

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

TUESDAY 5:15 P.M. NOVEMBER 12, 1996

PRESENT:

Steve Bradhurst, Chairman
Grant Sims, Vice Chairman
Joanne Bond, Commissioner
Mike Mouliot, Commissioner
Jim Shaw, Commissioner

Judi Bailey, County Clerk
John MacIntyre, County Manager
Madelyn Shipman, Legal Counsel

The Board met in regular session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the pledge of allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

96-1078 AGENDA

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the agenda for the November 12, 1996, meeting be approved with the following amendments: delete under Item 5, approval of the October 8, 1996, minutes; Item 13, recommendation to approve addition to Washoe County Fiscal Policies, Section 11; and Item 19, consideration of legislation and organization of Public Administrator/Public Guardian Office.

MINUTES

On motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the minutes of the regular meeting of October 15, 1996, be approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no response to the call for public comments.

96-1079 CANVASS OF THE VOTE - 1996 GENERAL ELECTION

Pursuant to NRS 293.387, Danny Clayton, Registrar of Voters, presented to the Board the abstract of the votes cast for all candidates and questions in all the precincts in Washoe County in the General Election conducted on Tuesday, November 5, 1996, and certified the same to be true and correct as certified by the Accuracy Certification Board pursuant to NRS 293B.390 for canvass. Duly executed Submission of Abstract and Certificate of Accuracy Certification Board were placed on file with the Clerk.

Mr. Clayton reviewed the statistics and results of the 1996 general election and answered questions of the Board. Mr. Clayton acknowledged the assistance and efforts of the poll workers, his staff, and staff of the Road Department and Management Information Services.

After conducting the canvass, the Board declared the abstract, as presented, to be a true vote cast and, on motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the members present execute the Certification of the Official Canvass for the 1996 General Election, as presented, and the Clerk be directed to enter upon the record of the Board an abstract of the results, which shall contain the number of votes cast for each candidate and question. It was further ordered that the Registrar of Voters submit a certified copy of the abstract to the Secretary of State.

[abstract set forth in full in the permanent minutes]

96-1080 "1996 PUBLIC SAFETY BONDS CANVASS RESOLUTION"

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following resolution be adopted and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute on behalf of Washoe County:

A RESOLUTION DESIGNATED BY THE SHORT TITLE "1996 PUBLIC SAFETY BONDS CANVASS RESOLUTION;" DECLARING THE RESULTS OF AN ELECTION HELD WITHIN THE COUNTY OF WASHOE, IN THE STATE OF NEVADA, ON THE BOND QUESTION SUBMITTED AT THE ELECTION HELD ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1996, TO THE QUALIFIED ELECTORS OF THE COUNTY; PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS RELATING THERETO; AND PROVIDING THE EFFECTIVE DATE HEREOF.

WHEREAS, the County of Washoe, State of Nevada (the "County," and the "State," respectively) is a county incorporated and operating as a county under the laws of the State; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners (the "Board") pursuant to a resolution adopted and approved on July 9, 1996, designated in 1 thereof by the short title "1996 Public Safety Bond Election Resolution," duly called and held an election on Tuesday, November 5, 1996 (herein the "Election"), at which there was submitted to the qualified electors of the County the following question:

PUBLIC SAFETY BOND QUESTION:

Shall the Board of County Commissioners on behalf of Washoe County be authorized to issue up to \$19,000,000 of general obligation public safety bonds, expected to be funded from existing property tax rates, for the purpose of improving and equipping public safety facilities including additions to the inmate housing units at the Consolidated Jail and a regional emergency radio system? Due to the retirement of other bonds and the recent growth in assessed valuation in the County, the County does not expect to increase property tax rates to pay the public safety bonds. (the "Question"); and

WHEREAS, the Board has canvassed the results of the Election and has considered all matters in the premises and desires to adopt this resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF WASHOE COUNTY, IN THE STATE OF NEVADA:

Section 1. This resolution shall be known as and may be cited by the short title "1996 Public Safety Bond Canvass Resolution" (the "Resolution").

Section 2. The returns of the board of election for each precinct and voting district, if any, for the County for the Election are hereby accepted and approved.

Section 3. The Election, including, without limitation, the election on the Question, was, and it hereby is declared to have been, held and conducted in accordance with law.

Section 4. The Question submitted to the qualified registered electors of the County at the Election was carried and the same hereby is declared to have carried by the following vote:

YES 64,530
NO 44,620
TOTAL VALID BALLOTS CAST 109,489
REJECTED 2

Section 5. The officers of the County are hereby authorized and directed to take all action necessary or appropriate to effectuate the provisions of the Question and of this Resolution.

Section 6. All bylaws, orders, and other resolutions, or parts of by-laws, orders, and other instruments in conflict with this

Resolution, are hereby repealed. This repealer shall not be construed to revive any bylaw, order, or other instrument, or part thereof, heretofore repealed.

Section 7. If any section, paragraph, clause, or provision of this Resolution shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, clause, or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Resolution.

Section 8. This Resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

96-1081 KENNEL PERMIT APPEAL - JAMES BIGGS

Katie Stevens, Animal Control Officer, provided background information regarding the kennel permit application requested by James Biggs to keep four dogs at 5364 Slope Drive in Sun Valley, and answered questions of the Board. She stated that there were 45 neighbor notifications; that 4 objections were received citing concerns of noise and the dogs being loose; and that because of these objections, this hearing was scheduled.

James Biggs, applicant, stated that this may be a temporary situation as one of the dogs belongs to his sister-in-law; that he keeps the dogs in the backyard, but occasionally they do get loose; and that out of 50 people being notified only 3 complained. In response to Commissioner Bond, Mr. Biggs stated that at night the dogs are inside most of the time.

Dennis Green and Emery Anderson, Slope Drive residents, spoke in opposition to the kennel permit citing problems of noise from barking dogs, dogs running loose, and too many dogs. Mr. Anderson stated that he was also speaking on behalf of his 93-year old neighbor, Ruth Rummel.

In response to Chairman Bradhurst, Ms. Stevens advised that no one has called the Sheriff's office to complain about the Biggs' dogs and explained the procedures and what Animal Control officers can and cannot do. Animal Control Officer Dede Monroe described the high quality of fencing installed by Mr. Biggs.

Following further discussion, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried with Commissioners Bradhurst and Sims voting "no," it was ordered that the kennel permit be granted. It was noted that Mr. Biggs was cautioned that if there are any more complaints, revocation proceedings could be initiated.

96-1082 KENNEL PERMIT APPEAL - MARIELLEN ST. CLAIR

Katie Stevens, Animal Control Officer, provided background information regarding the kennel permit application requested by Mariellen St. Clair to keep six dogs at 12205 Albert Way in Lemmon Valley, and answered questions of the Board. She stated that there were 20 neighbor notifications; that only one objection was received citing problems of barking and the dogs being loose; and that even with only one objection, this hearing was necessitated.

Mariellen St. Clair presented pictures of the three Great Danes that she breeds and shows as well as copies of their AKC certifications. She stated that the other three dogs are "rescue" dogs; that those three have been neutered; and that the dogs really help her with her husband who has Alzheimer's. In response to Chairman Bradhurst, Ms. St. Clair stated that when the dogs start barking, she brings them in; that the property is completely fenced; and that the Greyhound did get out once but came back as soon as she whistled. In response to Commissioner Bond, she stated that she breeds a litter approximately every 2 to 3 years and that the puppies from the next litter, which will probably be next spring, are already sold.

Claudia Whiteley, 440 Casey Court, stated that she applied for a kennel permit and was denied; and that she believes that if any permits are granted for this neighborhood at this time, one should go to her.

Mrs. Jim Clinkenbeard, 400 Casey Court, spoke in opposition to granting the permit stating that she has seen the dogs out on two occasions; that they bark at her every time she walks by; and that the dogs are not kept in their kennels.

Laura O'Donnell, Ms. St. Clair's daughter, stated that the dogs are mainly in the house; that they usually go out for a few

minutes 2 or 3 times a day; and that they are kept inside at night. Both ladies then answered several questions of the Board.

In response to Commissioner Sims, Officer Hughes stated that when he was at this residence the dogs were fine; that the kennels are in a real nice, shaded area and set up so that the dogs have some nice breezes through it; and that usually when he drives by the dogs are not out.

In response to Commissioner Bond, Ms. St. Clair stated that the dogs could be kept in the kennels when they are out; and that if the barking continues, she would consider having them debarked.

Following further discussion, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the kennel permit be granted subject to the dogs being in the kennels when they are outside and every effort being made to mitigate the barking problem. It was noted that Ms. St. Clair was cautioned that if there are any more complaints, revocation proceedings could be initiated.

96-1083 AWARD OF BID - STANDBY GENERATOR SYSTEM REMODEL - BID NO. 1965-97 - GENERAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

This was the time to consider award of bid, Notice to Bidders for receipt of sealed bids having been published in the Reno Gazette-Journal on October 3, 1996, for standby generator system remodel at the Washoe County Detention Facility on behalf of the Buildings and Ground Division of the General Services Department. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

Darrell Craig, Buildings and Grounds Division, responded to questions of the Board stating that this does include an additional backup generator. Mr. Craig also advised that the 275 kW generator has been increased to a 350 kW.

Bids, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk, were received from the following vendors:

Hansen Electric
F. Evans Construction, Inc.
Orion Constructors

Gruber Industries Incorporated submitted a "no-bid" response.

Upon recommendation of John Balentine, Purchasing and Contracts Administrator, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Mouliot, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that Bid No. 1965-97 for standby generator system remodel at the Washoe County Detention Facility on behalf of the Buildings and Ground Division of the General Services Department be awarded to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, Hansen Electric, in the net amount of \$339,400.00 which covers the base bid item #1 (\$335,200.00) and add alternate bid item #A, the 200 kW Load Bank on the new 350 kW generator set (\$4,200.00).

It was further ordered that Bid Item #2, a separate accounting for the labor and materials necessary for the reinstallation of the existing kW generator, be rejected; and that the Purchasing and Contracts Administrator be authorized to execute the agreement for the standby generator system remodel including the add alternate pursuant to the terms and conditions of this bid award.

96-1084 CORRECTION OF FACTUAL ERRORS - 1996-97 SECURED TAX ROLL

Upon recommendation of Jean Tacchino, Assistant Chief Deputy Assessor, on motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following Roll Change Requests, correcting factual errors on tax bills already mailed, be approved for the reasons stated thereon and mailed to the property owner, a copy of which has been placed on file with the Clerk. It was further ordered that the Order on each roll change directing the Treasurer to correct the error be approved and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute on behalf of the Commission.

RCR No. 350 Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board

APN 010-051-28

RCR No. 351 Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board

APN 010-051-29

RCR No. 352	Evelyn B. Thompson	APN 077-290-07
RCR No. 353	Silver Sage Manor, Inc.	APN 031-081-46
RCR No. 354	Helen E. Dechaine, Trustee	APN 049-661-08

96-1085 REFUND OF TAXES - AMERICAN WATER HEATER GROUP

Pursuant to District Attorney Opinion No. 6326, on motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following resolution be adopted and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute on behalf of Washoe County:

RESOLUTION -- Directing the County Treasurer to Refund Taxes

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of Washoe County, pursuant to NRS 354.240, has the authority to direct the County Treasurer to refund to an applicant the amount of money paid into the County Treasury in excess of the amount legally payable; and

WHEREAS, American Water Heater Group (Taxpayer) made application for the refund of 1994-1995 personal property taxes because the Assessor's Office double-taxed the Taxpayer's property, APN 090-050-10 and Personal Property I.D. #2/537-002 and 2/537-000; and

WHEREAS, American Water Heater Group has overpaid taxes for fiscal year 1994-1995 in the amount of \$203,795.68; and

WHEREAS, it is the opinion of the Board of Commissioners of Washoe County that the applicant for a refund has just cause for making such application and that the granting of such refund would be equitable.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of Washoe County as follows:

1. The Treasurer of Washoe County be and hereby is authorized and directed to refund to American Water Heater Group a total of \$203,795.68, that amount being the taxes overpaid by American Water Heater Group for the tax year 1994-1995 on APN 090-050-10 and Personal Property I.D. #2/537-002 and 2/537-000.
2. The Treasurer of Washoe County is further directed to debit the account of each governmental entity who has shared in the excess of the taxes collected in error for their pro rata share of the refund.

96-1086 AGREEMENT - MARCO CONTRERAS - INTERPRETER SERVICES - PUBLIC DEFENDER

Public Defender Michael Specchio stated that his office does not require certified court interpreter services and that this independent contract will save approximately \$20,000 this year. Upon recommendation of Brian Mirch, Senior Administrative Analyst, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that an Independent Contract for Out-of-Court Interpreter Services between Washoe County and Marco Contreras for interpreter services for the Public Defender's office be approved and Chairman Bradhurst authorized to execute.

96-1087 AGREEMENT - ALIAN GROUP - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES - PUBLIC DEFENDER

Upon recommendation of Brian Mirch, Senior Administrative Analyst, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that a two-year extension, effective July 1, 1996 to June 30, 1998, of the Retainer Agreement for Professional Services between Washoe County and Jack Alian and Debby Lumkes, the Alian Group, for the Public Defender conflict contract, in the amount of \$727,500, be approved and that the Public Defender be authorized to execute the agreement.

96-1088 THE RENO-SPARKS INDIAN COLONY SMOKE SHOP - VERDI PROPERTY - DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Cheryl Ryan, Department of Development Review Planner, reviewed background information regarding the trust application submitted by the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony property in Verdi and provided an historical account of the events that have occurred over the last year and a half regarding this proposal and the unsuccessful efforts to exchange this property for other suitable County property. Further, Ms. Ryan explained that under Title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), the Board is entitled to submit formal comments to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) on this trust application as to whether they believe the County will be impacted as a result of the removal of the land from the real property and personal property tax roles, and whether there are jurisdictional problems and/or potential conflicts of land use.

As to the first factor, impact on County tax roles, Ms. Ryan stated that research indicates that would be minimal since the land is undeveloped and not served by sewer and water, and therefore only \$650 to \$700 per year would be lost from the tax roles. In regard to the land use factor, she stated that the current land use designation is Low Density Suburban (LDS), which is a residential designation that would allow neighborhood convenience stores through the special use permit process; and that the old zoning was C-2, which is a commercial designation that may be used through the transition period until June 30, 1997, and which would require completing the site review process for a smoke shop. Ms. Ryan and Bob Katai, Department of Development Review, then answered questions of the Board concerning other uses allowed under the designations, exact location of the property, proximity to the Gold Ranch Casino and residential development, adjacent land uses, etc. Chairman Bradhurst asked if there have been any other plans put forth as to what the Tribe is going to do with the residual parcel, approximately 4 acres. Ms. Ryan stated that she is not aware of any other proposals. In response to Commissioner Shaw, Ms. Ryan stated that the Tribe has reaffirmed their commitment to construct the development according to the original site plan.

Arlan Melendez, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Tribal Chairman, stated that their original intent was to establish better working relationships with the County and the two Cities because they recognize that we all share this valley. He stated that the Colony purchased this land in November, 1993, for economic development purposes with the intent of establishing a smoke shop on the Interstate 80 corridor; that the smoke shops are the Tribe's main income stream; and that with cigarette smoking on the decline, they are being forced to seek other ways to try and maintain that revenue which supports their government. He stated that in September, 1994, they addressed the Verdi Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) regarding their proposal, which at that time was to develop the whole 5 acres; and that in an attempt to compromise with the citizens of Verdi, they decided not to develop an RV (recreational vehicle) park and to just do the smoke shop. Chairman Melendez stated that they currently do not have any plans for the residual acreage; that they chose this property because of its proximity to the casino and the tourist traffic already existing; and that contrary to the publicity, this is not a purely residential area. He further stated that they worked with the County Planners on trying to find a trade on the 4 acres, which was not successful; and that with the zoning change taking effect in June of next year, they have to do something with this land before they lose their investment. He stressed that they are still interested in a land exchange

for the residual parcel.

Chairman Bradhurst explained the site review process and stated that if the Tribe were to submit an application they would be subject to the same scrutiny by the Planning Commission, and by this Board if appealed, as anyone else; and that there would be no automatic approvals. He also expressed his concerns regarding signage and maintaining the scenic corridor.

Carol Pinto, Tribal Planner, stated that they have spent a great deal of time working with County planning staff in order to comply with the County's requirements.

She referred the Board to the contents of letters from staff indicating the proposed plans do comply with the Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan. She also stated that the plans were submitted to the Design Review Committee, who recommended only minor changes. Ms. Pinto further advised that the Tribe is also very concerned about the scenic corridor and that they will hire an advertising consultant to design the sign. She stated that they take these things very seriously because they want to be an asset to the community.

Richard Bulis, Verdi Township Citizen Advisory Board Chairman, stated that the community is against this project because the area is primarily residential in character; that there is nothing about this project that is a benefit to the community; and that their concerns are in regard to traffic, noise, signage, lighting, cigarettes, etc. He stated that on behalf of the CAB he is strongly urging the Board to request the BIA to deny this application or, if it is approved, to condition the approval on the Colony following the Washoe County Development Code.

Kevin Lods, Tenaya Lane Homeowner's Association President, advised that at their last meeting the Smoke Shop was discussed and they unanimously voted against it.

Jennifer Smith, Dr. James Craner, Joel Mar, and Parky May, Verdi residents, all spoke against having a smoke shop on this property, citing the concerns of signage, traffic safety, noise, pollution, etc.; stated that they do not want to promote cigarette smoking; stated that they believe this project will adversely impact both their quality of life and property values; and stated that their fear is that if this land goes into trust, the Colony, as a sovereign nation, will not have to abide by the County's development regulations. Dr. Craner emphasized that it is cigarettes that they are opposed to; and stated that if the Colony wanted to put in a bakeshop or a video rental store, the community would support those types of things. Mr. May stated that a very large sign will be necessary for this business to attract traffic off of Interstate 80, which is a serious concern to the community.

Paula Berkley, lobbyist for the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, refuted some of the comments made by Verdi residents; clarified the issue of the taxes paid by the Indians; and emphasized that the Colony stands by its word and does what it says it is going to do. She reiterated that the plans, which have been reviewed and approved by the County, have not changed; and that the fear by the people opposed to this that the Colony will do whatever they please if the trust status is granted, is totally unfounded.

A discussion ensued regarding the signage for the project and Chairman Melendez stated that they will comply with the County ordinances.

Chairman Bradhurst stated that he has grave concerns regarding potential uses of the residual acreage; that he feels the only way to make sure all the concerns are addressed is for the project to go through the required review processes; and that while he does not have a problem

trusting Chairman Melendez and Ms. Berkley to do what they say they will do, the fact is that organizations can change over time and it could be that someone else may be in charge in the future. Commissioners Shaw and Bond concurred.

Commissioner Sims also agreed and stated that the reason the new Federal courthouse has such terrible parking is because they did not have to comply with City ordinances.

Commissioner Mouliot stated that the Tribe is showing good faith just by appearing before the Board, which they do not have to do; and that that should not be overlooked.

Following further discussion, on motion by Commissioner Sims, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Mouliot voting "no," it was ordered that the following Board determinations, as well as the testimony received at this meeting, be forwarded to the Bureau of Indian Affairs regarding the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony's application for trust status for property in Verdi:

1. The Board believes the impact on the County resulting from the removal of the land from the real property and personal property tax roles would be minimal.
2. The Board has grave concerns regarding potential conflicts of land use and feels that the only way those can be mitigated fairly to both the property owner and the local area residents is to have the project reviewed in accordance with the Washoe County Development Code rules and regulations and is, therefore, opposed to the Bureau granting trust status for this property.

* * * * *

8:10 p.m. - Commissioner Sims temporarily left the meeting.

96-1089 ORDINANCE NO. 968, BILL NO. 1143 - AMENDING WCC CHAPTER 100 - INCREASING FEES FOR BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION

7:00 p.m. This was the time set in a Notice of Public Hearing published in the Reno Gazette-Journal on November 1, 1996, to consider second reading and adoption of Bill No. 1143. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

The Chairman opened the public hearing by calling on anyone wishing to speak for or against adoption of said Ordinance. There being no response, the hearing was closed.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that Ordinance No. 968, Bill No. 1143, entitled, "AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE UNIFORM CODES RELATING TO BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION BY INCREASING FEES FOR BUILDING, ELECTRICAL, MECHANICAL, PLUMBING AND SOLAR ENERGY PERMITS, DESIGNATING THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF SUCH FEE INCREASES AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO," be approved, adopted and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

96-1090 ABANDONMENT CASE NO. AB8-12-96 - WILLIAM AND PATRICIA ANTHONY - (APN: 26-021-48, -49 AND -50)

7:00 p.m. This was the time set in a Notice of Public Hearing mailed by certified mail to affected property owners on October 30, 1996, and

published in the Reno Gazette-Journal on November 1, 1996, to consider the recommendation of the Washoe County Planning Commission to conditionally approve Abandonment Case No. AB8-12-96 for William and Patricia Anthony to abandon 14 feet of a 50-foot wide access easement adjacent to three lots, encompassing portions of 3705, 3715 and 3725 Anthony Place. The three parcels total 1.44 acres, are designated Medium Density Suburban (MDS) in the Sun Valley Area Plan and are situated in a portion of Section 30, T20N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

Bob Katai, Department of Development Review, provided background information and answered questions of the Board.

Chairman Bradhurst opened the public hearing by calling on anyone wishing to speak regarding this abandonment. There being no response, the hearing was closed.

It being the consensus of the Board that NRS 278.840 is being complied with and that the abandonment of a portion of the access easement described in the aforesaid Notice appears to be in the best interest of the public and that no person would be materially injured thereby, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that Abandonment Case No. AB8-12-96 be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the recordation of the Order of Abandonment, the applicant shall submit legal descriptions to the County Engineer for review and approval. The legal descriptions shall be prepared by a registered professional and shall be for the area of abandonment, the portion of the abandonment reverting to each abutting property owner, and any required replacement easements.
2. Retention of all public utility easements or relocation of all public utility easements to the satisfaction of and at no expense to Washoe County or the existing public utilities which originally accepted and approved said easements as well as any other public utilities now in existence which currently utilize said easements. Said relocations shall be evidenced by the recordation of properly executed documents reflecting the grant of the new easements to said public utilities and the relinquishment by said public utilities of their former easements.
3. The applicant shall comply with all conditions necessary to effect the Order of Abandonment within two years from the date of the action by the Board of County Commissioners or this conditional abandonment will be null and void.

96-1091 ABANDONMENT CASE NO. AB8-13-96 - MICHAEL AND KATHLEEN WILLIAMS - (APN: 50-060-08, -13, -28, -34 AND -35)

7:00 p.m. This was the time set in a Notice of Public Hearing mailed by certified mail to affected property owners on October 30, 1996, and published in the Reno Gazette-Journal on November 1, 1996, to consider the recommendation of the Washoe County Planning Commission to conditionally approve Abandonment Case No. AB8-13-96 for Michael and Kathleen Williams to abandon 20 feet of a 50-foot wide access easement adjacent to five parcels encompassing 1915, 1935, 1905, and 1937 Lakeshore Drive and a portion of 1850 Slide View Way. The five parcels total 19.0 acres, are designated Low Density Suburban (LDS) in the South Valleys Area Plan, and are situated in a portion of Section 31, T17N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

Bob Katai, Department of Development Review, provided background information and answered questions of the Board.

* * * * *

8:16 p.m. - Commissioner Sims returned to the meeting.

* * * * *

Chairman Bradhurst opened the public hearing by calling on anyone wishing to speak regarding this abandonment. There being no response, the hearing was closed.

It being the consensus of the Board that NRS 278.840 is being complied with and that the abandonment of a portion of the access easement described in the aforesaid Notice appears to be in the best interest of the public and that no person would be materially injured thereby, on motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that Abandonment Case No. AB8-13-96 be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the recordation of the Resolution and Order of Abandonment, the applicant shall submit to the County Engineer for review and approval, legal descriptions, prepared by a registered professional, for the area of abandonment for each lot.
2. Retention of all public utility easements or relocation of all public utility easements to the satisfaction of and at no expense to Washoe County or the existing public utilities which originally accepted and approved said easements as well as any other public utilities now in existence which currently utilize said easements. Said relocations shall be evidenced by the recordation of properly executed documents reflecting the grant of the new easements to said public utilities and the relinquishment by said public utilities of their former easements.
3. The applicant shall comply with all conditions necessary to effect the Resolution and Order of Abandonment within two years from the date of the action by the Board of County Commissioners or this conditional abandonment will be null and void.

96-1092 SPECIAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. SPW7-30-96 - COLD SPRINGS STORMWATER DETENTION FACILITY - COLD SPRINGS 2000 - APPEAL OF DENIAL (APN: 87-021-07 & -11 & 87-491-19)

7:00 p.m. This was the time set in a notice mailed by the Department of Development Review to affected property owners on October 30, 1996, to consider the appeal of Summit Engineering Corporation on behalf of Cold Springs 2000, Inc., of the denial by the Washoe County Planning Commission of Special Use Permit Case No. SPW7-30-96, a request to construct Cold Springs Stormwater Detention Facility including an earthen dam, inlet structure, and spillway on a 60-acre portion of a 476.31-acre site. The project is designed to reduce the 100-year floodplain and the threat of flooding within developed and developing areas of the Cold Springs Valley. The project area is located northeast of Bordertown and approximately one mile north of the area of Cold Springs Valley developed at one-third acre density. The three parcels are designated General Rural (GR) and Medium Density Suburban (MDS) in the North Valleys Area Plan and are within portions of Sections 4 and 9, T21N, R18E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada.

County Manager John MacIntyre noted that this is also an opportunity for discussion and direction by the Board on past policy and options for future policy regarding funding for the operation and maintenance of County-owned drainage/flood conveyance/control facilities.

Don Young, Department of Development Review, presented the staff report, reviewed background information, and stated that although it is recognized that there are potential public benefits from this project, both staff and the Planning Commission recommended denial based on the fact that Washoe County has no defined policy that would allow for the operation, maintenance, assumption of liability, and the ownership of this facility. He stated that the proposed facility would consist of an earthen dam 30 feet in height, an inlet structure and a spillway; that the dam would be 1400 feet long and impound a 49-acre lake at spillover conditions; that the project would provide significant improvement to the drainage of the Cold Springs Valley area north of Whites Lake; that preliminary findings of a new study by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicate substantial 100-year storm flows and potential flooding of both existing and future residential areas; that this facility would decrease the impacts of peak flows and reduce the probability of flooding; and that the applicant is proposing to construct the facility at his expense and then to dedicate the facility to Washoe County. Mr. Young also requested, if the Board does grant this special use permit, that it be continued to November 26, 1996, so that staff can propose conditions.

Commissioner Bond asked if the County has ever done anything in the past that changed a FEMA map so as to take residences out of a floodplain. Dave Roundtree, Acting Public Works Director, responded that while nothing specific has been done, the Jumbo Grade--Washoe Valley area is one of the areas that has been discussed.

He further stated that in a situation where a drainage facility, either a flood control or storm drainage type of construction, has been built the County has stepped forward to take on maintenance of such a facility when the benefits accrue to other properties outside of the particular project. Mr. Roundtree stated that he feels the proposed facility is exactly that type of project; that while the proposed subdivision would receive a benefit, the surrounding community also receives a significant benefit in being protected by these facilities; and that these facilities could reduce the floodplain designation considerably.

Commissioner Shaw asked if the operation and maintenance is something the County could do in-house and, if so, whether it would require additional staff. Mr. Roundtree stated that the Road Department has the necessary equipment; that maintenance would probably mainly consist of removal of debris after a flood occurrence; that it would depend on how many occurrences there are per year; and that if the debris only needs cleaned out once or twice a year, personnel are available for that.

Legal Counsel Madelyn Shipman explained possible options that the Board could use to assume ownership of such a facility and handle the operation and maintenance of the facility, stating that one would be to exercise their general improvement district powers and another is for the County to request through legislation that the population cap be moved down to include Washoe County in flood control projects. She stated that it would be best from a liability standpoint that the County have control over the operation and maintenance of the facility, and to do that, the County must own the facility.

Chairman Bradhurst opened the public hearing by calling on anyone wishing to speak regarding this special use permit.

Bill Thomas, Summit Engineering representing appellant Cold Springs 2000 and Lifestyle Homes, stated that the issues that have been brought up regarding this project are recharge, water rights, and ownership/operation/maintenance of the facility.

He stated that they believe this project will benefit recharge; that recharge is an issue that will have to be addressed by the State Engineer; and that the dam will have to be approved by the State Engineer. He stated that they also believe that this facility is consistent with the

County Comprehensive Plan, specifically policies 3.6 and 3.8 regarding public services and facilities. Mr. Thomas stated that in regard to water rights, there were some misunderstandings when this was first presented to the Cold Springs Association in that some people felt the facility was intended to create water; and that in an effort to allay those misgivings, Lifestyle Homes is willing to quitclaim the filing on any water rights that may occur because of this facility and to provide those rights to Reno Park Water Company.

In regard to the third issue, Mr. Thomas distributed a proposed condition, which he read into the record, stating their plan that a homeowners association be established to fund maintenance of the detention facilities until such time as a stormwater maintenance district and fee are established by Washoe County and stating that Cold Springs 2000 agrees to participate in any such maintenance district. He further stated that they would also support the County in creating necessary legislation for maintenance districts for storm water; and that FEMA will hold Washoe County responsible for the facility and would not support the approach of the developer being responsible for the operation and maintenance of the facility.

Mr. Thomas then displayed maps of the existing floodplain, which has approximately 260 acres designated by FEMA as floodplain impacting 84 existing and 16 planned homes. He then displayed a map of the new proposed FEMA designations which will increase the floodplain area to 350 acres affecting a total of 174 existing and planned homes. The third map he displayed showed the FEMA designations if the proposed flood control facilities and additional drainage improvements are built which would encompass only 88 acres and there would be no homes in the floodplain. Mr. Thomas then directed the Board's attention to various policies in the Comprehensive Plan; pointed out the cost-benefit ratio of a developer constructed facility costing approximately \$400,000; and answered questions of the Board.

In response to Commissioner Bond, Clint Thiesse, Summit Engineering, described the second facility and stated that they do not yet have a site for that. He also discussed projected storm flows and drainage facilities that other developers are currently providing and explained the process that FEMA is currently undergoing that will change the flood designations.

Grace Bukowski, Chairman of the Cold Springs Association Water Committee and member of the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board, stated that she was the dissenting vote on this at the CAB meeting; that she is hearing too much conflicting information on this project as far as the water rights, the recharge issue, the size of the dam, the cost of the project, the benefits, etc.; and that she is concerned the area residents are not getting the real story. She stated that she has a major concern about living below an earthen dam; that the people feel they are being asked to bear the financial burden for a developer who wants to increase the density of a project; and that they would feel much more comfortable if the County designed and constructed the facility. She stated that there has been so much misinformation, and that it would be helpful for the County to come out and tell the people what is really going on, including the fact that this may increase everyone's taxes.

Kelly Probasco, Chairman of the Cold Springs Association, stated that the community does not want this; that they would rather have their own flood insurance; that they do not see where it is going to benefit existing residents; that it will only benefit the developer; and reiterated that there is just too much conflicting information being given out on this.

Pat Rosaschi, North Valley Association member, stated that their group voted against this project; and that when the developer stated that this will lessen the cost of development, she believes that pretty well sums up the issue.

Bob Marshall, attorney representing Reno Park Water Company, advised that it is clear to him that this whole thing is premature; that a second

facility is planned to be built at the same time, yet it is not a part of this proceeding and has not been presented to the Planning Commission; and that he does not believe the Commission can vote on only one-half of a plan. He stated that he has a letter from Summit Engineering dated August 16th regarding this plan which indicates that the length of the dam is one-half mile; that that is much longer than 1400 feet; and that the size of the dam is another thing that keeps changing. Mr. Marshall stated that Reno Park Water Company has several wells downstream; and that they are very concerned that changing the natural run off will impact the recharge of their wells as well as possibly affecting the water quality adversely. He stated that another reason this project is premature is that the County has not completed the Regional Water Study, which should be completed before projects of this type and magnitude are considered. Mr. Marshall also discussed liability issues and reminded the Board that several years ago another developer built some type of pond; that children got into it and one of them drowned; that these facilities are attractive nuisances; and that that is something the County has to consider.

Terry Katzer, a hydrogeologist, stated that constructing a dam in this valley for flood control purposes that will take water when it arrives in the dam and channel it and move it out to White Lake playa will disrupt the natural groundwater flow of the system; that there is a wastewater treatment facility directly upstream from three Reno Park wells; and that not having the benefit of the dissolution of the groundwater will degrade the groundwater quality of the area. He further stated that looking at the existing channels and debris flows that are out there, he does not see the peak flows that FEMA is projecting. Mr. Katzer discussed the soil types and conditions of the alluvial fan stating that it is the perfect recharge system now and described technical evidence that he has seen in the valley to support his findings.

Mr. Thomas rebutted some of the opposing statements. He stated that they are asking for approval, but do not yet have a final design; that that is why it seems that things are changing; that the dam will be a maximum of 2,000 feet and may be shorter depending on the actual topography on the final design; that the second facility is not a part of this; and that until they have a final design, they do not know what it will cost to construct this facility. He emphasized that the purpose of this project is to prevent a major disaster, not to increase the number of homes they can build.

Mike Buschelman, Summit Engineering, stated that most of the natural recharge in this valley occurs at the base of the mountains where it enters into the valley; that this facility will impact that recharge; that they do not know exactly how much, but he believes it will be minimal; and that he would hope that all of the recharge occurs at the interface of the mountain and the valley floor because if that was the case, then there would be no water in this facility and no impact to the recharge. He added that it is predicted that about every 100 years there will be an event; that if that happens there will be a little bit of extra recharge caused by this facility; and that they would like to make sure that any extra recharge is contained in this valley to be used by this valley.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Bradhurst closed the public hearing.

In response to the Board, Leonard Crowe, Washoe County Flood Control Manager, explained differences between the Boneyard Flat flood control facility in Spanish Springs and the proposal for Cold Springs Valley and stated that this detention facility would have to be designed and built not to Washoe County's satisfaction, but to the satisfaction of the State Division of Water Resources, which uses standards set by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Mr. Crowe added that the State will also be responsible for annual inspections and inspections after any major storm event. He also stated that the County did complete a flood control master plan in 1991; that it is a concept level report; that they did look at the Cold Springs Valley area; that the report recommended a flood channel, but not a flood

control facility, for the area; that staff has been looking at all areas of the County in more detail as time and funds permit; and that with this new FEMA map coming out, the Cold Springs area would have been moved up in priority. Mr. Crowe also answered questions regarding impacts on the wells and water quality and quantity, stating that he does not see an adverse impact; nor does he see that the facility will have any impact on the wastewater treatment plant. He added that as far as benefit to the public, if the new FEMA map does come out increasing the floodplain and flood flows as much as they are defined right now, this facility could basically preserve the status of the residents that are out there now. He stated that these new FEMA maps are going through the technical review process right now and these points cannot be argued out until the maps are actually given to the County. Mr. Crowe stated that he believes something significant for flood control is necessary in this valley and that it is opportune for the County that this facility would be privately financed.

Commissioner Shaw asked if sufficient conditions can be placed on this project to mitigate the concerns raised by the residents of Cold Springs Valley. Mr. Young stated that staff would certainly make every attempt to condition the project in order to protect the existing residents.

Commissioner Bond stated that the County needs to establish a policy concerning the ownership, liability, and operation and maintenance of these kinds of facilities; that she feels this is a necessary project for both current and future residents of Cold Springs; that the issue of the water rights should be laid to rest; and that since the County is going to have to take responsibility for this project, she believes that County staff should be actively involved in the design of this facility. She stressed the importance of the County seeking legislation to enable funding for these projects as well as to have the ability to maintain these projects. She stated that with the State Engineer involvement and other approvals by this Board that will be required for this project, she feels there are enough safeguards in place to be sure that this is a good project and moved that the appeal of the applicant be upheld; that Special Use Permit Case No. SPW7-30-96 be granted subject to staff developing appropriate conditions to be presented to the Board for approval on November 26, 1996. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Mouliot.

Legal Counsel Shipman reminded the Board that staff also requires direction regarding establishment of the funding mechanism for the operation and maintenance of the facility. Commissioner Bond requested that all the available options be presented for the Board to consider, stating that her long-term goal would be to get legislation in place that allows the County to provide funding, but in the interim, she would like to examine all the short-term options. Commissioner Mouliot stated that as part of his second, he would also like to see all these options when this item is brought back in two weeks, as well as the options of whether the developer or the County is going to do the maintenance.

Chairman Bradhurst pointed out the condition offered by the developer concerning the Cold Springs 2000 Homeowners Association funding maintenance costs of the detention facility and stated that he sees that as a very viable option since they are the people that will be moving into the area. He suggested that staff investigate that as the number one option, looking at the downside, and present that information as well as a couple of other possible funding options when they return with the conditions for the special use permit. He also expressed his desire that the conditions include State Engineer involvement as it relates to the recharge issue.

Commissioner Bond stated that she would add that to her motion and Commissioner Mouliot stated that he will second the amendments to the motion also. Upon call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

7:00 p.m. This was the time set in a notice mailed to affected property owners by the Department of Development Review on October 30, 1996, to consider the appeal of Gary R. Schmidt from the Washoe County Planning Commission approval of Site Review Case No. SR8-8-96 to William Buck and John Wood for the development of High Sierra Convenience Center, which will include a restaurant, retail and sports services, gas pumps, and 8 rental units on property located on the north side of the Mount Rose Highway (SR 431) opposite the Reindeer Lodge. Because the project proposes utilizing the C-1 (Limited Commercial) zoning, a site review is required by the transition policy on the 2.0-acre parcel designated Medium Density Suburban (MDS) in the Forest Area Plan and situated in a portion of Section 17, T17N, R19E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada.

Don Young, Planner, Department of Development Review, provided background information regarding the proposed project, cited issues brought up at the Planning Commission hearing as well as conditions proposed by the Planning Commission to address those concerns, and provided a copy of a letter from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) concerning their requirements that the developer construct a left-turn lane and acceleration/deceleration lanes on the Mt. Rose Highway for ingress/egress to the site.

Chairman Bradhurst asked if there had been any comments from NDOT regarding safety issues due to the curve on the highway in the area. Mr. Young stated that the one letter is the only response from NDOT although a letter was sent from the Chairman of the Planning Commission expressing these concerns in light of other projects that have been approved in the same area and even requesting that NDOT consider lowering the speed limit to 25 mph around that curve. He noted, however, that it has only been about a week since that letter was mailed to NDOT and there has been no response from them yet.

Chairman Bradhurst opened the public hearing by calling on those wishing to speak regarding Site Review Case No. SR8-8-96.

Gary Patelli, counsel for appellant Gary Schmidt, stated that he would like to address the transition process. Chairman Bradhurst advised that the transition process is not an issue of the appeal. Mr. Patelli stated that the transition process is an issue for his client, in particular the interpretation of the 5-year transition period for parcels with inconsistencies in their zoning created by the new Washoe County Development Code adopted in 1992 and how that is being applied to the subject property as well as how it has been applied to Mr. Schmidt's property. He cited sections of the Development Code relating to the transition process as well as portions of a memorandum from Assistant District Attorney Madelyn Shipman regarding same, stated that his client owns a contiguous parcel with the same zoning which he has been trying to develop in a similar manner but has been denied the availability to request a site review case, and requested that the Board render its opinion regarding this transition process. Mr. Patelli stated that these are due process concerns; that the 5-year time period started some time ago; that Ms. Shipman's memorandum was issued in June, 1996; and that they are also asking that the transition period be extended for those properties, such as Mr. Schmidt's, whose zoning was originally deemed consistent and was therefore denied the opportunity for site development review.

Gary Schmidt, appellant, stated that he has clearly stated his position in writing and clearly established a record for future action. He stated that he wanted to repeat that he is not opposed to the proposed development, but does have some concerns which he feels have not been adequately addressed; and that he believes this is a proper site for commercial development just as he believes his 5-acre parcel, which is adjacent to this, is also suitable for commercial development. He stated that he proposed a similar development on his parcel in 1989 and

attempted to develop a project through 1991, but was denied because of anticipated zoning changes; and that he has been denied the right to submit an application for the last 4 years for a similar project on property that is identically zoned.

Mr. Schmidt then explained his concerns regarding the proposal for the High Sierra Convenience Center. He stated that he raised the issue of snow storage at the Planning Commission hearing and described his 20 years of experience in handling snow at the Reindeer Lodge; that based on his testimony, a condition was added to address this which only deferred it back to the Department of Development Review; and that he believes a more specific plan should be required. Mr. Schmidt also expressed concern that the applicant is not providing enough parking; and that that will result in people parking on his property, which is trespassing, or they will just park on the side of the road, which further increases the highway safety hazards. He then discussed his concerns regarding highway safety and stated that he believes the best solution for the big curve on the Mt. Rose Highway would be a bi-directional left-hand turn lane that starts at Sunridge Drive and goes all the way up past the Tannenbaum entrance, so that it would encompass all the existing and proposed development along there; and that there should be only one shared ingress/egress to serve this project, his parcel, and the proposed condominium development, and offered that he is willing to discuss this with the applicant as his driveway is practically adjacent to the proposed project. He further stated that all this development has to be looked at together when NDOT is deciding what highway safety issues have to be addressed; and that he would also be willing to participate, financially or otherwise, in that for the Reindeer side of the highway as well. Mr. Schmidt also discussed the condition proposed concerning drainage requiring that excess drainage be retained on site and stated that that is impractical and unrealistic; that there should be a plan to transport drainage off that parcel without flooding his parcel; and that he will be documenting the existing drainage this winter. He stated that he is just not comfortable leaving these issues in the hands of the Department of Development Review and would rather the Board set some more specific conditions.

Skip Canfield, Jeff Codega Planning and Design, representing applicant, stated that they believe all the issues have been addressed in the conditions, and they agree to react to any snow storage plan the County requires.

Chairman Bradhurst asked Mr. Young to discuss the conditions of approval that would address Mr. Schmidt's concerns. It was the consensus of the Board that all the concerns were addressed and sufficient mitigation's in place, except for the issue of safety on the Mt. Rose Highway. As to the questions concerning the transition process, Chairman Bradhurst stated that that issue is not a part of this particular project but requested that it be placed on a future agenda for the Board to discuss.

Following further discussion, on motion by Commissioner Sims, seconded by Commissioner Mouliot, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the public hearing on the appeal of Site Review Case No. SR8-8-96 be continued to the November 26, 1996, meeting so that additional information from the Nevada Department of Transportation addressing highway safety can be received and reviewed. It was further ordered that staff include an item concerning the transition process on a future agenda.

96-1094 TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP CASE NO. TM8-10-96 WITH COMMON OPEN SPACE AND SITE REVIEW - WHISPERING PINES RANCH - APPEAL (APN: 055-010-12, -14, -16, -17 & -18)

7:00 p.m. This was the time set in a notice mailed to affected property owners by the Department of Development Review on October 30, 1996, to consider the appeal of the West Washoe Association from the Washoe County Planning Commission's reinstatement of a condition

regarding a 15-foot easement along Franktown Road in its approval of Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. TM8-10-96 to Heather Martini for Whispering Pines Ranch, a 17-lot single-family residential, common open space subdivision with lots ranging in size from 2.2 to 13.9 acres, with the common open space of 28.5 acres to be utilized as pasture land and for creek protection, the proposed project consisting of six parcels totaling 85.66 acres which are zoned A-4 (Farm and Forest) and are designated General Rural (GR) and Medium Density Rural (MDR) in the South Valleys Area Plan.

The property is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Old U.S. 395 (SR429) and Franktown Road, and because the project proposes utilizing the existing zoning, a site review is required by the transition policy. The parcels are situated in portions of Sections 3, 4, and 10, T16N, R19E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada.

Bob Katai, Department of Development Review, provided background information regarding the subject subdivision and stated that at issue is the requirement for a 15-foot easement along Franktown Road and the Board's recent decision to eliminate the bike path designation on Franktown Road and relinquish these easements.

Chairman Bradhurst opened the public hearing by calling on those wishing to speak regarding this matter.

Thomas Hall, Director and Legal Advisor of the West Washoe Association, read pertinent portions of Condition No. 26, which states that the easement is "...for future recreational trail development..." and stated that it is not for road enhancement as staff indicated. Mr. Hall continued to read the part of the condition that states: "The easement shall not be obstructed by any drainage improvements or underground utilities which would be in conflict with or would be an obstacle to the development of the bike lane." He also read the minutes from the August 13, 1996, Board of County Commissioners' meeting wherein the Board voted to do away with this bike trail designation and relinquish those easements, explained that when this subdivision came before the Planning Commission for approval of an amendment on October 1st, that body reinstated the requirement for the easement for the bike path, and asked how the Planning Commission can change the action of the County Commissioners. He stated that they are requesting that their appeal be upheld and that the bike path designation be eliminated once and for all.

Jane Countryman, West Washoe Valley CAB member, stated that the community has never supported this trail and it is their desire that the Board uphold their prior decision eliminating this bike path.

Debbie Sheltra, Franktown Road resident, stated that the issue of safety was brought up at the Planning Commission meeting and will be brought up here tonight and referred the Board to a letter from Jack Bauer, President of the West Washoe Association, wherein he disputes the statement that this is the "most dangerous part of Franktown Road."

Randy Walter, SEA, Inc., representing the property owner, stated that the easement doesn't matter to them one way or the other; and that they would just like to know the desire of the County once and for all.

Jon Christensen, West Washoe Valley CAB member, stated that the community has been divided concerning the bike path issue; that he believes this is not about a bike path; that this easement could be used for other valuable public safety measures; that he has often seen bike riders on the road and cars turning off old US395 which could result in a serious situation.

Bob Rusk, CAB member, read into the record the minutes of the Planning Commission hearing wherein he requested that this easement be retained by the County for safety purposes, distributed pictures of Franktown Road where this easement is located, and distributed a copy of a letter, which he also read into the record, that he received from the Nevada Department of Transportation stating that this right-of-way should be retained by Washoe County or transferred to NDOT around this dangerous, blind curve. Mr. Rusk urged the Board to deny the appeal for the good of all the people that use Franktown Road.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Bradhurst closed the public hearing.

Chairman Bradhurst noted that Condition No. 26 clearly states that the easement is for future recreational trail purposes; that there is no reference to using it for safety purposes; and that he could only support the Planning Commission recommendation if it stated that it was needed and would be used for safety purposes.

Commissioner Sims stated that because of the Board's prior action, it is his opinion that Condition No. 26 is a moot point. On motion by Commissioner Sims, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the appeal of the West Washoe Association be upheld; that Condition No. 26 be eliminated; and that Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. TM8-10-96, with Common Open Space and Site Review, for the Whispering Pines Ranch be approved subject to the following conditions:

CONDITIONS for TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP CASE NO. TM8-10-96 WITH SITE REVIEW for Whispering Pines UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED, PRIOR TO FINALIZATION OF ANY PORTION OF THE TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP, ALL CONDITIONS MUST BE MET OR FINANCIAL ASSURANCES TO ENSURE COMPLETION OF THE CONDITIONS MUST BE PROVIDED. THE AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING COMPLIANCE WITH A SPECIFIC CONDITION SHALL DETERMINE WHETHER THE CONDITION MUST BE FULLY COMPLETED OR WHETHER THE APPLICANT SHALL BE OFFERED THE OPTION OF PROVIDING FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

A COPY OF ALL AGREEMENTS, EASEMENTS, OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED BY THESE CONDITIONS SHALL BE FILED WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND/OR DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT REVIEW. THE DEVELOPER SHALL MEET WITH THE ENGINEERING DIVISION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AT LEAST SIXTY (60) DAYS BEFORE THE ANTICIPATED DATE OF APPROVAL BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO REVIEW SCHEDULING, REQUIREMENTS, FINAL CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS, AND DOCUMENTATION NECESSARY TO ADEQUATELY COMPLY WITH THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AND THE APPLICABLE STATUTES, ORDINANCES, RULES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES. NO FINAL MAP WILL BE SCHEDULED FOR A PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE THAT IS LESS THAN SIXTY (60) DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THIS MANDATORY MEETING.

A REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE RECORDING OF A FINAL MAP MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AT LEAST SIXTY (60) DAYS PRIOR TO THE EXPIRATION DATE OF THE TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP. SAID EXPIRATION IS ONE YEAR FROM THE DATE OF APPROVAL OF THE TENTATIVE MAP OR A SUBSEQUENT FINAL MAP BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OR, WHEN APPLICABLE, BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE STATUTES, ORDINANCES, RULES, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES AND WITH THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL OF THIS TENTATIVE MAP IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE DEVELOPER, ITS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST, AND ALL OWNERS, ASSIGNEES, AND OCCUPANTS OF THE PROPERTY, AND THEIR SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST.

GENERAL CONDITIONS

1. Final maps and final construction drawings shall comply with all applicable statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations, and policies in effect at the time of submittal of the tentative map or, if requested by the developer and approved by the applicable agency, those in effect at the time of approval of the final map.
2. Final maps shall be in substantial compliance with all plans and documents submitted with and made part of this tentative map request, as may be amended by action of the final approving authority. Substantial compliance shall be determined by the applicable agency and the Department of Development Review.
3. Development shall be in substantial compliance with the provisions of Article 408, Common Open Space Subdivisions, of the Development Code. Under that provision, a minimum lot size of 2.2 acres is permitted. The first and each succeeding final map shall not exceed the average gross density of 5 acre lots. Each final map shall contain a cumulative table of the above information. The Department of Development Review shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.
4. Conditions, covenants, and restrictions (CC&R's), including any supplemental CC&R's, shall be reviewed, approved, and recorded by the District Attorney's office. The CC&R's shall require all phases and units of the subdivision approved under this tentative map to be subject to the same CC&R's, be under the authority of the same homeowners association, and be under the authority of the same architectural control committee. Washoe County shall be made a party to the applicable provisions of the CC&R's to the satisfaction of the District Attorney's Office. Said CC&R's shall specifically address the potential for liens against the property and the individual property owner's responsibilities for the funding of the maintenance, replacement, and perpetuation of the following items, at a minimum:
 - a. Private streets within the subdivision.
 - b. Common area landscaping.
 - c. Snow removal and storage areas.
 - d. Fire and fuelbreaks on open space.
 - e. Detention basins and the accumulated sediment.

At a minimum, the CC&R's shall also address the following items:

- a. Notice that Washoe County will not accept responsibility for maintenance of private streets or accept streets for dedication unless the streets meet the Washoe County standards in effect at the time of the off of dedication.
- b. Notice of and specific reference to the following regulatory provisions of Article 424 of the Development Code [Washoe County Code Chapter 110]:
 - (1) Protected open space reference areas section [WCC 110.424.25].
 - (2) Building design, Building height, Yards, Parking, Fences and walls, and Significant natural features of the site development standards section

[WCC 110.424.30(b), (c), (d), (e), (g), (h), and (l)].

(3) Grading and drainage standards section [WCC 110.424.35].

(4) Vegetation preservation and restoration standards section

[WCC 110.424.40].

(5) Fire and Safety standard section [WCC 110.424.50].

c. Requirement to locate all structures and appurtenances (except common area facilities, streetscaping, and landscaping), within the building envelopes submitted with final map.

d. Requirement that each residence shall incorporate an individual residential water system and residential sprinkler system that will meet the N.F.P.A. 13 residential sprinkler system.

e. Specifications on the limitation of turf area.

f. Private fencing outside of the building envelope may enclose no more than 50% of the lot as long as the fencing is corral or kennel type.

g. Requirement to reduce grading impacts for lots containing 15 to 30% slope by incorporating design elements such as day light basements, split pad designs with height variations, step down foundations, and pitched, gabled and hipped roofs to blend in with hillsides.

5. The private drive for lot 10 shall be reviewed for conformance to the hillside ordinance (slope stability and scarring mitigation plan).

6. Proposed building envelopes shall be identified on the final map. In addition, the building envelope for lot 15 shall be reduced or reconfigured to decrease grading impact of the 30% slope areas.

7. A note shall be placed on all grading plans and construction drawings stating:

NOTE

Should any prehistoric or historic remains/artifacts be discovered during site development, work shall temporarily be halted at the specific site and the State Historic Preservation Office of the Department of Museums, Library and Arts, shall be notified to record and photograph the site. The period of temporary delay shall be limited to a maximum of two (2) working days from the date of notification.

8. Prior to ground-disturbing activity or prior to finalization of any portion of the tentative map, the developer shall submit an archaeological/historical survey to the Department of Development Review. The Department of Development Review shall submit the survey to the State Historic Preservation Office of the Department of Museums, Library and Arts for review. Following that review, the State Historic Preservation Office shall submit a letter to the Department of Development Review that indicates the survey was acceptable.

9. The developer shall submit a soil erosion and sediment control plan prior to the finalization of the map to the Washoe-Storey Conservation District.

10. The applicant shall identify the 25 year floodplain for Franktown Creek. The delineated area shall be shown on all lot plans. No livestock boarding or grazing shall be allowed within the delineated areas.

11. Any existing outbuildings and accessory structures violating setback requirements must be removed prior to finalization of the map, or the necessary variances shall be obtained.

12. Approximate locations of potential faults are shown within the geotechnical report by SEA, Incorporated (10-16-95). Individual affected lot buyers shall employ site specific geotechnical services to confirm the locations and make recommendations for property improvements, as may be required.

13. The final map shall designate faults that have been active during the Holocene epoch of geological time and the final map shall contain the following note:

NOTE

No habitable structures shall be located on a fault that has been active during the Holocene epoch of geological time. The Department of Development Review shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

14. The developer shall be required to participate in any applicable General Improvement District or Special Assessment District formed by Washoe County. The applicable division of the Department of Public Works shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

15. Prior to acceptance of public improvements and release of any financial assurances, the developer shall furnish to the Utility Division and/or Engineering Division a complete set of reproducible 'as built' construction drawings prepared by a civil engineer registered in the State of Nevada.

16. A complete set of construction improvement drawings, including an on-site grading plan, shall be submitted to the County Engineer for approval prior to finalization of any portion of the tentative map. Grading shall comply with best management practices and shall include detailed plans for grading and drainage on each lot, erosion control, slope stabilization and mosquito abatement. Placement or disposal of any excavated material shall be indicated on the grading plan.

17. The developer is to provide written approval from the US Postal Service for the plans for the installation of mail delivery facilities. The system, other than individual mail boxes, must be shown on the project construction plans and installed as part of the on-site improvements. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

18. All open space shall be identified as common area on the final map. A note on the final map shall indicate that all common areas shall be privately maintained and perpetually funded by the homeowners association. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition. The maintenance of the common areas shall also be addressed in the CC&R's to the satisfaction of the District

19. Prior to recordation of the affected final map, existing parcel lines shall be relocated through a boundary line adjustment or eliminated through a reversion to acreage, so they do not conflict with the proposed subdivision. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

20. The developer and all successors shall direct any potential purchaser of the site to meet with the Department of Development Review to review conditions of approval prior to the final sale of the site. Any subsequent purchasers of the site shall notify the Department of Development Review of the name, address, telephone number, and contact person of the new purchaser within 30 days of the final sale.

21. All existing easements that conflict with the proposed improvements shall be abandoned or relocated prior to recordation of the affected final map. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

22. If substantial changes are made to the Community Design Standards submitted with the proposed project, the developer shall resubmit a new detailed set of Community Design Standards to the Design Review Committee of the Washoe County Planning Commission for review and approval. At a minimum, the Community Design Guidelines shall address the items specified within the application plus the homeowners variance procedures, if any.

23. The applicant shall submit the following letters to the District Health Department and the Department of Development Review:

- a) A letter from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection certifying that agency's approval of the final map.
- b) A letter from the Washoe/Storey Conservation District approving the proposed method of erosion control and soil stabilization.

24. A note shall be placed on all grading plans and construction drawings stating:

NOTE

Construction noise and ongoing operational noise associated with the project shall meet all noise standards of the Development Code. Upon verifiable unresolved complaint from surrounding property owner(s) of excessive noise, Washoe County may secure the services of a qualified noise consultant. The applicant shall be obliged to compensate the county for all costs incurred to complete two 24-hour monitoring's of the operation to assure compliance with noise standards. Failure to compensate the county within 30 days of presentation of the contract fee shall result in a temporary "stop work" order until compensation is received. Should the noise monitoring report substantiate non-compliance with noise standards, within one week the applicant shall secure the services of a qualified noise consultant to promptly prepare a noise attenuation plan for submittal to the Department of Development Review. Upon approval of the submittal by Department of Development Review staff, the plan shall be immediately implemented and continuing monitoring shall be established and all costs incurred shall be funded by the applicant to ensure compliance with noise standards.

25. A deed restriction shall be recorded with the final map for lot 1 prohibiting any further subdivision of the parcel. A note shall be placed on the final map indicating that the lot has been deed restricted for this purpose. The Department of Development Review and the Engineering

Division shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

26. The building envelopes for lots 4 and 9 shall be moved to the south and shall have a minimum of 70 feet between the rear property line and the building envelope perimeter.

STREETS AND TRAFFIC

27. All roadway improvements necessary to serve the project shall be designed and constructed to county standards for private streets and/or financial assurances in an appropriate form and amount shall be provided. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

28. Approved Occupancy Permits shall be obtained from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), for access to, from or under roads and highways maintained by NDOT and a copy of said permit shall be submitted to the County Engineer.

29. Street names shall be reviewed and approved by the Regional Street Naming Coordinator.

30. The conditions, covenants, and restrictions (CC&R's) shall prominently note to the satisfaction of the County Engineer that Washoe County will not assume responsibility for maintenance of the private street system of the development nor will Washoe County accept the streets for dedication to Washoe County unless the streets meet those Washoe County standards in effect at the time of offer for dedication.

31. A minimum 30 foot wide easement shall be provided for the emergency access road. The County Engineer shall determine compliance for this condition.

32. Proposed landscaping and/or fencing along street rights-of-way and within median islands shall be designed to meet AASHTO site distances and safety guidelines. A minimum vertical clearance of 13 1/2 feet shall be maintained over all streets. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

33. The diameter of the Cul-de-sac bulb island and anything located within the island, such as landscaping, parking, etc., shall be designed to provide safe sight distances and an adequate turning radius for garbage trucks, snow plows and moving vans. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

34. A note on the final map and within the CC&R's shall indicate that no direct access from individual lots shall be allowed onto SR 429. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition. The note shall also be included in the CC&R's to the satisfaction of the District Attorney's Office.

35. The final geotechnical report shall address the need for subsurface drains and the stabilization of native soils under roads and other structural areas located in portions of the site with a high water table. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

36. Documented access to the Franktown Cemetery shall be provided to the County Engineer prior to the recordation of the first final map. The

covenants, conditions and restrictions shall state that the owners of lots in the Whispering Pines subdivision shall not use Will Saur Road for access.

37. Minimum 2 feet wide, Type 2 Class B aggregate base shoulders shall be provided on both sides of the private roadway. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

DRAINAGE

38. The conditional approval of this tentative map shall not be construed as final approval of the drainage facilities shown on the tentative map. Final approval of the drainage facilities will occur during the final map review and will be based upon the final hydrology report.

39. Prior to finalization of the first final map, a master hydrology/hydraulic report and a master storm drainage plan shall be submitted to the County Engineer for approval.

40. Prior to the finalization of any portion of the tentative map, a final, detailed hydrology/hydraulic report for that unit shall be submitted to the County Engineer. All storm drainage improvements necessary to serve the project shall be designed and constructed to County standards and specifications and/or financial assurances in an appropriate form and amount shall be provided. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

41. Any increase in stormwater runoff resulting from the development and based upon the 10-year storm shall be detained on site, or infiltration trenches shall be installed along all new driveways and all new building drip lines. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

42. Any lot grading required to perpetuate or redirect offsite flows through the subdivisions, such as the proposed drainage swale on Lots 12 and 14 that redirects a natural drainageway, shall be constructed as part of the subdivision improvements, not with individual lot improvements. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

43. Roadside ditches that carry the 10-year flow shall be provided so that runoff does not sheet flow across proposed streets. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

44. Flows from developed areas on Lots 16 and 17 shall not sheet flow across property lines. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

45. Notes on the final map and in the CC&R's shall address the following items to the satisfaction of the County Engineer and the District Attorney's office:

- a) All lots subject to the 100-year flooding shall be identified.
- b) Structures located within the 100-year floodplain must comply with County Code Article 416, Flood Hazards.
- c) If fencing is permitted within the 100-year floodplain, the fencing shall be designed to not obstruct flood flows and will require approval by the County Engineer.

46. The CC&R's and a note on the final map shall indicate that the common area and all drainage facilities shall be privately maintained and perpetually funded by the Homeowner's Association, to the satisfaction of the District Attorney's Office and the County Engineer.

47. All existing irrigation rights and irrigation flows exiting the site shall be perpetuated. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

48. Drainage easements shall be provided for all on site drainage facilities located outside of the street right-of-way. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

49. The 100-year floodplain boundaries and flood elevations shall appear on each final map. If the floodplain boundary has been changed by a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Conditional Letter of Map Amendment or Conditional Letter of Map Revision, the date of that letter and a note to that effect shall appear on the final map. If the applicant does not secure a letter of Map Amendment from FEMA for any portion of the map in current floodplain boundaries, the applicant shall comply with building and waste disposal provisions of the Flood Hazard Section 416 for the affected lots. The County Engineer shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition. Grading or building permits shall not be issued for areas currently shown as "A" zones on the FEMA floodplain maps until a Letter of Map Amendment or Revision is submitted or until conformance with Washoe County flood construction standards is determined by the County Engineer.

50. Standard reinforced concrete headwalls or other approved alternatives shall be placed on the inlet and outlet of all drainage structures, and grouted rock rip-rap shall be used to prevent erosion at the inlets and outlets of all pipe culverts to the satisfaction of the District Health Department and the Engineering Division.

51. The developer shall provide pretreatment for petrochemicals and silt for all storm drainage from the site to the satisfaction of the Engineering Division.

52. The developer shall submit to the District Health Department a letter approving the proposed methods of erosion control and soil stabilization from the Washoe-Storey Conservation District.

53. The developer shall obtain a Stormwater Discharge Permit from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP), and a copy of said permit shall be submitted to the County Engineer prior to construction. The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, as approved by NDEP, shall be included with the construction improvement drawings.

54. Culverts are required on Whispering Pines Lane to perpetuate the natural drainage's in Lots 10 and 11. The County Engineer shall determine compliance with this condition.

WATER AND WASTEWATER

55. The District Health Department and the Utility Division shall review and approve the design, construction, bonding, and inspection of all minor infrastructure for sewer collection. Applicable plan check and inspection fees will be collected.

56. The developer shall deposit with the Utility Division the sum of \$50.00 per lot prior to finalization of any portion of the tentative map. This

fee shall represent the development's prorated share for the South Truckee Meadows Facility Plan.

57. The District Health Department and the Utility Division shall review and approve the design, construction, bonding, and inspection of all minor infrastructure for potable water distribution.

58. Water rights for each parcel must be dedicated to Washoe County. The Utility Division shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition. The rights must be in good standing with the State of Nevada Division of Water Resources and must reflect a point of diversion, place of use, and manner of use acceptable to the Utility Division.

59. If a supplemental water source is required, evidence that an adequate source has been procured by the developer/water purveyor shall be submitted to the Utility Division for their review and approval. The water source shall meet both primary and secondary standards of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

FIRE PROTECTION

60. The plans submitted with a building permit application shall show evidence of compliance with the recommendations of the Nevada Division of Forestry. Those concerns are fire flows, fire hydrant number and location, access, sequential phasing of firebreaks during development, permanent firebreaks, minimum defensible space, use of fire resistant construction and/or roof material, sprinklering of structures, and spark arrestors in chimneys. Access and fire flows concerns shall be addressed prior to the introduction of any combustible materials to the site. The Nevada Division of Forestry shall be responsible for determining compliance with this condition.

61. The CC&R's shall be recorded with the first final map specifying that each residence shall incorporate an individual residential water system and residential sprinkler system that will meet the N.F.P.A. 13 residential sprinkler system.

62. Should a community water system be developed prior to completion of this subdivision, the remaining undeveloped or unrecorded lots shall be served from this new community water system.

63. The developer shall enter into talks with the Nevada Division of Forestry for any other requirements, such as, a fire station site, manpower and equipment needs, or for coordination with other developments that have similar requirements.

LANDSCAPING/ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

64. Prior to any ground disturbing activity or finalization of a final map, the developer shall submit a preliminary grading plan and a slope stability and scarring mitigation plan, certified by the project engineer, to the Department of Development Review for review and approval by the Design Review Committee. Said plans shall include a soils chemistry panel to examine if new top soil is required for all cut and fill areas.

96-1095 INFORMATIONAL ITEM - SPHERE OF INFLUENCE BOUNDARY AMENDMENT AND REGIONAL LAND USE AMENDMENT PROPOSAL - SOMERSETT PROJECT

7:00 p.m. This was the time set for the Board to take testimony on and discuss the Sphere of Influence Boundary Amendment and Regional Land

Use Amendment proposal sponsored by the City of Reno for the Somerset project, a residential project with supporting commercial uses proposed for property west of the McQueen area and north of the Mogul area. Chairman Bradhurst noted that the Board of County Commissioners will not be taking any action on the Somerset project, but will be forwarding the information received on to the City of Reno.

Tom Purkey, hired by the City of Reno to facilitate the cooperative planning process as set forth by the Regional Planning Commission required for this proposal, stated that to date a great deal of information has been presented and discussed by everyone involved; that at this particular point in time, there are only two questions that need to be focused on; and that those are: 1) whether to change the sphere of influence boundary westward to encompass the development area of the Somerset project; and 2) whether to change the current land use designations to allow the project to be built as proposed. He emphasized that this is the beginning of the planning process; that many meetings have been held bringing forth a great deal of public comment; that the intent at this stage is to identify issues; that it was not intended that there would be a technical analysis of the issues at this point; and that the project is in a very conceptual stage and issues will be addressed farther down the line. Mr. Purkey stated that some 22 issues have been identified and, at the request of the Board, displayed an overhead graphic listing those issues. He also advised that the full package of information has been available in five different locations throughout the County and over 600 letters were sent to property owners advising them of that availability, of the process, and of the schedule of meetings to be held.

Jeff Codega, Jeff Codega Planning and Design, representing the property owner, presented an overview of the proposed project touching on the issues of infrastructure, expansion of the City of Reno, police and fire protection, traffic, schools, wildlife habitat, stormwater management and flood control, water and sewer service, density, etc. He then answered numerous questions of the Board. Commissioner Mouliot asked several questions regarding schools, police and fire protection, snow removal, etc. Commissioner Bond asked several questions regarding the fiscal impact analysis. Commissioner Sims and Mr. Codega engaged in a very lengthy discussion regarding the methodology used in the fiscal analysis; and Commissioner Sims expressed his concern that before this project goes any further he would like to see a fiscal analysis based on the findings and recommendations that the Regional Planning Agency Fiscal Working Group Subcommittee is currently working on and an analysis that truly looks at the fiscal impacts and quality of life indicators, not just revenues and expenditures.

Chairman Bradhurst opened the public hearing by calling on those wishing to provide testimony regarding the proposed project, reminding them that the Board's action will be to forward their comments on to the Reno City Council.

The following persons spoke in opposition to changing the sphere of influence boundaries, the regional land use amendments, and the Somerset project:

- Richard Bulis, Verdi Township Citizen Advisory Board Chairman, on behalf of the CAB and citizens of Verdi,
- Parky May, Verdi resident,
- Robert Jordan, Verdi resident,
- James Craner, Verdi resident,
- Douglas Hartzell, Mogul resident,

The issues and concerns that they expressed were:

1. Density - current zoning would permit between 300 and 600 homes under the rural and rural reserve designations and the applicant proposes

2,200 residential units, which would result in a loss of their rural life style

2. City of Reno should annex the land in their current annexation program and the remaining "islands" of County land that are located within the city boundaries before going after other property.
3. The City should build out to the Sphere of Influence boundary before it requests that the Sphere be expanded.
4. The project does not respect the Regional Plan or the Verdi Area Plan and, in fact, is urban sprawl.
5. Inadequate fire and police protection.
6. The Verdi and Mogul residents are opposed to any access roads to the project going through their areas.
7. More students for the already overcrowded schools.
8. This would provide a revenue influx for the City of Reno but the people fear that the revenue will not be sustainable; that the increased costs to the City are being underestimated; and that there will also be unanticipated costs, all of which will only make the financial problems worse for Reno, a City that can't maintain its current streets and can't even decide what to do about the Mapes Hotel after many years.
9. Mr. Purkey's report is inadequate.

Brad Scott, who stated that he owns a large parcel that is basically surrounded by this project, spoke in favor of the project stating that if the area were allowed to develop under the current zoning, it would be large parcels with all different kinds of houses on them with any number of outbuildings; that there would be no CC&R's to ensure quality development and maintenance; that there would be no paved roads; that properties could be cross-fenced or completely fenced out; and that there could be any number of domestic animals chasing the wildlife off. Mr. Scott stated that he would much rather see a well-planned, quality development for the area, such as the one proposed, than what could happen there.

There being no one else wishing to speak, Chairman Bradhurst closed the public hearing.

Chairman Bradhurst commented that he is also concerned with the fiscal impacts; that an entity is rather short-sighted if they believe they can solve their financial problems by annexing property and building it up; and that with depreciation, the tax base goes down while the costs of providing services continue to go up.

Commissioner Mouliot stated that he wonders if the City of Reno is financially healthy or would they need assistance to provide the services that will be absolutely necessary to this development.

Commissioner Shaw expressed his concern that the City of Reno may not have really examined and considered all aspects of this development.

Chairman Bradhurst directed that staff forward all the testimony received and the Board's comments to the City of Reno as quickly as possible.

96-1096 INTERLOCAL CONTRACT AMENDMENT - NEVADA DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION - WASTE LOAD ASSESSMENT - VERDI - COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Upon recommendation of Donald Mahin, Hydrologist, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Amendment Number 1 to Interlocal Contract DEP 96-020 between the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Protection, and Washoe County, concerning modifying the expiration date for the Waste Load Assessment for the Verdi (Truckee Canyon West) Area, be approved and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute.

96-1097 AGREEMENT - DINAMATION INTERNATIONAL CORP. - CARNOSAURS EXHIBIT - RANCHO SAN RAFAEL PARK

Upon recommendation of Gene Sullivan, Parks and Recreation Director, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that a Revenue Sharing and Exhibition Agreement between Washoe County and Dinamation International Corporation, concerning the Spring, 1997, exhibit at the Wilbur D. May Museum at Rancho San Rafael Park, be approved and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute.

96-1098 AGREEMENT - JBR ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS - NORTH VALLEYS WATER SUPPLY OPTIONS - COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Upon recommendation of Steve Walker, Water Management Planner, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Agreement for Consulting Engineering Services between Washoe County and JBR Environmental Consultants, Inc., concerning an independent analysis of water supply alternatives for the North Valleys, be approved and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute. It was further ordered that the expenditure of funds, not to exceed \$107,000, from the Regional Water Management Fee be authorized to pay for this agreement.

96-1099 CANCELLATION OF LEASE AGREEMENT - STANHARRAH AND RENO-SPARKS CONVENTION AND VISITORS AUTHORITY

On motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the cancellation of a lease agreement between Stanharrah (landlord) and the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (tenant), in accordance with sections 2 and 12 of the lease provisions, be approved. John MacIntyre, County Manager, advised that this lease concerns property located at the northwest corner of Kietzke and Peckham Lanes which has been used for overflow parking.

96-1100 APPOINTMENT - PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Upon recommendation of Joanne Ray, Chief of Personnel, on motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that Bob Kilcourse be appointed to the Washoe County Personnel Committee.

96-1101 TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT - TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

On motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that Mike Harper, Director, Department of Development Review, be appointed as Washoe County's official representative to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Board meeting of November 20, 1996, and be empowered to act on behalf of Washoe County at said board meeting for any and all agenda

items.

96-1102 APPOINTMENT - WASHOE-STOREY CONSERVATION DISTRICT BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

On motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that Jim Arden be appointed as county representative to the Washoe-Storey Conservation District Board of Supervisors for a term to expire July 1, 1998.

96-1103 CONTINGENCY TRANSFER - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT - DAVID BENNETT - JAIL POPULATION MANAGEMENT PLAN AND COURT ASSESSMENT

Gary Goelitz, Senior Administrative Analyst, explained that the focus of this contract will be on delivering specific written products concerning alternatives to incarceration and associated ramifications, assisting the Sheriff's Department with the computerized dispatch system, streamlining the judicial system, and Mr. Bennett will bill the County monthly showing actual time and expense reports. The Board expressed concerns regarding how much longer Mr. Bennett will be retained.

Upon recommendation of Mr. Goelitz, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that a Professional Services Agreement between Washoe County and David Bennett concerning a jail population management plan and court assessment be approved and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute such contract terminating on June 30, 1997. It was further ordered that \$70,000 be transferred from Contingency, Account No. 001-1890-7328 to Consulting Services, Account No. 001-1031-7105.

96-1104 STREET NAME CHANGE - ROGERS RANCH ROAD TO WHITE WOLF COURT - DENIED

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of Rogers Ranch Road located south off of Valley Verde Drive, to White Wolf Court, be denied.

96-1105 STREET NAME CHANGE - LOGAN MEADOW LANE

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to name an existing easement located west off of North Timberline Drive, to Logan Meadow Lane, be approved, effective May 12, 1997.

96-1106 STREET NAME CHANGE - OWL LANE TO HAWK STREET

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of Owl Lane, located east off the terminus of Hawk Street, to Hawk Street, be approved, effective immediately.

96-1107 STREET NAME CHANGE - VALERIE LANE TO VALERIE COURT

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of Valerie Lane, located south off of Tyner Way, to Valerie Court, be approved, effective May 12, 1997.

96-1108 STREET NAME CHANGE - ESTATES DRIVE TO ESTATES ROAD

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of Estates Drive, located south off of Deodar Way, to Estates Road, be approved, effective immediately.

96-1109 STREET NAME CHANGE - CANNASBACK LANE TO CANVASBACK LANE

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of Cannasback Lane, located north and south between Gull Street and Ouzel Way, to Canvasback Lane, be approved, effective May 12, 1997.

96-1110 STREET NAME CHANGE - RENO PARK BOULEVARD TO WHITE LAKE PARKWAY

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of Reno Park Boulevard, located north off of U.S. 395 North at Cold Springs, to White Lake Parkway, be approved, effective May 12, 1997.

96-1111 STREET NAME CHANGE - DECADENCE DRIVE TO GORHAM COURT

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of Decadence Drive, located east off of Red Rock Road, to Gorham Court, be approved, effective May 12, 1997.

96-1112 STREET NAME CHANGE - WOODSPARK DRIVE TO WOODS PARK DRIVE

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of Woodspark Drive, located off the Mount Rose Highway, to Woods Park Drive, be approved, effective immediately.

96-1113 STREET NAME CHANGE - EAST ZOLEZZI LANE TO DAMONTE RANCH PARKWAY

Upon recommendation of the Regional Street Naming Committee, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the request to change the name of East Zolezzi Lane, located east off of South Virginia Street, to Damonte Ranch Parkway, be approved, effective immediately.

96-1114 EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS - GIS DATABASE FOR GROUNDWATER/WELLS AND SEPTIC TANKS - ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Leonard Crowe, Natural Resource Planner, was present and answered questions of the Board. Upon recommendation of Mr. Crowe and Gary Goelitz, Senior Administrative Analyst, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Mouliot, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the expenditure of a sum not to exceed \$170,000 for the development of a GIS database for groundwater/wells and septic tanks within the Environmental Health Division and the Comprehensive Planning Department be approved.

96-1115 AREA IDENTIFICATION SIGNS/COMMUNITY BULLETIN BOARDS - DEPARTMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

John Hester, Director, Department of Comprehensive Planning, stated that there have been several requests from citizen advisory boards for the County to provide area identification signs and/or community bulletin boards for advertising their meetings and staff is seeking direction from the Board regarding this.

Commissioner Mouliot stated that he feels these signs will just be targets for vandalism. Chairman Bradhurst expressed his concern that these signs not be located in rights-of-way. Commissioner Bond stated that what she would like to see is a page in the local newspapers where the CAB's and other associations can publish their agendas.

Madelyn Shipman, Assistant District Attorney, advised that the Mt. Rose Geiger Grade CAB did put up a sign, which was very nice for the short period of time that it lasted before vandals destroyed it; and that unless these signs can be placed where they are really protected, this will be a maintenance nightmare. Chairman Bradhurst suggested that signs advertising the meetings could be placed on buildings so they would be less of a target.

Commissioner Mouliot asked what happened to the "Washoe County Page" in the Reno Gazette-Journal that the Board discussed over a year ago. Mr. Hester stated that he would look into that. Chairman Bradhurst stated that the annual newsletter that was supposed to be sent out to the public was never accomplished either.

The Board directed that staff review these comments and suggestions and determine if there is a better way to provide information to the public and a specific area that could possibly be tested as a pilot program.

96-1116 COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN - REQUEST FOR WORKING SESSION

John Hester, Director, Department of Comprehensive Planning, explained that he originally misunderstood the request from John McQuay, one of the County appointees on the Water Planning Commission, for a working session with the Board regarding the Regional Water Management Plan; that he thought Mr. McQuay was requesting this session prior to adoption of the plan by the Regional Water Planning Commission, which would be contrary to the legislation; and that it is now clear that this session, if the Board desires to do that, would not be until after the plan is adopted and recommended to the County Commissioners. It was noted that the Water Planning Commission will be adopting the plan on November 20, 1996; and that there is a workshop on same scheduled for the Board on December 9, 1996.

96-1117 COUNTY REORGANIZATION

As previously directed, staff presented a report regarding the pros and cons of consolidating all the water functions, i.e., water, stormwater, and wastewater programs, into one department, the pros and cons of consolidating all planning, development review and building and safety functions into one department, and a request for proposals for a consultant to evaluate the County's organizational structure and proposed reorganization plans. Gary Goelitz, Senior Administrative Analyst, and John Sherman, Management Analyst, were present and answered numerous questions of the Board.

Commissioner Mouliot stated that he believes consolidation of the water functions and consolidation of the planning functions should be effectuated as he cannot see paying a consultant several thousand dollars to do what staff is capable of doing. He further stated that this issue has to have some closure because employees have been left hanging far too long.

Commissioner Bond agreed and stated that she also felt the Board could decide what to do about other functions, such as roads, engineering, after they see how these consolidations work out.

Mr. Goelitz suggested a six month evaluation and a progress report on the successes/failures of these consolidations, as well as further reports or recommendations concerning reorganization of the other departments still at issue.

Following further discussion, on motion by Commissioner Mouliot, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the District Attorney's office be directed to draft the necessary ordinances to consolidate the water functions into one department and to consolidate all the planning functions, including the Building and Safety Division, into one department; and that staff continue working on other departments and report back to the Board in six months. It was further ordered that the request for proposals be held in abeyance at this time.

96-1118 REFUND OF BUSINESS LICENSE RENEWAL FEE

Upon recommendation of Karen Carmel, Code Enforcement and Licensing Supervisor, Department of Development Review, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the refund of the \$100.00 renewal fee paid by Karen Page in October, 1996, be approved.

96-1119 NEW AND REVISED CLASSIFICATIONS - PERSONNEL

Upon recommendation of the Personnel Committee and the Personnel Division, in accordance with Section 5.095 of the Washoe County Code, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the following new and revised classifications be approved:

Personnel Records Technician I, code 0509, grade C070 (\$26,270 - \$34,694)

Personnel Records Technician II, code 0510, grade C080 (\$28,454 - \$37,856)

96-1120 GRANT OF EASEMENT - SOUTHWEST POINTE ASSOCIATES, L.L.C. - UTILITY DIVISION

Upon recommendation of John Collins, Chief Sanitary Engineer, through David Roundtree, Acting Public Works Director, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the Grant of Easement from Southwest Pointe Associates, L.L.C. as Grantor and Washoe County as Grantee, for construction and future maintenance of a water line, be accepted and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute. It was further ordered that the Chief Sanitary Engineer be directed to record the Grant of Easement with the County Recorder's Office.

96-1121 ACCEPTANCE OF DONATION - 1996 FORD WINDSTAR VAN - SHERIFF

Upon recommendation of Richard Kirkland, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the donation of one 1996 Ford Windstar Van, V.I.N. Number 2FMDA51U4TBB99209, purchased via the Inmate Commissary Fund at no cost to the taxpayer, be accepted.

96-1122 RESOLUTION - ESTABLISHING AN ALTERNATIVE SENTENCING DEPARTMENT - DISTRICT COURT

Cathy Krolak, Court Administrator, submitted a resolution concerning establishment of an Alternative Sentencing Department for the Board's consideration.

Commissioner Mouliot stated that he believes it should be the prerogative of the sentencing judge as to what an individual should pay; that it is his understanding that the \$20.00 fee is the minimum amount; and that he feels only the sentencing judge should be able to reduce or waive the fees. He requested that the resolution be changed.

Madelyn Shipman, Assistant District Attorney, advised that the law requires that there be a provision that allows the Chief of the program, not the Judge, to waive the imposition of, or reduce the amount of, the fee. She stated that what she would suggest is that some specific criteria for waiving or reducing the fees be established and approved by the Judges. The Board agreed that that would solve the concern; and Ms. Shipman stated that she would pass that message along.

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Mouliot, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following amended resolution be adopted and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute on behalf of Washoe County:

RESOLUTION: A Resolution Establishing an Alternative Sentencing Department

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 211A of the Nevada Revised Statutes, a county may create a department of alternative sentencing to provide a program for supervision of misdemeanor probationers; and

WHEREAS, due to overcrowding in the Washoe County Jail, there is a desire to provide alternatives to jail for misdemeanor offenders; and

WHEREAS, an alternative sentencing department provides such an alternative by allowing certain misdemeanants to be given a suspended sentence requiring supervision by an alternative sentencing department instead of being sentenced to jail; and

WHEREAS, the Court Services Division of the Second Judicial District Court desires to administer an alternative sentencing department under

the name of the Day Reporting Center;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County as follows:

1. That the Board hereby designates the Day Reporting Center as the alternative sentencing department for Washoe County, within the intent of the provisions of Chapter 211A of the Nevada Revised Statutes.
2. That the Chief of the alternative sentencing department shall be the director of the Court Services Division and the duties of said Chief shall be as defined by 211A.110 of the Nevada Revised Statutes.
3. That a minimum monthly fee of \$20.00 to be set by the sentencing judge is hereby established for probationers supervised by the alternative sentencing department to defray the costs of supervision.
4. That the monthly fee may be waived or reduced by the Chief if it is determined that payment of the fee would result in economic hardship to the probationer.

96-1123 410 MINI-GRANT - NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES, OFFICE OF TRAFFIC SAFETY - SHERIFF

Upon recommendation of Richard Kirkland, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that \$5,000 in grant monies from the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles, Office of Traffic Safety, be accepted and Chairman Bradhurst be authorized to execute the Impaired Driving Mini Grant Project Agreement document. It was further ordered that the following budget adjustments be authorized:

INCREASE REVENUE:		INCREASE EXPENDITURES:	
15237G/4301	\$5,000.00	15237G/7003	\$3,000.00
		15237G/7843	\$2,000.00

It was noted that the 410 Mini-Grant will be utilized in order to reduce the incidence of impaired driving within Washoe County Sheriff's Office jurisdiction.

96-1124 FEDERAL GRANTS - DIVISION FOR AGING SERVICES - SENIOR SERVICES

Upon recommendation of Karen Mabry, Director, Senior Services, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the following grant awards and discretionary funds from the Division for Aging Services in the amount of \$656,697 be accepted:

Washoe County Case Management Program	\$ 75,000.00
Washoe County Senior Law Program	68,000.00

Washoe County Homemaker Program	30,000.00
Washoe County Native American Social Services Program	21,936.00
Washoe County Senior Health Program	30,000.00
Washoe County Senior Nutrition Program	431,761.00
	\$656,697.00

It was further ordered that \$18,358.50 in discretionary funding awarded by the Division for Aging Services for the purpose of purchasing the following equipment be accepted:

- Capital equipment items for Sparks, Gerlach and Sun Valley sites
- Dining Tables (25) - Reno Center
- Various Food Service equipment items

It was further ordered that establishment of the following revenue and expenditure accounts be authorized:

REVENUES		
	Amount	Account
Case Management	\$ 75,000.00	25562G-4301
Law	68,000.00	25482G-4301
Homemaker	30,000.00	25472G-4301
Native American Social Services	21,936.00	25582G-4301
Health	30,000.00	25302G-4301
Nutrition	431,761.00	25442G-4301
Nutrition Equipment	17,858.50	25292G-4301
Computer Equipment	500.00	25432G-4301

EXPENDITURES		
	Amount	Account
Case Management	\$ 75,000.00	25562G-7000
Law	68,000.00	25482G-7000
Homemaker	30,000.00	25472G-7395
Native American Social Services	21,936.00	25582G-7000

Health	30,000.00	25302G-7321
Nutrition	431,761.00	25442G-7392
Nutrition Equipment	14,020.00	25292G-7849
	3,838.50	25292G-7392
Computer Equipment	500.00	25432G-7829

96-1125 GRANT APPLICATION - EXPANSION OF DRUG COURT - SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

Upon recommendation of Cathy Krolak, Court Administrator, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the application of a federal grant for the expansion of Drug Court be approved.

It was noted that federal funds available for this program will be seventy-five percent of the total program cost of approximately \$150,000 and will require a twenty-five percent match by the County of approximately \$37,500; that the award period is for twelve to eighteen months; and that the application is due by December 2, 1996.

96-1126 REQUEST TO PURSUE GRANT - NEVADA LAW FOUNDATION - SENIOR SERVICES

Upon recommendation of Karen Mabry, Director, Senior Services, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that the Director of Washoe County Senior Services be authorized to pursue a grant from the Nevada Law Foundation for FY96-97 in the amount of \$22,000.

It was noted that the grant is being pursued on behalf of the Senior Law Program to cover costs associated with extending an existing part-time position to a full-time position.

96-1127 BUDGET AMENDMENT - FY 96/97 AIDS PROGRAM - DISTRICT HEALTH

Upon recommendation of Dave Rice, District Health Officer, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that an amendment to the District Health Department FY96/97 AIDS Program budget be approved and the following account transactions be authorized:

Account Number	Description	Amount	Amount
002-1700-1712G3-4301	Federal Funds	\$9,250.00	
002-1700-1712G3-7140	Other Professional Services		\$6,960.00
-7230	Educational Materials		1,280.00

-7250	Office Supplies	(40.00)
-7261	Postage	20.00
-7357	Printing	80.00
-7382	Telephone	300.00
-7620	Travel	650.00
	Total Expenditures	\$9,250.00

96-1128 BUDGET AMENDMENTS - FY 96/97 SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES PROGRAM - DISTRICT HEALTH

Upon recommendation of Dave Rice, District Health Officer, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Bradhurst ordered that amendments to the FY 96/97 Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STD) Program in the amount of \$20,200 be approved and the following account transactions be authorized:

Account Number	Description	Amount	Amount
002-1700-1713G1-4301	Federal Funds	\$10,000.00	
002-1700-1713G1-7001	Salaries		3,500.00
-7230	Educational Materials		1,000.00
-7620	Travel		3,000.00
-7829	PC Hardware		2,500.00
	Total Expenditures		\$10,000.00
002-1700-1713G2-4301	Federal Funds	\$10,200.00	
002-1700-1713G2-70021	Per Diem		2,420.00
-7049	FICA		145.00

-7050	Medicare		35.00
-7140	Other Professional Services		1,500.00
-7230	Educational Materials		4,000.00
-7418	Outpatient Lab		2,100.00
	Total Expenditures		\$10,200.00
	Total Revenue	\$20,200.00	
	Total Expenditures		\$20,200.00

* * * * *

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 2:00 a.m., Wednesday, November 13, 1996.

STEPHEN T. BRADHURST, Chairman
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST: JUDI BAILEY, County Clerk