

KINGSBURY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
AWARD OF THE SNOW REMOVAL CONTRACT
TUESDAY AUGUST 27, 2025**

CALL TO ORDER - The meeting was called to order at the Kingsbury General Improvement District office located at 160 Pine Ridge, Stateline, Nevada at 1:01p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL – In person attendance were Trustees Parks, Johns, Trigg, Nelson and Felton. Also present were General Manager Derek Dornbrook, Utility Operations Superintendent Joe Esenarro, and General Counsel Chuck Zumpft. Public attendees included Sara and Jaime Lopez, Kathy Odom, Robert Hererra, Mike Paulson, Charlena Manchester, Jason Torres, Douglas Mathews, Diane Banning, Cory Lobato, Ben Tomson, and Larry Schussel. Remote attendees (Zoom) were Clint Martin with Colbre, Paul Korbani and Jeff Enzo. Note: There may have been public attendees that did not use the sign-in sheet or identify themselves on Zoom.

PUBLIC COMMENT – There was no public comment.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA – There were no questions.

M-08/27/2025-1 – Motion by Johns, seconded by Trigg, and unanimously passed to approve the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS FOR POSSIBLE ACTION:

CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE AWARD OF SNOW REMOVAL CONTRACT

The Kingsbury General Improvement District (District) received three Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for consideration and possible award of the 2025–2028 Snow Removal Contract.

All proposals were due to the District by August 21st. A total of three RFPs were submitted by the following firms for review by the Kingsbury Board of Trustees:

- Manchester Enterprises, Inc.
- Colbre Grading and Paving of Nevada, Inc.
- Lopez Snow Removal

The meeting began with a slide show highlighting the available equipment, resources, and operational capacity of each of the three contractors. This presentation was made prior to the Board's review and discussion of the submitted RFPs.

Colbre:

The Board began its review with the proposal submitted by Colbre Grading and Paving of Nevada, Inc. Trustees noted several deficiencies in the submission, including:

- Incomplete RFP documentation
- Highest overall cost among the submissions
- Limited experience in the Tahoe Basin
- All equipment listed as rented, rather than owned
- Failure to provide required insurance information
- Lack of details regarding company qualifications and the number of personnel available

Following this review, Dornbrook stated that further consideration should be narrowed to the proposals from Manchester Enterprises, Inc. and Lopez Snow Removal, due to the insufficient information provided in Colbre's submission.

Lopez:

During the Board's review of the proposal submitted by Lopez Snow Removal, the following comments were made:

- Nelson expressed that she was impressed with the thoroughness of the proposal. However, she raised concern about the company's lack of experience managing snow removal across large service areas such as the district's.

- Felton noted that the proposal was well-prepared and easy to read. He raised concern regarding the size and condition of the equipment and the company's plans for equipment storage. At the same time, he was impressed by the use of technology, including cameras and machine tracking.
- Trigg stated that the RFP was clear, easy to understand, and addressed all questions she had.
- Parks agreed that the proposal was well-organized and easy to read.
- Johns stated that his main concern was regarding the number of employees, flat-rate pricing and lack of road experience.
- Dornbrook remarked that he was impressed by the overall proposal as well as the quality of the equipment, specifically noting that all plow blades were equipped with gates or wings which could potentially reduce berm conditions. Dornbrook raised concerns regarding the staff and their lack of experience serving the district.

Concerns: Where would they store their equipment, the quantity and size of equipment, Insurance in NV, (Doesn't need a contractor's License by the state contractors board). Parks mentioned fiscal responsibility of the district and the concern that selecting Lopez could result in an excess balance in the snow fund at the end of the season.

Response from Lopez: Lopez explained that their flat-rate pricing structure includes snow removal around hydrants and should be viewed as a long-term investment, even though profit margins may be limited. They stated that larger equipment would be designated specifically for KGID and that additional resources would be made available if required. They further noted that two different tracking systems are in place, with some features built into newer equipment, to ensure accountability and efficiency.

Lopez emphasized that communication and integrity are core values of their operation. Their crew is housed and employed year-round, which allows for stability and preparedness during the winter season. They pointed to a strong record of positive client experiences and reported that KGID would be their primary client, ensuring that the district's needs would be given priority.

Manchester:

Nelson expressed that the most significant advantage for Manchester is their long-standing relationship with the district, having provided services since 1979. Felton noted that the RFP response submitted by Manchester was difficult to follow, while Trigg countered that the company's history is irrelevant because their direct experience with the district already demonstrates familiarity with its operations. Johns echoed similar comments, reinforcing the observations made by others. Parks agreed that the RFP was disorganized, with numerous cross-outs, and supported the decision to remove Manchester's response from consideration due to its lack of clarity. Dornbrook was impressed by the number of emails he received from constituents in support of Manchester. He added that it would be irresponsible to disregard the opinions of District stakeholders when evaluating the proposals. He also agreed that the primary focus of snow removal operations should be that of public health and safety concerns, not customer convenience or overall cost of such services.

Concerns: The proposal submitted by Manchester did not include any information regarding claims or litigation history, nor did it provide details about employee qualifications aside from a reference to Flipper. The proposal also set a minimum contract value of \$500,000.00 per year, which raised concerns about what the maximum costs could ultimately be. Johns expressed particular concern that several pieces of information specifically requested in the RFP were not provided, and he questioned how the minimum annual cost reached such a high level. Parks noted that the proposal included charges for snow removal around fire hydrants but failed to specify the labor costs associated with shoveling hydrants.

Response from Manchester:

Manchester apologized for the condition of the RFP, acknowledging that it was confusing to review, and clarified that, in the past, fire hydrant clearing had been listed separately in the contract at a rate of \$100 per hydrant. Under the current proposal, however, hydrant clearing is included within the overall scope of work and will not be charged separately in the future.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Kathy Odom: Award should not be based on the popularity, reality of equipment and how old it is concerns her.

Mr. Poulsen: Questioned where they are going to store the sand, stating one sand truck will not be sufficient. Lopez has no backup plows in case they hit a vault sitting above grade in a District roadway.

Ben Johnson: Speaking upon behalf of Tahoe Douglas Fire and voiced his concern about clear roadways and clear hydrants for the safety of our residents and visitors stating the risk associated with lack of EMS access. Lopez could do a great job but there's no history demonstrated, which is terrifying and unpredictable. His hope is that the district can settle past differences with Manchester.

Cory Labato: Stated he delivers mail at 5:30 am and sees Manchester plowing at 3:00am and questioned if Lopez has sufficient crew to start that early in the morning. The postal service experienced issues with Lopez snow removal who plows the parking lot where he works in Roundhill, it's supposed to be plowed by 5:00 am and that does not always

happen, also the salt that they use is deteriorating the concrete.

Jodie Nelson: Reviewed past budgets to review historical snow removal costs. She states that flat rate is a poor business model and bad business practice for the district. She further noted that this is not sustainable business practice.

Paul Korbani: A resident of Tina Court, noted that his driveway is above the Summit Village overflow parking lot where Lopez stages their equipment. His experience with Lopez has been stellar as they have very good people working with them.

Jeff Enzo: A resident on Andria and Sunflower Circle for 20 years, rates the quality of service provided over the years at a 10, and that Manchester does an incredible job.

General Counsel Chuck Zumpft advised the Board that the agenda item presented three different options for consideration. He cautioned against pursuing the second option, which involved negotiating directly with the proposers, and recommended that the Board avoid this approach. Of the three options, Zumpft indicated that the first was the safest and most appropriate course of action. He further encouraged Board members to complete the ranking of the RFP submissions, noting that this ranking serves as the proper basis for determining the award.

Final Comments:

Johns: Expressed concerns regarding both proposals. Lopez was found to be lacking in experience and equipment, raising doubts about their ability to perform and ensure the district's safety. Manchester's response to the RFP was unsatisfactory, as was their \$500,000 minimum requirement. Johns was not inclined to support award to either proposal.

Felton: From a cost perspective, he stated that he is much more comfortable with Lopez. He also favored Lopez in terms of the quality of equipment. However, he noted that Manchester has the advantage when it comes to the overall amount of equipment available. With respect to personnel, he observed that Manchester employs more people but also has more jobs to manage. He added that if the district were willing to accept some degree of risk, awarding the contract to Lopez would provide them with the opportunity to gain valuable experience. He acknowledged that there are both pros and cons to each proposal but emphasized that he was not comfortable with Manchester's RFP submission, particularly due to the presence of crossed-out clauses within their response.

Trigg: Noted that because Manchester has historically been the provider for the district, there is a tendency for the company to act as though it owns the job and, at times, does not demonstrate the level of respect expected toward the district. She emphasized that the Board should seek a company that is eager to work for the district and committed to serving its needs.

Nelson: Expressed that the Board should become more knowledgeable about the RFP process before making a final decision. She stated that she could not support selecting Lopez due to concerns with personnel, equipment, and overall lack of experience, and was not comfortable choosing a new company to provide snow removal services. She noted that her scoring input was limited, as she is not a snow removal professional and lacks the technical expertise to evaluate proposals thoroughly, emphasizing that Board members are not subject-matter experts and that the snow removal committee should have conducted the evaluations and presented recommendations. Nelson concluded that public health and safety concerns weighed heavily on her decision not to support Lopez.

Parks: Noted that while it is a risk not to choose a company with which the district has 40 years of experience, Lopez cannot gain experience without being given the opportunity. She emphasized the need for a fresh start and stated that, from a fiscal perspective, it was in the District's and Board's best interest to support Lopez. Parks also reiterated her frustration with Manchester's poor response to the RFP.

Dornbrook: Expressed concern regarding the selection of a contractor who lacks snow removal experience within the district. He cautioned that either an "epic" winter or even a normal winter could result in multiple operational failures under such circumstances, and this significant risk outweighs any potential benefit.

Additionally, he emphasized the significant volume of customer feedback he had personally received, indicating strong support for Manchester. He recommended that this customer sentiment be carefully considered as part of the contractor selection process. He reiterated his belief that public health and safety should be the foremost criterion for award.

Larry Schussel: Expressed his understanding of the RFP to the Board.

Zumpft: Stated that the Board must either evaluate the bids currently under consideration and make a decision today, or alternatively, allow staff to revise the RFP and repost for new submissions.

M-08/27/2025-2 – A motion was made by Trigg, seconded by Felton, that the board accept the RFP from Lopez snow

removal based on the criteria evaluation and the proposed matrix evaluation.

The motion **passed**, with the following vote breakdown:

- **In favor:** Trigg, Felton, Parks
- **Opposed:** Nelson, Johns

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Parks, Chair

Attest:

Cindy Trigg, Secretary