

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Board of Supervisors was scheduled for 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, August 3, 2017 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Mayor Robert Crowell
Supervisor Karen Abowd, Ward 1
Supervisor Brad Bonkowski, Ward 2
Supervisor Lori Bagwell, Ward 3
Supervisor John Barrette, Ward 4

STAFF: Nick Marano, City Manager
Adriana Fralick, Chief Deputy District Attorney
Kathleen King, Chief Deputy Clerk
Cheryl Eggert, Deputy Clerk

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the Board's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the Clerk, during the meeting, are part of the public record. These materials are available for review, in the Clerk's Office, during regular business hours.

1 - 4. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INVOCATION, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
(8:30:23) - Mayor Crowell called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Ms. King called the roll; a quorum was present. Calvary Chapel Pastor Pat Propster provided the invocation. Mayor Crowell led the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT (8:32:28) - Mayor Crowell entertained public comment. (8:32:57) Sheriff Ken Furlong expressed appreciation for everyone who participated in and attended the recent National Night Out event. He commended Deputy Lisa Davis on, once again, coordinating an excellent event. Mayor Crowell commended Sheriff Furlong and his staff.

(8:35:15) Public Works Department Director Darren Schulz introduced Transportation Manager Lucia Maloney. Ms. Maloney provided background information on her family and education, and discussed her work philosophy.

(8:38:46) Hope Tingle advised of having "read with great amusement ... the article in the Wednesday, July 26th *Nevada Appeal*," and expressed objection to "referring to the citizens of this community as average and unable to make these kinds of decisions ..." She expressed disagreement that "people with planning or engineering background would be better suited for a position on the Planning Commission." She expressed the opinion that "recreational marijuana use for adults ... is not as horrific as maybe people are making it out to be, given the opioid abuse epidemic going on." With regard to the Planning Commission position, she advised of a 10:00 a.m. meeting and that she may not be able to participate in the interview process. She suggested that Supervisor Bonkowski consider abstaining from participating in the interview process based on his possible prior or future business dealings with one of the applicants.

(8:44:55) Olcese Waste Services Owner Tillio Olcese provided an overview of his business. He requested the opportunity to bid the contract for waste services in Carson City at the appropriate time.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting

Page 2

(8:46:11) Carol Paz advised of having been asked by Bud Southard, of the Quail Run Senior Resort Community Homeowners Association Board of Directors, “to represent the residents.” Ms. Paz advised of having recently circulated a community petition, which resulted in a “92%” opposition to the zoning change. “8% of the residents were opposed to signing or just wanted to remain neutral.” Ms. Paz responded to questions of clarification, and described the location of the community. She read a prepared statement into the record, as follows: “We, the undersigned residents of Quail Run, disagree with not only the zoning change for marijuana distributors but disagree with permitting any businesses pertaining to marijuana cultivation, manufacturing, warehousing, and retail sales in this area. We believe that not only are our future home values compromised, but even more significantly are the three schools: Fremont Elementary, the Silver State Charter High School, and Seeliger Elementary, which are located within a short distance of the limited industrial zoning area. We would simply ask that you use wisdom for the community as you address this issue and we trust that you will.” In response to a question regarding the decrease in traffic on Fairview Drive, she expressed appreciation for the opening of the new freeway.

(8:50:23) Bill Johnston, a resident of Carson City, provided background information on his residence and his youth in Iowa. He requested the Board members “to take a common-sense approach. Let’s not be ... railroaded by the Tax Commission of this state and ... the Governor of our state into doing something that the residents of Carson City have said no to. I think it’s a teachable moment actually that, because of Clark County, the rest of the state had to follow suit. ... if this is not a teachable moment for keeping the Electoral College in place for the election of our president, I don’t know what is. If not for the electoral college, we would be ruled by New York and Los Angeles liberals right now. So, I urge us ... have we thought it through? Have we thought through what the impacts are? ... Do we really know what the impact is on enforcement of this law? People are supposed to smoke it in their homes. Now, is there anybody in this room that believes that that law is enforceable? I certainly don’t believe it with all the festivals and all the activities that Carson City has planned because of our new, wonderful Main Street and all of the social areas that we’ve created downtown for people to come to. Do we really think that it’s only going to be consumed in the home? And what about all this candy that’s going to go on sale? ... I don’t think we know ... what the impact of this is going to be, but I think that our neighbors to the south, in Douglas County, have taken a common-sense approach. They put a moratorium on it and I strongly recommend that we implement a one-year moratorium until we know exactly what it is we’re getting into with this recreational marijuana thing.”

(8:55:22) Elaine Briggs, a resident of Carson City, advised of having “read with interest the articles that have been in the paper ... on the recreational marijuana bill. My feeling is pretty much the opposite ... We did vote, as a state. We legalized marijuana in this state and, if we go with the other logic, then Nevada voted for Hillary Clinton. Why don’t we just make her president? That’s not how it works.”

(8:56:59) Monique Gerrone, expressed agreement with Mr. Johnston’s comments. She expressed the belief that “the people of Carson City did vote ... that we did not support the idea of marijuana being sold in Carson City even though maybe it’s legal ... I agree that there should be a moratorium and let’s tread a lot more lightly and much slower and see how things proceed and work out in Las Vegas. I know ... already that the guidelines and the laws that are in place in Las Vegas I don’t think are being adhered to and I don’t know what kind of enforcement is happening in Las Vegas. But I’m sure that the rules that are in place are not being followed. There are many people, such as myself, that have children. I have a 17-year-old son. I have a lot of ... friends that do not want marijuana to be accessible recreationally and the only reason that they’re not here to speak is because they work and Thursday morning is not a convenient time. ... I actually

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting

Page 3

took off from work so I could be here. I know it's a potential revenue source and it just sounds to me like that might be a big reason why this is going forward. ... I understand that that might be a good idea to get revenue for the City but I think it's just moving too fast." She discussed concerns over adverse impacts on the community, and reiterated "it's in direct conflict with what the people of Carson City said during the election." She suggested carefully reviewing statistics in Colorado and "other places and ... wait at least a year and tread a lot more lightly and slower before any decisions are made." Mayor Crowell entertained additional public comment; however, none was forthcoming.

6. POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - July 6, 2017 (9:01:30) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and entertained suggested revisions to the minutes. Mayor Crowell entertained a motion. **Supervisor Bonkowski moved to approve the minutes, as presented. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.**

7. POSSIBLE ACTION ON ADOPTION OF AGENDA (9:01:58) - Mayor Crowell entertained modifications to the agenda and, when none were forthcoming, deemed the agenda adopted, as published.

CONSENT AGENDA

(9:02:03) - Mayor Crowell entertained requests to hear items separate from the consent agenda. Supervisor Bonkowski requested to hear item 9(B) separately. Mayor Crowell entertained a motion to approve the consent agenda with the exception of item 9(B). **Supervisor Bonkowski moved to approve the consent agenda, consisting of items 8, 9(A), and 9(C). Supervisor Abowd seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Brad Bonkowski
SECOND:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
AYES:	Supervisors Bonkowski, Abowd, Bagwell, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

8. FINANCE DEPARTMENT - POSSIBLE ACTION TO ACCEPT THE REPORT ON THE CONDITION OF EACH FUND IN THE TREASURY, AND THE STATEMENTS OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, THROUGH JULY 21, 2017, PURSUANT TO NRS 251.030 AND NRS 354.290

9. PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS

9(A) POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF CRACK SEALANT, FROM MAXWELL PRODUCTS, INC., FOR A NOT-TO-EXCEED ANNUAL AMOUNT OF \$140,000, TO BE FUNDED FROM THE STREET REPAIR ACCOUNT; MAXWELL PRODUCTS HOLDS THE PATENT AND IS CONSIDERED A SOLE SOURCE FOR CRACK SEALING PACKAGING

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 4

9(B) POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF FW12 DIATOMACEOUS EARTH FILTER MEDIA FROM EP MINERALS, FOR A NOT-TO-EXCEED ANNUAL AMOUNT OF \$125,000, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2022, TO BE FUNDED FROM THE CHEMICALS ACCOUNT; EP MINERALS IS THE ONLY COMPANY WHICH CARRIES THIS SPECIFIC TYPE OF DIATOMACEOUS EARTH; THEREFORE, CONSIDERED A SOLE SOURCE (9:03:30) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and Purchasing and Contracts Administrator Laura Rader reviewed the agenda materials. Public Works Department Director Darren Schulz reviewed details of the proposed purchase. Supervisor Bonkowski expressed a preference to approve the purchase annually. Mayor Crowell entertained additional Board member questions or comments and, when none were forthcoming, public comments. When no additional comments were forthcoming, Mayor Crowell entertained a motion. **Supervisor Bonkowski moved to approve the purchase of FW12 Diatomaceous Earth filter media from EP Minerals, for a not-to-exceed amount of \$125,000, through June 30, 2018. Supervisor Abowd seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Brad Bonkowski
SECOND:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
AYES:	Supervisors Bonkowski, Abowd, Bagwell, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

9(C) POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE CONTRACT NO. 1718-048 WITH NEXLEVEL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, INC. FOR CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF THE PROPERTY TAX / CAMA SYSTEM, FOR A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF \$49,625, TO BE FUNDED FROM THE CAPITAL OUTLAY / SOFTWARE REPLACEMENT ACCOUNT, AS APPROVED IN THE FY 18 BUDGET

ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER ITEMS

10. ANY ITEM(S) PULLED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA WILL BE HEARD AT THIS TIME (9:03:25) - Please see the minutes for item 9(B).

11. PURCHASING AND CONTRACTS

11(A) POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY HARDWARE THROUGH JOINDER CONTRACT WITH INSIGHT PUBLIC SECTOR, THROUGH US COMMUNITIES CONTRACT #4400006644; CONVERGEDONE, INC. / CISCO THROUGH NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE PROCUREMENT OFFICIALS (“NASPO”) CONTRACT #AR233; DELL THROUGH NASPO CONTRACT #MNWNC-108; APPLE THROUGH NASPO CONTRACT #MNWNC-102; CDW GOVERNMENT LLC THROUGH NATIONAL INTERGOVERNMENTAL PURCHASING ALLIANCE (“NIPA”); AND SHI INTERNATIONAL CORP. THROUGH NASPO CONTRACT #ADSP016-130651, FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,000,000, FROM VARIOUS CITY ACCOUNTS, AS APPROVED IN THE FY 18 BUDGET (9:06:02) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and Purchasing and Contracts

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 5

Administrator Laura Rader reviewed the agenda materials and late material. Chief Information Officer Eric Von Schimmelmann reviewed details of the proposed contract. Supervisor Barrette requested a more detailed “breakdown” of City accounts, “especially the parts that come from general fund.” Mr. Von Schimmelmann explained “the reason ... I cannot define specific accounts is I have requests from every department across the City that they present to me ...” Discussion followed.

Mayor Crowell entertained public comment and, when none was forthcoming, a motion. **Supervisor Abowd moved to approve the purchase of Information Technology hardware, through joinder contract with Insight Public Sector through US Communities Contract #4400006644; ConvergedOne, Inc. / Cisco through National Association of Procurement Officials (“NASPO” Contract #AR233; Dell through NASPO Contract #MNWNC-108; Apple through NASPO Contract #MNWNC-102; CDW Government LLC through National Intergovernmental Purchasing Alliance (“NIPA”); and SHI International Corporation through NASPO Contract No. ADSPO16-130651, for an amount not to exceed \$1 million from various City accounts, as approved in the FY18 budget. Supervisor Bagwell seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
SECOND:	Supervisor Lori Bagwell
AYES:	Supervisors Abowd, Bagwell, Bonkowski, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Supervisor Barrette reiterated the request for additional detailed information in the future.

11(B) POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF VARIOUS VACCINATIONS FOR HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, THROUGH JOINDER CONTRACTS WITH GLAXOSMITHKLINE; MERCK SHARP & DOHME CORP.; AND SANOFI PASTEUR, INC., IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$304,531.00, TO BE FUNDED FROM THE HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES PRIVATE VACCINE AND VACCINE GRANT FUND ACCOUNTS FOR FY 2017 / 2018 (9:11:28) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and Purchasing and Contracts Administrator Laura Rader reviewed the agenda materials. Health and Human Services Department Director Nicki Aaker reviewed details of the proposed contract. Mayor Crowell entertained public comment and, when none was forthcoming, a motion. **Supervisor Bonkowski moved to approve the purchase of various vaccines for Health and Human Services, through joinder contracts with GlaxoSmithKline; Merck Sharp & Dohme Corporation; and Sanofi Pasteur, Inc., in the total amount not to exceed \$304,531.00, to be funded from the Health and Human Services Private Vaccine and Vaccine Grant Fund accounts, for FY 2017 / 18. Supervisor Bagwell seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 6

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Brad Bonkowski
SECOND:	Supervisor Lori Bagwell
AYES:	Supervisors Bonkowski, Bagwell, Abowd, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

12. CITY MANAGER - POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPOINT ONE MEMBER TO THE CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A TERM THAT EXPIRES JUNE 2021 (9:13:58) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and invited Hope Tingle to the meeting table. (9:14:31) Ms. Tingle responded to questions regarding her interest in serving; proposed amendments to the City's development standards; review of the current development standards; and the method by which to make decisions under the City's current development standards. Ms. Tingle acknowledged having read the City's development standards. She responded to additional questions regarding the method by which to render objective versus personal decisions; her opinion of how Carson City should look in 20 years; and her opinion of updating the City's master plan. Mayor Crowell offered Ms. Tingle the opportunity to comment further, and she discussed her concerns relative to various aspects of the community. Mayor Crowell thanked Ms. Tingle for participating in the interview process.

(9:34:37) Mayor Crowell welcomed Garrett Lepire to the meeting table. Mr. Lepire responded to questions regarding his interest in serving; his opinion of the role of planning and zoning in urban development; his opinion of updating the City's master plan; and his opinion of how the City should look in 20 years. Mr. Lepire acknowledged having "read through" the City's development standards. In response to an additional question, he discussed proposed amendments to the City's development standards. Mayor Crowell offered Mr. Lepire the opportunity to comment further. Mr. Lepire thanked the Board for the opportunity to interview, and requested their consideration.

(9:42:29) Mayor Crowell welcomed Betsy Strasburg to the meeting table. Ms. Strasburg responded to questions regarding her interest in serving; her thoughts on the role of planning and zoning in urban development; and proposed amendments to the City's development standards. Ms. Strasburg acknowledged having reviewed the City's development standards. She responded to additional questions regarding her objectivity; her opinion of how the City should look in 20 years; her opinion of the need to update the City's master plan. Mayor Crowell offered Ms. Strasburg the opportunity to comment further. Ms. Strasburg reiterated her interest in serving, and requested the Board's consideration.

Mayor Crowell entertained discussion of the Board members. Following extensive discussion, Mayor Crowell entertained a motion. **Supervisor Bagwell moved to appoint Hope Tingle to the Carson City Planning Commission for a term that expires June 2021. Supervisor Abowd seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 7

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Lori Bagwell
SECOND:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
AYES:	Supervisors Bagwell, Abowd, Bonkowski, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Mayor Crowell recessed the meeting at 10:07 a.m., and reconvened at 10:23 a.m.

13. FINANCE DEPARTMENT

13(A) POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE APPLICATION TO REMOVE THE UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE SPECIFIED IN THE APPLICATION FROM THE RECORDS OF THE AMBULANCE FUND, FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$311,081.31, IN UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE (10:24:00) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and Chief Financial Officer Nancy Paulson reviewed the agenda materials. Mayor Crowell entertained Board member questions or comments and public comments. When no questions or comments were forthcoming, Mayor Crowell entertained a motion. **Supervisor Abowd moved to approve the application to remove the uncollectible accounts receivable specified in the application from the records of the Ambulance Fund, for a total amount of \$311,081.31 in uncollectible accounts receivable. Supervisor Bonkowski seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
SECOND:	Supervisor Brad Bonkowski
AYES:	Supervisors Abowd, Bonkowski, Bagwell, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

13(B) POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE INTERLOCAL CONTRACT FOR SELF INSURANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSULTING SERVICES, BETWEEN CARSON CITY, NEVADA AND DOUGLAS COUNTY, NEVADA FOR CARSON CITY TO PROVIDE CONSULTING SERVICES AT DOUGLAS COUNTY'S EXPENSE (10:25:15) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and Chief Financial Officer Nancy Paulson reviewed the agenda materials. Mayor Crowell entertained Board member questions or comments and public comments. When no questions or comments were forthcoming, Mayor Crowell entertained a motion. **Supervisor Bonkowski moved to approve the First Amendment to the Interlocal Contract for Self-Insurance and Risk Management Consulting Services, between Carson City, Nevada and Douglas County, Nevada, for Carson City to provide consulting services at Douglas County's expense. Supervisor Bagwell seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 8

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Brad Bonkowski
SECOND:	Supervisor Lori Bagwell
AYES:	Supervisors Bonkowski, Bagwell, Abowd, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

13(C) POSSIBLE ACTION TO ACCEPT THE AUDIT COMMITTEE’S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECTS FOR FY 2018, TO INCLUDE GRANTS INTERNAL CONTROL TESTING; LARGE PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS REVIEW; IT SECURITY REVIEW; PERFORMANCE METRICS VALIDATION; PUBLIC GUARDIAN FOLLOW UP; ONGOING INTERNAL AUDITOR SERVICES; AUDIT FINDINGS VALIDATION; AND FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE PROGRAM COORDINATION (10:26:28) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item. Moss-Adams LLP Partner Mark Steranka narrated a Power Point presentation, copies of which were included in the agenda materials. Mr. Steranka responded to questions of clarification, and discussion ensued. Mayor Crowell entertained public comment and, when none was forthcoming, a motion. **Supervisor Abowd moved to accept the Audit Committee’s recommendations for projects for FY 2018, to include Grants Internal Control Testing; Large Public Works Projects Review; IT Security Review; Performance Metrics Validation; Public Guardian Follow Up; Ongoing Internal Auditor Services; Auditing Findings Validation; and Fraud, Waste, and Abuse Program Coordination. Supervisor Bagwell seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
SECOND:	Supervisor Lori Bagwell
AYES:	Supervisors Abowd, Bagwell, Bonkowski, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

13(D) POSSIBLE ACTION TO APPROVE AMENDMENT NO. 8 TO CONTRACT NO. 1112-133, WITH MOSS-ADAMS LLP, CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS, TITLED “INTERNAL AUDITING SERVICES,” TO INCREASE THE CONTRACT TERM FROM SEPTEMBER 30, 2017 TO JUNE 30, 2018, AND PERFORM THE CITY’S INTERNAL AUDIT FUNCTION FOR A NOT-TO-EXCEED COST OF \$110,000.00, TO BE FUNDED FROM THE INTERNAL AUDIT BUDGET ACCOUNT, AS PROVIDED IN FY 2018 (10:38:59) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item. Chief Financial Officer Nancy Paulson reviewed the agenda materials, and responded to questions of clarification. Mayor Crowell entertained public comment and, when none was forthcoming, a motion. **Supervisor Abowd moved to approve Amendment No. 8 to Contract No. 1112-133 with Moss-Adams LLP, titled “Internal Auditing Services,” to increase the contract term from September 30, 2017 to June 30, 2018, and to perform the City’s internal audit function for a not-to-exceed cost**

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting

Page 9

of \$110,000.00, to be funded from the Internal Audit budget account, as provided in FY 2018. Supervisor Bagwell seconded the motion. Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
SECOND:	Supervisor Lori Bagwell
AYES:	Supervisors Abowd, Bagwell, Bonkowski, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

14. PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - POSSIBLE ACTION TO DIRECT STAFF TO BEGIN THE PROCESS OF PURSUING A 20-YEAR BOND, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,875,000, TO SUPPORT STORM WATER CAPITAL EXPENSES AND A ONE-TIME STORM WATER RATE INCREASE OF THIRTY PERCENT, TO SUPPORT THE DEBT SERVICE ON THE BOND AND TO PROVIDE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT (10:41:16) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and Utility Manager David Bruketta reviewed the agenda materials in conjunction with displayed slides. Mr. Bruketta responded to questions of clarification. Supervisor Bonkowski clarified “this is the initial rate increase to be able to fund these immediate projects. There will be, I believe, additional rate increases ...” Supervisor Bonkowski advised of having received email correspondence requesting culvert maintenance in the area of Goni Canyon, and complaints of rate increases. “... just to go on the record with this, we can’t have it both ways. In order to do the maintenance that we actually need to do for the storm drain system, we need more revenue to do that and I see that that’s where we’re going to be going with this. Finally, this item ... is requesting money to do projects. It’s not addressing the issues for the underlying storm drainage rate system which is where the problem is.” Supervisor Bonkowski requested “that we continue to meet, as we have been, to work on the solutions to the rate system prior to the rate study that Dave mentioned that should be coming up in about 18 months. Actually, by the time we get to that rate study, I’d like to have most of these solutions vetted so that we can match them up at that time and have a program ready to go at that time.”

Supervisor Abowd concurred, and advised of having received email correspondence “from folks that are concerned about the storm water rate increase and the inequity of how that is laid out. ... I think it’s time that we re-look at it based on low-impact development ..., some credits for that, ... and broaden our categories in terms of how we bill.” Supervisor Barrette commented, “This might not be the perfect solution but it’s the solution we’ve got so we’re probably going to go with it.” Supervisor Bagwell advised of having received email correspondence requesting the Board to “find another way.” She advised of having assured the citizen that the Board, the City Manager, and the Finance Department staff, “don’t go to a fee increase first. ... We are very cognizant of the community’s ability to pay and ... a fee increase is the last place that we go.” Mayor Crowell commended the comments, and expressed agreement with reviewing the rate design. He suggested that the rate design studies consider a method by which to ameliorate “some of the hardship that’s going on out there ...” Supervisor Abowd advised that she and Supervisor Bagwell are working to develop such a method.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 10

Mayor Crowell entertained additional questions or comments of the Board members and, when none were forthcoming, public comment. (10:56:50) Maurice White discussed concerns regarding projects 13 and 17. “We do have an issue there in that ..., in particular, project 17 stops at Bunch [Way]. We have a very serious problem at the intersection of Carmine and Sherman. I realize there’s not a lot of detail here because we are at the high level getting it together.” Mr. White encouraged the Board to direct staff to review projects 13 and 17, “and include that intersection.” He provided background information “on what has happened there over the years.”

Mayor Crowell entertained additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, a motion. Supervisor Bonkowski advised of having heard from other Nichols Lane property owners and of having indicated he would discuss the issues with Public Works Department staff. **Supervisor Bonkowski moved to direct staff to begin the process of pursuing a 20-year bond, in the amount of \$4,875,000, to support storm water capital expenses and an initial storm water rate increase of thirty percent to support the debt service on the bond and to provide maintenance support, and to continue with regular meetings to discuss improvements or solutions to the underlying rate system. Supervisor Bagwell seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Brad Bonkowski
SECOND:	Supervisor Lori Bagwell
AYES:	Supervisors Bonkowski, Bagwell, Abowd, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Mayor Crowell recessed the meeting at 11:04 a.m., and reconvened at 11:09 a.m.

15. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, PLANNING DIVISION

15(A) POSSIBLE ACTION TO INTRODUCE, ON FIRST READING, AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO MARIJUANA; AMENDING TITLE 18, ZONING, OF THE CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, TO ESTABLISH VARIOUS PROVISIONS TO ALLOW MARIJUANA RETAIL STORES AS A CONDITIONAL USE WITHIN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL AND GENERAL INDUSTRIAL ZONING DISTRICTS LOCATED WITHIN CERTAIN AREAS OF CARSON CITY; TO ESTABLISH VARIOUS PROVISIONS TO ALLOW MARIJUANA CULTIVATION ESTABLISHMENTS, MARIJUANA PRODUCT MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS, AND MARIJUANA TESTING LABORATORIES AS A CONDITIONAL USE WITHIN THE GENERAL INDUSTRIAL AND GENERAL INDUSTRIAL AIRPORT ZONING DISTRICTS LOCATED WITHIN CERTAIN AREAS OF CARSON CITY; TO ESTABLISH VARIOUS PROVISIONS TO ALLOW MARIJUANA DISTRIBUTORS AS A CONDITIONAL USE WITHIN THE LIMITED INDUSTRIAL, GENERAL INDUSTRIAL, AND GENERAL INDUSTRIAL AIRPORT ZONING DISTRICTS; AND TO REVISE CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS CONCERNING LAND USE AND SITE DESIGN GOVERNING MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS TO INCLUDE MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS (11:09:40) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and read into the

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 11

record a prepared disclosure statement relative to items 15(A), (B), and (C). Mayor Crowell advised that he would participate in discussion and action on each of the three items. Supervisor Bonkowski read into the record a prepared disclosure statement, and advised that he would participate in discussion and action on each of the three items. Mayor Crowell entertained additional disclosures; however, none were forthcoming.

Community Development Director Lee Plemel provided an overview of items 15(A), (B), and (C). He explained that all three items “would establish all the regulations pertaining to marijuana establishments and, further, in the Title 4 ordinance, it would rescind the moratorium.” Mr. Plemel reviewed the agenda materials pertinent to item 15(A) in conjunction with displayed slides. Deputy District Attorney Dan Yu responded to questions of clarification.

Supervisor Abowd reiterated her position that the same rules which apply to medical marijuana should apply to adult-use marijuana. “That would include zoning ...” Supervisor Abowd inquired as to whether the Board can regulate the number of head shops. Ms. Fralick cautioned against straying from the agenda. Mr. Yu, Ms. Fralick, and Mr. Plemel responded to additional questions of clarification, and discussion ensued.

Mayor Crowell entertained public comment. (11:45:15) Bruce Kittess read a prepared statement into the record, expressing the opinion that “an affirmative vote by any of you ... confirms your contempt for federal marijuana law; your contempt for Carson City citizens who voted no on recreational pot; your contempt for our Sheriff’s recommendation to slow down.” Mr. Kittess expressed offense over the Board considering “a proposed zoning change to accommodate a federal, illegal drug and it’s another incremental encroachment to diminish the quality of life on our residential neighborhoods. ... The largest competitor to legal pot production and sale is the black market and it’s going to continue to thrive. It’s been here for 50 years. You can always get pot ... Now it’s going to be tax free no matter what you do ...”

(11:49:43) Former Supervisor Shelly Aldean read a prepared statement into the record, expressing passionate opposition to the zoning change. She expressed the opinion “this is ... the antithesis of who we are as a community. I’m also unhappy because I find myself at odds with people for whom I have enormous respect. It’s been one month since recreational marijuana sales began in Washoe County and, with the possible exception of one juvenile pot and booze party in Northridge, according to the Sheriff, he is unaware of any other criminal instance in Carson City with a direct link to marijuana sales in Washoe County. And, in fact, the source of the marijuana confiscated at the party, on July 3rd, has not been confirmed. This initial data undermines the premise behind zoning and recreational pot sales as a way of offsetting the negative impacts from sales in Reno. If you want a larger sampling of data, I encourage you, I implore you to extend the moratorium on retail sales at your meeting on August 17th until the end of the year so we can better evaluate the actual impacts of sales in Washoe County. Please don’t act precipitously because, as you all know, it’s impossible to unring that proverbial bell.” Ms. Aldean suggested that, based on the questions asked by the Board members and staff’s response, “we’re still grappling with definitional issues, with statutory issues. ... we’re not ready for prime time and ... doing anything prematurely puts this community at risk.” Ms. Aldean distributed copies to the Board members of a recently-released U.C. Davis study, and reviewed the same.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 12

Ms. Aldean suggested that “caution is the better part of valor. There are people in the community who expected none of this to occur until the end of the year and ... we do need to continue collecting data. I don’t think that the adverse impacts we were anticipating from Washoe County sales have come to fruition and ... we need to, in all things, be careful, studious, and meticulous before we make a decision that could have such a profound impact on the health of our community.”

Mayor Crowell acknowledged the struggle over the health and welfare aspect of recreational marijuana. He expressed agreement with Mr. Kittess’ comments regarding the “odd situation [of] ... a federal law that says one thing and a state law that says another. ... I struggle also with the fact that this law ... was an initiative petition. Initiative petitions have imprimatur of both petition clause of the First Amendment of the United States [Constitution] and Article 15 of the Nevada Constitution. And the vote in this community was 48 - 52 ...” Mayor Crowell noted that the initiative petition stated, in the official written opposition, that the “law doesn’t even allow for local opt-out provisions as Colorado did. ... Now we’re saying it does.” Mayor Crowell inquired as to what would allow the Board to “effectively, administratively, ... disenfranchise 48 percent of our community.”

Ms. Aldean inquired as to what allows the Board “to disenfranchise the remaining people in our community who voted against this ill-conceived idea of making recreational pot sales available. ... Obviously, there are other counties. Most of the counties in Nevada have opted out. There is an opt-out provision. We are not required to make zoning changes to accommodate the sale of recreational marijuana in the State of Nevada.” In response to a question, Ms. Aldean inquired as to whether the opt-out provision is precluded. “There’s nothing in state law that says it’s mandatory that we accommodate these recreational marijuana dispensaries.” Ms. Aldean responded to additional questions, and extensive discussion ensued. Ms. Aldean reiterated the opinion, “... this is premature. ... what I’d like this Board to do is to sit back, study the issue a little more thoroughly, make those technical changes, wait until some of the ambiguities in state statute have been resolved and see what happens over the ... next six months. ... to do [this] prematurely, especially when ... in our earlier discussions, the reason we were rushing to the finish line is because ... they’re going to start selling pot in Washoe County on July 1st and the world’s going to come to an end. Well, it hasn’t come to an end and, accordingly, I have the email from the Sheriff right here in my ... stack of papers, there has been no uptick in marijuana related crimes. So ... we’re basing it all on false premise. You’re still going to get ... revenues generated from cultivation and from manufacturing just not from retail sales, not now. Let’s take a look at the landscape in January and see where we are. I just am always an advocate for doing things in a careful and methodical way.”

Supervisor Abowd discussed concerns over regulation due to safety issues associated with home grows. Ms. Aldean suggested that home grows won’t stop “because there are people who want to control their own product, they don’t want to pay taxes on it. I think it’s a fallacious argument that somehow it’s going to prevent people from growing their own pot. I don’t think that will happen. And ... there have also been plenty of articles written about police officers getting shot, people breaking in to dispensaries to get their pot, ... armed people ... raiding cultivation sites. ... this is an incredibly slippery slope but I know that we only have control of our own little universe here in Carson City.” Ms. Aldean reiterated the request for the Board to wait until January.

Discussion took place regarding the zoning issue, and Supervisor Bagwell pointed out “it is against the federal law, our community did not support it, and the initiative petition did not eliminate the right of the local government to zone it out.” In response to a question, Supervisor Bagwell advised she would have

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 13

the same opinion if the vote on the initiative petition had been reversed. Mayor Crowell advised of having thoroughly reviewed the initiative petition over several months. He expressed agreement that there's a clause in the initiative petition that allows zoning. "But it ... doesn't say whether you have the right to zone out. Specifically, it doesn't say that. As a matter of fact, the Nevadans for Responsible Drug Policy ... specifically said the law doesn't allow for local opt-out. It doesn't. And people voted on that. ... people had that in their minds when they voted on this matter." Mayor Crowell inquired as to the specific zone-out provision. "The other end of that argument is there's a couple paragraphs on what you can do with zoning and what you can't do with zoning. And all I'm saying is show me where the law allows you to zone out. If you can't opt out, how can you zone out? I grant that there's going to be other arguments for that or against because I do think that, under our general health and welfare, you can zone out. I think you can do that otherwise we wouldn't be here. But where I struggle is this: this is a statewide initiative petition ... and I appreciate that other counties have done what ... they've wanted to do. That's fine. It's a statewide initiative petition that was circulated under Article 15 of the Nevada Constitution. It has a constitutional underpinning. It also has a constitutional underpinning under the petition clause of the First Amendment of the United States. Those are facts. And when we say ... Carson City didn't vote for it; therefore, zone it out. Well, that wasn't on the ballot. ... As a matter of fact, I'll repeat it again, it was very specifically said there was no way to [zone out]. That's what the opposition to this initiative petition said whether that's right, wrong or indifferent. To me, that's what the people had on their mind, or should have had on their mind, when they read this ballot initiative and all the arguments pro and con.

"Believe me, this is not easy for me because one of the first things I ever saw ... was zone it out. ... then I started thinking, 'Well, what does that mean ...?' ... in a sense, it comes down to ... we can use the health and welfare powers to zone out. I think you can do that. On the other side, there's a statewide initiative petition circulated, pursuant to First Amendment rights, that ... did not specifically say we could zone out; that actually led one to believe that you couldn't opt out and that, to me, is the rule of law. And so I think that ... which comes first for me? The rule of law in that situation or the health and welfare of the community? That's a difficult decision because what Shelly says is right. There's a lot of things that we don't know about marijuana and issues like that. I've had lots of discussions with folks. ... to a certain degree, you do reap what you sow. On the other hand, that same argument applies to now following the rule of law because if we start a slippery slope here, where does that end? Particularly when initiative petitions carry with them a heightened First Amendment right and we're an administrative body, not a judicial body and so it's difficult for me to say the rule of law or the health and welfare of our community allows me to somehow find that we can disenfranchise those who voted in favor of a successful statewide ballot question ... because we're taking away their First Amendment rights. It's an argument. I'm just saying I struggle with it ..."

Supervisor Bagwell stated that "everything I've been taught, through my whole life, is that ... you have to follow the federal ... law. So, ... just because the people said, I'm going to not follow the federal law? ... The federal law says no and we can write into our regulations something that says, 'Oh, by the way, we're not following federal law.' We write this great clause in there to protect us and say, 'If the federal government comes into Carson City, we're not liable. The guy that's selling the marijuana is liable.' But I don't get that either because, yes we are. We're saying it's okay. So just because we write a clause that says indemnify me and make me look not responsible. The federal law says no." Discussion followed.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 14

(12:22:00) Jim Hartman referenced Amendment 64 of the Colorado State Constitution, and advised it had “very specific opt-out language ... When ... the industry wrote the initiative in Nevada, they didn’t like that because 73% of the communities of Colorado opted out. So when ... the Marijuana Policy Project came in here and wrote an initiative that was circulated, they paid for it ... that initiative doesn’t have any language about opt out.” Mr. Hartman read a portion of the initiative petition into the record, as follows: “‘Localities are not prohibited from adopting and enforcing local marijuana control measures pertaining to zoning and land use for marijuana establishments.’ When we debated this with Mr. Adler, Mr. Adler said, on behalf of the proponents, ‘Any community can zone this out if this passes.’ That was the position of the proponents in the election of 2016.

“I am a strong believer that we ought to, at least, extend the moratorium out to the date at which time we thought marijuana would be available here commercially. In other words, when we passed Question #2, it talked about marijuana would be legalized on 1st of January 2017, and it would be commercially available no later than January 1, 2018. That’s what people voted on here. They didn’t vote for an early start program on July 1, 2017. And, in fact, I would ask people where did that come from? Where did we get early start ... And you know what the answer is? That was a creation of the Department of Taxation without any hearings, without any debate, without any vote, without any public participation at all. That’s a date, July 1, 2017, that came from Ms. Contine, who is the tax executive director. No vote of the Tax Commission. They never debated it ... and I would only say this: four days after early start began on July 1, 2017, four days later the Governor is issuing an emergency statement that ... there’s an emergency shortage of marijuana in Nevada ... It made headlines all across the country. Nevada has this marijuana emergency that’s been declared four days after early start began and I will tell you that the reason we have a problem ... is we haven’t gotten our ducks in order. The distribution piece in all of this had never been figured out and that’s why the state is in court. They lost on an injunction that they were enjoined for not giving to the alcohol distributors the exclusive right to be distributors of marijuana. That issue is still out there. It will be heard on the 6th of September.

“So this rush that we’ve got to get this stuff done immediately has really resulted in the problems we’re in today. And I would say to this body, please take your time here. There’s a lot still to be determined. And let’s go back, ... the Governor of Colorado ... went on television about two weeks before the November election and he said to people, ... in Colorado, we’ve had this for two and half or three years. I would urge people that have this on their ballot, wait awhile. Maybe it’s a year, maybe it’s two years, maybe it’s three years, but study what happens in Colorado before you rush headlong into going forward with marijuana. We didn’t take that advice. Our state officials didn’t take that advice. They’re so anxious to get some tax revenue and the medical marijuana industry is so anxious to begin to make some money, they will freely concede they can’t make any money in medical marijuana. They need recreational marijuana and they need it now and that’s why we were driving into a July 1, 2017 start to marijuana in this state.

“Final point ... is please read ... the Legalization of Marijuana in Colorado, the Impact. It’s 215 or 220 pages. It’s published by the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area. It’s a DEA spinoff. They report on the experiences in Colorado and I really think before you guys jump headlong into a ... September start date or a November start date or an August start date, I think you ought to read that. And I will also say ... I think you ought to also pick up the phone and start talking to people that have some authority in Colorado.” Mr. Hartman referred the Board members to Andrew Friedman, who was the “Pot Czar in Colorado. He is now a consultant ... for implementation ...”

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 15

(12:30:41) Bradley Harris, a resident of Carson City, advised of a background in “human resources, coaching, and neuroscience.” Mr. Harris expressed disagreement with previous comments “on a factual basis.” He disagreed with the “idea of an addictive personality.” He stated that the vote on the initiative petition “has absolutely no meaning in law. This was not an election held in a county. It was an election held in a state. ... it may inform us in that we have ... 52% of the people that went to the polls that day or over that time voted against. And we vote to make decisions and that decision is on a state level. What the county did has no meaning in the law so get off of it. It may inform your thinking but don’t tell other people that this is somehow important because it’s not. It is meaningless from a legal standpoint.” Mr. Harris stated that “zoning laws ... are not magic. The truth of the matter is that you can’t pass a zoning law and change the rule of economics. The rules of economics are about supply and demand. There’s going to be demand for this product and there’s going to be a supply for it so what this is all about is whether you want that supply and demand process to be regulated. I want it to be regulated.” In response to a question, Mr. Harris advised that there is neuroscience background to his statement about no such thing as an addictive personality.

(12:37:20) Linda McKenzie advised of having sent email correspondence to the Planning Commission with copies to the Board of Supervisors. She advised that she lives “on the border of limited industrial. I knew it was limited industrial when I bought the house. Of course, it was vacant at the time and it’s been vacant for nine years. Someone did buy it. They’re very nice. I have no problems but I look at that map and there are homes and residences around every single area of this limited industrial and I just don’t think it’s necessary to change that zoning so that a liquor distributor can distribute marijuana as well. It’s setting precedent ... if you’re changing the zoning to allow one person to do it. What’s going to stop the next company from coming in and saying ... I want to have a cement plant but I’m in limited industrial but I’ll just go and ask and they’ll change it for me. I don’t think it’s right to change it for one entity and I think there’s plenty of general industrial and I just don’t see the need for it. I don’t see the need to change it. I’m not asking you to vote no because you’re going to do what you want to do. I’m asking to take out that one line, limited industrial.” Mayor Crowell assured Ms. McKenzie that, based on previous discussion, limited industrial will not be included.

(12:40:32) Jay Aldean advised of having worked in city government for approximately 23 years. He is familiar with elected officials. He provided an overview of his educational and professional experience, and stated, “The money problem is fixable. It is. I don’t care if state says it needs money. That means it’s a budgeting process. I have been through years of budgeting processes. I know how they work. I have traded streets and roads and drainage facilities for fire trucks many times in my career and I understand the decision that you ... have to go through. It’s fixable and if you listen to what Shelly had to say, there are a number of alternatives. There are suggestions. If it takes me coming down to volunteer my time, I would be glad to help out in any budgeting process. And, after I retire which may come in a year and a half or two, I would be happy to volunteer that time to the City because this is my home. I love this community. It is my home. We are a family.

“The second point that I would like to make is that we need to take a wait-and-see attitude. We talked about that *ad nauseum*. If you recall, if you think back into your own personal experiences, perhaps many of you have children that have come to you and said ... I want the new iPhone 8. I need it for school. And what do you say? Well, let’s wait and see if you really do need it. Let’s see what happens. Let’s be patient. We told our children to do that and I think we need to do that as well. Nothing more to argue with.”

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting

Page 16

Mr. Aldean related personal stories from his career and from his childhood. He expressed disagreement with “the argument of regulation.” “If you can say with a clean conscience that you know you’re going to be bringing these people into our home, my home, and you can do that with a glad heart, well, I couldn’t look at myself in the mirror. ... I don’t care how you vote from the standpoint of calling you friends. You are all my friends and you will always remain my friends and I am very grateful to you for the work that you do.”

(12:48:14) Hannah McDonald, of Partnership Carson City, encouraged the Board to extend the moratorium. Ms. McDonald referenced a meeting with Supervisor Abowd and Mr. Marano and advised that “data is most effective when you have pre-data and you have post-data before an agent or a new substance is entered into the life. And we’re entering new substance into our life of Carson City. The reason for the approval of the moratorium is that we could get some post-data during the next few months and partner with City Supervisors, different agencies, and the dispensary owners that attended that meeting with us to gather effective data that will help with criminals or criminal justice systems for our juveniles, help within the schools for parents, so we can all get ... a base of what is going to happen in our community. We can bring more prevention dollars into our community. We can help with our dispensaries knowing what they’re really seeing going on in the community as they did positively express that they don’t want to have a negative impact. ... we appreciate that. With that said, we are just asking that you extend the moratorium so that we can collect some data, get that pre-data before we rush into anything. ... Because we work in prevention, we want to be able to hit the ground running when we start seeing some changes with our adolescents because we know that’s most likely going to happen but we’d like to be prepared.”

(12:50:37) Monique Gerrone provided an overview of her profession, and advised that her husband is a clinical psychologist who works in outpatient behavioral health. Ms. Gerrone discussed poor choices relative to alcohol and drugs which result in damage to individuals and their families. “These are the same people that would have more access to marijuana. These are the same people that would make those poor choices at home, be leaving edibles sitting around the table. Their teenage kids already are affected by their poor choices. Their teenage kids, their middle-school aged kids, their elementary school kids are seen by people like my husband, who is an outpatient clinical psychologist who comes home and tells me stories, keeping confidentiality, of course, ... and I would say way more than 50% of the scenarios are due to poor parenting. Poor choices made by the parents and, again, these are already people that are struggling, poor socio-economic status, people that Shelly was talking about that are already desperate in desperate circumstances, needing assistance, lack of support, all kinds of horrific problems. They don’t need another problem with having more access to marijuana. They’re already making horrific choices that are having horrific impact on their kids. More access to marijuana sitting around is going to have more horrific impact on those kids. It’s just going to increase the workload of all those social workers and behavioral psychologists out there and it’s going to have an increased negative impact on our community.”

Ms. Gerrone advised that addictive personality disorder is not found in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual “but it is freely used in the medical community. So ‘addictive personality’ is used by the doctors at the hospital ...” Ms. Gerrone pointed out, “You can’t put the genie back in the bottle. If you proceed with this, everything Shelly says, I see it at the hospital. My husband sees it in behavioral health and that’s why I just had to get up here to support everything that she said. It’s right on. You can’t put the genie back in the bottle.” Ms. Gerrone requested the Board to “reconsider what you’re doing. ... I don’t see what the big hurry is.”

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 17

Mayor Crowell recessed the meeting at 12:56 p.m., and reconvened at 1:05 p.m. He entertained additional public comment. (1:06:19) Kurt Brown, owner of Capital Beverages and Palladin, LLC, advised that his businesses are located in a limited industrial area. He provided background information on his residence and business in Nevada. He expressed the opinion that “a distributorship on an interchange in a City that has a major interchange is not the highest and best use for a distributorship. Common sense will tell anybody that. But for you to make an assumption based upon what you think somebody needs, based upon what is already there, is kind of presumptive of you, as individuals. The marketplace will dictate what goes around in a major interchange and it has to be the highest and best use.

“I find it ironic that people identify Carson City as a place that they want to live in. I love that they do, but I often find that when they come here, they want to change it to what they moved from because they don’t like some of the things that are in place here and have been in place for 50 or 60 or 70 years. I served on a committee, under Marv Teixeira, that did ... a study on the maximum population that Carson City could withstand with the present resources that they had. And that population was established by that committee at 75,000 people. It hasn’t reached that yet but there’s been a lot of growth between then and now. And I don’t know if that’s relevant today.

“I have been in the liquor industry for over 45 years. I do not have an addictive personality. I view the marijuana industry and the alcoholic beverage industry as having some common threads in its history.” Mr. Brown provided an overview of the Volstead Act. “There is no other industry that has been put out of business and put into business by an amendment to our constitution. ... Our industry that I’ve been involved in has ... were part of the invention of privileged licenses and that privileged license came out of the 21st Amendment because they wanted to regulate our industry and that product based upon what history had ... shown. And that was abuses by a lot of people, a lot of businesses, and a lot of other things that were involved in the prohibition and they thought they would change it by implementing rules and regulations that they incepted after the 21st Amendment was passed. Alcohol has been in business and out of business as marijuana has. Times change and our society goes forward based upon the history that it has learned or hopefully learned.

“My involvement in the marijuana industry is kind of an anomaly. ... as a marijuana distributor, [I] was not part of the medical marijuana rules and regulations. It came about by Question #2 and it specifically addressed it in Question #2.” Mr. Brown reviewed the application process for an alcoholic beverage distributor and for a marijuana distributor. “In most instances, government creates black markets by rules, regulations, and their taxing and licensing policies. And the cost they impose on legal businesses run prices up and, therefore, black markets exist. How do I know this? Look at markets such as cigarettes and alcohol that are still done today and marijuana that’s still done today, whether it’s legal or illegal ... I kind of resent lumping me in, as a distributor, with a grower, a producer, and a retailer. My office space for this distributorship for marijuana is probably no more than 30 square feet. I located it in a building that I presently own that Capital Beverages does business on. It’s not visible by the street or any drive-bys. It has no signage on it except what the Fire Department makes me put on there. But other than that, there was more traffic generated into my parking lot and out of my parking lot, on South Lompa Lane, by people who made wrong turns off of Fairview Drive or off the freeway ... My limited vehicles that will come in and out of that facility is 15 times less than that traffic that was generated by the freeway.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 18

“... I am part of the suit that’s in the Supreme Court today. We filed another suit against the department which we lost and Judge Russell ruled against us and that was about the Governor declaring an emergency for marijuana. And basically Judge Russell said ... that the Governor has a right to declare an emergency on anything he desires if it’s about collecting taxes and we were done.” Mayor Crowell clarified the state of emergency declared by Governor Sandoval.

Mr. Brown acknowledged that he was asking for marijuana distributors to be allowed in the limited industrial zoning district. “If you look at my situation as an individual, based on the testimony I gave on what that interchange looks like down there, ... what are you going to do with it?” Supervisor Barrette expressed an understanding for “both sides of this question.”

(1:20:10) Will Adler, of the Sierra Cannabis Coalition, advised that his clients are in their current zoning locations because of the medical marijuana program and they’re not changing those locations. He commended the Planning Division staff “on writing up how to implement a recreational sales program through our current medical marijuana dispensaries. You will have retail sales limited to two dispensaries. They must have a medical license and they must have a clean operations history and they do because they are currently inspected by your local law enforcement officers. One of them is here today. And they also are inspected by the state at the highest level. So they meet those requirements. Those are not being lessened. And I just want to point out that we have done what we could to reach out to the community. We’ve had meetings with Partnership Carson City. They’ve tried to come to agreements on, and they have, that they would like to be a partner in Carson City, not just selling marijuana there. So we will be moving forward with bringing educational material out that is approved by our local partners and to not just promote marijuana with our fliers, but to actually have educational statements on them to work with community members to do that and to even run it by Carson City for ... your approval for what we should be handing out at our stores. Because we don’t want to ruffle any feathers and we do want to be a positive impact on these communities.

“At the same time, I’ve heard hundreds of times, it’s all about the money and how it’s been pushed for ... Honestly, it wasn’t even us. I told everyone, even during the campaign, to expect to have recreational sales in January sometime. It was the Governor. It was a higher level power that said to meet a budgetary year you must be there July 1st ... That put the Department of Taxation in a position that was almost undoable. They had to do an emergency regulatory process to get here to this day that was extremely expedient but they did it. It was a full public process. We had the Governor’s Task Force. We had vetting. We had inputs from law enforcement, community members, all sorts of groups. So it has been vetted to that extent and right now we’re doing the permanent regulations and they’ve already been released for their first draft. Those will go to LCB and those will be finalized sometime in November / December. So the process is moving forward but it was not our will do it this quickly. It was above us but we’re trying to be there. We’re trying to meet you where you’re at and we’re trying to be a partner in Carson, not just another business. We know our position and we appreciate what’s been rendered here and it looks very amenable to us ...”

In response to a question, Mr. Adler stated, “We are on a weird time line here so the initiative that was passed by the voters in November declared January 1st, it’s legal to possess and use marijuana. It is currently legal to possess and use all the marijuana you wish in your home as long as you only have one

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 19

ounce at a time. So we're in a state where it is currently fully legal for everyone to use it. Carson City is in a position where, because we could approve on the temporary regulations, you could take out the biggest problem in marijuana which is home growing.

"... home growing is an unregulated bastion of marijuana consumption and growth where you're allowed to have six plants personally or 12 in the home, depending upon whether you have two or more people in the house. And that is the number one problem Colorado stated was home growers are unregulated. ... So that's why Nevada put in this radius effect" which he explained. In response to a question, Mr. Adler explained the differences between dispensing, distributing, and delivering marijuana. He responded to questions of clarification. (1:35:08) Mr. Brown provided additional clarification of a distributor's role relative to marijuana. Mr. Adler responded to additional questions, and discussion followed.

Mayor Crowell entertained additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, discussion of the Board members. Supervisor Bagwell inquired as to the rush "to do the retail. The law didn't say that was supposed to happen until January. The plants are already there ... that you're concerned about the home growing. They're already doing that. They've had the ability to do that. We haven't seen the Sheriff's Office come up and say, 'Look at all the home growing that's happening and all the detrimental impacts.' Why do we need to rush to the retail? Why can't we just leave that the way that the law said in January? Why do we have to rush now?" Supervisor Bonkowski stated, "The facts are that growing it now in your homes is legal and that creates a number of unacceptable issues for me. It's unregulated. It's unsecured. You can't tell a property owner how to take care of the interior of their house so if they create health issues that are going to affect the neighboring properties, it's the same arguments that we're hearing for not moving forward with commercial sales. But, again, it's exponential. There's an issue out there and we need to deal with the issue. We can do it today or we can do it in six months from now but we're going to have to do it and it's going to be the same arguments and the same comments six months from now. Nothing is going to change, between now and six months from now, with the possible exception of the verbiage in the final regulations that get distributed.

"There's been great points on both sides today but Bradley Harris made a very great point that I want to reiterate and that is that the basic tenet of democracy is that you have an entity that conducts a vote and there are people that are going to be unhappy with the results of that vote because they're not on the side that gets approved. And that is the situation that we have in Carson City. But it wasn't a local vote. It was a statewide vote. So we have people in Carson City that are going to have to remain unhappy with the results of the statewide vote but it doesn't matter because it's state law. That's the way democracy works. If you take that away from the process of democracy, then you have chaos and anarchy and we certainly can't go there. Because at what point do you stop that? So the state doesn't have to listen to the federal government. My preference would be that the federal government step up and tell us what to do here. ... They're not doing that. The locality doesn't have to accept what the state says. I don't have to accept what the City says. My kids don't have to accept what I say. Where does that stop?

"So ... we have a problem. We need to deal with it. I think the best way to deal with it is to regulate it, to be the driver, to make sure that we do this in the safest possible way. We are not voting on prohibiting marijuana. That needs to be very clear. It's legal. It's here. ... We've just got to deal with the problem."

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 20

Supervisor Abowd commended the points made by all the citizens, and expressed agony over this because of not having supported Question #2. She expressed reluctance over waiting to see, and concern that “our hospitals are inundated from surrounding counties as well. It’s an issue and if we don’t put in place our two facilities current for recreational sales, we do open up the door for home grow in Lyon County ... in Douglas County and in Carson. That I see as a serious issue. As Brad mentioned, it’s not regulated. There is no oversight for our youth. That bothers me as well. It’s of huge concern. And Andrew Friedman ... was one that spoke in this community and discussed the fact that regulation was primary. That is something that we have to do. As the capital city, I feel like we need to set a standard and I can’t bury my head in the sand and pretend it doesn’t exist. I wish it was not legal in our state but it is.”

Supervisor Barrette advised of having voted in opposition to Question #2 “because we really didn’t let our medical marijuana situation ripen. Medical marijuana actually is a good idea and it’s one that has been tarred with the opponents’ view that it’s just a stalking horse for recreational marijuana. Unfortunately, I think the industry has led us to believe that by virtue of their actions, though they don’t do it by virtue of their words. I’m still against recreational marijuana now so I tend to agree with what Lori said. I don’t have any problem with waiting a few weeks or months because I’ve observed, watching government all my life, that government has a tendency to do one of two things when it comes to ... timing or deadlines. They either hurry too fast or they drag their feet and go too slowly and that’s because we are caught in the middle between what 52% ... and 48% want. It’s very true what Brad and Bradley say. There’s no doubt about it. This was a state issue. We are having to clean up after the state. The state has not done the great job that the industry is saying. The industry has not done the great job that the industry is saying. ... these are just facts. The truth of the matter is we wouldn’t have this distributor problem if the law had been written with more. We wouldn’t be stuck with three years which I’m sure the industry wanted because they wanted to be able to roll out. There’s a lot of things about this that made me vote against it. Nevertheless, this horse was out of the barn years ago and this horse is going to continue running whether we do anything or not. I’ll be happy to wait until January if that’s what we decide to do. I do think, however, that if we’re going to go down this road as the majority has already indicated ... that we might as well just be honest about the situation. ... I don’t want it but I’m going to wind up getting it. I know that. So, I still don’t know how I’m going to vote on this in the final analysis but I don’t like the fact ... that we’re changing our medical marijuana zoning situation, which we determined after a long, hard process, because one distributor happens to have already been located where he’s located and now wants to go into another business. ... we’ve already talked about that. I assume we’re going to do something about it. I will vote when the time is called for me to vote and I’m not going to say now because I’m still making up my mind. It’s a tough one.”

Following discussion among the Board members and, in response to a question, Mr. Yu advised that the moratorium doesn’t have any applicability to the zoning ordinance. “That really relates more to the Title 4 ordinance that’s on the agenda for later discussion. The reason ... it doesn’t really have any applicability to the Title 18 ordinance is because state law ... already ... leaves the zoning authority to local government. So even in event of adoption of regulations on January 1st or earlier or later, the fact of the matter is it wouldn’t have any substantive affect on the Planning Commission’s authority to zone. So the moratorium issue ... has more to do with Title 4 business licensing regulatory framework at the local level. It doesn’t have anything to do with the zoning. ... just by okaying or approving, on first reading, the Title 18 zoning ordinance does not, in and of itself, make it so that a person is automatically approved to get a business a license. Two separate regulatory schemes. One deals with land use and zoning. One deals with business licensing. Different titles.”

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting

Page 21

Mayor Crowell entertained a motion. Supervisor Bonkowski moved to introduce, on first reading, Bill No. 118, an ordinance relating to marijuana; amending Title 18, Zoning, of the Carson City Municipal Code, to establish various provisions to allow marijuana retail stores as a conditional use within the General Commercial and General Industrial zoning districts, located within certain areas of Carson City; to establish various provisions to allow marijuana cultivation establishments, marijuana product manufacturing establishments, and marijuana testing laboratories as conditional uses within the General Industrial and General Industrial Airport zoning districts located within certain areas of Carson City; to establish various provisions to allow marijuana distributors as a conditional use within the General Industrial and General Industrial Airport zoning districts; and to revise certain provisions relating to development standards concerning land use and site design governing medical marijuana establishments to include marijuana establishments. Supervisor Abowd seconded the motion.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Brad Bonkowski
SECOND:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
AYES:	Supervisors Bonkowski, Abowd, Bagwell, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

Supervisor Bagwell explained her vote in favor of the motion. "This is a zoning issue, as was just discussed and so I want to participate because I already know where we're going to be going. And so I want to make sure it's zoned the best way that we can live with it." Mayor Crowell recessed the meeting at 2:04 p.m. and reconvened at 2:18 p.m.

15(B) POSSIBLE ACTION TO CONSIDER A BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT AND DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT BUSINESS LICENSE FEES PROPOSED FOR MARIJUANA RETAIL STORES AND MARIJUANA TESTING FACILITIES IMPOSE A DIRECT AND SIGNIFICANT ECONOMIC BURDEN ON SUCH ESTABLISHMENTS, OR DIRECTLY RESTRICTS THE FORMATION, OPERATION OR EXPANSION OF SUCH ESTABLISHMENTS, AND TO FIND THAT A BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT HAS BEEN PREPARED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH NRS 237, ACCEPTED, AND IS ON FILE WITH THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (2:18:40) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and incorporated the previously-made disclosures. Special Projects Planner Susan Pansky reviewed the agenda materials. Community Development Director Lee Plemel and Ms. Pansky responded to questions of clarification. Mayor Crowell entertained additional Board member questions or comments and, when none were forthcoming, public comment. When none was forthcoming, Mayor Crowell entertained a motion. **Supervisor Abowd moved to find that the proposed business license fees for marijuana retail stores and marijuana testing facilities do impose a direct and significant economic burden on such establishments, but do not directly restrict the formation, operation, or expansion of such establishments; that a business impact statement, submitted as late material, has been prepared in compliance with NRS 237, accepted, and is on file with the Board of Supervisors. Supervisor Bonkowski seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 22

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Karen Abowd
SECOND:	Supervisor Brad Bonkowski
AYES:	Supervisors Abowd, Bonkowski, Bagwell, Barrette, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

15(C) POSSIBLE ACTION TO INTRODUCE, ON FIRST READING, AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO MARIJUANA; AMENDING TITLE 4, LICENSES AND BUSINESS REGULATIONS, TO ESTABLISH VARIOUS PROVISIONS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF A BUSINESS LICENSE TO OPERATE AS A MARIJUANA CULTIVATION FACILITY, MARIJUANA PRODUCT MANUFACTURING FACILITY, MARIJUANA DISTRIBUTOR, OR MARIJUANA RETAIL STORE; TO REPEAL VARIOUS OTHER PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF A TEMPORARY BUSINESS LICENSE TO OPERATE AS A MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENT; AND TO REPEAL PROVISIONS ESTABLISHING A MORATORIUM ON THE ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS FOR A BUSINESS LICENSE TO OPERATE AS A MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENT (2:27:54) - Mayor Crowell introduced this item, and incorporated the previously-stated disclosures. Special Projects Planner Susan Pansky reviewed the agenda materials. Mr. Yu clarified that “for state licensing purposes, we’re talking about two different frameworks; two different types of regulations. Medical marijuana establishments, in existing law, ... don’t really relate to anything that the Board is doing today in either one of these two ordinances. An establishment has to go through the process to receive a ... certificate of registration. For the retail side of things for marijuana is a temporary business license, as approved by the Department of Taxation via its temporary regulations. At the local level, I believe that it is okay, especially in the context of us requiring a co-location concept.

“In other words, if you want to open up a retail marijuana store, you have to be co-located within the existing marijuana dispensary. That’s a policy call. That’s not something that is required by state law ... but it was a policy decision that was put forth before this Board in previous meetings ...”

Mr. Plemel advised that both Rise and Sierra Wellness have applied for their retail marijuana licenses. “Those are single entities. So, as a business entity, ... they’re going to do both so they can get a combination license from us so we have one business license that’s for a retail marijuana establishment and medical marijuana distributor’s license. The fees are across-the-board for all of the gross receipts for all things. ... if Rise and Sierra Wellness partnered in one location and one was doing medical and one was doing recreational, they are two entities, ... they could come get two licenses. We’re just trying to simplify it for them and us and let them come in under one license and submit one payment on a quarterly basis rather than to split it up. ... those sales are certainly tracked and taxed differently at the state level but ... that would not affect our collection.” Discussion followed.

Mayor Crowell entertained public comment. (2:27:43) Linda Lang advised that her last day with Partnership Carson City was last Monday. In reference to the previous discussion, Ms. Lang suggested it should “say something to a few of you up there as to why to wait until the 1st.” In reference to previous meetings, she stated, “Some of you looked us directly in the eye and said, ‘What’s the rush?’ and you didn’t

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 23

promise because I know you don't make promises up there but you did a gentleman's conversation with us indicating 'What was the rush?' and that we would wait until January 1st. On our end, what we have been doing here in Carson City is we have been good partners with our dispensaries, having the meetings as Will indicated to try to move forward on some of the educational campaigns ... we've done our part. I'm a little confused today as to why a moratorium is going to be lifted when we were promised working groups, we were promised conversations.

"The only thing I've heard today is one reason and that is so we don't have home grows. ... I'm not going to swear but I will say that that is baloney and I think we're really, really digging deep, deep in the well to try to find one reason to move this forward quickly. The home grows are not an issue in Carson City. They are not yet. We're not ready in the month of August. We only have four more months left in this year. That is not going to explode in those four months. If you go by what your gentleman's agreement was and to allow us to go ahead and wait until the state regulations are finished and we start in January."

(2:40:24) Partnership Carson City Executive Director Kathy Bartosz suggested "there was some misinformation given here earlier and that is a month ago, the meeting before last, you did hear premier service providers in this community and they did very clearly tell you they need more time. Those people were Ali Bannister, your Chief Juvenile Probation Officer. She wants more time. Chris Bayer ... he's now sort of the Director of CASA. ... certainly from his expertise, he should be respected. He asked you for more time. Richard Stokes, your School Superintendent has sat here three times and every time he asked you for more time. Nicki Aaker, your Health and Human Services Department leader, she asked you for more time. The Community Counseling Center, Diana, they're going to take a big hit on this. They need preparation. They asked you for more time. Lisa Lee was here. She was unable to stay because of the length of time but she went in for the record and said she needs more time. Joyce Buckingham, she said she needs more time. ... eight people. John Tatro has contacted several of you and said he sees a direct correlation between marijuana use and the more severe drug cases that they see. Their misdemeanor court needs more time. So I would like that noted in these minutes because they were also in the previous minutes from two meetings ago.

"I would also like to take a look at something that was said and Hannah very eloquently, very politely said to you that she met with two of the dispensaries along with Supervisor Abowd and Mr. Marano. And it was a good meeting. ... One thing that was said during that meeting was, first of all, this was very interesting that the dispensaries both said they were not all that in favor of recreational marijuana because of the conflict that it demonstrates with their current clients who do not like to be lumped in with recreational users. That's not who they are. They are patients. So they don't seem to be in any hurry. ... What you also heard in that discussion was they would be very, very interested in collecting data. ... Data takes time. They indicated they'd be willing to pay for it. She asked them ... how much do you think you could put out there? And they said, 'Well, how much would a good evaluation cost?' She said, 'Between \$70,000 to \$100,000.' That's what good evaluation takes, especially if you're not going to fast track and have it done by January. And they said, 'That's doable.'

"When are we going to do this if we have to have pre-data and post-data? We have to be able to say where we're at right now, what our kids are thinking right now in terms of the perception of harm and their availability to access this subject. That's the two things that implement kids-using raids. We need to get that data now and then compare it to after the dispensaries open. Wouldn't you like to see that data? I think I would like to see that data. I'd also like to see the impact statement. I'd like to see the proposed

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 24

impact statement from all of these people. ... I'm going to be unemployed here in another month. I'll be happy to do that. I will sit down. I'm good at this. I am good at this. ... I will go and I will sit down and I will talk to every single one of these people and I will get an impact statement from them on exactly what they're afraid might happen so that we can see it doesn't end up happening. We need that data. You guys don't want to hear Colorado data. ... So maybe you want Carson City data? We need that but we'll need a moratorium to do that.

"And the last thing I want to say is I've got to agree ... with what [Ms. Lang] said about home grows are [not] going to explode. Excuse me, but have you seen water bills? People are not getting into home grows because they can't afford the water. That's happening. ... I've been told this. ... So, no, that's not going to happen but also it mirrors the argument that I dealt with for years on underage drinking where parents say, ... 'Well, ... I'm going to have the kegger at my house because if we don't have it here where we can control it, they're going to be out there drinking without us knowing where they are. At least, if I have them here at my house, ... I can take the keys and make sure that they don't leave here inebriated and drive drunk.' Did we not love those parents? ... That's the same thing we're saying here.

"And let's also talk a little bit about the unintended consequences. Once we have medical marijuana here, guess what we've got going on now? The unintended consequences. We have a physician that got ran out of Fallon and is now doing business here in Carson City. The reason he was run out of Fallon was because he was over-prescribing opioids and was in illegal possession of an AK-47. So where is he now? He's in Carson City. He's opened up shop and every Tuesday he is here to give out medical marijuana recommendations. ... This is the kind of people that come into your community when you let something out of the gate a little bit too soon. What is waiting until January, what's the problem here? Look at these people in the eye and tell them you can't give them four months."

Ms. Fralick and Mr. Yu responded to questions of clarification, and discussion ensued. Mayor Crowell reopened public comment. (2:54:12) Jim Hartman reviewed reasons for leaving the moratorium in place until January 1st. (2:56:06) Will Adler clarified earlier discussion regarding pre- and post-data. (2:57:48) Linda Lang reiterated the request for the Board to consider "what was originally agreed upon." Discussion followed.

Mayor Crowell entertained a motion. **Supervisor Bagwell moved to introduce, on first reading, Bill No. 119, an ordinance relating to marijuana; amending Title 4, Licenses and Business Regulations, to establish various provisions for the issuance of a business license to operate as a marijuana cultivation facility, marijuana product manufacturing facility, marijuana distributor, or marijuana retail store that would be effective January 1, 2018; to repeal various other provisions relating to the issuance of a temporary business license to operate as a marijuana establishment; to repeal provisions establishing a moratorium on the acceptance of applications for a business license to operate as a marijuana establishment; and to allow the District Attorney's Office to make technical corrections and appropriate title changes. Supervisor Barrette seconded the motion.** Mayor Crowell entertained discussion on the motion. Supervisor Bonkowski stated, "I've said from day one that I felt that we should take our time to do this correctly meaning that, while Clark County and Washoe County were rushing to get their ordinances in place for facilities to open by July 1st, we were not going to do that; that we would go through our normal process which I believe that we have done which would allow the opening of facilities, basically around the first of September. So I feel like we've complied with what we said we would do. I can also see where the rest of the Board is going with this and I think that it is important that

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting

Page 25

we provide a united front so, though I don't necessarily agree with this decision 100 percent, I am going to vote for it because I do believe, at this point, ... we have to make a decision, we have to make a decision, and ... go forward." Supervisor Bagwell expressed agreement. "I'm adamantly opposed but we need to do the right thing together." Mayor Crowell entertained additional discussion on the motion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	Approved [5 - 0]
MOVER:	Supervisor Lori Bagwell
SECOND:	Supervisor John Barrette
AYES:	Supervisors Bagwell, Barrette, Abowd, Bonkowski, and Mayor Crowell
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	None
ABSTAIN:	None

16. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS NON-ACTION ITEMS:

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (3:09:43) - Supervisor Abowd requested to agendize discussion regarding the "limiting of head shops. ... If we're working forward on education ... and working hard to regulate, that's something that has to be regulated as well." Supervisor Bagwell requested to agendize a report on the school resource officer's grant.

STATUS REVIEW OF PROJECTS

INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

CORRESPONDENCE TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STATUS REPORTS AND COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS (3:10:24) - Supervisor Bagwell commended the Public Works Department on their recent open house event. Supervisor Abowd commended Cooperative Extension Educator Lindsey Chichester, RSVP, the Tractor Club, and all the participants who put on a "great county fair for Carson City." Supervisor Barrette commended the National Night Out event and the Parks and Recreation Department on the recently-installed park benches at Sonoma Park.

STAFF COMMENTS AND STATUS REPORTS

17. PUBLIC COMMENT (3:12:12) - Mayor Crowell entertained public comment. (3:12:20) In reference to his earlier comments, Maurice White advised that he had intended to reference the Carmine and Sneddon intersection. In response to a question, Supervisor Bonkowski advised that he is working with the Public Works Department on the storm water capital projects. Mayor Crowell entertained additional public comment; however, none was forthcoming.

CARSON CITY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Meeting
Page 26

18. ACTION TO ADJOURN (3:13:10) - Mayor Crowell adjourned the meeting at 3:13 p.m.

The Minutes of the August 3, 2017 Carson City Board of Supervisors meeting are so approved this 7th day of September, 2017.

ROBERT L. CROWELL, Mayor

ATTEST:

SUSAN MERRIWETHER, Clerk - Recorder