

**COLUMBUS COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
WATER DISTRICTS WORKSHOP**

**Monday, July 25, 2011**

**6:30 P.M.**

The Honorable Columbus County Commissioners met on the above stated date and at the above stated time in the Dempsey B. Herring Courthouse Annex Building, located at 112 West Smith Street, Whiteville, North Carolina, for the purpose of conducting a Water Districts Workshop.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Giles E. Byrd **Chairman**  
Amon E. McKenzie, **Vice Chairman**  
James E. Prevatte  
P. Edwin Russ  
Lynwood Norris  
Ricky Bullard  
Charles T. McDowell

**APPOINTEES PRESENT:**

William S. Clark, **County Manager**  
Mike Stephens, **County Attorney**  
June B. Hall, **Clerk to Board**  
Bobbie Faircloth, **Finance Officer**

**WORKSHOP CALLED to ORDER:**

At 6:30 P.M., Chairman Giles E. Byrd called the July 25, 2011 Water Districts Workshop to order.

**PURPOSE of WORKSHOP:**

Chairman Byrd requested that Mike Stephens, County Attorney, state the purpose of the workshop. Mr. Stephens stated the purpose of the workshop was to discuss the rules and regulations for all water districts.

**ITEM I: DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS**

**Presentation by Kip McClary, Public Utilities Director:**

Kip McClary, Public Utilities Director, presented the following two (2) memorandums to the Board for review and consideration.

July 25, 2011

**MEMORANDUM**

To: County Commissioners  
From: Kip McClary, Public Utilities Director  
Reference: Delinquent Accounts in Water District #4

Since my last report to you in June three customers have caught up their accounts and are now current with the water department. Presently there are 79 customers who signed up for the water but are not paying the minimum bill.

As of July 18, 2011 these 79 customers owed \$14,560.00 in unpaid water bills not including penalties. With penalties they owe a total of \$28,036.00.

For the Fiscal Year of 2011 – 2012 Revenues are budgeted at \$353,518.00.

Current Projections for the Fiscal Year 2011 – 2012 have Revenues at about: \$335,200.00

If these 79 customers were paying the minimum bill of \$25.00 each the annual revenues would increase by \$23,700.00 to a projected total of \$358,900.00.

The Current Water Policy in Section 26. Billing and Collecting states: “if the bill is not paid in full within ninety days the district will initiate legal procedures to collect the amount due.”

The issue lies with enforcement. We currently have no way to collect on delinquent accounts except turn off the water. These 79 customers have never connected and the accounts are accumulating

penalties.

Clearly the Public Utilities Department must take another step to collect the unpaid revenues. Below I have listed some options to consider:

Option 1: Use the Debt Set-Off Program with the State – this will capture the revenues from those who anticipate receiving a State Income Tax Refund.

Option 2: Report Delinquent Accounts to Credit Bureau.

Option 3: Raise the base rate for everyone in the district to make up for the short-fall. This would require raising the minimum bill approximately \$3.50.

Option 4: Add a special district tax like we have in Water District #2 and Water District #3

## **Uniform Rules for All Water Districts and Retail Water Facilities Operated by Columbus County Public Utilities**

### **Amendment I**

#### **Section 26. Billing and Collecting**

(E) Bills are due when rendered and considered late 15 days from “Date Bill Mailed.” A late fee of \$5.00 will be charged if payment of water bill is not received by 5:00 P.M. on “Due Date”. If the bill is not paid by the last working business day of the month the account becomes delinquent and a \$30.00 delinquent penalty is charged. Service may be discontinued by the district if the bill is not paid by the last working business day of the month. **If the bill is not paid in full by the end of ninety days the district will initiate legal procedures to collect the amount due.**

#### **Section 28. Termination Clause**

By requesting water service and payment of a connection fee, the recipient of the water service hereby understands and agrees to pay a minimum monthly water bill if not connected to the system and using water sixty days after such is made available to the dwelling. If connected to the system, the recipient is responsible for the minimum bill plus usage.

The customer will be responsible to pay the bill for a minimum of five years from the date the first bill is assessed. Customers wishing to disconnect from the system after the five year period may do so by paying a \$250.00 disconnect fee.

Tenants of rental property may disconnect from the system by paying the bill owed in full plus a \$25.00 disconnect fee.

The owner of the rental property will be responsible for the bill when the property is not occupied by a tenant. The owner of the rental property may disconnect the property from the system after the five year period by paying a \$250.00 disconnect fee.

Properties connected to the system prior to the use of the water service application in 2003 are exempt from the 5 year obligation.

Approved and Adopted this 18<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2011.

Columbus County Board of Commissioners

/s/ **Giles E. Byrd, Chairman**

/s/ **June B. Hall, Clerk to Board**

July 25, 2011

**MEMORANDUM**

To: County Commissioners

From: Kip McClary, Public Utilities Director  
 Reference: Other Water Policy Considerations

### **Requests for extensions:**

Presently the Water Policy is silent on the procedure for handling requests for extensions to serve customers where there are no water mains available. There are many areas scattered across the districts where customers would like to hook on to water but there is no water main available to serve them.

Until now we have been bringing the requests to the Board for consideration when it makes good sense to consider or when there is funding available to make the extension.

Do we want to continue with the present format of bringing each request to the Board for consideration or do we want to establish another procedure?

### **Connection where water is available:**

Many other Counties require new construction to hook on to County Water where the water is available as do most Cities and Towns. Many counties charge an availability fee based on the installation cost of the main passing by the property.

Presently there are many new properties being developed within the County where water mains are available, but potential customers have the option of drilling a well rather than hooking on to County water.

Do we want to consider amending the Water Policy to require new properties being developed in all districts to connect to County Water where it is available?

Kip McClary stated the following:

1. The statistical information is listed in the memorandum referencing delinquent account in Water District #4;
2. I would like to point out to you on the second page, Amendment I, which was approved on January 18, 2011, it is in our current water policy for all districts, the final sentence in the first paragraph reads as follows - *"If the bill is not paid in full by the end of ninety days, the district will initiate legal procedures to collect the amount due"*;
3. It does not address what we will do, but it says we will initiate legal procedures; **and**
4. The question before you tonight is what procedure do we want to take?

### **DISCUSSION:**

**Commissioner Prevatte:** Have we ever taken any legal procedures against customers in other districts?

**Kip McClary:** We are presently in the process of taking procedures against people who are outstanding and tampering with meters. That is ongoing right now, and that is in District I.

**Chairman Byrd:** Kip, it looks to me like Option 1 or Option 2 are the only real choices we got. Everyone on this Board does not like district taxes, and we don't need to penalize the customers that joined on with us in the beginning, and said they wanted to get on board, they got on board, and they are doing everything they possibly can. From reviewing the penalties that we have discussed before, if we had some type of incentive, and extend it county wide, it would help to get them on the water lines. I can't even imagine Option 3 or Option 4.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** At the last meeting, I think our attorney stated you could not legally release the penalties and fees. Is that correct?

**Mike Stephens:** As a general policy, it is not in our favor to release the penalties and fees. However, that is in a general statement. You can go about it from a business standpoint if the Board decided to adopt a resolution and give a period of time where you could forgive the penalties and the fees, but there again, the \$25.00 mandatory is the minimum fee and would still be in place.

**Chairman Byrd:** We need to make decisions, and positive decisions, because if we mess up with this water district, none of us will see it going any further. We are here to make decisions and make them for the best interest of the people of the county. It is not fair to tax people that don't have water

available to them, and will never have it.

**Commissioner Bullard:** On an average, how much is the penalty that a water customer would have in District IV that has not been paid?

**Kip McClary:** \$35.00 A month.

**Commissioner Bullard:** How many months has it been activated?

**Kip McClary:** The first bills went out in November.

**Commissioner Bullard:** Personally, as a Commissioner, I am not in favor of imposing a district tax in no water district, but I am not in favor of the district tax in my water district. I think it is a bad way to do business. I am also not in favor of pressing legal action for \$250.00. I think it will cost the County to do the process to collect that money.

**Kip McClary:** That \$250.00 is the penalty. There is still several months of \$25.00 minimum bills that have not been paid.

**Commissioner Bullard:** stated the following:

- I am not in favor of taking legal action to collect the penalty at \$250.00;
- I think it is very important that we make a good decision, and the right decision, without looking in the rear view mirror at the past and seeing what other water districts have done;
- We need to look forward at what is in the best interest of the people in District IV, whether they are in my district or not;
- If you give 90 days or 120 days, or whatever, to forgive the penalty, then they should hook up and start paying their water bills, this would be the first step;
- The second step would be to enforce the Debt Setoff Program through the income tax returns;
- The third step would be to enforce legal action;
- We need to go the extra mile to help people;
- In the future we need to explain the process better to the people; **and**
- We need to do what is right, try to encourage people and stay on their good side.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** If you sign and agree to do a certain thing, you should be required to do it, you are obligated to do it. Water is very important to this County. We need to put some teeth in the water system. We have got millions of dollars in the ground with this water system that has to be paid. I think if they pay the \$175.00 amount of water bills in arrears, then in the time allotted, possibly 90 days, we, as a Board, would then allow them to pay \$25.00 additional dollars per month for the penalty and late fees until they are paid in full.

**Chairman Byrd:** What you are saying is not to forgive the penalty and late fees. You want them to be paid.

**Commissioner Prevatte:** stated the following:

- I concur with Commissioner Bullard;
- The \$250.00 is not enough to take legal action;
- This amount will continue to accumulate until the time that action is taken;
- By the time we could get to the Debt Setoff Program, which might be 1-2 years, this amount will increase;
- I feel for the people in District IV very much, and I feel for the people in Districts II and III;
- We are talking about all districts, and we have got people in Districts II and III that have been charged penalties and late fees that may be several years old;
- If we are going to forgive penalties and late fees for District IV for \$250.00, we need to take care of all the penalties for Districts II and III also; **and**
- We need to give them the same agreement that if you catch up your water bill within 90 days, one time only, the penalty and late fees will be forgiven.

**Chairman Byrd:** Will the 79 customers get the advantage of the low tap-on fee?

**Kip McClary:** Yes. They have already paid the tap fee. They would not be listed here if they had not already paid a tap fee. These are people who have paid a tap fee, and signed an application.

**Commissioner Bullard:** How much was that tap fee?

**Kip McClary:** It was \$100.00, plus a \$50.00 security deposit. Some of these have not paid the security deposit because they only wanted to pay the tap fee so they could put the account in a tenant's name. They were depending on later letting the tenant come in and paid the \$50.00 so the water bill would go in their name. We have that scenario going on out there also. If they paid the \$100 connection fee, and signed the application, their name is on this list.

**Commissioner Norris:** I concur with Commissioner Bullard and Commissioner Prevatte.

**Commissioner Russ:** stated the following:

- I feel the same way;
- If you sign the dotted line, you should be obligated to pay;
- I am willing, if the County would be willing to pay for their line, to run the water line to their house, and let them have a plumber to hook to the house;
- There are many people in District IV with financial limitations and very bad water that need some assistance, and there are no grants out there to help them;
- We could rent a trencher to do this with, and allow these people to pay the County back in monthly payments; **and**
- If they signed for the water tap, then they need to pay for it.

**Commissioner Bullard:** Trenching for the water line is not a major issue. It can be done with a shovel.

**Chairman Byrd:** We would need to look at a limit of distance if we decide to do this. The main thing is to get the line loaded. With the bleed off, how much water are we turning loose into the swamp?

**Kip McClary:** About 30% of what is pumped.

**Chairman Byrd:** If we had these 79 customers, it would cut that down drastically. Also, talking county wide, with the bleeding of the wells and the dead-end lines, maybe we are wrong on the base number of gallons that we are giving each month.

**Commissioner Bullard:** If we were to throw this \$150,00, which is the \$100.00 tap-on fee and the \$50.00 deposit fee, back in the pot, and say if you don't hook on in 90 days, which you will be forgiven the penalties, and say you are going to lose your tap-on and deposit fee which will go toward your penalties after the established deadline date, and then when you want to tap on, it will cost you the full price.

**Commissioner McDowell:** stated the following:

- I have listened to what everyone has stated, and I think we are all close to the same place; **and**
- My concern is the following:
  - we have to be as fair as we can to everybody, and treat everybody the same and be uniform;
  - when we are talking about penalties exceeding the water bill, we are talking about the penalties and the late fees exceeding what the water bill would have been;
  - I am in favor of forgiving the penalty fees and the late fees;
  - I think increasing the minimum amount is a good idea;
  - There needs to be a definite time period, and every district should be given the same amount of time, and this should be a one-time only;
  - We have to make it as generous as we can, to get as many people to accept it, and then say this is it, and be good to our word; **and**
  - I think we are all on the same page, it may just be a matter of changing the verbiage here and there for all of us to agree to the same document.

**Chairman Byrd:** Right now, we are talking about people that have signed up for the water. We have got plenty of lines running by houses out here, and new houses being built, and there are no requirements for them to hook up. They can have the water line in front of their house and still drill their own well. I think we need to address that issue, and then to get rid of this tax in Districts II and III. I think we need to look at an availability fee, rather than a tax.

**Commissioner McDowell:** I agree. Kip has given us some information regarding an availability fee. If we are going to make our water districts viable, then we need to increase numbers. If we don't increase numbers, then we have to increase revenue. An availability fee may be something we have to look at. The bottom line is we have to make the water district viable.

**Kip McClary:** I would like to introduce some of my staff that is here tonight, Amanda Davis who is our Administrative Assistant, Michelle Hoffman who is our billing officer, and then three (3) of our Water Board members, as follows: Rick Hammonds, Verne Hufham and Thaddes Williams. I would like to defer to them, and let them speak to that, Michelle works with these accounts every day and knows what exists in the archives, and Bobbie Faircloth, Finance Director, has been assisting in that area also. She is aware of what has been charged off in the past.

**Michelle Hoffman:** The question is, the balance of the penalties in the districts?

**Kip McClary:** In other districts.

**Michelle Hoffman:** Everything I brought with me tonight is District IV, so I don't have that in front of me.

**Kip McClary:** Are you aware that some do exist that is hanging balances that has just been left in the archives?

**Michelle Hoffman:** There are. Not a great amount, and I could gather that information for you.

**Chairman Byrd:** May I ask why not, because those districts are so much older than District IV.

**Michelle Hoffman:** I am speaking from the time that I have been there in the last 10 months. The penalties monthly aren't as great as they are in District IV. As far as the receivables, for prior periods, the balance from District IV is probably greater because it has been in existence a lot longer.

**Chairman Byrd:** Somewhere we don't have things uniform then, if other districts' penalties are not as the same as District IV. This is what we are sitting here now and trying to figure out that all five (5) districts are going to be treated exactly the same way on penalties and late fees, and all.

**Kip McClary:** Keep this in mind. At one point, there were penalties assessed in Districts II and III, and then it was decided by the Board, at that time, to put those accounts in a delinquent status since the people were not paying, and then they went to the tax. So those numbers still exist within the system, and they are still attached to the property address that the account was established for. Then, they started paying a tax. That number still sits there.

**Chairman Byrd:** They started paying taxes. Also, those people who were 10 miles away from the closest water line started paying the same taxes as the person that signed saying I want it. That is not fair and that is what this Board has got to work to eliminate.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** Are these amounts before or after the mandatory hookup?

**Kip McClary:** I wasn't here then. From the archives, this is what we have seen. There was a freeze date put on some of those accounts, and it just stopped. Some of those accounts accumulated \$400.00 to \$500.00, and then it froze, and they were put in a delinquent status. The accounts are still there but they are not in use.

**Commissioner McDowell:** If we have a customer in any of the water districts that chooses not to pay their water bill, are they charged the same late fee and penalty fee?

**Kip McClary:** Yes sir.

**James Prevatte:** Reference has been made to increasing the minimum base usage of water, and you need to remember if you decide to do this, the revenue will drop.

**Chairman Byrd:** I am not sure it will drop that much, because people will start using more water.

**Commissioner Bullard:** If we give them more water, it needs to be after they pass the 4,000 gallons mark.

**Kip McClary:** We could put together for you some rate scenarios if you want to go back to there and look at it. The current structure we have now was designed to make the water district more solid. Any time we reduce gallons or increase gallons, we affect revenue. There will be some impact. The State has done extensive studies with UNC Chapel Hill on rate structures across the state. There is a dashboard program out there where you can input our county and compare with other areas and there are multiple ways to approach this. We can put together some scenarios that we would think that would be most conducive to what we do, if you want to see that, and bring it back to you, if you would like to consider changing the rate.

**Commissioner McDowell:** I would, and I would like for you to make sure that you include the manpower that we use to bleed those lines, and somehow incorporate that expense in, so we could pass that savings on to the customer by using more water.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** Why don't we start the adjustments by increasing the base usage of water from 2,000 gallons to 3,000 gallons, and see what happens.

**Kip McClary:** You are going to drop \$4.00 on a good portion of the accounts.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** If that \$4.00 constitutes 400 more customers, then it would be well worth it.

**Kip McClary:** That is a risk we would have to take.

**Chairman Byrd:** What is the average number of gallons used monthly per household?

**Kip McClary:** The average number of gallons used monthly is between 2,900 and 3,300.

**William S. Clark:** You need to take into consideration the revenue if you increase the minimum base usage.

**Chairman Byrd:** We need to take into consideration also, an availability fee to eliminate this tax. The main thing we need to do is to keep a tax from going on District IV, and the next thing is to eliminate the tax in Districts II and III. Then, we get all 5 districts on the same \$25.00 rate, same amount of late fees, everything. But until we get ride of these extra taxes, we can't. That is why I suggested an availability fee. I got some figures from Richard Gore, Tax Administrator, last year when we were working on this. On that time, in Water District II, the real estate was valued at \$289,360,000. The number of parcels was 7,452. The average parcel value was \$38,330, and equivalent to that puts them paying \$27.00 taxes. 70% Of these folks are probably not on the water line. They could not, did not, and do not have availability of the water today.

**Commissioner Bullard:** That is not including the vehicle tax either.

**Chairman Byrd:** That is just the land. Water District III, which was at 11 cents, was \$179,507,737, the number of parcels was 2891, with an average per parcel value of \$62,000, which puts them paying an equivalent of \$68.00 per parcel, and the main thing is keeping in mind, that 70% of these people are nowhere near the water lines, and they are still paying the equivalent of \$68.00, and they don't even have a chance of water.

**Commissioner Prevatte:** How much would we have to charge in an availability fee in District II to equal the amount of the tax being paid? Is there any way to calculate the people who have access who have not hooked on to the water?

**Kip McClary:** We have done some research in that area, and based on the number of potential available customers, we worked up some numbers, and I am a little bit fuzzy on that tonight, and something just under \$200.00 per year availability fee would eliminate the tax. That is the customers where the water is available. Based on those same numbers, we were looking at about \$330.00 per potential customer in Water District III would have to be charged to replace the tax.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** If we impose a \$25.00 availability fee on all of the potential customers that have the water lines running by their house, but are not using the water, would this eliminate the special tax in Districts II and III? If we did that, it would not alienate a person who does not have a water line running by their house.

**Commissioner Bullard:** I think a \$25.00 availability fee is too high. Maybe we could charge \$12.50.

**Commissioner McDowell:** I think \$12.50 is the right amount to charge if this amount would equate to the same amount of the special taxes. Then, how do we determine the distance from the water line?

**Kip McClary:** Up to 300' of the water main. The question will be, is how do you collect?

**Chairman Byrd:** Assess on the property tax bill like we do the trash collection. Can we do it?

**Mike Stephens:** We are right back to the original question. How are going to enforce? An availability fee is not a special tax. Basically, what you have now, they signed up with this application saying they are going to pay the minimum charge. In essence, that is an availability fee. It is available to them, but they are not using it.

**Chairman Byrd:** It is the same thing with someone with a trash can. They may have a house out there, and they don't have a trash can, and they don't pay the annual fee. What is the difference?

**Charles McDowell:** Based on the information that Kip has given us, it states that many counties charge an availability fee based on the installation cost of the main passing by the property. How do they do it if we can't do it.

**Kip McClary:** It has got to do with the structure of their organization. A good example is Brunswick County. If they extend a line down a road, then they charge everybody on that road an availability fee based on the cost of that construction.

**William S. Clark:** You can charge an availability fee. What Mike is saying is you can't place it on their property tax assessment.

**Commissioner McDowell:** If you charge it, how do you collect? If our hands are tied, and they know our hands are tied, we're back to . . . We have customers now who choose not to pay their water bill who are using the water, and we charge them an availability fee, the neighbors say well, he doesn't even pay his water bill, I am certainly not going to pay an availability fee. So, how do we collect?

**Kip McClary:** That is where we are right back to.

**Chairman Byrd:** We need suggestions from you, Mike. How do we collect?

**Mike Stephens:** The Debt Setoff Program, and let it build up enough where it is financially feasible for use to take these people to court to try and collect on the money owed.

**Commissioner Bullard:** Is that the way Brunswick County does, or any of the surrounding counties?

**Mike Stephens:** At this time, I don't know.

**Kip McClary:** We could research this and get back to you.

**Commissioner Prevatte:** You can plan for revenue from additional people with an availability fee, but you are not going to pay the tax. Some of these will be bad debts.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** You will always have a percentage of people who are not going to pay. The main thing is getting something in place.

**Commissioner McDowell:** I agree with you, but we have to have options on how we are going to collect.

**Commissioner Bullard:** When was this water policy in force, the way it is now on the collection fees?

**Kip McClary:** The last update was done in January, 2011.

**Commissioner Bullard:** I wonder if all of us voted yes on this issue.

**June B. Hall:** The vote was unanimous.

**Commissioner Bullard:** Maybe we need to stick by our guns when we make decisions, bite the bullet and go on sometime if that is what is being enforced throughout the county.

**Commissioner Prevatte:** We are still not doing anything to get rid of the special taxes in Districts II and III.

**Commissioner Bullard:** I was listening to what Mr. Stephens stated. I don't want to have to go to court, I don't think it would be a good relationship with the customers. But you have got to have a stopping point somewhere and quit changing policy every time you hit a bump in the road.

## **ITEM II: WATER LINE EXTENSIONS:**

**Commissioner Prevatte:** A gentleman has approached me about running a water line to his house off of Highway 701. He stated his mother had been promised in years past they would run the line for her if she paid the \$150.00 and she said no. He is living in the house now and would like to know if we can run the line for him at this price. I think we need a policy in place that states if it is economically feasible.

**Chairman Byrd:** I would like to address some information that is listed on one of the pages that have been provided to us as follows:

*"Until now we have been bringing the requests to the Board for consideration when it makes good sense to consider or when there is funding available to make the extension.*

*Do we want to continue with the present format of bringing each request to the Board for consideration or do we want to establish another procedure?"*

I think each request should come before the Board, and we need to have multiple opinions instead of a few.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** There are multiple requests that have been submitted prior to this one that need to be considered.

**Commissioner Bullard:** I think on new construction, we need to require them to tap onto the County Water system. This would eliminate them drilling a well.

**Chairman Byrd:** I think we are all in agreement to do whatever it takes to eliminate the special tax in Districts II and III, and not to create an additional special tax. It seems like the consensus of the Board was most everybody was for setting a time limit to forgive the penalties and the late fees, to come on and hook up. My recommendation would be to set the time for January 01, 2012 or January 12, 2012.

**Commissioner Bullard:** My recommendation would be 60 days.

**Mike Stephens:** There is a statute of limitation of 4 years.

**Vice Chairman McKenzie:** I would like to hear what the County Manager has to say.

**William S. Clark:** stated the following:

-I would just do it in Water District IV;

-I think you should give the people 90 days;

-If they don't pay in 90 days, you go after results, but you have to force them to pay;

-You are going to go in Districts II and III, you got it working, people are use to it, you go in there and change it and start forcing something on people that haven't had it, and you will have an uproar.

**Chairman Byrd:** You are going to be relieving people who haven't had the water or are not going to have a chance to get the water.

## **SYNOPSIS of RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. It is not fair to do one district and not the other districts;
2. Give them 90 days to come on board, and if they don't come on board, charge them an availability fee;
3. Do all these actions at once;
4. If the numbers will work, we need to look at the numbers before we make a decision;
5. Assessment fee should be for the whole county too;
6. The water systems have been put together like a puzzle with many differences;
7. At the present time, District IV, with the revenue stream we got, we can't pay our bills, we can't retire the debit for the water lines that are laid in the ground;
8. Water Districts II and III are working with the revenue stream we have now;
9. If you can generate the revenue to make up for the special tax in Water Districts II and III, we can charge an availability fee;

10. To allow enough time to get the numbers together and bring the numbers back to the Board;
11. Have enough actual customers on system, not just paper customers, to make system viable;
12. The need for more information to make sound decisions;
13. Bring numbers to the second meeting in August, 2011, and decide on a workshop or action to be taken;
14. What good are the signups if we don't enforce them;
15. Report based on availability fees that can be exchanged for the current special taxes in District II and III;
16. Set a time limit to forgive the penalties and late fees; **and**
17. Increasing the number of gallons for base usage.

**WORKSHOP ADJOURNED:**

At 7:55 P.M., Chairman Byrd stated the workshop was adjourned.

**APPROVED:**

---

**JUNE B. HALL, Clerk to Board**

---

**GILES E. BYRD, Chairman**