

WEST WASHOE VALLEY CITIZEN ADVISORY BOARD



DRAFT

Minutes of the regular meeting of the West Washoe Valley Citizen Advisory Board held April 7, 2008 at Bowers Volunteer Fire Department, 3905 Old 395, Washoe Valley, Nevada.

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairperson Struffert called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m., with a quorum of five members present.
2. **MEMBERS PRESENT** – Hans Struffert (Chairperson), Jane Countryman, Rod Smith, Debbie Sheltra, William Elliott
MEMBERS ABSENT – none
3. **CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA FOR APRIL 7, 2008 MEETING** – Chairperson Struffert reported he received an e-mail from Bob Webb which stated certification of posting of agendas was no longer required.
4. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR MEETING OF APRIL 7, 2008** – Board member Countryman reported Ginger Pierce would be providing a Nuisance Ordinance report for agenda item 8C. Rod Smith moved to approve the April 7, 2008 meeting agenda. Debbie Sheltra seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
5. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 3, 2008** - The following corrections were noted: (a) on page 1, item 7C, 2A, ninth sentence, “wild land” should be changed to read “wild land fire protection”; (b) on page 4, item 10A, ninth sentence from the top, “free left turn lane” should be changed to “merging lane”; and (c) on page 5, second bullet, tenth sentence, “Board member Countryman” should be changed to “Board member Sheltra”. Jane Countryman moved to approve the March 3, 2008 meeting minutes as amended. William Elliott seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
6. **UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE** – Chairperson Struffert announced the following:
 - ❖ There was a Washoe County Commission meeting on April 8, 2008. One item on the agenda regarded a recommendation to approve resolution reorganizing Sierra Fire Protection District from the district receiving Federal aid formed under Chapter 473 of the Nevada Revised Statutes into a County Fire Protection District formed under Section 474 of the Nevada Revised Statutes through the dissolution of the Chapter 473 Fire District and the establishment of the new 474 Fire District and assenting to terminate the cooperative agreement for provision of fire services between Washoe County’s Sierra Fire Protection District, the State of Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, and the Nevada District of Forestry effective June 30, 2008 and, if approved, to authorize a Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners to sign the resolution.
 - ❖ Mr. Lowden separated his business from Mr. Weston, which had originated as the Weston-Lowden plan from the South Valleys Area Plan. He submitted a separate plan to sub-divide his approximately sixty acre parcel of land into five-acre parcels.
 - ❖ The first joint meeting between West Washoe Valley and East Washoe Valley to discuss the finalization of the South Valleys Area Plan would be held on May 7, 2008 from 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. at Bartley Ranch. The second meeting would be held on May 28, 2008. The County Planning Commission would approve of the changes at their June 17, 2008 meeting. The plan would then be presented to the County Commission on July 28, 2008. It would then be presented to Regional Planning for final approval somewhere between August and October 2008.
 - ❖ The Nevada Fire Safety Council provided information regarding the Lakeview Home Owners Association and their plans on the Fire Safe Plan.
 - ❖ RTC (Regional Transportation Commission) has been attempting to get on the West Washoe Valley CAB agenda, but have not been successful due to the fact that some issues were not of interest to the area such as the synchronization of traffic signals.
 - ❖ There will be two upcoming vacancies on the West Washoe Valley CAB due to the fact that Chairperson Struffert would be retiring on June 30, 2008. Board member Countryman would also be retiring from the Board this year.
7. **ACTIVITY AND INCIDENT REPORTS BY REGIONAL/COUNTY DEPARTMENTS** - These reports are based on need as determined by the departments as well as the availability of presenters.
 - A. **Washoe County Sheriff’s Office Items** – Sgt. Phil Condon introduced Deputy Brian Atkinson, who patrols the area on a daily basis. Sgt. Condon reported the area was quiet in crime activity. During the past month, there were three false alarms; one fraud case; and one disturbance case.
Concerns/Comments
 - Board member Smith requested to know the general patrol route and how often the route is patrolled. Deputy Atkinson reported the patrol varies based on traffic.
 - B. **Fire Safety Issues**
 1. **Reno Fire Department** – There was no one in attendance to present a report.

2. Sierra Fire Protection District - Chief Mike Greene announced this Saturday, April 12, 2008 at 10:00 a.m. would be the evacuation class to discuss how to be prepared during an evacuation; Next Saturday, April 19, 2008 would be the evacuation drill of residents on the west side of Franktown Road to the Fire Station. Chief Greene stated they were working with such agencies as Animal Control, Red Cross, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Emergency Management, Search and Rescue, the CERT Team, and Social Services. Each agency would provide a brief summary on their role at the April 12th evacuation class. Flyers regarding the exercise were made available. On the day of the evacuation drill, residents would receive a reverse 911 call to evacuate to the Fire Station. Then, each agency will demonstrate what they can do. They would also be recruiting for volunteers. Everyone living outside of the area was invited to also participate. If individuals do not have a land line phone, they can go to the Washoe County website to put in their cell phone number and address to receive a reverse 911 call for the evacuation drill. Chief Greene also reported they received two large grants relating to fuels management. One of the grants would fund a position for a person who would complete fuel inspections throughout the fire district. They would also look for defensible space and identify danger areas. They would then contact the land owner requesting the area be cleared. If the area was not cleaned up within thirty days, they would go in and clean it up and charge the land owner for the cost. Through the Fire Safe Council, they also received approximately \$385,000 to complete some of the fuels management projects.

Concerns/Comments

- ❖ Chairperson Struffert requested to know who authorized charging individuals who do not clean up their areas. Chief Greene stated it was part of NRS 473.040.
- ❖ Board member Sheltra stated the evacuation exercise originated because some residents were unhappy with how prior evacuations had been conducted regarding animal rescue. She asked how residents can make sure they would be conducting this evacuation exercise. Chief Greene stated they handled responses in their own jurisdiction; however, one of the points of the evacuation exercise was to address issues that may arise early. Board member Sheltra commented that allowing individuals to evacuate their animals during a fire emergency was the reason why an evacuation exercise was originally requested.
- ❖ A request was made to clarify the Sierra Fire Protection District jurisdiction and the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District jurisdiction. Chief Greene reported the Sierra Fire Protection District territory in the Franktown Road area was the west side of Franktown Road through St. James Village, Galena, Saddlehorn, Verdi, Peavine, and Cold Springs. They realistically protect 200 homes, but they respond to a larger area than their own territory.

A. Update on Sierra Fire District Strategic Plan Funding - With a PowerPoint presentation, Chief Greene provided a brief history on the Sierra Fire Protection District. In 1950, the Fire District was known as the Sierra Forest Fire Protection District and included Douglas, Carson, and Washoe Counties. It was a fuel barrier between Federal properties and populated areas. It was originally established for watershed protection and wild land. The State managed the Sierra Fire Protection District because they were able to utilize Federal funding. As time passed, the Fire District changed focus as individuals moved into the area creating greater service demands and Federal funding expired. In 2006, the Board assumed control. It was always a geographical tax area with the Sierra Fire Protection District Board being the County Commission Board. The County would collect the revenue and the State would utilize the revenue to provide the service. The fiscal and operational challenges existed before the transfer. In 2007, the Legislature made some changes which modernized Fire District Law. There are two classes of fire districts: 473, which was the old style Fire District; and 474, which was the newer style Fire District. In Washoe County, Truckee Meadows was a 474 as well as North Lake Tahoe. West Washoe Valley was the only 473. The Board stated they wanted them to ensure the long-term fire emergency medical services and to obtain community input on alternative service delivery options and to bring the recommendation to the Board. The community stated they did not want to see a loss in reduction of service. There was also concern about taxpayer money from one area providing service to other areas. A need for a potential tax rate increase in order to fund services was also heard from individuals. Chief Greene explained the City of Reno provides, under contract, the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District services. The County owns the facilities and pays a portion of their budget to the City of Reno, so Truckee Meadows employees became City of Reno employees; however, when the City of Reno and North Lake Tahoe were approached, they stated they did not want to subsidize the Sierra Fire Protection District. Carson City was also approached about a merger, but stated it was not a viable option and MDF stated they would not use State revenue to subsidize a local fire district even though they would face the same situation as the Sierra Fire Protection District Board because they have the same revenue. Chief Greene summarized that individuals want a long-term solution, no cuts in service, and that there was also concern about the tax impact. They took community input and developed and evaluated goals: service delivery goals, financial goals, and governance goals. The goals were then used to measure options and recommendations would be provided to the Board. Service delivery goals would include having the closest unit to respond to an emergency regardless of the agency; to respond to an emergency in six to seven minutes ninety percent of the time; and to have the arrival of a second fire engine to a structure fire within eight minutes. Financial goals

established: to pay for equipment needed; to pay for the cost of extinguishing wild land fires; to have savings for unanticipated expenses; to pay for construction and replacement of fire stations; to pay competitive salaries; and to be long-term viable. Options being considered: to dissolve the district as it currently exists and create an independent district and adjust the tax rate; to dissolve the district and adjust the tax rate and get a facilities bond; to remain as is; to give the district back to MDF; or to dissolve the district to create an independent district for a merger. The Board could agree to the first two options, but assistance would be needed for the other options. MDF would have to agree to take back the fire district. Another entity would have to agree with a merger. Another Board would also have to agree to a county-wide fire district or a joint operating agreement. The Board could agree to create an independent 474 with an adjusted tax rate or a facilities bond could accomplish a lot, but it would not address all of the issues. Chief Green reported this situation was identical with the Truckee Meadows fire district before they consolidated with the City of Reno. Unless the Board takes action before July 1st, the Sierra Fire Protection District was facing a \$500,000 shortfall and service delivery cuts. He reported the West Washoe Valley tax rate was 42% and explained new governments receive a new tax rate for the first year before abatements. The current 473 status would have a \$495,000 budget shortfall beginning next year. If the tax rate was raised to fifty-two cents, which was the anticipated increase, there would be an additional \$784,000, which would meet goals, but would not expand service. Increases would be adjusted proportionately. They recommended to the Board to dissolve the current 473 district and create a new 474 district. A proposed budget would also need to be developed for the potential tax increase and other funding that would address revenue shortfalls and facility needs. There was also the need for a long-term plan for possible consolidation or merging in the future. The Board acted on those recommendations at the last meeting.

Concerns/Comments

- ❖ Chairperson Struffert requested to know if tax increases would affect only those residences within the service boundaries. Chief Greene stated that was correct and that it was only on the fire tax. Chairperson Struffert suggested reviewing the geographic boundaries to include those areas where eighty percent of service was actually done. Once established, tax increases could then be spread out. Chief Greene stated he believed that making the fire district financially viable now would be the best opportunity to distribute the cost throughout the rest of the County and the unincorporated area; however, geographic boundaries can only be moved if a 474 district was created and once the current agreement expires. A long-term solution would be to erase the boundaries and homogenize the service delivery so that everyone was paying the same for the same service. Chairperson Struffert stated it did not make sense to design service depending on where equipment was and the personnel was. He explained the immediate issue was to take care of the current budget shortfall and the second issue would be to determine what would need to be done to provide the best service in any given area, which should require a review of geographic boundaries. Chief Greene explained the only way those suggestions could be done was when looking at renewing that agreement.
- ❖ Board member Smith suggested solving the short-term budget shortfall problem first before tackling a long-term solution. He stated he was bothered with the tax increase due to the fact that a future consolidation with the City of Reno would only allow the fire district to break even, financially. He also expressed concern that eighty percent of service was outside the area with no reimbursement.
- ❖ Board member Elliott reported residents at a Home Owners Association meeting yesterday had stated this current situation was due to poor management and no proper planning as to where a source of funding was coming from before money was spent and equipment was bought. Board member Elliott stated Chief Greene was asking for residents to go beyond reasonable limits to save the station, but there would still be no solution.
- ❖ Board member Countryman asked if costs for running the station would change if service was limited to only those residences within the fire district. Chief Greene stated the only thing that would be saved was diesel fuel. In response to Board member Elliott's comments, Chief Greene explained how it would be hard to justify one fire station for only forty calls. It would be better to homogenize. It would not be logical to say "keep the fire station open at all costs" without residents not wanting to pay all those costs.
- ❖ Board member Elliott stated raising tax rates would not ensure that the fire station would not close because Chief Greene had stated there was only 8,900 homes to raise \$3.5 million a year which does not include cost of living increases and other such costs. Board member Elliott stated he wanted the fire station to remain, but there had to be a more viable solution.
- ❖ Board member Sheltra explained the station was opened by MDF due to its critical location and that eighty percent of calls were medical and seventy-six percent were regional so the regional location of this station should be of concern to the County Commissioners, but there has been no indication that they would provide a long-term solution. The problem was that residents did not want to be the regional care takers of the community by themselves. There were also concerns about future expenses.

- ❖ Board member Elliott reported no one knew the extent of the fire district. He stated he wanted to help, but “ammunition” was needed in order to help. Chief Greene stated he agreed that there had to be a long-term solution, but they would not be viable by the time the contract expires without a tax rate increase. He stated he believed the only long-range solution would be to have all tax payers pay the same tax rate to obtain the same service.
- ❖ Chairperson Struffert stated that, in his opinion, the issue was not a tax rate increase. He reiterated that the number one issue was to do anything to ensure the continuing service that the valley requires. In order to do that, funding needed to be obtained somewhere to operate for the time being. The next issue would be to look at how to prevent this same situation from occurring in the next budget year and the budget year after that.
- ❖ Board member Smith commented that there were other ways to obtain funding for the station other than looking internally. Chairperson Struffert remarked that the issue was that individuals who receive service have to pay for service. Board member Smith stated individuals have not realized they were paying for one station when service was being provided from another station.
- ❖ Board member Elliott reported one issue that was brought up during the Home Owners Association meeting was to have a profit center that provide services and get paid for those services.
- ❖ Chairperson Struffert requested the Board consider what the community wanted in order to provide the community input Chief Green was requesting.
- ❖ Cliff Low requested to know the following: how residents would be reassured that the station would remain open if the fire district changed to a 474 district; if there were areas within the Sierra Fire Protection District that were being provided with service from Truckee Meadows or another fire district; and where the incentive would be on the part of the County Commission to make the district financially viable. Chief Greene stated he believed the same issue existed throughout the fire district and that he was not hearing the Commission saying they wanted to ignore the problem or not to have a long-term solution. He reminded the Board of the third recommendation which was to develop a citizen-driven group to present a recommendation in a year before the contract expires to address all these issues, which should be the focus. The Commission was requesting the district demonstrate financial self-sufficiency, but there would be no resistance to solve this problem long-term.
- ❖ Chairperson Struffert commented that showing financial self-sufficiency was not the first step in solving this problem. It was looking at the whole system backwards. Needs need to be established first. Once established, equipment and personnel can then be looked at in order to fill the need. Then, the cost can be calculated.
- ❖ Board member Smith pointed out the district was set up to service the west side of the lake, but the services were not being paid for.
- ❖ Board member Sheltra stated she wanted the County Commission to know that a regional solution was needed and to recognize that it was a County Commission responsibility to take care of the county as a whole.
- ❖ Chairperson Struffert stated it should be made clear that residents wanted a continuation of service the way it has been in the last two years since the split from MDF and that it was up to the County Commission to come up with a financial solution to ensure that same service. Then, a long-term solution should be considered before the contract with Truckee Meadows/City of Reno expires.
- ❖ Board member Elliott stated something to add to that would be that there would be very little opposition to any home owner that was on this side of 395 not wanting to be in this district.
- ❖ Chairperson Struffert stated this whole thing is service requirement driven and not budget driven.
- ❖ Board member Smith asked if a total income from the residences west of the lake was considered. Chief Greene stated the revenue was approximately \$½ million. He also clarified tomorrow’s Commission meeting would not be establishing a tax rate. It was a discussion of changing the district to a 474 district. It also requires a time period for the State Forester to agree. The time to change to a 474 district expires June 24, 2008.
- ❖ Board member Countryman requested to know why the County Commission could not work with the City of Reno to resolve the territory issue. Chief Greene stated it would require the City of Reno to agree to any changes in the contract, but the City of Reno did not want to make changes to the contract. Board member Countryman commented the County Commission’s hands were tied because of the contract to help the district resolve this issue which was why the stop-gap help was needed first so that the County can get into a position to take action. She stated her only concern was that the County makes some kind of written commitment that they intend to address that at that time.
- ❖ Chairperson Struffert re-read the agenda item to be heard at the April 8, 2008 Washoe County Commission meeting. Discussion followed. Chairperson Struffert stated that all they can do at this point based on the information provided was to give Chief Greene the authority to tell the Commission that the Board and residents would insist on a continuation of the service level that

currently exists; that they support finding a short-term budget solution for operating expenses; and that within the remaining two years, find a solution to the unacceptable borderline situation that exists between the three different fire protection agencies.

- ❖ Board member Smith suggested adding a statement about how much a tax rate residents would be willing to accept. Chief Greene clarified the tax rate issue would not be presented to the Commission before May 13, 2008. Additional information was needed before the Board could formalize a recommended tax rate. He stated he was not asking for a tax recommendation now. He was asking for the mechanism to allow a tax rate.
- ❖ Board member Sheltra commented that Chief Greene had presented to the Commission and to this Board twice that a 474 district would not work without the ten cent or twenty-four percent increase to Sierra District residents so if the Board agrees to allow for a tax rate that would be, in essence, saying to the Commission that residents agree to a twenty-four percent increase when they do not agree to a twenty-four percent increase. She stated the Board wanted the County Commission to find a regional solution. Chairperson Struffert stated it was not Chief Greene's responsibility or authority to state what kind of tax increase was needed in order to remain in operation. Board member Sheltra pointed out Chief Greene was asked for and presented a tax increase to the Commission. Chairperson Struffert stated that was a different story because Chief Greene had to review finances and present a tax rate. Board member Sheltra stated that begs the issue that if funding was provided, a solution would not need to be found.
- ❖ Board member Elliott commented that it had been stated that the Board would help if the right information was received. He stated it should be presented to the Commission that the Board was in favor of helping and that they want to be a part of the system and they want it to work.
- ❖ Chairperson Struffert reiterated the district had to continue to be able to operate in order to provide the essential services needed. The Commission also needed to seriously address the fact that organizational review of the three different fire authorities had to be done preferably within the two years before they were forced to renew the contract with the City of Reno.

Jane Countryman moved to ask Chief Greene to make sure there was continued service for the area; that a short fund resolution was completed for the funding; and that there a review of reallocating the districts so that it was viable in the future for a long-term resolution and for the Commission to put it in their motion that they would provide a review of a reallocation. William Elliott seconded the motion. Discussion followed.

- ❖ Board member Sheltra stated she wanted the motion to include that the County Commissioners had to find a regional solution. Board member Countryman agreed to amend her motion to include that the County Commissioners had to find a regional solution. Board member Sheltra also wanted it added in the motion that residents would agree to only a twelve percent tax increase to put them on parity with Truckee Meadows. Board member Smith agreed. Board member Countryman stated she thought it was discussed that Chief Greene does not have the authority to discuss a tax rate. Chairperson Struffert stated the motion was just to convey what the Board and residents think need to be done.
- ❖ Board member Countryman expressed concern that an increase to only forty-seven cents might lose current services. Discussion followed. Chief Greene stated it was perfectly reasonable to look at equalizing the tax rate as part of the long-term solution, but it should not be put in the motion to have a certain amount of services with a limited amount of funding.
- ❖ Chairperson Struffert stated the tax rate should not be an issue at this point because they were only addressing the short-term solution.
- ❖ Board member Smith and Board member Sheltra stated they were not in agreement with the motion then because it was providing a carte blanche tax rate. Board member Sheltra stated she wanted the County Commissioners to find a regional solution because it was a regional station.
- ❖ Cliff Low requested to know if Board members would be in attendance at tomorrow's County Commission meeting. Board member Smith stated the Board was discussing the motion of what the Board and residents wanted to accomplish and that tomorrow's County Commission meeting would only be addressing the change to a 474 district. Discussion followed regarding making a motion to support the changing of the district to a 474 district.

William Elliott withdrew his second. The motion failed due to the lack of a second.

Jane Countryman moved to support Chief Greene going forth before the County Commission to change the designation to a 474 district. William Elliott seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of three Board members in favor of the motion and two Board members opposed to the motion. Board member Elliott stated the three Board members who voted in favor of the motion had no responsibility to this. Discussion followed. Chairperson Struffert stated his position was very clearly for the long-term solution which would support that Chief Greene's service area be officially expanded to include the entire west side of the valley. Board member Smith stated he would support that, but there was no reason for Chief Greene's district to go from 473 to 474 until other things were decided. Chairperson Struffert stated changing to 474 was absolutely necessary

because, under 473, the district would go broke. Board member Smith commented that the only reason there was a change to 474 was to increase taxes and that it should not happen until the tax issue was resolved. Board member Elliott expressed concern with having to rely on Carson City for service. Debbie Sheltra moved that the formation of the 474 district includes the action of having a parity of rate between all the Washoe County fire tax payers. Rod Smith seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Board member Elliott stated he would oppose the motion because the Board needed to do whatever needed to be done to sustain services first and to discuss redistribution of taxes once additional information was received. Board member Smith stated he felt everyone should be paying the same taxes for the same services. Board member Elliott stated he did not have a problem with that. The motion carried by a vote of four Board members in favor of the motion and one Board member opposed to the motion.

- ❖ Janet Scarpelow requested to know how many homes were in the district. Chief Greene reported they receive forty calls a year and there were two hundred homes. Ms. Scarpelow stated the four home owners in the district in attendance during tonight's meeting agreed to a tax rate to continue service and that she would like to serve on the citizen-driven committee. Board member Sheltra stated Chief Greene's vision in front of the County has been to have all of Washoe Valley in one district, which was something the Board would be willing to support.
- ❖ Cliff Low stated he was disturbed that there was a loop hole around the three percent tax cap. He suggested that future motions require the concurrent formation of a group charged with the task to come up with a regional solution.

8. UPDATES AND LIAISON REPORTS

A. Liaison Report – There was no one in attendance to present a report.

B. County Commissioner/Community Liaison Updates – Sarah Tone, Washoe County Community Outreach Coordinator, reminded Board members to go to the Washoe County website and fill out the County survey. She reported there was a scheduling conflict with the recording secretary so a change in meeting dates to the third Monday of the month was being requested for the CAB. If the Board did not agree to the change, the current meeting date would remain. The Board did not agree to the change due to the difficulty they faced when changing to the current meeting date.

At this time, Board member Sheltra left the meeting.

Ms. Tone reminded the Board the Lowden plan presented to East Washoe Valley was for a zoning change. The County Commission agreed to give up a portion of the fuel tax to RTC to work on their Regional Roads Program, which would maintain their roads.

At this time, Board member Sheltra returned to the meeting.

Ms. Tone added crime statistics could be reviewed at crime-reports.com.

C. Nuisance Ordinance (Proposed) - Ginger Pierce reported the Citizens Committee has made a lot of progress. They ended their review of Section 8. There were some wording changes to 18 and 19, but not a lot. Then, Section 9 would be reviewed, which included the special needs of the unincorporated areas.

D. I-580 Project - Board member Sheltra commented she received a call from Todd Montgomery who was in charge of the area around the Chocolate Factory and stated Bob Rusk was part of the committee and could provide an update at future meetings. She encouraged Chairperson Struffert to have Mr. Rusk at the next meeting because there was a vision problem on Parker Ranch Road. Chairperson Struffert reported he received an e-mail a couple of days ago from NDOT stating the contractor has not gotten to the point because there were some other issues that had to be resolved.

E. South Valleys Area Plan - Board member Countryman requested Bob Rusk's name be removed from the agenda item due to the fact that more Board members were involved on the plan. She stated they were making great strides to get the plan worded and shaped to fit the community. The draft plan should be available this month. Board member Countryman also reported Mr. Weston was requesting a special option be put on the plan. She encouraged individuals to review that special option.

Concerns/Comments

- Board member Sheltra requested to know if Eric Young and Adrian Freund would go along with the plan. Board member Countryman explained it would be the Board who would make the decision. Chairperson Struffert reported the County Commission has stated very clearly the changes they wanted and, unless the changes were in there, the community was not going to recommend acceptance. Board member Countryman stated the changes asked for including the changes from the County Commission were in the main draft. There would be options attached to the back of the main draft for the Commission to review and decide upon.
- Cliff Low requested clarification of what Mr. Lowden was requesting. Chairperson Struffert stated Mr. Lowden was requesting a zoning change. It was reported Mr. Weston was requesting a special option to the South Valleys Area Plan.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT - There were no public comment requests.

10. OLD BUSINESS - There was no old business agendized for review.

11. NEW BUSINESS – Time for each item’s presentation is limited to no more than fifteen minutes to provide sufficient time for questions and comments. An extension may be granted by the Chair.

A. Illegal Dumping Task Force Presentation - Cliff Low will provide a 10-minute, information-only presentation discussing the problem of illegal dumping and what is being done in our community to address the matter.

While the PowerPoint presentation was being set up, Board member Smith announced the West Washoe Association clean-up event would be held on May 3, 2008 at 8:00 a.m. Due to computer malfunction, Debbie Sheltra moved to agendize this issue until the next meeting. Rod Smith seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Regional Animal Services Overview - Cindy Sabatoni, Manager with Regional Animal Services, will give a brief overview of the services including field services, disaster response, animal identification, spay/neuter responsibilities and volunteer and animal rescue opportunities. This item is for information only and the CABs will take no action.

There was no one in attendance to give a presentation.

12. CHAIRMAN/BOARD MEMBER ITEMS – (This item limited to announcements of topics/issues posed for future workshops/agendas.)

Chairperson Struffert asked if a presentation by RTC regarding road maintenance should be added to the agenda. Ms. Tone explained County Commissioners approved \$1 million from the fuel tax to the RTC Regional Roads program. She clarified RTC maintains regional roads which was used by all Washoe County residents. Maps of regional roads were available on RTC Washoe.com.

18. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:51 p.m. William Elliott moved to adjourn the meeting. Debbie Sheltra seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.