

APPROVED OCTOBER 10, 2017

The Regular Meeting / Master Plan Update of the Planning Commission was held on September 12, 2017 in the meeting room of the County Administration Building, 1616 8th Street, Minden, NV, beginning at 9:00 AM.

CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Margaret Pross; Anje de Knijf; James Madsen; Frank Godecke; Jo Etta Brown and Bryan Davis. Stacy Noyes was absent.

STAFF PRESENT: Mary Anne Martin, Deputy District Attorney; Mimi Moss, Community Development Director; Heather Ferris, Planning Manager; Kathleen Schmidt, Deputy Clerk.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Member Brown led the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Slade was glad to see the County had authorized the feasibility study of impact fees on new construction, believing that new development should pay its own way and not be a burden on existing taxpayers. He felt growth had occurred too quickly in the County and infrastructure had not kept up with the need, as evidenced by the condition of our roads. Taxes and fees were raised and bonds needed because growth had not paid for itself. Existing residents shouldn't have to pay for new growth. The protection of our rural character should be a high priority. Mr. Slade supports imposing realistic impact fees as a necessary step in the process of making new construction pay its own way.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

No public comment.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Jo Etta Brown, Board Member
SECONDER:	James Madsen, Board Member
AYES:	Godecke, Brown, de Knijf, Madsen, Pross, Davis
ABSENT:	Noyes

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Aug 8, 2017 1:00 PM

No public comment.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Anje de Knijf, Vice Chairwoman
SECONDER:	Frank Godecke, Board Member
AYES:	Godecke, Brown, de Knijf, Madsen, Pross, Davis
ABSENT:	Noyes

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. For possible action. Discussion on Ordinance No. 2017-1492, amending Douglas County Code, Title 20, Sections 20.654.020; 20.658.020; 20.660.070; 20.662.010; 20.664.130; 20.666.010; and 20.668.090 to allow open or subsurface mining subject to specific standards in the General Industrial (GI) zoning district only upon approval of a Special Use Permit approved by the Board of County Commissioners, and prohibit open or subsurface mining in all Agricultural, Forest and Range, and Public Facilities zoning districts; and other properly related matters. Development Application (DA) 17-073. (Mimi Moss & Mary Anne Martin)

To review documentation regarding Item 1, please see Board Packet.

Member Godecke disclosed that he attended the Board of County Commissioners first reading of this Ordinance and made strong statements during the meeting, calling Republicans in Douglas County “closet Socialists”. He reluctantly recused himself because of the strong possibility that the discussion could materially affect him.

Mimi Moss, Community Development Director presented Title, Background, Issues Raised to Date; Board Requested Code Amendment; Summary of Changes; Additional Changes for Consideration; Findings for Zoning Text Amendment; Public Comment; Speaking to the Agricultural Community regarding mining use; the proposed changes will affect active and legally permitted mining or gravel operations and as long as they hold their valid permit, they are grandfathered in. It does not affect non-commercial mining activity on private land per the exceptions mentioned in the Code. It doesn't impact existing agricultural operations. It does identify commercial, large scale mining operations. The question regarding the 1,000 cubic yards is whether that requirement meets the needs of property owners. There are a number of borrow pits on ranching property and the Code doesn't speak to them, because ranchers use them on their own private property. Those uses can continue, as they fall under the exception or the determination by the director and have nothing to do with agriculture operations; Recommended Action, recommend adoption.

Mary Anne Martin, Deputy District Attorney, addressed comments regarding “taking”, stating that the power of eminent domain is limited by the US Constitution in the Fifth Amendment and extends down to the state level in the Fourteenth Amendment. The takings clause prohibits government from confiscating property without payment of just compensation. Because County ordinances constitute State action, the Commission must look at how much the use of property can be restricted without triggering a payment obligation. If the owner is deprived of reasonable economic use or value of their property, **then the ordinance constitutes a taking**. For example, in a case where the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency issued a 32 month moratorium on all

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

construction in the Lake Tahoe Basin, the Supreme Court decided that it did not effect a categorical taking because property rights were not revoked and property values were not decreased. The ordinance being considered in this meeting doesn't constitute a taking under any of the statutes or applicable case law, as it doesn't prohibit mining; rather, it restricts mining to areas zoned General Industrial. Neither the surface owner nor property owner is deprived of a property right or the reasonable use of their land and/or materials. The process to acquire the Special Use Permit may take time but is the least restrictive means to protect the health and safety of the community. The increased amount of required insurance would cover damages even if the operator becomes insolvent.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Durso agreed that this ordinance is not a ban on mining in Douglas County, but ensures that mining is conducted in an appropriate area. It codifies the Master Plan goals. He felt that the system didn't work to protect citizens on the gravel pit/batch plant which previously came before the Planning Commission, stating that Planning recommended approval of the gravel pit twice and not all Commissioners believed it was inconsistent with the Master Plan goals and actions. The gravel pit in East Valley isn't a dead idea, since the owners have stated at their meetings that the current political climate isn't right and inferred that it could possibly reintroduce the idea in the future. This ordinance is good for all Douglas County residents.

Gail Durham supported the amendment of Ordinance 2017-1492, feeling that it was long overdue. Mining should only be allowed on General Industrial zoned lands. She thanked Ms. Moss for addressing the agriculture uses, being sympathetic to agriculture but feeling that agriculture lands are not the proper place for industrial mining.

Bob Ballou reminded the Commissioners that mining in Nevada is on the rise. He defined mining from the dictionary as "the extract of coal, minerals or ore", also as "an excavation of the earth for the purpose of extracting coal, salt or minerals". Minerals can be any inorganic substance from dirt and gravel to gold. This ordinance is not a ban on mining; rather, it saves residents angst regarding quality of life and future property values. The language in the ordinance coordinates with Master Plan language, recognizing mining as an Industrial use. This subject hadn't come up until the Sewer District in Tahoe wanted to put a commercial gravel mine in East Valley and many residents spoke out against it. If this ordinance had been in effect, it would've been obvious that the operation had no place in the proposed location and the owners may need to seek rezoning if they want to continue.

Dan Mrvos attended the Board of County Commissioners meeting, stating that his family has been in Nevada since 1907 and worked in the mining industry. He supports mining as well as agriculture as part of the tradition of Nevada. He also supports this ordinance and doesn't see it as interfering with agriculture activities; instead, it sensibly defines mining as an industrial activity. He grew up in Pittsburgh, which was considered the most industrialized place in the US, and the zoning regulations kept the industrial plants away from the residential areas. The East Valley gravel pit, known officially as the Buckeye Creek Reservoir Project was never brought to an official vote and the system worked only when you consider the huge public outcry.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

Will Adler, Silver State Government Relations Firm, representing his client, Sue Parker, stated that he understood the problems that residents have with industrial projects located in their back yard; however, that is not the situation for his client. She has an existing mineral right which was developed into a mine in the 1990's but closed on the death of her husband. It is an existing mining operation on Forest and Range land, quite a distance from existing homes. He understood that this ordinance could be appropriate in some regards but could also be a red tape factory, if distances and/or exceptions were not taken into consideration. His client's mine is on a 40 acre FR property, over three miles from the nearest home or Single Family Residential property line. He supported some of the comments but feels the need to take into consideration other mining rights and existing mining claims. His client can't get rezoned as General Industrial because of the distance and the requirements for industrial zoning. Douglas County already has a Special Use Permit process in place to get approval on mining. He suggested that the year the mineral claims were found, the length of time the mine has been in existence and the distance from other zoning areas should be considered for mountain distance mining operations.

Sue Parker stated that she and her sisters own a 40 acre parcel surrounded by BLM land. The Utopian Mine, Hard Rock Mine and Delaware Mining District are all on their property, which has been in existence for 150 years. Her family worked the Utopian Mine, with her husband being the driving force of the mine until his death. The family is still working the mine in a limited fashion. She is asking for accommodation to keep using the mine without being required to apply for a zoning change.

Woody Worthington, president of the Farm Bureau, thanked Ms. Martin for her comments but believed this ordinance is just one step away from personal property rights. He was concerned that residents would see commercial trucks that move dirt and think they were part of a mining operation. He advised consulting with the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, as well as revising the ordinance to reflect 100 acres or more.

Tony Cresamono stated that he was in favor of the ordinance for all of the reasons stated by the District Attorney.

Russell Scossa owns a ranch with the borrow pits mentioned by Ms. Moss. He suggested a distinction between ownership vs leasing. He clarified that one cubic yard is equal to one bucket load from a backhoe. He asked that the Commissioners reconsider the amount of material that could be moved.

Jim Slade commended Staff for their presentation today and at the recent Board of County Commissioners meeting. He felt the current ordinance is too liberal in where it allows mining operations and this proposed ordinance seeks to tighten up the regulation in order to protect the well-being of the residents. Mining operations anywhere near residential developments spoil the rural character with the truck traffic, dust and noise. Mr. Slade highlighted Land Use Policy 2.4 and 2.7 from the Master Plan as important indicators to where industrial scale mining locations should be limited. This ordinance requires that the land be appropriately zoned in order to protect public safety and welfare.

Karen Durso thanked the Board for considering this common sense legislation that will benefit all Douglas County residents. She also thanked Ms. Moss and Ms. Martin for their comments on

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

the agricultural community. She felt it was the Board's responsibility to protect the environment and to keep Douglas County open and rural, which this ordinance codifies, reassuring homeowners. Aggregate is currently imported into the County at a reasonable price so not having a local gravel source doesn't mean that the industry will come to a halt. She requested support for this ordinance.

Public comment closed.

Member Madsen mentioned that this ordinance came forward because of the Tahoe Sewer District and the abuses. He felt that Mr. Scossa brought up a good point and asked that they consider changing the amount to 1000 cubic yards per 100 acres, which is a more reasonable number.

Ms. Martin clarified that Member Madsen was referring to Section 20.660.070, the Definition of Mining, and 20.668.090 Exemption from Reclamation Plans, making the change to 1,000 cubic yards per 100 acres per year.

Member Madsen stated that in response to Sue Parker, he felt her property is so removed that there's no impact to the surrounding areas. It's not reasonable to make her go through the process to be zoned industrial. He sees the need to put some distance into the ordinance, perhaps a mile or so. She should be exempted because she is so far removed and dealing with the Bureau of Land Management in regard to mining is an experience in itself. A distance exemption of at least a mile shouldn't affect the residents. He also agrees with Mr. Slade that the impact fee is long overdue.

Ms. Martin underscored that the mining ordinance wouldn't apply to any federal claims on BLM land as they retain jurisdiction for their land. In regard to the property around the BLM land, there was discussion at the Board meeting to possibly increase the noticing requirement, however, that was not brought forward to this meeting. Watersheds were also taken into consideration with the distance requirements, covering the possibility that a uranium mine, for example, wouldn't be opened next to a watershed area.

Member Madsen emphasized that he thought three miles was excessive.

Ms. Moss responded to the comments of Ms. Parker regarding the Utopian Mine; two owners digging and testing is allowed if meeting the 1000 cubic yards per year. The code applies when the condition changes from digging/testing to becoming a viable commercial use.

Ms. Martin agreed that is the purpose of the ordinance. The hobbyist, the geologist, or the recreationist is considered separate from a junior exploration company doing drilling. An exploration company needs to be fully insured in order to protect neighboring landowners who might have water or soil issues due to more invasive drilling. The hobbyist mining, if not commercial, would be sustained under the threshold of 1,000 cubic yards. Staff is concerned about the fly-by-night mining operations that might not have insurance and then have a chemical spill that trickles down into agricultural land.

Member Brown asked if \$1 million dollars was enough insurance if there was a chemical spill.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

Ms. Moss answered, no, that is why the proposed change to \$2 million dollars.

Ms. Martin interjected that there are four agencies in Nevada that oversee mining operations and it is possible that one of them could have a higher insurance requirement, in which case, Douglas County would defer to that agency.

Member Brown questioned if there were currently any areas zoned General Industrial.

Ms. Moss replied that there are two General Industrial zoned sites in Douglas County. One is off Airport Road and the other is on Timber Court off Sawmill Road; both have Industrial Land use and General Industrial zoning. She reminded the Commissioners that nothing is rezoned General Industrial and all General Industrial land use requires a General Industrial zoning. If a property owner wanted to move forward with a mining use on their land, they would first have to do a Master Plan Amendment and Zoning Change, then the Board and Staff would determine if it was an appropriate use for that surrounding area, and finally, the owner would apply for a Special Use Permit. If findings were not made, the proposal wouldn't move forward.

Member Brown asked what protection was in place for existing residential areas near the current industrial areas.

Ms. Moss answered that the land uses surrounding the current General Industrial areas are already industrial or agriculture and each proposal would be considered on a case by case basis.

Vice-Chairwoman de Knijf stated that she lives two and a half miles from the Bings Pit on Kimmerling Rd. and can hear what's going on there on a quiet morning.

Member Davis mentioned the change of the threshold of 1,000 cubic yards per 100 acres, wondering if there would be issues with smaller agricultural parcels and if the amount should be made proportionate.

Ms. Martin reminded the Commission that there is a catch-all exemption that allows for infrequent nature or minor surface disturbances. In such cases, the property owner can email the director to inform them for courtesy purposes. In regards to Mr. Scossa's comments regarding owning/leasing land, the proposed threshold of 1,000 cubic yards is per each parcel; however, Member Madsen's suggested amount of 1,000 cubic yards per 100 acres per year is probably more generous.

Chairwoman Pross asked if the Commissioners were in agreement to make the change to 1,000 cubic yards per 100 acres per year.

Ms. Martin confirmed that the change could be made when they recommend to the Board.

Chairwoman Pross asked if they could change the motion.

Ms. Martin answered yes.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

Cynthea Gregory, Deputy District Attorney, confirmed that four votes are required for the motion to carry, since Member Godecke recused himself.

MOTION to recommend adoption of Ordinance no. 2017-1492 to the Board of County Commissioners based on the ability to make the required findings. If deemed appropriate, further recommend revising ordinance No 2017-1492 to expand the exception to the definition of “mining” to allow 1,000 cubic yards per 100 acres per year within agricultural and forest and range zoned districts, and expand the reclamation plan exemption to allow non-commercial prospecting and extraction in amounts of 1,000 cubic yards per 100 acres per year.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Jo Etta Brown, Board Member
SECONDER:	James Madsen, Board Member
AYES:	Brown, de Knijf, Madsen, Pross, Davis
RECUSED:	Godecke
ABSENT:	Noyes

2. For Presentation Only. Review and discussion on Amendments to the Master Plan Elements including amending all existing chapters, as well as the creation of new chapters, and other related matters. No action will be taken on this item. (Candace Stowell)

To review documentation regarding Item 2, please see Board Packet.

Candace Stowell, Wells Barnett & Associates, presented the remaining Elements for the Master Plan Update; Economic Development; Parks & Recreation; Public Facilities; Public Safety; Implementation; the Washoe Tribal Lands Element was not included in the Draft as the consultant was unable to gather information from the Tribe.

Economic Development Element: Ms. Stowell presented Focus Areas; Douglas County Average Annual Employment by Industry, 2016; Douglas County Average Annual Wage by Industry 2016; Location of Industrial Zoning in Douglas County compared Light Industrial acreage to Service Industrial and General Industrial; Business Parks and Industrial Zoning in the Airport and East Valley Community Plans; Industrial Zoning in Gardnerville and Minden Community Plan; Industrial Zoning in Gardnerville Ranchos Community Plan; Industrial Zoning in Topaz Ranch Estates / Holbrook Junction Community Plan; Economic Development Issues & Opportunities; Goal, Policies and Actions.

Goal 1, a new goal, creating a better synthesis with the existing focus areas of the Economic Development Program; no actions associated with this goal.

Goal 2 is an existing goal, to emphasize the importance of “place”; all actions were updated.

Goal 3 is new, creating a better line up with existing focus areas, specifically on industries; all actions were updated.

Member Madsen was displeased that agriculture was not separated in the industry information but lumped in with mining. Agriculture is a separate item and residents need to know how many people are employed in agriculture. He would like to see that addressed. Also, he was interested to see that the industries with the most employees receive the lowest compensation, which is way out of balance. He disagreed with Commissioner Dave Nelson when he said “if you can't afford

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

to live here, then move” at a Board of County Commissioners meeting. Member Madsen foresees very little construction in the near future, due to the recent hurricanes and feels the Housing Element will be seriously impacted, anticipating a 10-20% cost increase in materials. This is a real problem that will restrict the economic development of our County.

Member Godecke asked if Ms. Stowell was working at Douglas County when the Business License proposal came before the County. Even though it has not been popular with the business community in the past, he anticipated it will probably be heard again. He asked if home operated businesses will be included.

Ms. Stowell confirmed that the Business License should include home locations, for example, child care, to make sure they are meeting safety requirements, etc. Any business activity that is run out of a home should be included.

Member Godecke asked if the Business License included rental properties.

Ms. Stowell answered, yes.

Vice-Chairwoman de Knijf remarked that rental property management is not considered a business and no Business License was needed.

Member Godecke affirmed that although it was part of the proposed business tax from the State at one time, rental property management and trusts were exempted by the Department of Taxation.

Vice-Chairwoman de Knijf maintained that a Business License was not required for managing your own personal rental properties.

Member Brown asked if there was a current tracking mechanism for why businesses leave the county, specifically restaurants.

Ms. Stowell answered that the restaurant industry can be fickle and hard. The Main Street Gardnerville program tracks when businesses enter and leave the town, but she wasn't sure if they surveyed owners.

Member Brown mentioned that when she was recently in Sacramento, she saw a pamphlet about Minden/Gardnerville in the hotel and wondered who put it together.

Ms. Stowell responded that the Visitors Authority publishes that information.

Member Brown commented that it missed some things she thought were important and felt perhaps we were not capitalizing on some things.

Chairwoman Pross added that she considered the Business License to be an extremely important way to find vulnerabilities in a business that could potentially produce a problem. She gave the example of her previous hometown in Illinois, which started a Business License program and

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

went from business to business to find out what was in the business community, discovering that they had a crematorium. She sees it as a benefit to businesses as well as the community; however, she didn't see it as an Action item in this Element.

Ms. Stowell clarified that it was discussed in the Economic Development and Public Safety Elements and is an Action item under Public Safety.

Member Godecke commented on the learning aspect of Policy/Goal 1, which had no action items, stating that he felt the Master Plan Update should address how we interact with Western Nevada Community College and suggest what classes would be appropriate for the future economic development in the County.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bill Chernock, representing Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce, stated that they were still compiling comments and would submit to them to staff. He sees this Master Plan Update as part science, part art/politics; he asked that they keep a consistency across the Elements. If something is said in the Economic Development Element, it needs to be backed up in the Housing Element. He recognized the truth to Member Madsen's comments regarding the possible change in housing costs due to the recent hurricanes. In regards to the Business License fee, he recognized the health and safety concerns and wondered about the possibility of bouncing information from the Secretary of State's website to the County.

Jack Jacobs declared that he pays almost \$1,000 annually in Business License fees to the State of Nevada on businesses that might generate \$10,000 in a year, which is a difficulty. If a Business License were approved, he doesn't want any more fees.

Jim Slade considered it important to encourage a curriculum that would help with economic development at Douglas High School and Western Nevada Community College. He agreed that we need to capitalize on the outdoor recreation opportunities; in that regard, the Fay-Luther trailhead parking needs attention. It is on Forest Service land, which is not the County's responsibility, but as an act of good faith, suggested occasionally patching potholes. He was concerned with Redevelopment areas, as they take revenue from other uses. There is some talk in the county that the Redevelopment area in Genoa has outlived its usefulness and should be ended. He wondered where the money for the Casino Redevelopment area would go if the convention center was not built. The \$37 million dollars in that fund is worth considering.

Public comment closed.

Chairwoman Pross asked if a State Business License had already been obtained by a business, could their information be included in the Douglas County listing through the Accela software that is being introduced to Community Development.

Ms. Stowell said that the details would have to be worked out.

DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017

Parks & Recreation Element; Ms. Stowell presented Park Acreage in Douglas County Graph by type; Listing of Regional Parks; Community Centers in Douglas County; Issues & Opportunities; Goals, Policies and Actions.

Goals are the same as previously given in the Master Plan; minor changes were made to Policies, no interest in specific actions from the Parks and Recreation Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Slade felt it was appropriate that River Fork Ranch be included in the list of Park and Recreation facilities, especially as it contains half of the park acreage in Douglas County and is due to the generosity of the donors, Bill & Judy Sturgis. Although its status is categorized as Developed, it consists of only a small parking lot and interpretive center, with 800 acres not developed. It is an important part of the open space for Douglas County. He supported suggestions for the trails plan and mentioned again that the Fay- Luther parking lot needs improvement. Road biking is popular in Douglas County but flooding is still a concern at corner of Fairview and Fredericksburg Roads and needs to be improved.

Public comment closed.

Member Godecke asked if they had identified a funding source for Parks & Recreation in Douglas County.

Ms. Stowell answered that it is complicated. She was focused on the Regional Transport Commission (RCT) but could include information on the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) and Sales Tax revenue.

Member Godecke agreed that it would be helpful to know where funding is coming from and identify other funding sources for the future.

Public Facilities and Services Element; Ms. Stowell focused on Water, Wastewater, Solid Waste, Schools, and Libraries, as other services are being included in the Public Safety Element. Presentation included Providers; Coverage by General Improvement Districts; Water Systems; Water Systems in Carson Valley; Gardnerville Water Company Service Area, Major Water Systems in Topaz Region; Major Water Systems in Tahoe Basin; Wastewater Service Providers; maps of Wastewater Service Areas in the Carson Valley Region; Minden-Gardnerville Sanitation District, Tahoe Basin; Septic Systems in Johnson Lane Community Plan; Current Operations for Solid Waste (mandated only in towns); Douglas County School District, School Capacity vs. Actual Enrollment; High School Graduation Rates in Northern Nevada; Douglas County Library District; Issues & Opportunities; Goal, Policies and Actions.

Goal 1 remained the same, adding Action 1.1, the Dig Once Policy for underground telecommunications infrastructure.

Goals 2 and 3 remained unchanged with no associated actions.

Goal 4 remained the same, adding Action 4.1 to consider the idea of adopting impact fees, which are limited by State law in where the revenue can be used.

Goal 5 included minor edits to the goal and revised Actions 5.1-5.4.

Goal 6 included minor edits to the goal and revised Actions 6.1-6.5.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

Goal 7 remained unchanged with no associated actions.
Goals 8-10 remained unchanged.

Ms. Stowell reminded the Commissioners that the challenges ahead for Public Facilities are not due to growth but to reaching capacity, required upgrades and meeting State, Fire and environmental regulations. The School District and Library have plenty of capacity but a lot of capital needs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Slade took issue with the statement that Public Facilities won't be affected by population growth. He spoke about water needs vs. ground water supply and the ability to provide. He preferred to focus on infill, stating that there is no need to expand the current urban service boundaries. He was glad impact fees will be considered and would like more information on what those funds are allowed to be used for.

Public comment closed.

Ms. Stowell confirmed that she will provide more specific information about the allowed uses of impact fees by state regulations. Setting up an impact fee structure is very complicated and it's necessary to consider the effect of additional costs on housing.

Member Godecke mentioned that the handout from Minden-Gardnerville Sewer District was unreadable and it would be good to have a readable copy.

Member Brown asked if impact fees usually include schools and libraries.

Ms. Stowell answered that you cannot set up impact fees for school systems; parks, streets and drainage are allowable uses for those funds.

Mimi Moss, Community Development Director, referenced page 130, Financing for Public Facilities, which gives a good idea of what impact fees can be used for. The County Manager is reviewing state law and impact fees in regards to the feasibility study, to know what can be charged and for what reason.

Public Safety Element; Ms. Stowell presented the Public Safety Overview which is a new Element for this Update; East Fork Fire Protection District; Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District; Public Safety Facilities Map; Douglas County Sheriff's Office; Crime Rate through 2015; Violent Crimes vs. Property Crimes graph; 911 Calls; National Hazards-Floods; Flood Hazard Zones in Carson Valley and Topaz Regions; Significant Wildland Fire Loss History; Wildland Fires in Pinenut and Topaz Regions Map; Evacuation Routes; Issues and Opportunities; Goals, Policies and Actions (many have moved from other sections into this new Element).

Goal 1 is unchanged; Action 1.7 and 1.8 were added, adding East Valley Road to the capital improvement program to provide an evacuation route in case of a flood and install and/or replace missing stream gauges to maintain early warning systems for the community.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

Goal 2 is new with Action 2.1, to establish a Business License permit process.
Goals 3 and 4 are unchanged with no associated actions.
Goal 5 is new with Action 1.1 which comes from the 2013 Hazard Mitigation Plan.
Goal 6 is new with Actions 6.1 and 6.2.

Chairwoman Pross noted that Action 1.8 shows up as Action 3.8 in the Commissioners packet.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Slade repeated that the County's highest priority should be protecting the health and safety of the public. That brings him back to Redevelopment, which takes money from other uses. The School District and Fire Chief are very aware of how much funding they lose to Redevelopment. It is always a tradeoff and contrary to priority-based budgeting. Projects should be prioritized and budgeted for, rather than come from Redevelopment monies.

Public comment closed.

Member Madsen looked at the evacuation routes and asked why we are spending money protecting idiots.

Member Godecke referred to Action 1.2, pointing out that irrigation ditches and canals belonging to the agriculture community are being used to protect from floods. The agricultural community feel they should be exempted from the utility fee since they are doing the work and providing that infrastructure.

Member Brown noted that earthquakes were not included in the list of natural hazards.

Ms. Stowell remarked that they will be including updated GIS maps. Earthquakes are a national hazard that is discussed in the Hazard Mitigation Plan and will be highlighted better as they update this information.

Mimi Moss, Community Development Director, noted Public Facilities Action 6.2, thinking that it was a duplicate of an action item in the Airport section. The Transportation Plan was considered by the Board but not adopted; it shows the evacuation routes but some adjustments may need to be made to the map as the information has been updated.

Chairwoman Pross agreed that earthquakes should be included in the list of natural hazards.

Member Brown asked if there had been any discussion about the need for additional first responders.

Ms. Stowell replied that both agencies would like to hire more employees or have more volunteers. East Fork Fire Department is now an independent board so they will be looking at where they can increase career fire personnel.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2017**

Member Brown asked if the number of inmates per day in the Douglas County jail was just Douglas County or if the number included Carson City inmates.

Ms. Stowell responded that she didn't know the answer to that. She also mentioned that some of the actions have been on the books for a while in regards to storm water, but may not be necessary if they are addressed with the new Storm Water Board. In addition, she noted that the City of Reno pays for ditch companies to maintain ditches, so they are better prepared for a flood event.

Implementation Element; Ms. Stowell presented the 2016 Master Plan Action matrix.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Slade addressed the four Actions listed in the Growth Management portion of the Implementation Matrix; the County should develop key indicators to monitor the impacts of growth, especially in regards to water and traffic; provide input for the annual CIP; the Open Space Acquisition Program could have enough support at this time; the Transfer of Development Rights Program, which is well intentioned but should not be the driving force for development. Public Facilities Action 4.1, the implementation of impact fees is a good idea.

Public comment closed.

Ms. Stowell confirmed that a 2/3 majority vote would be required to approve the Implementation Matrix. They will provide analysis for public and staff comments that come in after today's meeting and provide that information to the Commissioners before the meeting on October 10, 2017.

Chairwoman Pross thanked Ms. Stowell and Community Development staff.

RESULT: FOR PRESENTATION ONLY

PLANNING MATTERS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:15pm.

Respectfully Submitted:

Approved:

_____/s/_____
Margaret Pross, Chairwoman

_____/s/_____
Kathleen Schmidt, Deputy Clerk