn't be wasting your time talking about it.

Morones: Understood and I totally agree, the hours and the days of the pool are one thing. I am with you. What we are tasked with is another thing.

P. Alstatt: And that is what I am saying it shouldn't go that route.

Morones: I would rather people speak and I would love to hear what you have to say, but at the same token, maybe she does, maybe she doesn't, none of us know that, so we advise that we have on a normal agenda, which this is nothing more than a special meeting, that we talk about department issues and on a normal meeting we do, and that would certainly be one I would love to know. What are you going to do different now to bring people in?

P. Alstatt: Roger, I understand that and I know you need to move on and do the lifeguard thing, but I want to tell you that that should have been addressed before she was ever even hired. I am sorry.

Morones: Polly I will tell you, she is not our employee to address it with.

P. Alstatt: I know, but I am just telling you, I don't want to see you guys waste valuable time in discussing something that should have already been done, that is out of your realm.

Morones: I am going to disagree, that we are not wasting valuable time, so I would really like to hear what the people say.

P. Alstatt: Absolutely.

Morones: And I appreciate that, thank you.

A. Swazey: About the hiring, how do you guys know you are doing the process correctly? You guys don't have a standard, you have no by-laws, how do you know you are doing the process correctly?

Morones: Standard is done by Pool/Pact, is that correct? So we can provide him with the standards of Pool/Pact hiring?

A. Swazey: But how do you, you have no by-laws.

Morones: Would you like to know how, because we follow the Pool/Pact standards of HR practices.

P. Alstatt: Which is what?

Morones: So if you would like to see that, you are more than welcome to get with Pearl.

Olmedo: You can come to the office Monday thru Friday 8 to 5.

P. Alstatt: But you don't know them off hand to answer the question?

Morones: To answer the question, that is not for us to decide, we follow Pool/Pact and that is why we have a Town Manager.

A. Swazey: That is for her to answer right now.

Morones: You can see them and address those issues any time she is available, daily for you.

A. Swazey: I am just saying it doesn't sound like you guys know the standard to follow it. How are you guys executing a standard without knowing it?

Dutton: We do not hire the people, that is not our job.

A. Swazey: I am not saying that you hire the people, I am saying you don't know the standard on how you bring this up and how you decide who gets hired.

Morones: We need to bring this around.

Swigart: Ok, that is enough, stop everybody, we are going to get back on track now. We are not talking about the Town Manager, we are not talking about the recreational, it is not on the agenda. What we are talking about is hiring lifeguards. Advertising to hire lifeguards, before we can swim, we must have what? Water. And then what? Lifeguards. That is where we are at right now, it is not on the agenda, don't bring it up anymore. This is what we are talking about, lifeguards, advertising to hire lifeguards.

Dutton moved to advertise to hire lifeguards. Morones seconded the motion; the motion passed 4-0.

REVIEW AND APPROVE VOUCHERS

Morones: B of A. I am assuming this is for training?

Olmedo: Yes, she attended in March.

Morones: AT&T these are different locations?

Olmedo: Yes, Town Hall, Recreation and the Pool.

Morones: Did we make multiple trips on the same day for cover plates?

Olmedo: It is possible.

Morones: Can we have them be mindful of what they need and maybe make a list so we are not making multiple trips for cover plates.

Olmedo: They are usually good about it.

Morones: Fallon Ford Toyota \$3461.10. What is that for?

Swigart: 481.

Morones: 3561.74

Hansen: They charged us sales tax and they said to just deduct the sales tax.

Morones: There it is, I am sorry, it is noted on here.

Davila: What is it for?

Olmedo: It is for one of our maintenance vehicles, the headers I believe, the head gaskets had to be replaced. We couldn't do it on site, so it had to go to Fallon.

Swigart: It might have been for the diesel, it might have been due for an overhead.

Olmedo: Yes for the diesel truck that we have.

Morones: Operating expense, for \$11.78 for the general store, do we know what this was for?

Olmedo: Cases of water.

Morones: Hitech \$89, commercial service, customer dropped off for repair, so we had something repaired?

Olmedo: Dishwasher.

Morones: Sam's Custom upholstery, high density foam \$566.88. Which was for?

Olmedo: It was for the weight benches next door. They have not been repaired in a number of years, and some of the patrons were complaining about the tears in the benches.

Morones: Western Nevada testing labs \$222.12, looks like pH for the water of the pool?

Olmedo: No, that is for the utilities company. It's samples that we are required to send.

Dutton moved to approve the vouchers as read. Morones seconded the motion; the motion passed 4-0.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT (SECOND)

Davila: I would like to say something. I just want to thank you guys for all coming up, I understand that you are once again compassionate about the issues, but it is kind of good to come to these meetings and see people who truly care and have opinions about stuff and sharing it with the Board. Personally it means a lot to me to have you guys here, so thank you very much.

Morones: Amen, I second that.

Swigart: And it is ok, this is America, this freedom of speech thing. It really means a lot. You have the right and we can disagree, and we can disagree to disagree, but as long as we respect each other, and we don't harass each other or we do no harm to each other, or their family, or their property. It is very, very important. If it goes the other way, I will personally see that there are charges brought against property damage, harassment, anything against this Board, Town Manager, any of the employees of this town.

Vangie Barber: I'm Vangie Barber and just sitting here, just looking at people talking. It would be nice for that person to say what they have to say without Roger over talking over them, I think that would be really nice, because it is just like you said, freedom of speech, let that person talk and then you guys answer, because it was kind of, it's upsetting kind of.

Morones: Thank you Vangie, I appreciate that.

Davila: Thank you

Swigart: Very good.

ADJOURN MEETING

Morones motioned to adjourn the meeting at approximately 5:20 p.m. Davila seconded the motion; motion passed 4-0.