

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

TUESDAY

1:00 P.M.

MARCH 19, 2002

PRESENT:

Pete Sferrazza, Chairman
Joanne Bond, Vice Chairman
Jim Galloway, Commissioner
Jim Shaw, Commissioner
Ted Short, Commissioner

Amy Harvey, County Clerk
Nancy Parent, Chief Deputy Clerk
Katy Singlaub, 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:

02-292 AGENDA

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the agenda for the March 19, 2002, meeting be approved.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Sam Dehne, local resident, sang a song about the train trench. He expressed his discontent with the City of Reno spending taxpayer's money on RETRAC propaganda.

1:10 p.m. **Commissioner Short arrived at the meeting.**

MANAGER'S/COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Short said he attended a Flood Coalition meeting last Saturday and everything is going very well on that project. He requested that another joint meeting be scheduled with Storey County Commissioners. Commissioner Short requested that an item be placed on the joint meeting agenda with Reno City Council to determine if there is support to place a question on the ballot regarding Animal Control.

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, stated that Chairman Sferrazza would be representing the County at the Spellbinders Contest.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW WASHOE COUNTY EMPLOYEES

Approximately 22 new employees introduced themselves to the Board. Chairman Sferrazza welcomed them to Washoe County on behalf of the Board.

02-293 COUNTY COMMISSION DISTRICT 2 SPECIAL FUNDING ACCOUNT – STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE – ESTRAY HORSE PROGRAM

On motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that an expenditure of \$1,500 from County Commission District 2 Special Funding Account to the State of Nevada, Department of Agriculture to purchase the panels necessary to build one additional horse trap to be used in the Estray Horse Program be approved.

02-294 INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT – UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE – CONSTRUCTION COSTS – JAN EVANS JUVENILE JUSTICE CENTER

Upon recommendation of Mary Ann Woolley, Division Director, Juvenile Services, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the Intergovernmental Cooperative Agreement between the United States Marshals Service and the Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services setting forth the conditions under which Washoe County will be reimbursed for \$150,000 in construction costs for the Jan Evans Juvenile Justice Center be approved and Chairman Sferrazza be authorized to execute.

02-295 APPOINTMENT – RICHARD HARRIS – TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY’S ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

On motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that Richard Harris be appointed to fill the vacant seat on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency’s Advisory Planning Commission.

02-296 RATIFY APPOINTMENTS – SOCIAL SERVICES ADVISORY BOARD

Upon recommendation of Mike Capello, Director, Social Services, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the appointments of Lori Fralick, Michael Sanderfer and Deborah Armstrong to four-year terms, effective March 19, 2002, to the Washoe County Social Services Department Advisory Board be ratified.

02-297 GENERAL FUND, CASH FLOW AND DEBT SERVICE SCHEDULES – FIVE MONTHS ENDED NOVEMBER 30, 2001 (UNAUDITED) – COMPTROLLER

Upon recommendation of Kathy Garcia, Comptroller, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the General, Fund, Cash Flow and Debt Service Schedules for the five months ended November 30, 2001 (unaudited), be accepted.

02-298 GENERAL FUND SCHEDULE AND CASH FLOWS – BUILDING AND SAFETY FUND SCHEDULES – SIX MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2001 (UNAUDITED) – COMPTROLLER

Upon recommendation of Kathy Garcia, Comptroller, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the General, Fund Schedule and Cash Flows and Building and Safety Fund Schedules for the six months ended December 31, 2001 (unaudited), be accepted.

02-299 ABOLISH POSITIONS – OUTREACH SPECIALIST – TEACHER’S AIDE – BUDGET DIVISION

Upon recommendation of Anna Heenan, Senior Administrative Analyst, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the grant funded Position Control Number 112 (Outreach Specialist) and 113 (Teacher’s Aide) in the Juvenile Services Department be abolished.

02-300 AWARD OF BID - #ITB-2321-02/RW ROAD CRACK (WIDE) AND (NARROW) SEALING MATERIAL – ROADS DIVISION

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 January 16, 2002, for Road Crack (Wide) and (Narrow) Sealing Material, on behalf of the Roads Division of the Washoe County Public Works Department. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

Bids were received from the following:

| VENDOR | BID ITEM #1 | BID ITEM #2 | DELIVERY |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Construction Sealants Supply | \$.1831/lbs | \$.21/lbs | 10 Days ARO |
| Maxwell Products | \$.171/lbs | \$.171/lbs | 10 Days ARO |
| World Asphalt Company | \$.186/lbs | \$.31/lbs | 10 Days ARO |

Deery American Corporation was disqualified, as they did not return the entire bid document.

Upon recommendation of John Balentine, Purchasing and Contracts Administrator, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that Bid No. ITB-2321-02/RW for Road Crack (Wide) and (Narrow) Sealing Material, on behalf of the Roads Division, Public Works Department, be awarded to Maxwell Products, Inc., in the following manner:

| | |
|--|---|
| Bid Item #1 Road Crack Sealing (Wide) Material | Bid Item #2 Road Crack Sealing (Narrow) Material |
| Product: Elastoflex #56 Price: \$.171 per pound | Product: Elastoflex #44 Price: \$.171 per pound |
| Delivery: 10 days after receipt of order. | |
| Road Crack Sealing Material both wide and narrow shall be procured on a requirements basis in no less than 40,000-pound increments. Mixed loads of (wide and narrow) material, per order, in 40,000+ pounds of road crack sealing material are acceptable from the supplier. | |
| Material shall be delivered to the Washoe County Road Division, 3101 Longley Lane, Reno, Nevada 89502. | |
| This award shall run from the date of bid award to February 1, 2003 with a provision for a one year extension provided that prices do not increase. | |

02-301 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT – JNADEAU ASSOCIATES – LEGISLATIVE/INTERGOVERNMENTAL ISSUES – SHERIFF

Upon recommendation of Dennis Balaam, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the twenty-five month Professional Services Agreement for \$3,333 per month between the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office and jnadeau associates, Inc., as it relates to representing the Sheriff in certain legislative and intergovernmental matters be approved and Chairman Sferrazza be authorized to execute.

02-302 DONATION – WAL-MART CORPORATION – SEARCH AND RESCUE EQUIPMENT – SHERIFF

Upon recommendation of Dennis Balaam, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the donation of \$1,500 from Wal-Mart Corporation be accepted with gratitude. It was further ordered that the donation is to be used for the purchase of Search and Rescue Equipment, and the following budget adjustments be approved:

| INCREASE REVENUES | |
|------------------------------|------------|
| 15237D-5802 | \$1,500.00 |
| INCREASE EXPENDITURES | |
| 15237D-7245 | \$1,500.00 |

02-303

**DONATION – WEIGHT AND EXERCISE EQUIPMENT –
WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPUTIES ASSOCIATION -
SHERIFF**

Upon recommendation of Dennis Balaam, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the donation of miscellaneous weight and exercise equipment by the Washoe County Sheriff’s Deputies Association (estimated value of \$14,398.00) be accepted with gratitude.

It was noted that the weight and exercise equipment will be placed in the staff workout room located on the second floor of the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office and used by commissioned and civilian personnel for maintaining and improving their physical fitness. The equipment will be installed by Association staff working on a volunteer basis during their off duty time.

02-304

**ACCEPTANCE OF GRANT – STATE OF NEVADA HOMELAND
SECURITY COMMITTEE – WESTERN STATES SEARCH AND
RESCUE CONFERENCE - SHERIFF**

Upon recommendation of Dennis Balaam, Sheriff, on motion by Commissioner Short, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the Nevada State Homeland Security Committee grant of \$12,300.00 be accepted. It was further ordered that the grant is to be used for the setup and operation of this year’s Western States Search and Rescue Conference, and the following budget adjustments be approved:

| INCREASE REVENUES | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| 15266G1-4301 | \$12,300.00 |
| INCREASE EXPENDITURES | |
| 15266G1-7250 | \$ 2,600.00 |
| 15266G1-7261 | \$ 700.00 |
| 15266G1-7357 | \$ 5,000.00 |
| 15266G1-7620 | \$ 4,000.00 |

02-305

**ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF AWARD – UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY – WASTE WISE
PARTNER OF THE YEAR – PURCHASING DEPARTMENT**

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the receipt of the prestigious award by the United States Environmental Protection Agency naming Washoe County as the “Waste Wise Partner of the Year for a Local Government” for 2001 be acknowledged.

It was noted that this is the third year in succession that Washoe County has won this award.

John Balentine, Purchasing and Contracts Administrator, thanked all Washoe County employees for doing their part.

02-306 **ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT – NATIONAL PURCHASING INSTITUTE’S ACHIEVEMENT OF EXCELLENCE IN PROCUREMENT AWARD FOR 2001 – PURCHASING DEPARTMENT**

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the receipt by the Purchasing Department of the National Purchasing Institute’s “Achievement of Excellence in Procurement” Award for 2001 be acknowledged.

It was noted that this is the sixth such award in succession that the Purchasing Department has won. The Board expressed their appreciation to the Purchasing Department for their good work.

John Balentine, Purchasing and Contracts Administrator, expressed appreciation to the County Commissioners and Management for their support. He said part of the Purchasing Department’s job is to see that they get the right products to the right place at the right time for the right price. He said Washoe County would be participating in the Supplier Opportunity Day at the Livestock Events Center, where they hope to reach out to the small businesses in the community.

02-307 **APPEARANCE – GARTH DULL – CITIZENS AGAINST BIGGER TRUCKS – RESOLUTION**

Garth Dull, on behalf of Citizens Against Bigger Trucks, requested the Board support the resolution, which would maintain the current freeze on truck size and weight. The freeze has been in place for a number of years and they would like to continue it, primarily due to safety and protection of infrastructure. He said the longer-combination vehicles allowed in Nevada are up to 129,000 pounds and are around one percent or less of the fleet, however, if this were to be allowed nationwide there would probably be more longer-combination vehicles in Nevada than there are currently. The current federal weight limit for the interstate system is 80,000 pounds, but there were 21 states that were grandfathered in before the law went into effect, and Nevada is one of those states. Trucks as a rule do not pay their fair share of roadway costs, and are not likely too anytime soon. He said they are not intending a rollback, they are just trying to maintain the status quo. Nevada has limited the bridge formula that controls axle limits and axle weights per cluster of axles based on space. Nine axles are allowed for longer-combination vehicles but that allows up to 129,000 pounds and 105-feet in length. Mr. Dull said a rollback is impractical and they probably would not have much success in accomplishing that.

Commissioner Bond asked if pending federal legislation was generating the letters, such as the one to Senator Harry Reid from Senator William Raggio. Mr. Dull

said yes, and it is because of the reauthorization of T21, the Transportation Equity Act. The Act expires in October 2003, a little over a year away. Hearings would begin on the issue as early as this summer, and one of the stated objectives of the American Trucking Association is to get rid of the freeze and increase truck size and weight in various areas. He said, if that is allowed to happen, it would affect Nevada and many other states.

Chairman Sferrazza said, if it is possible he would like to limit new ones, and request the Nevada Legislature to not permit increases in triple-trailers. Mr. Dull said a good cost recovery program would be a better way to do that, because right now they do not and cannot pay their fair share because of the tax structure. If Nevada went to a weight distance tax everybody would pay the same for what they use.

Commissioner Shaw asked if the resolution was being promoted throughout the State of Nevada seeking support. Mr. Dull stated that a resolution or a letter is being requested from the Counties to show their support on the freeze.

Sam Dehne, area resident, said this issue has been high on his irritation list for many years. This issue should be fought with more intensity, and the trucking companies should be told they cannot continue to buy new triple-trailers. He said pedestrian and vehicle safety should be the main concern for Counties, and the resolution is window dressing and hogwash because really nothing is being done.

On motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following resolution be adopted with a transmittal letter in support of the resolution, and Chairman Sferrazza be authorized to execute:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, maintaining safe and reliable highways is essential to Washoe County's economic development and tourism industry; and

WHEREAS, many of Washoe County's roads are already very congested; and

WHEREAS, lifting the current federal freeze on longer combination vehicles (LCV's) would result in a significant increase in the number of triple-trailer and double-trailer trucks on Nevada's roads; and

WHEREAS, an August 2000 U.S. Department of Transportation Commission Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Study found that multi-trailer trucks are 11% more likely to be involved in a fatal accident than single-trailer trucks; and

WHEREAS, the same U.S. Department of Transportation Study found that expanded operation of LCV's would require significant bridge reconstruction, thereby worsening congestion; and

WHEREAS, public opinion polls have shown that many motorists object to sharing the road with triple-trailer and long double-trailer trucks; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Washoe County Commission supports keeping the LCV freeze intact and urges members of the Nevada congressional delegation to oppose any proposals to repeal the LCV freeze.

**02-308 APPEARANCE – JUAN PALMA – PAM DRUM – JOHN UPTON –
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY**

Juan Palma, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), introduced Pam Drum, Public Affairs Coordinator, TRPA, and John Upton, Consultant to TRPA.

Ms. Drum reviewed the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) that included the following:

***Environmental Thresholds**

Water Quality, Air Quality, Soil Conservation, Wildlife Habitat, Fish Habitat, Vegetation, Scenic Quality, Recreation and Noise

***Projects**

Primary Funding Sources – Federal Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, other federal grant, California, Nevada State bonds, Special Funds, General Funds, TRPA Mitigation Funds, Redevelopment Area Funds/TOT Funds, and CTS other Transit Funds

***Research & Monitoring**

Primary Funding Sources – Federal Lake Tahoe Restoration Action, other federal programs and grants, e.g. USGS, Army Corps, EPA, etc., California, Nevada bond funds, Special Funds, General Fund, State Universities

***Operations and Maintenance Funding**

Total cost over 20 years = \$95-100 million, Water Quality Improvident Projects only

Mr. Upton stated that the capital portion of the local government costs of the EIP Programs are well identified. He discussed current funding needs, and said the basic finding of the feasibility study is that none of the revenue sources are ideal. He discussed the various fees that could be charged, including a possible fuel tax.

Chairman Sferrazza asked if the fuel tax would be Countywide. Mr. Upton said yes that is what is being considered. Chairman Sferrazza said he would not impose a fuel tax on his Reno constituents because this only benefits Tahoe. He said, to

move the cost to people who may never even go to Tahoe is unfair, and the people should be allowed to vote on the issue before he would even consider it.

Mr. Upton said none of the revenue sources are perfect and each has its pros and cons. He said looking at a Countywide gas tax would include all of the basin counties, and they continue to look at optional sources. He said they want local governments to be aware of the fact that the issue of gas tax is out there. They continue to research the various aspects of that proposal and continue discussions with the local government committee and the stakeholder groups. He said alternatives are still being considered as a viable solution.

Commissioner Galloway said whether it is a gas tax or some other tax, Lake Tahoe is a resource for the entire County and not just for the people who live there. They are talking more and more about promoting this area as a tourist destination rather than a gaming destination. Other things need to be considered, such as Virginia City, Lake Tahoe and some of the other historic areas nearby that people may want to visit. He said he does believe Lake Tahoe is economically valuable, scenic and a cultural resource for the area. It is very meaningful to the Washoe Tribe, and it is one of nature's wonders of the world. As long as Lake Tahoe is accessible to residents, a case can be made that everyone benefits from its preservation. He said staff has pointed out that in a gas tax scenario, there would be one County that is a beneficiary County and the other Counties would be donor Counties. He questioned if there would be ways to reduce the amount of that discrepancy to where it would be within acceptable limits. Mr. Upton said that is why he said they could look at optional sources, because maybe the fuel tax makes sense for everyone else and not Washoe County. Maybe the approach could be to look at one of the other sources with respect to Washoe County or have a differential level of fuel tax in some Counties than others. He said he thought the most equitable source would be something like a basin user fee, although he does not want to go there now. He reminded the Board that no solution is perfect but they continue to work to come up with something that makes sense for everybody.

Chairman Sferrazza suggested that a package of the top four revenue solutions be submitted. He said there is a benefit from Tahoe, but not everyone in his district benefits and there are people who will never go there and cannot afford to go there. He asked why they should pay. He noted that the RSCVA does send back one-third of the room tax to Incline Village and suggested that money could be used. Consolidation was previously discussed and IVGID did not want to be a part of it, and, in fact, they talked about forming their own County. He will not ask his constituents to send money to IVGID or Tahoe when it appears to be a one-way street. He does not have a problem with the people who live there and utilize the lake being charged a \$2 parking fee, because then the people who are utilizing and benefiting from the lake do pay. He said to impose a fuel tax on people who live in Washoe County and never go to Tahoe is wrong and he would not support that without a vote of the people.

Commissioner Short asked if a sales tax could be imposed on just a part of the County. Madelyn Shipman, Legal Counsel, said no tax could be imposed without

legislation authorizing it. Any enabling legislation would obviously authorize the creation of a taxing district, if that were the proposal in front of it.

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, said one of the things the Board could suggest is exploring a nexus with water quality, because Tahoe is one of the primary sources of the County's surface water. She said perhaps something in the water fees could be looked at and considered.

Mr. Palma said Lake Tahoe is truly a jewel of the Sierra Nevada, and it is a legacy that can be left behind to future generations. There is a funding gap for operations and maintenance of the lake and that is the issue they are trying to resolve. He said TRPA would come back to the Board with a proposal for funding, after they go out and meet with the public.

Commissioner Shaw asked if the funding proposals have support from TRPA. Mr. Palma said some of the proposals have support, but the user fee does not have a lot of support right now. The support seems to be leaning toward some type of configuration of a fuel tax for a five County area.

Terri Shannon, area resident, said at a local STMGID meeting there was a draft report regarding the preservation of surface water within this part of the region. She said it is important, if taxation is considered to take into account all environmental protection type of things. She said she believes that the Regional Water Commission will be submitting more expensive proposals to restore surface water.

Sara Ellis, Incline Village Board of Realtors, expressed appreciation to staff and the local government subcommittee for their work on a funding mechanism for operations and maintenance of Lake Tahoe. She said they are interested in the maintenance portion of the EIP. There are currently discussions taking place in the threshold update to tie building allocations to the implementation of the EIP and to the consistent maintenance of those projects. She requested the Board keep that in mind when they go through the budget process.

**02-309 APPEARANCE – TINA NAPPE – TRANSFER OF CALIFORNIA
BLM LANDS TO STATE OF NEVADA**

Tina Nappe, area resident, said she has no complaints against any of the California BLM employees, but more to do with the administration and the linkage between Northern Washoe County, the rest of Washoe County and the State of Nevada. She said she is a member of the Sierra Nevada Resource Advisory Board. Northern Washoe County is unique in being such a large area that is administered by another State office. The California BLM has many problems that it needs to address and the State office will naturally be focused on many of those problems. She said she has been impressed with the Nevada State office and its role in working with the local offices and providing a lot of leadership within the State as a whole as well as at the local level. She said many people are concerned about the future of recreation and wildlife in Northern

Nevada. The resolution is designed to set in motion a discussion about whether these lands should be transferred to Nevada BLM. She said she prefers that Washoe County become its own district but does not know if that is a possibility.

Chairman Sferrazza asked whether the County could request that the Cedarville office be supervised by the Nevada BLM. Ms. Nappe said that would be opening a dialogue and if the concern is to retain the Cedarville office that could be a provision of the resolution. She said she is truly looking at the value of a Nevada State office in providing the kinds of support that it does to its offices and residents.

Commissioner Bond said the issue seems to be the Cedarville office. She asked, if the land located in Northern Washoe County was moved out of the Cedarville jurisdiction to a Nevada State BLM, would that result in a closure of the Cedarville office.

Ray Page, Greater Surprise Valley Chamber of Commerce, said he is in opposition to the change, and is very opposed to the BLM office being removed from Cedarville. He explained how the Sheldon National Antelope Range came to be, and said that used to be cattle grazing country for their community. It was taken away in 1976 and now there are no livestock on the Sheldon Range. He said just recently the Black Rock Desert became a National Conservation Area. There will be more diminished livestock grazing areas, and each time these types of things happen their community shrivels.

Commissioner Bond asked if there were any anticipated changes that are going to take place in the Cedarville BLM office. Mr. Page said small things end up being bigger issues and pretty soon they will end up with only a few people on staff. He said just recently a new Field Officer started at the Cedarville BLM office.

Donna Potter, on behalf of Michael Stewart, owner of Rafter 7Z Ranch in Vya Nevada, said that Mr. Stewart submitted a letter expressing support for lands being managed in Nevada by Nevada BLM. She said he is very concerned with opening up this issue because there is going to be a lot of dialogue, but it is important that nothing changes in Cedarville. There is a unique area in Surprise Valley, where the Cedarville office, the BLM and the Forest Service have been mandated by Congress to have an experimental stewardship program. The program has a committee comprised of ranchers, agency folks, and environmentalists working together to try different things for managing the area, and that issue would need to be addressed so it does not change. There is a new Area Manager coming in to the Cedarville office, and it would be fair to give the new person an opportunity to work with the people. She said Mr. Stewart would like the Board's consideration of the resolution to be postponed to a later date.

Commissioner Short said he would like to preserve Cedarville the way it is and not impose any economic hardship on the people there. He said, if there was any way Cedarville could work under the auspices of the Nevada BLM, the people in Cedarville would be very happy. Ms. Potter said that the most important thing is whatever decision is made that no changes occur to the Cedarville office.

Commissioner Bond said maybe this matter should be continued for one year and an evaluation be conducted after one year. She said things are happening very fast in that area. There are also water issues in the area, and she would like to continue the status quo and work efficiently and cooperatively on behalf of Northern Washoe County.

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, said staff could work with the appropriate individuals, which would include the Cedarville office, the Winnemucca office and the Carson City office.

Commissioner Galloway said the language in the resolution is not quite right, and it could be simply that the Cedarville office would rely on the Nevada BLM to make the decision regarding the lands in Nevada.

Chairman Sferrazza requested that a Washoe County office be considered for the entire County so they are not split into three districts.

Following further discussion, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that this matter be deferred for one year, and during the interim staff look into this and consider any possibility of moving the jurisdiction.

3:15 p.m. Amy Harvey, County Clerk, arrived at the meeting.

02-310 **RESOLUTION – REVENUE REFUNDING BONDS – AIRPORT
AUTHORITY OF WASHOE COUNTY**

On motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the following Resolution be adopted and Chairman Sferrazza be authorized to execute:

**RESOLUTION NO. 02-310
(OF WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA)**

**A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE ISSUANCE OF
REVENUE REFUNDING BONDS BY THE AIRPORT
AUTHORITY OF WASHOE COUNTY**

WHEREAS, the Airport Authority of Washoe County (the “Authority”) has requested that the County approve its Airport Authority of Washoe County, Nevada, Airport Revenue Refunding Bonds, in the aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$60,000,000 (the “Bonds”) pursuant to the provisions of Section 147(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the “Tax Code”); and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on the Bonds has been held before the Airport Authority of Washoe County, and a report on the public hearing has been provided to and considered by the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County; and

WHEREAS, the Bonds are proposed to be issued for the purpose of effecting interest rate savings or effecting other economies by defraying wholly or in part the cost of refunding certain outstanding revenue bonds of the Authority secured by revenues of the Authority's Airport System.

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

Section 1. The Bonds are hereby approved for the purposes of Section 147(f) of the Tax Code.

Section 2. This resolution shall be in full force and effect on its passage and approval.

02-311 DEPUTY CLERK I, II, AND III – PAY PLAN – DISTRICT COURT

Ron Longtin, District Court Administrator, appearing on behalf of Chief Judge James Hardesty, Second Judicial District Court, commented that Judge Hardesty provided information on this item at yesterday's Caucus. The District Court is requesting closure on the establishment of the maximum salary range for its classifications of Deputy Clerk I, II & III. The salary range has been unresolved for almost a year, and it impacts approximately 27 court staff. On February 26, 2002, the Board approved County classifications through a reclassification process as a result of the Hay Study. The maximum salary ranges recommended are those that were recommended to the Board approximately one year ago. The recommendations are based on the National Center for State Court Study and the positions are not performing the same functions as County positions. The recently transferred Micrographic staff from the Clerk's office are now performing full duties of the Deputy Clerks under the Court classifications. He said it would be detrimental to these classifications and employees to have to wait for another year or so regarding their salary levels. He said, if the request is approved, the Court would only allow employees to attain a higher pay level upon reaching their anniversary date, and only upon an approved merit increase. The overall fiscal impact now results in a \$568.00 requirement for the current budget cycle, and a \$1,172.00 requirement for the next budget cycle.

Commissioner Galloway asked if this authorization would impose a problem between the employees, because his understanding was there were employees in the same office working side-by-side, some for the County and some for the Court. Joanne Ray, Human Resources Director, said the Deputy Clerk I, II, and III positions, at the request of the Board, went through the Hay Study and were point factored and salaries set based on the points given. These positions and salaries were set by following the same process that was used for the rest of the County positions. She said the Board felt there

were positions in the County Clerk's office that were similar in nature to the duties and responsibilities of the Court Deputy Clerk I, II and III positions.

Commissioner Galloway asked if desk audits were done on these positions. Ms. Ray said there were no desk audits done throughout the WERRCS Project. Now when reclassification requests come in a desk audit is part of the process the reclass has to go through. John Sherman, Finance Director, added that one of the issues pointed out by staff regarding the District Court's request is the survey methodology. Staff recognizes the National Center for State Court Study of the District Court's salary structure looked at a number of different states and the final salary structure was identical to Clark County. The salary structure in Clark County at that time was approximately 10 percent higher than Washoe County. The next issue was the relative recruitment areas of individual positions, and it is staff's opinion that these positions are primarily, if not wholly, recruited in the local market as opposed to Clark County.

Commissioner Galloway said prior to the County having a point system there clearly was a feeling of inequity. Ms. Ray said she believes that the County's current methodology will serve the County well, because it will take the uniqueness of every position and measure it in a way that is much more objective.

Commissioner Galloway asked if employees are paid more than the points are worth elsewhere in the County, such as developed through the Hay Study, what would be the result of that inconsistency. Ms. Ray stated that she always had a problem with the different job evaluation methodology used by the Courts.

Chairman Sferrazza asked if the qualifications for the County Clerk's positions differ from the qualifications for the Court's Deputy Clerks, and what the educational requirement is for a Deputy Clerk I. Mr. Longtin responded to Chairman Sferrazza's questions regarding the qualifications of the Court Deputy Clerks versus the County Clerk positions.

Chairman Sferrazza asked if any of the Court's salary ranges correspond to any of the County's salary ranges. Ms. Ray said no they do not.

Chairman Sferrazza said he does not have a problem with the Court's request, but if it is approved, he would want the County's Clerks to be paid the same. Mr. Sherman said that fiscal impact would be very significant, as all of the salaries within the County are linked with every other salary. That means if one position is moved up, it flows through the entire system. Mr. Sherman said they view the fiscal impact significantly different than the District Court.

Mr. Longtin stated that part of the difficulty faced by the District Court is that other than the Deputy Clerk I, II and III positions, no other Court classifications have gone through the scrutiny of the Hay Study process. The Court's request for salaries for the Deputy Clerks is very close to the initial County position. He said in reality the Dep-

uty Clerk positions are being treated unfairly because their positions have gone through scrutiny that the rest of the Court employees have not.

Commissioner Shaw said he understands the Court's position, but he finds it difficult to support the Court's request because these employees have had their opportunity. Mr. Longtin said it is just an assumption that the County Clerks and the Court Clerks perform the same functions and duties. They operate under different position descriptions and they perform different functions. The employees may work side by side but that is based on the environment they have to work in.

Commissioner Galloway said the reason the other Court employees did not go through the Hay Study is because the judges insisted they wanted another job evaluation study. These job positions went through the Hay Study because there was a commonality and many of the other Court positions are not as similar to other County positions. Mr. Longtin said the Deputy Clerk positions had no basis for appeal when they went through the Hay Study. Ms. Ray said that is true, the Deputy Clerks did not go through the appeal process because the Courts did not agree to participate in the WERRCS Project or the Hay Study.

Chairman Sferrazza said the only employees that are not Washoe County employees are the District Court Judges who are State employees. All of the rest are County employees and should be treated equitably. He asked if the Justice Court Clerks are on the same schedule as the District Court's or the County's. Ms. Ray said the Reno and Sparks Justice Courts participated in the National Center Study for State Courts, but they separated from the District Court's schedule in the end and they have a different schedule. Mr. Longtin said he believes the Justice Court Clerks have a different salary range, which is less than the District Court's proposal.

Chairman Sferrazza said he cannot support the District Court's salary range request for the Deputy Clerks because it just creates further inequity within the system.

Commissioner Galloway said he believes the Court Deputy Clerk positions should have the right to appeal to the HayGroup regarding their classifications. Chairman Sferrazza said he would support the right to appeal as well. Commissioner Bond said she would like to see the salary issue of the Clerk positions for the District Court, Justice Court and the County resolved once and for all. Commissioner Short said the County authorized the Hay Study to try and make all positions within the County equitable and he does not want to destroy the process they have worked so hard for. He said he would agree that the Deputy Clerks should be given the opportunity to appeal the Hay recommendation.

On motion by Commissioner Shaw, seconded by Commissioner Galloway, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the recommended pay plan as to the maximum pay ranges for Deputy Clerk I, II and III be denied.

02-312

**AWARD OF BID – SUN VALLEY HIGHLAND RANCH PARK
(PWP-WA-2002-118) – PUBLIC WORKS**

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 February 20 & 22, 2002, for the Sun Valley Highland Ranch Park (PWP-WA-2002-118), on behalf of the Public Works Department. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

Bids were received from the following:

| CONTRACTORS | BASE BID |
|------------------------|-----------------|
| Atlas Contractors | \$468,896.00 |
| Cruz Construction | \$429,447.50 |
| Gradex Construction | \$448,175.00 |
| Horizon Construction | \$481,393.25 |
| Interstate Utility | \$514,844.00 |
| MKD Construction | \$534,999.00 |
| Perata Excavation | \$403,145.50 |
| West Coast Contractors | \$486,137.00 |

Upon recommendation of Anthony McMillen, Licensed Engineer, through Dave Roundtree, Public Works Director, on motion by Commissioner Bond, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that Bid No. PWP-WA-2002-118 for the Sun Valley Highland Ranch Park, on behalf of the Public Works Department, be awarded to the low, responsive, responsible bidder, Perata Excavation Company in the amount of \$440,629.50, and Chairman Sferrazza be authorized to execute the contract documents upon presentation.

It was noted that the bid award includes the base bid plus add alternates 1, 2 & 3 for a picnic shelter, volleyball court and horseshoe pits.

02-313

**AWARD OF BID - #ITB-2323-02 – FLEET HEAVY EQUIPMENT –
EQUIPMENT SERVICES DIVISION**

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 January 4, 2002, for Fleet Heavy Equipment, on behalf of the Equipment Services Division of the General Services Department. Proof was made that due and legal Notice had been given.

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

- Cashman Equipment Company, Inc.
- Empire Equipment Company dba Nortrax-West
- Komatsu Equipment Company

Upon recommendation of John Balentine, Purchasing and Contracts Administrator, on motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Bid No. ITB-2323-02 for Fleet Heavy Equipment, on behalf of the Equipment Services Division of the Washoe County General Services Department, be awarded to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, Cashman Equipment Company as follows:

| | | |
|------------------------|--|----------------|
| Bid Item #1 | Two Caterpillar 140H Articulated Motor Graders | |
| Bid Item #2 | Five Caterpillar 950G 3-yr Wheel Loaders | |
| Bid Item #3 | Three Caterpillar 966G 4-yr Wheel Loaders | |
| Bid Item #4 | Two Caterpillar 430 DIT Backhoe Loaders | |
| Initial Capital Outlay | Guaranteed Buyback | Total Net Cost |
| \$1,902,557.00 | \$1,389,000.00 | \$513,557.00 |

It was further ordered that the County's right to procure additional fleet heavy equipment from the successful bidder through December 31, 2002, be affirmed, provided there is no increase in pricing offered and capital outlay requests have been approved.

It was noted that under the terms of this award, Cashman Equipment Company will provide the County with new replacement fleet heavy equipment for a total initial capital expenditure of \$1,902,557.00, and warranty all major components thereof, including providing loaner units if required, for a period of three years. Cashman Equipment Company will further provide performance bonds guaranteeing to buy back the equipment from the County at the end of three years for a total of \$1,389,000.00, resulting in a net total cost to the County at the end of the three years of \$513,557.00. Ownership costs to the County during the three-year period averages \$1,188.74 per unit, per month, for state of the art, fully warranted equipment. This is well below the average rental rate of \$4,000-\$5,000 per month for comparable heavy equipment.

**02-314 CAPITAL PROJECTS – COURTHOUSE BASEMENT
OFFICES/LOCKER ROOMS – CRIME LAB INFORMATION
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM – SPARKS LIBRARY REMODEL –
FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

Upon recommendation of John Sherman, Finance Director, on motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Bond, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the following three capital projects be authorized to proceed:

| Project Title | Project Account | Balance at 3/6/02 |
|--|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Courthouse Basement Office/Locker Room | 920441 | \$307,173.00 |
| Crime Lab Information Mgmt System | 920443 | \$220,000.00 |
| Sparks Library Remodel | 920890 | \$422,834.00 |
| TOTAL | | \$950,007.00 |

It was further ordered that the following five capital projects be canceled and that they be considered for funding in next year's budget:

| Project Title | Project Account | Balance at 3/6/02 |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| LAN Meeting Broadcast | 920264 | \$44,392.00 |
| District Court Sound System | 920315 | \$36,500.00 |
| Sheriff Incline Parking | 920440 | \$57,600.00 |
| Mira Loma Road Improvements | 920525 | \$75,000.00 |
| Mayberry Park Land Acquisition | 92112 | \$142,500.00 |
| TOTAL | | \$355,992.00 |

02-315 BILL NO. 1335 – AMENDING WASHOE COUNTY CODE
CHAPTER 85 – HIGHWAYS, ROADS AND SIDEWALKS

Bill No. 1335 entitled, “AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 85 OF THE WASHOE COUNTY CODE (HIGHWAYS, ROADS AND SIDEWALKS) BY REVISING AND ADDING DEFINITIONS, REVISING GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR PERMITS INCLUDING ESTABLISHING TIME LIMITS AND AUTHORIZING CONDITIONS FOR PERMITS, REVISING BOND AND INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS, REVISING THE SCHEDULE OF FEES INCLUDING ADDING A PAVEMENT RESTORATION FEE, PROVIDING THAT PERMANENT PATCHES WILL BE INSTALLED BY THE COUNTY, REPLACING TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION, REQUIRING TRAFFIC CONTROL AND OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO,” was introduced by Commissioner Bond, the title read to the Board, and legal notice for final action of adoption directed.

02-316 BILL NO. 1336 – AMENDING WASHOE COUNTY CODE
CHAPTER 40 – TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY
ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Bill No. 1336 entitled, “AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 85 OF THE WASHOE COUNTY CODE BY AMENDING SEC. 40.220 AUTHORIZING THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY TO ENFORCE THE PROVISIONS OF WASHOE COUNTY CODE RELATING TO WATER WITHIN THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY SERVICE TERRITORY; AMENDING SEC. 40.230 TO ADD A SUBSECTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF A RECOMMENDATION BY THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY ON A WATER EMERGENCY; AMENDING SEC. 40.260 TO REQUIRE A COPY OF ANY NOTICE OF INFRACTION AND RESOLUTION TO BE FILED WITH APPROPRIATE AGENCY; AMENDING SEC. 40.265 TO REQUIRE THE FILING OF A COPY OF ANY NOTICE OF APPEAL WITH THE TRUCKEE MEADOWS WATER AUTHORITY; AND OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO,” was introduced by Commissioner Shaw, the title read to the Board, and legal notice for final action of adoption directed.

02-317 DISCUSSION – SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS – 1996
REGIONAL PLAN – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Following discussion, upon recommendation of Mike Harper, Planning Manager, Community Development, on motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Short, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the amendment to the 1996 regional plan be withdrawn while reserving the right to restore it, should the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency open the door to other amendments to the 1996 regional plan.

02-318 CENTRAL TRUCKEE MEADOWS REMEDIATION DISTRICT -
REMEDICATION DISTRICT FEES – WATER CONSUMERS –
CONTAMINATED PARCEL AREA – WATER RESOURCES

Commissioner Galloway asked whether they just consider one year's water bill to determine the levied fee. Jim Ford, Remediation District Program Manager, said the statute requires they look at the previous year's annualized water bill.

Madelyn Shipman, Legal Counsel, advised that by next year they will have had an opportunity to inventory any unimproved property within the contaminated area and come up with an appropriate fee based on the possible uses of property and tie it to a water bill.

Commissioner Galloway asked what the current fee is. Mr. Ford said last year it was approximately 3.3 percent. Commissioner Galloway said if the recommendation by staff is approved, a fee will be calculated that will raise the total budget amount for both the remediation of the water and the cleanup benefits.

Commissioner Shaw asked if there should be an appeal process within the ordinance once it is established. Mr. Ford said there are no provisions for an appeal process in the statute and there has not been any in the past. Ms. Shipman said there is an informal process, such as when people call the Water Resources Department regarding factual errors. She stated that the Board approved a resolution approximately 3 or 4 years ago that allowed Water Resources in conjunction with the County Treasurer to correct those bills, but there is no appeal process for someone who thinks the fee is unfair.

Chairman Sferrazza said there was no calculation done on the ad valorem methodology, as to what it would be per dollar of assessed valuation. Mr. Ford said they looked at an ad valorem for the contaminated area and a water based fee for the larger area. Ms. Shipman said there is a remediation fee based on water use. The legal interpretation was that they could not have one fee based on water use and one based on ad valorem, and her opinion is there would be a question of equity and fairness if costs solely associated with remediation of properties in a contaminated area were spread across the entire water user base. She said they can only do a single rate on the total taxing district, if they go with ad valorem.

John Sherman, Finance Director, said the fee goes on the property tax bill, and it is not an ad valorem tax, it is just a billing mechanism that State law allows them to add to the property tax bill. Ms. Shipman said now that the remediation district has reached a point where it is going to undertake certain activities that only benefit certain properties within the contaminated area, they need to differentiate as the statute authorizes between the added benefit going to the contaminated area properties and those that go to the water user group. The contaminated property area obviously gets sort of a double whammy, but under statute, they cannot go more than 4 times the formula.

Chairman Sferrazza said he is concerned because most of the affected property is within his district, and some of the ones that are going to get the 4 to 1 hit are poor property owners. Commissioner Short said there are a lot of people paying the fee who are not even close to the contaminated area. He noted that the fee is being imposed on wholesale water as well, such as in Hidden Valley, Sun Valley and Damonte Ranch.

On motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Shaw, which motion duly carried, Chairman Sferrazza ordered that the Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District be directed to proceed with development of an ordinance in revising the Remediation District fees. It was noted that the revision would acknowledge two benefit groups, "Water Consumers" and the "Contaminated Parcel Area," in generating Remediation Plan implementation funds. The Remediation Plan budget for the Water Consumers benefit group is \$1,534,000, which is an approximate 15 percent decrease from FY 2002. The Remediation Plan budget for the Contaminated Parcel Area is \$1,155,500.00.

02-319 REGIONAL PLAN UPDATE – COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Eric Young, Planner, Community Development, said some changes from the last time they discussed the update is goal and policy language for a joint approval process. He discussed some of the issues regarding the joint approval process. Mr. Young stated if a joint plan is underway, a lot of changes should not be made to the zoning and master plan on a parallel track. Maybe a few zoning changes and a minor change to the master plan here or there to make things work in the mean time would be appropriate.

Commissioner Galloway said it is hard to define a minor change, and he does agree there should be no regional plan land use changes. If entities want to make those types of changes, they will be made in the update anyway. Mr. Young requested the Board review the interim approval process and the policies that relate to the County's proposal.

Commissioner Short said it is imperative the County inform people of the potential ramification of a new sphere of influence and annexation. He said the people in the incorporated City of Reno need to know what the fiscal impacts of the plan could have on them. Every sewer customer hooked up from Double Diamond and south is a

Washoe County sewer customer. The City of Reno is subsidizing from their sewer fund the difference between Washoe County's sewer fee and Reno's sewer fee, which is about a 20 percent difference. That issue should be researched and people in the incorporated City of Reno should be informed of how much this could cost them down the road. There is also a question of how many roads will have to be maintained if these areas are all included in the annexation. Mr. Young said they previously mailed about 450 letter that included a map showing the proposed sphere of influence, has also been included as the official draft. Maps were included in those letters as well as an extensive position statement. Many people do not know what to think about the proposal and do not want to be included in the City of Reno. They are afraid to complain because if they complain and end up in the City, they may be treated differently.

Chairman Sferrazza asked if the McMullen/Beckworth property is in the reasonable expansion that the County is approving. Mr. Young said it is not.

Commissioner Galloway said Commissioner Short's request should run parallel with the compromise proposal. The proposal is scheduled to go before the Regional Planning Governing Board in May and if there is no compromise proposal that has support as an alternative to what Reno has proposed, then all of the people that Commissioner Short is concerned about will be worse off. They need to have the support for the compromise proposal because then they have a chance of getting something they can live with.

Madelyn Shipman, Legal Counsel, advised that included in State law is the specific language that says any piece of the plan dealing with the spheres of influence should also include procedures for how development is going to be approved and take place in the sphere area. She said the parties can agree how to develop what the process will be.

Terri Shannon, area resident, stated that she has attended meetings where people have overwhelmingly felt uninformed. She said she has been unable to open the maps on the County's Web site because they are so large, and she usually gets knocked off the server before the maps open up. People need to hear how much they will be impacted by the City of Reno's proposal. She commented that there are so many numbers and argumentation between the entities that people do not know what to believe.

Gary Feero, area resident, said the County is being shafted on the update, and the expansion in the North Valleys alone is huge. He said Reno cannot currently fund police properly in the North Valleys now. He said City of Reno residents need to know the impact that the proposal from Reno would have on them, and he believes will eventually cost millions.

02-320 INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT – PARK MAINTENANCE

Karen Mullen, Director, Parks and Recreation Department, advised the County has regional parks, regional type open space and regional trail systems versus

neighborhood parks, community parks, the internal subdivision type open space and trails within subdivisions that may lead to open space. She advised the Board that during the annexation process they discussed annexation of islands, and they were talking about neighborhood parks and community type parks, not regional parks. They also discussed how they receive land, which is through the development review process, Park Construction Tax, gifts and donations, BLM leases, and on rare occasions they pick up land through tax delinquent property. She reviewed the process they went through regarding the properties that would be effected by the Annexation Agreements. She said the City of Reno redrafted the proposed resolution because there was no agreement on the issue of maintenance and the more detailed notations they had originally discussed. Ms. Mullen said Park Construction Tax cannot be utilized for the actual acquisition and/or development of trail systems or open space, it can only be used for neighborhood parks. She said they try to be very clear about how that money can be used, so there is no confusion down at the legislature on how the money is spent.

Commissioner Galloway asked if there was anything in the County's draft that the actual Reno City Council would disagree with. Ms. Mullen said there seemed to be a feeling that the County was trying to tell people how to maintain or operate their park facilities, which is not true. She said standards need to be adopted because everyone needs to know what the standards of operation and maintenance are so there is continuity. Ms. Mullen said there are National Standards from the National Park and Recreation Association that discusses these various issues. She said various levels of service can be adopted, just like in the paving programs.

Chairman Sferrazza said it is inappropriate for Washoe County to dictate how people operate and maintain their parks. He said he understands the standards if they are going to consolidate, but other than that he does not believe Washoe County should be telling people how to run their parks. Ms. Mullen said she agrees with that, but staff was looking at it from a point of view that everyone wants to know what they are accepting, and all staff was trying to do was come up with something that would be agreeable to everyone.

5:11 p.m. Commissioner Bond left the meeting.

Katy Singlaub, County Manager, said this item is on the March 26, 2002, agenda, pursuant to the Board's discussion regarding consolidation of services. She said the City of Reno has proposed a full consolidation of the Parks and Recreation services, and in the past this Board has focused on the likely elements, with park maintenance being one of them.

EMERGENCY ITEMS

There were no emergency items.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS

The following communications and reports were received, duly noted, and ordered placed on file with the Clerk:

02-321 COMMUNICATIONS

A. Notice of Intent to Annex Land into the City of Sparks, 1,238.6 acres of land, generally located on the eastern boundary of the City of Sparks abutting existing industrial and warehousing uses along Vista Boulevard and Salomon Circle north of Interstate 80. (Bill No. 2296)

B. Contract No. 3094, Project No. STP-0445(005), on SR 445, Pyramid Highway, in Sparks from McCarran Boulevard to 0.11 miles south of Orr Ditch (B-815), Washoe County, PAR Electrical Contractors Inc.

C. Notice of Completion between Washoe County Department of Water Resources, Utility Services Division, and Mike's Trenching Inc, State Contractor's License No. 10711A for construction of the Lemmon Valley Water System Meter Retrofit Program. (Filed with WC Recorder on 2/14/02)

D. Notice of Completion - the Washoe County Board of Commissioners did on June 27, 2001, enter into an agreement with Insituform Technologies, Inc, contractor's license number 0048110, to construct sewer system improvements for the Lemmon Valley Sewer System, Horizon Hills Sewer Rehabilitation, and on December 2, 2001, a final inspection of the work was conducted by a authorized representative of Washoe County and found to be substantially complete within the terms of the plans and specifications.

E. Resolution – Airport Authority of Washoe County Nevada, Airport Revenue Refunding Bonds Series 2002, and Working Group Distribution List.

02-322 Reports – Monthly (January/February)

- A. County Clerk
- B. Court Clerk
- C. Court Clerk - February
- D. Animal Control
- E. Animal Control - February
- F. Treasurer

02-323 Reports – Quarterly (ending December 2001)

- A. Verdi Television District
- B. Grand View Terrace GID
- C. Washoe County School District

* * * * *

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

PETER J. SFERRAZZA, Chairman
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST: **AMY HARVEY**, County Clerk

*Minutes Prepared by
Jeraldine Magee, Deputy County Clerk*